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THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

CORINTHIANS
INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. In the case of no book of the New Testament is it more essential to a true understanding of its language, that we should have a clear view of the circumstances under which it was composed, than in the case of 2 Corinthians. It is the most autobiographical of all St. Paul's letters, and it abounds in personal allusions, which it is difficult, at this distance of time, to appreciate, and of which some will probably always remain obscure. It glows with the heat of fervid life, and was evidently written under the influence of strong emotion. And, if we do not assign it to its true place in St. Paul's life, we are likely to miss a good deal of the force of its earnest and eager words. It is, therefore, desirable to enter into more detail as to the occasion of its composition than was necessary in the case of a treatise like the Epistle to the Romans, the arguments of which are largely independent of the circumstances of the author at the time when it was written.

2. In the nineteenth chapter of the Acts we find that Ephesus has become St. Paul's headquarters; the centre of interest has been shifted from Jerusalem and Antioch, and the Apostle's labours are being mainly spent upon Asia Minor. Corinth, however, occupies a considerable share in his thoughts; and, during the period of over two years which he spends at Ephesus, communications with the Corinthian Church are being carried on. It is the sequence of events during this period and the subsequent six months that we have to examine. Such an examination of the order in which events followed one another might be made without any determination of the absolute dates of any; but it is convenient to

See Hort, Judaistic Christianity, p. 98.
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indicate here the system of chronology which has been adopted. Provisionally, the dates assigned to the principal events of St. Paul's life by Mr. Turner will be taken as a basis for investigation. It is now pretty generally agreed among scholars that the dates formerly accepted, e.g., by Wieseler and Lightfoot, are two years too late; but this does not, of course, affect materially the accuracy of Lightfoot's conclusions as to the order in which the several incidents of the Apostle's career took place. Indeed, the scheme of reconstruction of St. Paul's history while at Ephesus, which has approved itself to the present editor, is in the main that put forward by Lightfoot, although his dates have not been followed. This scheme is not without difficulties; but it is dependent on fewer subsidiary hypotheses than any other which has been proposed, and it possesses special claim to consideration from the fact that it is an attempt to explain the documents as they stand without resort to the heroic measures of dissection which some critics have found it necessary to adopt.

3. I start, then, with the assumption that St. Paul's sojourn of over two years at Ephesus (Acts xix. 10) lasted from December, 52, or January, 53, to March or April, 55, and I proceed to examine his communications with Corinth during that period. The Church at Corinth had been founded by the Apostle on his second missionary journey, late in the year 50 (Acts xviii. 1 f.); but, all too soon after its foundation, it became apparent that the laxity of morals, for which Corinth was notorious, was showing itself in the lives of the Christian converts. Men do not easily shake themselves free from evil traditions and associations; and the power of the new faith took time to establish itself there as elsewhere. When the restraints imposed by the Apostle's presence were removed, various scandals betrayed the moral weakness of these clever Greeks who had welcomed the new teaching but a short time before. It would appear that while St. Paul was at Ephesus bad news reached him from Corinth as to the morals of his converts; and in consequence of this he paid to that city a brief disciplinary visit, of which indeed no account has been given by St. Luke, but which is alluded to in St. Paul's Epistles (see especially 2 Cor. xii. 21, where we are informed

1 See article "Chronology of N.T." in Hastings' Bible Dictionary.
2 See Biblical Essays, pp. 222, 274.
3 It is probable that the "three months" of ver. 8 is to be reckoned in addition to the "two years" of ver. 10; cf. τρία μήνες, Acts xx. 31.
4 On the Church at Corinth, see the first chapter of Prof. Findlay's Introduction to 1 Corinthians (vol. ii., p. 729 ff.).
that it was in consequence of the lax morality of the Corinthians that he visited them in grief).

4. The reasons for holding that this visit (which we shall call the "Intermediate Visit") took place are as follows. We have seen that St. Paul's first visit to Corinth is recorded in Acts xviii. Another visit is mentioned in Acts xx. 3, *viz.*, that which was subsequent to the two Canonical Epistles to the Corinthians, and which was in contemplation while he was writing both. Its date was 55-56. But it appears from 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, that this was his *third* visit;¹ and hence a visit to Corinth must have been paid between the years 50 and 55 (probably towards the end of the period, say in the autumn of 54), of which no account is given in the *Acts.*² It is all but impossible to fit in this visit if we do not suppose it to have been paid from Ephesus; and it would have been an easy matter for St. Paul to have undertaken this. Ephesus was only a week or ten days' sail from Corinth, and on the receipt of ill news it would have been the most natural thing in the world that he should thus cross the Ægean hastily to set matters right. It appears distinctly from 2 Cor. ii. 1 that this visit was a painful one, and such as he would not wish again to have experience of. And, further, the language of xii. 21, xiii. 2, suggests that the trouble which caused this Painful Visit was not faction or schism, but unchastity of life among his converts.

5. St. Paul thereafter returned to Ephesus and wrote, probably after no long interval, a letter which is now lost. It is mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9; and it contained, he tells us, injunctions to the Corinthian Christians "to keep no company with fornicators," injunctions (probably) suggested to him by what he had seen on his recent visit. That visit had been one of stern rebuke rather than of counsel; and it is quite intelligible that on his return he should desire to put in writing his deliberate advice. There is no indication that anything had happened up to this point which suggested the rise of schisms or of party spirit at Corinth. Indeed it may well have been that his visit, ἐν λόγῳ (2 Cor. ii. 1), was the proximate cause of the schisms with which the Church at Corinth was soon to be troubled; for the attempt to enforce discipline for lapses in morality

¹ This, indeed, has been denied by Paley (*Hora Paulina*, chap. iv., § xi.) and, recently, by Prof. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 275) and Dr. Robertson (*Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 494); but I cannot think that their explanations of 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, as alluding to a visit intended, but not paid, are satisfactory.

² The language of 1 Cor. xvi. 7, ὁ Θεός γὰρ ἐμὸς ἔρτο ἐν παρδέσ ζεῖν, seems to suggest that his last visit to Corinth had been a brief and hasty one.
would naturally stir up party opposition, and would stimulate disaffection on the part of the less stable members of the little community. The Lost Letter, then, consisted mainly of rules as to conduct, and was not concerned, so far as we know, with the question of schism, which had probably not yet arisen. Two other topics, however, it may have touched upon, viz., the Apostle's plans of travel and the collection for the poor Judean Christians. We must not lose sight of the fact that St. Paul's plans were in the main determined during these years by his purpose of making a collection to relieve the needs of the poorer converts in Judea and of bringing it in person to Jerusalem. Now, as to his plans of travel, it is plain that the route mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, and actually adopted in the sequel (Acts xix. 21), was not the route which the Corinthians expected him to take. At one time he had wished to travel from Ephesus to Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth—Jerusalem, a route which would twice give them the benefit and the privilege of seeing him while he was in Europe (2 Cor. i. 15, 16). This plan seems to have been communicated to them before 1 Corinthians was written; and it is obvious to suggest that it was announced in the Lost Letter. Again, it will appear (see § 7) from a consideration of the structure of the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians that the Corinthians in their letter which preceded it had asked for details about the manner in which the collection for the Judean Christians was to be made. In other words, they had already been informed by St. Paul that such a collection was being organised; and so we are led round to the suggestion that this information also was contained in the Lost Letter.

6. We now proceed with the history. Some time after the Lost Letter had been despatched bad news again came from Corinth, and this of two kinds. First, members of Chloe's household (οι Χλοης, 1 Cor. i. 11, cf. also 1 Cor. xi. 18) reported that factions had arisen, and that a Peter party and an Apollos party were setting themselves up in opposition to the party of Paul. Some indeed went so far as to call themselves, par excellence, the "Christ party" (1 Cor. i. 12). And, secondly, a rumour reached Ephesus that an abominable case of incest had occurred among the Christians at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 1). This was much worse than any of the moral lapses which the Apostle had previously rebuked in person or by letter; it was a wickedness

---

1 This is an argument which should not be overlooked for placing the Intermediate Visit before the Lost Letter, or at any rate before the First Canonical Epistle.
which even the heathen did not tolerate.⁰ About the same time
that these distressing reports reached Ephesus, a dutiful message
to St. Paul was brought from Corinth by Stephanas, Fortunatus
and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17). These envoys seem to have
brought with them a letter asking for advice on certain points of
conduct and discipline, viz., about Marriage, Celibacy, the use
of Idol-meats, the Gifts of the Spirit, and the Collection,² with each
of which the Apostle deals separately in his reply under a distinct
heading, beginning περὶ δὲ ... It is interesting, because so
natural,³ that the Corinthians seem to have made no mention in
their letter of the schisms and disorders which had arisen among
them.⁴

7. It was in consequence of the reports which had reached him,
as well as in reply to this letter of the Corinthian Church, that St.
Paul wrote the First Canonical Epistle. Of this the early part is
entirely taken up with warnings against schism (chaps. i.-iv.), and with
a stern rebuke for the sins of the flesh into which they had fallen,
and of which the Church had not taken cognisance (chaps. v., vi.).
The remainder of the Epistle is mainly occupied with the letter
of the Corinthians to him, taking up their points in order: περὶ δὲ ἐν
ἐγγύσει, καλὸν ἀνθρώπων γνωμένος μὴ ἐπεστραφή (1 Cor. vii. 1); περὶ δὲ
tῶν παρθένων (1 Cor. vii. 25); περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰσωλοθύτων (1 Cor. viii. 1);
περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν (1 Cor. xii. 1); περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας (1 Cor. xvi.
1). It thus appears, and it is important to bear it in mind, that
chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 Corinthians are of the nature of an appendix or
excursus, and that chaps. i.-vi. constitute the letter proper, as con-
taining the Apostle's special message to the Corinthian Church at this
juncture. His language in reference to the party spirit which was
manifesting itself is grave and uncompromising (1 Cor. iii. 12-15),
and he writes about his own position in a spirit of depression (1 Cor.

¹ See Cicero, pro Cluentio, 6, 15.
² Lewin (St. Paul, vol. i., p. 386) and Findlay (Expositor, June, 1900) have tried
to reconstruct this letter; but beyond the general fact that it dealt with certain topics
we have no data upon which to go.
³ See Paley, Hora Paulina, chap. iii., § 1.
⁴ Mention may be made here of an apocryphal letter of the Corinthians to St.
Paul and his supposed reply, which are extant in Armenian and in Latin. An
English translation by Lord Byron will be found in Stanley's Corinthians, vol. ii.,
p. 305. These letters do not correspond in any way to the lost correspondence
discussed above (1 Cor. v. 9, xvi. 17), and, although they were admitted into the
Armenian and Syrian canon, have no claim to authenticity or genuineness. They
were originally incorporated in the apocryphal Acts of Paul (see Sanday, Encycl.
iv. 11-13); but when he begins to speak of the bad living of his converts, and to comment on the shocking news which had reached him, his tone is one of severe and unsparing rebuke. He is astounded that such a scandal as has been mentioned to him (1 Cor. v. 1) should be endured for a moment, and he bids them excommunicate the offender at once (1 Cor. v. 5). In the Lost Letter he had warned them against associating with persons who lived impure lives, but now it has actually become necessary to rebuke them for tolerating the company of a man who is living unchastely with his stepmother (1 Cor. v. 1). They must "put away the wicked person" from among themselves (1 Cor. v. 13). It is their duty to "judge them that are within," and it is a scandalous thing that such wrongs as a Christian father endures when his son has robbed him of his wife should be brought for adjudication before heathen tribunals. The Christian community should exercise its own spiritual prerogative (1 Cor. v. 4), and decide such cases without the interference of heathen lawyers (1 Cor. vi. 1-7). The wickedness of sins of the flesh only appears in its true light when judged on Christian principles (1 Cor. vi. 15 ff.), and it is by these that the fitting punishment should be determined.

8. Such is the language and the drift of the body of 1 Corinthians. The allusions to the Passover feast (1 Cor. v. 7, 8, cf. xv. 20, 23) make it probable that it was written about Easter, and the year was, according to the system we have adopted, 55 A.D. This is a consequence of 1 Cor. xvi. 8, from which it appears that when it was composed it was St. Paul's intention to leave Ephesus after the ensuing Pentecost. Thus the letter was written during the last months of his stay at that city. Nothing is said as to the bearers of the letter; but 2 Cor. xii. 18 seems to indicate that Titus

1 The Roman law under which a prosecution for adultery would be made was the lex Julia de adulteris, passed by Augustus, 17 B.C. It is probable, however, that native Greek law would be enforced at Corinth. This also recognised adultery as an indictable offence; the damages allowed in any special case being assessed at the discretion of the judges.

8 The subscription in the received text states that it was written at Philippi; but this is a manifest mistake, probably due to a misunderstanding of the words Μακεδονιαν γαρ διδχομαι in 1 Cor. xvi. 5. Ver. 8 of the same chapter is conclusive as to the place of writing. This subscription further adds that the letter was carried to Corinth by the envoys Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus along with Timothy; but this again seems to be a misapprehension, although there is some justification in 1 Cor. xvi. 18 for the supposition that the envoys who had brought the Corinthian letter to Ephesus took back the answer (see above). For Timothy's movements see § 13 note.
and an unnamed brother (see note in loc.) were entrusted with it. This is confirmed by 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, passages which explain how St. Paul's grave anxiety as to the reception which the Corinthians would give to his letter of warning and rebuke was allayed by the news which Titus brought him about it (see notes in loc.).

9. I have already remarked that the directions about the collection to be made at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 1) were given in answer to enquiries on the subject sent by the Corinthian Christians, and presuppose that his correspondents were already sensible of the obligation which rested upon them of helping the poor brethren of Judaea. It is only the manner in which the collection is to be made that is now prescribed for the first time (Easter, 55). And we have also seen (§5) that the information as to St. Paul's plans of travel given in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 was such as to cause the Corinthians keen disappointment. He then announces that he will come via Macedonia, and that he may possibly winter at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 6). This plan was carried into effect. He left Ephesus about April, 55, shortly after the riot which was stirred up by Demetrius, and proceeded to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1) via Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12). Here he had arranged to meet Titus on the return of the latter from his mission to Corinth; but he was disappointed. We do not know how long he waited for Titus; but after an interval during which "a door was opened unto him" (2 Cor. ii. 12) he crossed over to Macedonia in much anxiety of spirit. At last they met at some undefined point in St. Paul's Macedonian tour of inspection (Acts xx. 2), not improbably at Philippi, as Neapolis the port of Philippi was the natural place of embarkation for Troas. Thus St. Paul would be likely to meet Titus at Philippi on his way to their rendezvous. Further, Philippi was a place where St. Paul

1 See, on this question, Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 280 f. Titus is mentioned nine times in 2 Corinthians, and evidently had a special interest in and connexion with Corinth. That his name does not appear in 1 Corinthians is no more surprising than that it does not appear in Acts. It is likely that it was the ability with which he conducted himself as the bearer of 1 Corinthians, and as St. Paul's representative at that critical moment at Corinth, that first marked him out as fit to be a leader in the Church.

2 Dr. Robertson says (Hastings' Bible Dictionary, vol. i., p. 493) that 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6 is "a passage totally out of correspondence with the situation presupposed in 2 Cor. i. 23. Moreover, in defending his change of plan (2 Cor. i. 15-23) St. Paul would not have failed to appeal to the clear statement of his intentions in 1 Cor. xvi. 5." I cannot understand where the difficulty comes in. The Corinthians took umbrage at the message of 1 Cor. xvi. 5; appealing to it would have had no point. St. Paul's line of defence is quite sound (see §12 below).
had many good and staunch friends; and it was a suitable centre from which to visit the Christian communities formerly founded by him. 1

10. Titus reported in the first instance that the Corinthians had loyally responded to the appeal made by St. Paul in 1 Cor. v. and vi. as to their treatment of the case of incest. They had taken the case into their own hands, and had punished the offender with extreme severity (2 Cor. ii. 6 ff.). They had gone so far in their zeal to assert the spiritual prerogative of the Church, in which St. Paul deemed himself to have an important share (2 Cor. vii. 12; cf. 1 Cor. v. 4, συναχθεῖτω ήμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος), that it was now desirable to offer counsels of forbearance (2 Cor. ii. 6 f.) rather than to inflame their indignation against the offender. The really important end which the Apostle had in view when writing 1 Cor. v. had been gained, vis., he had convinced the members of the Church that it was their duty to take cognisance of grave moral offences. Quite possibly the civil courts might have decided equitably as to the measure of the penalty to be inflicted for the δικαία; but the primary purpose of his sharp rebuke was not to secure due retribution in this particular instance (οὐχ ἔνεκεν τοῦ δικαίατος οὐδὲ ἔνεκεν τοῦ δικαίωτος, 2 Cor. vii. 12), although this was doubtless necessary, but to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church to pass judgment in all cases of moral lapse, as was its inherent right and privilege. The Church at Corinth was an Apostolic Church. It had been founded by St. Paul. Though "absent in body" he was "present in spirit" at the deliberations of its members (1 Cor. v. 3). And to vindicate the spiritual authority of the Church founded by him was, in effect, to vindicate his authority. Thus he can go so far as to say that the main purpose of his stern letter of rebuke (1 Cor.) was ἔνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθήναι τὴν σπουδήν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνέπτυν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor. vii. 12, where see note). To manifest their zeal for St. Paul's authority was to manifest their sense that Christian standards of living were widely different from heathen standards, and it was further to recognise that the Church has spiritual authority "to bind and to loose". In exhibiting their zeal for him, their founder, they had made clear their recognition of this great principle. If it be said that to read this into 2 Cor. vii. 12 is to go beyond the tenor of the words used, it must be replied

1 The subscription to 2 Corinthians, Πρὸς Κορινθίους Θεού τῷ Θεοῦ Φίλοις θεούς τῆς Μακεδονίας διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκᾶ, would be a confirmation of this conclusion, if any reliance could be placed on these colophons to the Epistles. See notes on 2 Cor. viii. 18, xiii. 14.
that St. Paul's language in the earlier letter sufficiently shows the
high spiritual authority which he would have the Corinthians attach
to the deliberate decisions of their assembled leaders. "In the
name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit,
with the power of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 4). The words "and
my spirit" indicate not only his sympathy for them, but his assurance
that the decisions to which such an assembly would be guided would
be even as the decisions promulgated by his own apostolic authority
which was "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus
Christ and God the Father". 1

11. The second matter which Titus reported was not so satis-
factory to St. Paul. Titus explained, as it would seem, that the
Corinthians were much distressed at the news that the Apostle's
plans of travel had been changed (2 Cor. i. 16, 17), and that they
were ready in consequence to impute to him instability of purpose
which amounted to fickleness. St. Paul's answer is found in 2 Cor.
i. 23, ii. 4. He did not carry out his former intention of crossing
direct from Ephesus to Corinth because he thought it better that
there should be a short interval, during which they might mend
their ways, before he again addressed them. His last visit (the
"Intermediate Visit") had been ζωτικος; and it was undesirable that
his next visit should be of the same character. So instead of visiting
them at once, he wrote a severe letter (1 Cor.), and proceeded to
Macedonia in the first instance, reserving his visit to Corinth until
they should have had time to profit by his written rebukes. In this
change of plan there was no display of fickleness; his one desire
was to edify them and to do what was best for their true welfare.

12. And, thirdly, Titus had no good news to bring about the
factions in Corinth, concerning which St. Paul had already written
(1 Cor. i. 12-18, iii. 1-6). When he despatched the First Canonical
Epistle he was already aware that his authority had been called in
question at Corinth, and that some were passing unfavourable judg-
ments upon his acts (1 Cor. iv. 3-5). Already he had bidden the
rebellious party not to be too ready to judge by the superficial appear-
ance of things, but to distrust their hasty conclusions about him
(1 Cor. iv. 5, 10-14). He had written mildly, but with authority, as
became an Apostle. "Be ye imitators of me" he had twice repeated
(1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1). And he had assured them that when he came,
as he certainly would come (1 Cor. xi. 34), to Corinth, those who had
ventured to rebel would be treated with severity, if they did not

1 Gal. i. 1.
repent (1 Cor. iv. 18-21). But Titus seems to have reported that the factious opposition to St. Paul's authority was even more bitter than it was before 1 Corinthians was written. The Apostle's postponement of his visit gave the malcontents courage to break out into open defiance (2 Cor. x. 10-12).

13. On learning all these facts from Titus, in part consoling, in part most distressing, St. Paul wrote the Second Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians, associating the name of Timothy with his own in the address at the beginning. The principal person entrusted with the carriage of the letter was, as was natural, Titus (2 Cor. viii. 17), whose former mission had been so prudently and honourably discharged (2 Cor. xii. 17, 18). With Titus were associated two

1 It will be convenient to state at this point the view of Timothy's movements which has been adopted. We learn from 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, that he was supposed by St. Paul to be on his way to Corinth when the First Canonical Epistle was written, and that the Apostle expected him to return to Ephesus with "the brethren" who were the bearers of that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 11). It does not appear that he was entrusted with any special mission to the Corinthian Church, the language of 1 Cor. iv. 17, "who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ," being suggestive rather of informal conference than of a formal embassy, and that of 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11 implying, as it would seem, that Timothy is to be welcomed at Corinth only as a passing visitor on his way back to the Apostle's side. Now it is natural to identify this journey made by Timothy with that recorded in Acts xix. 22, where St. Paul is said during the last weeks of his stay in Ephesus to have "sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus". Timothy had been associated with St. Paul on his first visit (about the year 50) to the cities of Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5), and he was evidently a suitable lieutenant to send in advance to prepare the way for the Apostle's second visit. Most probably the business of the collection in Macedonia was entrusted to him to organise. And the date of this journey of Timothy to Macedonia (January or February, 55) well agrees with the date which must be assigned to the journey referred to in 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10. The plan seems to have been to visit the churches of Macedonia (this, the important purpose of the journey, is all that is mentioned in Acts) and then to return to Ephesus by sea from Corinth (this, as the only point in the journey interesting to the Corinthians, is alone mentioned in 1 Cor.). Erastus, Timothy's fellow-traveller on this occasion, bore the same name as the city treasurer at Corinth, whom we find there about February, 56 (Rom. xvi. 23), as well as at a later period (2 Tim. iv. 20); and it is highly reasonable to identify him with this important member of the Corinthian Church, and to suppose that when we find him with Timothy he was on his way home. Timothy is also found at Corinth in St. Paul's company when the Epistle to the Romans was written (Rom. xvi. 21); but we have nothing to show us whether or no he had got so far during the preceding spring. It is on the whole probable that he found so much to do in Macedonia that he stayed there during the whole spring and summer of 55 (so Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 276 f.). At any rate we meet with him next in Macedonia (and probably, as we have seen, at Philippi) in St. Paul's company about the month of November, 55, when 2 Corinthians was despatched (2 Cor. i. 1).
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others, possibly Luke and Barnabas, but of their names we cannot be certain (2 Cor. viii. 18, 22, where see notes). The Epistle being despatched, St. Paul travelled slowly through Macedonia, arriving at Corinth in due course as he had promised (1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6), and staying there three months (Acts xx. 3). This period probably covered December, 55, and January and February, 56. In consequence of a Jewish plot he then returned through Macedonia instead of sailing direct for Syria as he had intended to do (Acts xx. 3); and starting from Philippi “after the days of unleavened bread” (Acts xx. 6), i.e., March 18-25, he arrived in Jerusalem in time for the Pentecost festival of the year 56.

14. The account which has been given above of the sequence of events during St. Paul’s sojourn at Ephesus assumes that the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians is the “Painful Letter” to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, 12; and it has been urged by several critics that it does not answer to the description there given.¹ The two allusions are as follows: “For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you” (2 Cor. ii. 4); and “For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it although I did regret; for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. . . . So although I wrote unto you, I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your zeal on our behalf might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God” (2 Cor. vii. 8, 12). It is said that “from beginning to end of 1 Corinthians there are no traces of anguish of heart and much affliction, either in utterances expressing these feelings or in the style of the Epistle itself”.² I believe that the passages which have been quoted in § 8 demonstrate the inaccuracy of any such assertion. Critics have strangely overlooked in this connexion the fact that chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 Corinthians are mainly taken up with answering the queries which his correspondents had put to St. Paul; and that the body of the letter proper is contained in chaps. i.-vi. It is in these earlier chapters that we are to look for traces of mental anguish and depression, and I hold that they are plainly there to be found, and that the note of identification afforded by 2 Cor. ii. 4 is answered by such passages

¹ E.g., this objection was raised by Klöpper (1870) and has been repeated by Waite in the Speaker’s Commentary, by Robertson (Hastings’ Bible Dictionary, vol. i., p. 494) and by Kennedy (2 and 3 Corinthians, p. 64 f.), as well as by others.
² Kennedy, loc. cit., p. 65.
as 1 Cor. iii. 12-15, iv. 11-13, v. 1-6, 13, vi. 5, 9-11. Had the structure of 1 Corinthians been sufficiently attended to, I cannot think that this objection would ever have seemed forcible. And so with 2 Cor. vii. 8. It has been urged against the identification of the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians that "it is scarcely comprehensible that St. Paul should have said, even in a moment of strong excitement, of so costly a monument of Christian truth as the First Epistle is, that he repented for a while of ever having written it".¹

But this is to exaggerate the measure of the Apostle's regret. He merely says (2 Cor. vii. 8) that for a moment he regretted having given them pain by what he had written, i.e., he regretted the severe sentences which he had penned; but not that he lamented the composition of the whole Epistle. The earlier part of the Epistle, which is, I repeat, the core of the letter, is extremely severe, and especially chaps. v. and vi.² In the phrase "the Painful Letter" there is, in fact, a latent fallacy. The language of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, would be sufficiently accounted for if any part of the letter to which he refers seemed to St. Paul (for the moment) to be unduly severe, or if any section of it had caused unexpected grief to the Corinthians.

15. An objection of a somewhat similar character is that the language used in 2 Cor. ii. 6-11 cannot be taken as referring to the punishment of the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1-5, inasmuch as the mild treatment suggested by St. Paul in the later Epistle would be quite inadequate to the offence.³ Not to dwell on the fact that unrelenting severity is not a Christian virtue, and that Titus may have reported some extenuating circumstances of which we know nothing, I believe that the considerations brought forward above in § 10 go a long way to break the force of this objection. The intimate connexion between the fifth and sixth chapters of 1 Corinthians has not been sufficiently recognised by commentators, and thus the primary purpose of St. Paul's message of rebuke has been misconceived. He was more anxious to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church at Corinth, and to prevail upon its members to exercise their powers of spiritual discipline, than to adjudicate between the wronged father and the offending son. Excommunication was the only suitable penalty for the latter's grave offence, but St. Paul had never meant

¹ Waite, Speaker's Commentary, p. 383.
² Compare also the great severity of the incidental remark in 1 Cor. xv. 2 δένται εἰς μὴν ἐκεῖνον ἐκτενέστερα. That he should suggest such a possibility shows how much he is depressed as he writes.
³ This is urged by Schmiedel and Jülicher amongst others.
to convey (although the Corinthians had misunderstood his counsel) that the ban could not be taken off by the same authority which had imposed it, if evidence of penitence were forthcoming. Indeed the identification of δ ἀδίκηςας in 2 Cor. vii. 12 with the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1 seems to be not doubtful when the language and purport of the earlier passage are considered. I have already pointed out (§10) that the aim of the Apostle in writing 1 Cor. v. and vi. was not merely that the offender should be excommunicated, but that the scandal of such a case being brought by Christians before a heathen court should be avoided. Consider, further, St. Paul's language. Some persons, he says (1 Cor. iv. 18, 19), "were puffed up" (ἐφυσωμένοι) as though he were not coming; i.e., they made little of his authority in his absence. The same word (πευσωμένοι) is used (1 Cor. v. 2) of the action, or rather the inaction, of the Christian community in reference to the case of incest; and in this matter he declares "Your boasting is not good" (οὐκ ἐὰν καὶ ἀπαίτητα ἡμῶν, 1 Cor. v. 6). That is to say, their αἰτία consisted in their resistance to his apostolic authority; they were "puffed up," and so they had not dealt with the offender as they would have done had they followed his teachings (1 Cor. v. 2). It is with reference to this that he says in the later letter, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐγραψά, ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοον ἐστε (2 Cor. ii. 9). Again, the sentence which he directs to be pronounced upon the offender is παραδώναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ἀπελθόν τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but when he bids them be merciful and forgive, his reason is ἵνα μὴ πλοεικηθῆμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ (2 Cor. ii. 11). The man was only "delivered over to Satan," εἰς ἀπελθὸν τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but care must be taken lest Satan rob the Church of his soul (2 Cor. ii. 11). The reference to Satan in the later Epistle is pointless, unless we bear in mind the tenor of the sentence in the earlier one. And there is another phrase perhaps worthy of attention. The offender is called δ ἀδίκηςας in 2 Cor. vii. 12, and the injured person is δ ἀδίκηταις. If we turn back to 1 Cor. vi. we find that the words ἀδίκειν and ἀδίκος (1 Cor. vi. 8, 9) are specially used of the carnal offences which St. Paul has there in view. The point of his rebuke in that chapter is that it would have been better for the offended father to have suffered wrong (ἀποστερεῖται; cf. for the force of this 1 Cor. vii. 5) than to have brought the matter before the heathen tribunals. And when St. Paul speaks of the Corinthians as having proved themselves in the end to be ἄγνοος τῷ πράγματι (2 Cor. vii. 11), the last words recall the ἀντὶ τῷ πράγματι of 1 Thess. iv. 6, where the reference is to adultery, the language used being strikingly like that of
1 Cor. vi. 8. There are also some other links connecting the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians which should not be overlooked. In 2 Cor. ii. 4 St. Paul is careful to explain that the letter which was written with tears was written ώθα ἵνα λυπηθῇτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνώτε ἣν ἐχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὅμας. It might be expected therefore that the Painful Letter should exhibit some trace of this overflowing ἀγάπη. And such a trace is conspicuously present in the last words of 1 Corinthians, ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (1 Cor. xvi. 24). No other letter of St. Paul's has so affectionate a farewell. It was plainly added for some special reason. But if we identify this letter with the "Painful Letter," 2 Cor. ii. 4 gives an excellent reason for its addition. And, once more, the reference in 2 Cor. iii. 1 f. to a former self-commendation which the Apostle had indited finds its best and simplest explanation if we bring it into connexion with 1 Cor. ix. 1 f.

16. Something must now be said about other schemes of reconstruction of the history which have been proposed by recent writers. It is unnecessary to rehearse them all, but the discussion of one or two of the most plausible may serve to bring the difficulties of the problem into clearer relief, and to supply tests by which the adequacy of the solution that has been adopted may be estimated. In England, the editor of 1 Corinthians in this Commentary, Professor Findlay, and Professor Sanday (not to speak of German writers) interpolate a second lost letter from St. Paul to the Corinthians between the First and Second Canonical Epistles. They hold it probable that the embassy of Timothy to Corinth via Macedonia (Acts xix. 22, 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10) succeeded so far as this, that Timothy reached Corinth, but that his mission was not a success as regards the healing of disorders there. In consequence of the bad report brought back by Timothy, St. Paul wrote a second lost letter and sent it by the more capable hands of Titus. It is the return of Titus from this mission which St. Paul awaited with such anxiety at Troas (2 Cor. i. 13), and the missive which Titus bore was the Painful Letter to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8.

---

1 An elaborate account of the various theories which have been propounded will be found in an article by Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie (1899), and a comparative table is given by Schmiedel in the Handkommentar, pp. viii, ix. Cf. also Jülicher's Einleitung for a good discussion.


4 On this hypothesis Titus was not the bearer of 1 Corinthians.
Another scheme agreeing with this, in so far as it refuses to identify the Painful Letter with 1 Corinthians, has recently been expounded by Dr. Robertson. This writer holds that after the despatch of 1 Corinthians by the hands of Titus, St. Paul changed the plan of travel announced in that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 5) and decided to take the route Ephesus—Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth, which would give the Corinthians a δυνάμει χαρᾶ; that painful news having been brought back by Titus from Corinth, the Apostle reverted to the plan announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, as he was unwilling to visit Corinth so soon under the circumstances; that he wrote a severe letter, now lost, of which Titus was again the bearer; and that it was on Titus' report of the result of this second mission that 2 Corinthians was written and entrusted to the same capable messenger.

17. On both these theories the same observation may be made at the outset. They are highly complicated. Quite apart in the one case from the assumption (for which there is no evidence) that Timothy reached Corinth and that his mission there was a failure, and from the assumption in the other case that the language of 2 Cor. i. 15 cannot be explained unless we suppose St. Paul to have changed his mind as to his route twice after the despatch of 1 Corinthians, both theories presuppose events and documents of which no historical trace has survived. Doubtless we must not assume that all the facts have been recorded; it may be necessary to introduce some hypotheses in order to co-ordinate the fragments of history at our disposal. Nevertheless, the theory which depends on the fewest hypotheses has the best claim to acceptance, provided that it covers the facts. Now the writers whose theories have been indicated in § 16 agree in interpolating a letter between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, which has utterly vanished out of knowledge. Such an interpolated letter was suggested by Bleek as long ago as 1830, and its actuality has been assumed by many critics since in Germany as well as in England. No doubt the phenomena may be accounted for by an artifice of this sort. We may put anything we please into a letter of which we know nothing; there is no way of proving our speculations to be wrong. But the necessity for so large an hypothesis must be glaringly evident before the hypothesis can be justified.

1 Hastings' Bible Dictionary, vol. i., p. 495, s.v. "2 Corinthians".

2 Dr. Sanday seems also to favour this idea of a double change of intention as to his route on the part of St. Paul (Encycl. Biblica, vol. i., p. 903). See § 16 above.
And it has not been proved, as we have seen (§§ 14, 15), that the "Painful Letter" of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, cannot have been the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians. It is upon this supposed impossibility that the whole edifice of theory rests, and the base does not appear—to the present writer at least—to be broad enough to bear the superstructure.
CHAPTER II.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Our discussion has hitherto taken for granted the unity of the Epistle (2 Cor.) with which we have to do. But this has been repeatedly questioned, and the arguments alleged in support of the composite character of the document require to be considered in detail. So far back as 1767 Semler urged that the Epistle could be resolved into three parts: (1) chaps. i.-viii. + Rom. xvi. 1-20 + chap. xiii. 11-13; (2) chaps. x.-xiii. 10; (3) chap. ix.; of which he held (2) to be posterior to (1). After a struggling existence the analysis attracted fresh interest when Hausrath in 1870 took it up in part and advocated the distinctness of chaps. x.-xiii. from chaps. i.-ix. Schmiedel (in the Hand Kommentar) defended this view in 1890, and Clemen has since adopted it, and indeed regards it as an established result of criticism. The theory has not had many advocates in England, but it has been vigorously supported by Dr. J. H. Kennedy in his work entitled The Second and Third Epistles to the Corinthians (1900). By no writer has the matter been more carefully and acutely investigated, and his arguments demand attention.

2. Dr. Kennedy’s view of the sequence of events during St. Paul’s stay at Ephesus is as follows: 1. Titus was sent on a mission to Corinth to preach and to continue St. Paul’s work (2 Cor. xii. 18) at some period after the Apostle’s first visit (Acts xviii. 1). 2. Lost Letter to the Corinthians. 3. Mission of Timothy to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 5). 4. 1 Corinthians written from Ephesus about April, 54. 5. St. Paul stayed at Ephesus because of the greatness of the opportunity there (1 Cor. xvi. 8). 6. He formed a fixed purpose of visiting Jerusalem with the offerings which were being collected (Acts xix. 21). 7. Bad news came from Corinth. 8. St. Paul accordingly paid a brief disciplinary visit

1 See Theologische Literaturzeitung, 22nd Dec., 1900; and cf. Clemen’s work entitled Die Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe.
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to that city. 9. On his return he wrote from Ephesus the Painful Letter, of which the end is preserved to us in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. 10. Mission of Timothy to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). 11. Mission of Titus to Corinth to subdue the rebels there. 12. On Titus' report of the success of his mission St. Paul wrote from Macedonia about November, 55, a letter of which we have the beginning preserved in 2 Cor. i.-ix., the rest being lost. 13. This letter was forwarded to Corinth by Titus and two unnamed companions, the bearers being entrusted also with the business of the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6). It will be recognised at once that this is a highly complicated scheme. Dr. Kennedy has to assume three missions of Titus to Corinth instead of two, the number which commentators have generally recognised; and he has, in like manner, to find room for two missions of Timothy, one to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17) and a second, quite distinct from this, to Macedonia (Acts xix. 21). In addition, he has to push back the date of 1 Corinthians by a year, in order to give time for all the incidents of which he finds traces in the Epistles; and he splits up 2 Corinthians into two fragmentary letters. We shall consider these points separately.

3. First, then, as to the missions of Titus. Dr. Kennedy takes in close connexion the two verses 2 Cor. viii. 6, 7, and translates (p. 122), "I summoned (? exhorted) Titus that as he had made a beginning, so he might accomplish in you this grace also; yea that as ye abound in everything, in faith and utterance, and in all diligence, and in your love towards us, so ye may abound in this grace also". This translation is probably right (see note in loc.); but the inference which its author derives from it is by no means inevitable. Dr. Kennedy holds that the words prove that the furtherance of the collection for Jerusalem was the purpose of Titus' later visit only, and formed no part of his commission in the earlier visit. But this cannot be maintained. Such an interpretation will harmonise with Dr. Kennedy's scheme of Titus' visits (see above); but the passage is quite consistent with the other view that Titus' two visits to Corinth were made as the bearer of the two Canonical Epistles. For in what St. Paul says, the emphasis is on the contrast between προείρησαν and ἐπιτελέσαν. A beginning had been made by Titus in the matter of the collection; he is now to finish his work, that the Corinthians may be as conspicuous for their liberality as they already are for other graces. Dr. Kennedy objects to this that it is inconceivable that St. Paul when sending Titus with a strong message of rebuke should also have instructed him to obtain money contributions. "Such a course," he says, "would have been as inconsistent
with wise diplomacy as with the self-respect which formed so marked a feature in St. Paul's character.1 But to argue thus is to overlook the fact that St. Paul's instructions about the collection in 1 Cor. xvi. 1-5 were given in answer to queries addressed to him on the subject by the Church of Corinth. The first part of the letter which Titus carried was taken up with rebuke; but there was nothing undiplomatic in the fact that St. Paul sent his answers to these queries by the same hand. In fact to have withheld his answer would have only given offence.2

4. We have now to consider the evidence adduced for the dissection of 2 Corinthians. First, it is urged that there is not only a change of tone at x. 1, but that the way in which the chapter opens shows that something has been lost which immediately preceded it. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ are the first words, and οὗτος (it is said) marks an antithesis. The passage "contains an allusion to an objection which had been brought against the Apostle, which it brings before us not as if the subject were now for the first time introduced, but as if it had been already mentioned".3 Rather should we say that οὗτος marks the transition to a new subject, a usage to which we have an exact parallel in viii. 1 of this very Epistle; where after the words which conclude chap. vii., χαιρῶ δὲ εἰ παρεῖ θαρρῶ εἰ όμιν, St. Paul passes to his next topic with the words γνωρίζομεν δὲ ομιν. Another parallel is found at 1 Cor. xv. 1, where in like manner a new subject is introduced by the words γνωρίζω δὲ όμιν. It is unnecessary to assume, as some have done, that the change of tone here was caused by the arrival at this point of a messenger from Corinth bringing tidings later and less favourable than that brought by Titus. This may, indeed, be so; but the hypothesis is not needed. It is hardly likely that any of St. Paul's more important letters were written or dictated at a single sitting; and the change of tone is sufficiently accounted for by a change of mood such as every busy and over-burdened man is subject to, especially

1 Loc. cit., p. 124.
2 These considerations also break the force of Dr. Kennedy's main argument for the early date of 2 Corinthians. It is plain that the business of the collection had been set on foot before the date of that letter, in which counsel is given as to the best method of carrying it on; and thus the phrase ἄνω τίτων (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2), in which so much difficulty has been found, receives adequate explanation. The Corinthians would truly be said in November, 55, to have "made a beginning" a year ago, and St. Paul's boast to the Macedonian Christians that Achaia had been "prepared for a year past" was quite justifiable (see note in loc.).
3 Kennedy, loc. cit., p. 96.
if his health is not very robust (cf. 2 Cor. i. 8, 9, and xii. 7). The
Second Epistle to the Corinthians is not a formal treatise like
the Epistle to the Romans; it is a personal letter, and in such
letters we have no reason to expect either systematic arrangement
of topics or pedantically uniform treatment.

5. This consideration helps us, too, to dispose of the difficulty
that the last four chapters contemplate an openly rebellious minority
at Corinth, the existence of which is not emphasised in the first
nine chapters. It was entirely natural that Titus' report being
of a mixed character, partly good and partly bad, St. Paul's letter
based upon it should show traces at once of his gratification and
of his grief. And, indeed, chaps. i.-ix. are not without indications that
his authority was not cheerfully accepted by all the Corinthian
Christians. His defence against the charge of fickleness (i. 15-17)
shows that the charge had been made; the mention of οἱ πλείονες in
ii. 6 (cf. iv. 15) shows that a minority did not heartily concur in
the sentence which was inflicted, although, as a matter of fact, all
had acquiesced in his view that the Church should take cognisance
of the moral scandal which had occurred; ¹ he more than hints
in ii. 17 that οἱ πολλοί make merchandise of the word of God,
and his remark loses point if none such were to be found at Corinth;
that πορευόμενοι, "some persons," make use of commendatory letters (iii. 1)
is brought up to their disparagement; the comparison between the
ministries of the Old and New Covenants in iii. 6 f. is indirectly
aimed at the Judaising party (xi. 22, 23); so, too, those who boast
ἐν προσώπῳ καὶ οἴκῳ καρδίᾳ (v. 12) are his Corinthian opponents; and,
lastly, the force of the antitheses in vi. 8-10 depends on the fact
that corresponding statements to his discredit were being made
at Corinth. The situation was simply this. The Church as a whole
(and, indeed, unanimously, cf. vii. 15, 16) had taken the action
he desired in the case of the offender; but there remained a
turbulent minority who resisted his authority in other matters. The
evil of unchastity does not here need special consideration; it was
always present at Corinth.

6. It is time to adduce the passages upon which defenders of the
theory that chaps. x.-xiii. constitute a part of the Painful Letter
mainly depend. The case is best put by Dr. Kennedy, ² who produces

¹ I cannot think that Dr. Kennedy's view (loc. cit., p. 102) that the "minority"
here indicated were out-and-out supporters of St. Paul who were anxious to go
rather even than he, will commend itself to many minds.
² Loc. cit., p. 81 f.
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three pairs of parallels between the first nine and the last four chapters of the Epistle. (a) In xiii. 10 the Apostle wrote διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὸν γράφων, ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρῆσομαι; and to this it is said that ii. 3, καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτῷ, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθων λύπην ἔχω, refers. But this reference is by no means inevitable; it is quite as natural to suppose that the effect of the Painful Letter (which I take to be 1 Corinthians) having been so salutary, as is indicated in ii. 3, the Apostle would again try the effect of a written threat of severe dealing.

(b) In xiii. 2 we have προκύρηκα καὶ προλέγω ὅς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἀπὸν τῶν τοῖς προημαρτηκόντων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἐλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν οὐ φείσομαι, to which i. 23 corresponds well if we suppose it written at a later date, ν.δ., φείδομεν ζήμων οὐκ ἕλθον εἰς Κόρινθου. On the other hand, it is plain that the texts may be taken up by another handle; and we may understand their sequence to be that the Apostle having said at i. 23 that he had not come to Corinth before as he wished to spare them, he explains at xiii. 2 with plain sternness that when he does come he will not spare. There is nothing gained in lucidity or in force by the hypothesis that xiii. 2 represents the earlier statement and i. 23 the later. (c) Again, in x. 6, St. Paul says of himself: ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικήσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὁμών ἡ ὑπακοή, while at ii. 9 he writes, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ἡμῶν, εἰς πάτα ὑπήκοοι ἔσετε. Here it is not to be gainsaid that an excellent sense emerges from counting x. 6 to be prior to ii. 9, which seems, when taken in connexion with vii. 15, 16, to speak of unanimous obedience on the part of the Christians at Corinth. But the character of this obedience has been indicated above in § 4. So far as the specific case as to which St. Paul had written the Painful Letter was concerned, the “obedience” had been that of “all”; but there remained a faction which was disobedient at heart, and until they should have yielded to his authority it could not be said that their “obedience” was “fulfilled”. As to these three pairs of parallel passages, then, it is not the case that a satisfactory explanation can be provided only by the expedient of recognising chaps. x.-xiii. as prior to chaps. i.-ix.; on the contrary, they yield a consistent sense when the Epistle is interpreted as a continuous whole. A remarkable commentary upon the danger of relying too much on coincidences of language of this sort is afforded by the fact that exactly an opposite inference to that with which we have been dealing has been drawn by another critic, Drescher. This writer, like Schmiedel and Clemen and Kennedy, regards chaps. x.-xiii. as distinct from chaps. i.-ix.; but he is led from internal evidence, as it appears to him, to count the Nine Chapters.
as earlier in date than the Four.\textsuperscript{1} When internal evidence leads competent scholars to such entirely divergent conclusions, it is a natural inference that the arguments on which they rely do not amount to demonstration.

7. It is further to be borne in mind that the theory which regards chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. as parts of distinct letters which have been joined together by mistake depends on the concurrence of several improbable hypotheses. We have to suppose not only that chaps. i.-ix. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its concluding pages, and that chaps. x.-xiii. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its opening pages, but that in each case the mutilation happened to come at a point where a new sentence began a new page. This is a most unlikely thing to happen. Take any book or manuscript at random and count the number of places where the tearing away of pages does not leave a clause incomplete. The number will be small indeed.\textsuperscript{2} But the measure of the improbability of this happening must be twice repeated before we reach the improbability of 2 Cor. i.-ix. and 2 Cor. x.-xiii. being both fragments. For neither 2 Cor. ix. 15 nor 2 Cor. x. 1 is an incomplete sentence. It has been argued indeed (see above, § 4) that 2 Cor. x. 1, \textit{ἀποθεοῦτο ἐγὼ} . . . , points to some preceding argument which is not to be found in 2 Cor. ix. The argument is unconvincing; but what is here dealt with is the improbability that a tearing of the MS. should have left no trace on the grammatical coherence of the sentence which followed the mutilation. In fact, it is not too much to say that the phenomena of the existing document cannot be explained as resulting from the mere juxtaposition of two fragments of other letters. We have to postulate, in addition, an editor who trimmed the ragged edges and brought the end of chap. ix. and the beginning of chap. x. into grammatical sequence by emendation of the texts which the two fragments presented. And beside all this we have yet to reckon with the improbability, be it great or small, that the two fragments belonging to distinct letters should have become joined together under the mistaken impression that they were parts of one whole.

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Studien und Kritiken}, Jan., 1897. Krenkel takes the same view, and holds that chaps. x.-xiii. form a letter later in date than chaps. i.-ix. This was also Semler's view.

\textsuperscript{2} A good illustration is afforded by the end of St. Mark's Gospel. It is generally (though not universally) believed that a page has been lost at the end, and that the present conclusion is by another hand. But one of the strongest arguments for this view is that ver. 8 is incomplete, and that it ends \textit{ὁφέσουρρω γάρ}, \textit{i.e.}, "for they were afraid to . . . ". There is no such incompleteness apparent at 2 Cor. ix. 15.
Under these circumstances we fall back on the *primâ facie* case, which is that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is an *ens integrum*, and we proceed to bring forward some of the positive data which point to its unity.

8. First, attention should be directed to passages in chaps. x.-xiii. which point back to passages in chaps. i.-ix. 

(a) In xi. 15 St. Paul writes that the false apostles, whom he calls Satan's *diákonoi*, are trying to pass themselves off as *diákonoi diakaisuvnhs*, *i.e.*, as *apóstoloi Christou* (ver. 13). Now there is nothing in the context to suggest such a phrase as *diákonoi diakaisuvnhs*, and it does not, as a matter of fact, occur in any other of St. Paul's letters or in the N.T. outside this Epistle or in the LXX. The one passage which explains it is iii. 7-11, where the Ministry of the Old Covenant is declared to be less glorious than that of the New, and where *diakonia tis diakaisuvnhs* is set over against *diakonia tis katoikias*.

Unless the readers of xi. 15 were aware that St. Paul used the phrase “the ministry of Righteousness” as descriptive of the ministry of the Gospel, the title *diákonoi diakaisuvnhs* would have had no special meaning for them. Thus we conclude that the discussion of iii. 7-11 is presupposed by the use of the title in xi. 15. 

(b) The charge which his opponents brought against St. Paul at Corinth is thus described by him in xii. 16, *dàpax oúv panoúrgos dolw ómás elábov*. They had called him a *panoúrgos*, “a crafty man,” and suggested that his dealings in the matter of money were full of guile (*dólos*). At iv. 2 he refers to the same charge, *mē periopatoúntes ev panoúргipr̃ mēḏ doλou̱ntes τον λόγον του Θεού*. The meaning of the latter clause, “handling deceitfully the word of God,” is fixed by the parallel in ii. 17, *kataklúontes τον λόγον του Θεού*, which shows that the *dólos* repudiated by him was crooked dealing in regard to money, “making a traffic” of the Gospel. 

(c) The passages just cited from the earlier part of the letter have other echoes in the later part. In ii. 17 those who make merchandise of the word of God at Corinth are *oi polloi*, and he speaks of his opponents again as *polloi* in xi. 18. His declaration in ii. 17 is that he preaches *eis eilukriaías* (cf. i. 12), and in iv. 2 that it is *tē phairóswi tēs ἀληθείας*; so in xi. 6 he says of himself, *ἐν παντὶ φανερώσης ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὁμας*. And, lastly, the asseveration of his sincerity in ii. 17, *kataánvnti Θεού ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦντες*, is repeated in xii. 19, the only other place where it occurs in his Epistles. 

(d) In x. 5 he speaks of bringing every thought into captivity, *eis tēn ὃπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and of his readiness to avenge all disobedience, *διαν πληρωθῇ ὁμῶν ἡ ὃπακοή*. Seven verses before, in ix. 13, he had written of the ὃπαγή τῆς ὁμολογίας ὁμῶν εἰς το
and the language is sufficiently similar to suggest that x. 5 was written while the phrases of ix. 13 were still in his mind. (e) The concluding summary of the Epistle (xiii. 11) is important (see note in loc.). The exhortations χαιρετε . . . παρακαλεσθε are specially noteworthy, for they exactly reproduce the two leading thoughts of its earlier part, Rejoice . . . be comforted. It is difficult to understand how the words are to be explained on the hypothesis that they sum up the message of the Painful Letter. They are entirely harmonious with chaps. i.-ix., but not harmonious at all with chaps. x.-xiii. "Comfort in affliction" is (as Dr. Plummer points out) the keynote of the first part of the Epistle, "boasting in weakness" being the keynote of the second part. παρακαλεσθε is an appropriate summing up of much that is contained in chaps. i.-ix., but is irrelevant as regards chaps. x.-xiii.3 And thus, as we find in xiii. 11 a summary of 2 Corinthians as a whole, we conclude that it is a single document, and is not made up of parts of two letters which have been joined together by mistake.

9. In the next place the linguistic parallels between chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. are in many instances so close as to render it difficult to believe that the Epistle is not an ens integrum. (a) The phrase εαυτων συνωτανει only occurs once in the N.T. outside 2 Corinthians, viz., at Gal. ii. 18, and there the meaning is quite different (παραβατη εαυτων συνωτανει = "I prove myself a transgressor") from anything in 2 Corinthians. Not only does the phrase occur in both parts of this Epistle (iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18), but it always implies a bad kind of self-commendation, as contrasted with the similar phrase ωσκεσεν εαυτων (iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11), which is used throughout in a favourable sense. (b) ιησοστασις only occurs twice in St. Paul, and each time in the same phrase, εν τη ιησοστασις ταυτη [s.c., της καινης], which is found once in the earlier (ix. 4) and once in the later (xi. 17) part of 2 Corinthians. (c) St. Paul uses τασιων of himself in vii. 6 and x. 1; the word only occurs once again in the Pauline letters (Rom. xii. 16). (d) νοημα occurs five times in 2 Corinthians and in both parts of the Epistle (ii. 11, iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3), and is always used in a bad sense. In the only other place of its occurrence in the N.T. (Phil. iv. 7) there is no suggestion that νοηματα must be bad. (e) διρωπια.

1 Smith's Bible Dictionary, vol. i., p. 657.
2 Semler seems to have had some suspicion of this, for he joins on chap. xiii. 11-13 to the first part of the Epistle in his scheme of dissection.
occurs in vi. 5 and xi. 27, but nowhere else in the N.T. (f) προσ-
αναπληροῦν occurs in ix. 12 and xi. 9, but nowhere else in the N.T.
(g) ἔτοιμος occurs both in ix. 5 and x. 6, 16; only once again in St.
Paul (Tit. iii. 1). (h) δυνατεῖν is found in ix. 8 and xiii. 3; only
once again in St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 4). (i) θαρτεῖν occurs in v. 6, 8,
vii. 16 and x. 1, 2, but not elsewhere in St. Paul. It is true that
in x. 1, 2 it is used to express stern confidence in himself (θαρτω ἐς
ὑμᾶς), and in vii. 16 to express hopeful confidence in his corre-
spondents (θαρτν ἐν ὑμῖν); but this does not alter the fact that he
does not use the word in any sense in any other Epistle. (j)
πλεονεκτέω occurs in ii. 11, vii. 2 and xii. 17, 18; only again in St.
Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 6. (k) παρακαλέω occurs thirteen times in chaps.
i.-ix. and four times in chaps. x.-xiii.; that is, with unusual frequency
in both parts of the Epistle. It is the word used throughout of the
Apostle's directions to Titus (viii. 6, 17, ix. 5 and xii. 17). Other
words and phrases occur with marked frequency in both parts of
the Epistle, such as ἐν παρθε, καυχάμαι, περισσότερος (-ως), etc.;
but while such phenomena fall in with the conclusion we have
already reached, they are hardly significant enough to be registered
as supplying independent arguments. But, on the whole, the
linguistic facts powerfully support the traditional view, viz., that
the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is a single document and not
a patchwork of two or more detached pieces.

10. It is further to be borne in mind that neither MSS. nor
versions lend any countenance to these disintegrating theories.
They all, from the earliest times, treat the Epistle as a whole, as
Irenaeus explicitly does more than once. He quotes ii. 15, 16 (Hær.,
IV., xxviii., 3) and xiii. 7, 9 (Hær., V., iii., 1) as alike contained in the
secunda ad Corinthios. No doubt the union of fragments is sup-
posed to have taken place long before his time. Nevertheless the
fact that there is no trace of it in literature is significant. "The
attestation of the N.T. text is so varied and so early that a displace-
ment of this magnitude could hardly fail to bear traces of itself."

11. One section of the Epistle (vi. 14-vii. 1) has been regarded
as an interpolation by many writers who accept the Epistle in other
respects as a complete document from the hand of St. Paul. And
it is not to be denied that this section comes in awkwardly in its
present place. It is much more like what we would expect a frag-
ment of the Lost Letter (1 Cor. v. 9) to be than a genuine part of
the Epistle before us. Nevertheless, I am not satisfied that a case

has been made out for its rejection; and I have given (in the notes in loc.) the reasons which seem to me to justify the Pauline authorship of the section, and plausibly to explain its insertion at this particular point. It is not impossible (though for the hypothesis there is no external authority) that the section is a marginal gloss which has crept into the text at a very early period, or a postscript written in the margin by St. Paul or his amanuensis. But, on the whole, I believe that it ought to be retained.
CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORY STYLE AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISODE.

1. The external tradition as to the circulation and authority of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is abundant from the year 175 onward. It is quoted by Irenæus of Gaul repeatedly (e.g., Ἰαρ., iii., 7, "aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse," etc.); by Athenagoras of Athens (de resurr. morte, xviii.); by Theophilus of Antioch (ad Autol., i., 12, iii., 14); by Tertullian of Carthage (de Pudicitia, 13 et passim); by Clement of Alexandria (frequently, e.g., Strom., iii., 14, iv., 6), witnesses representing Churches widely separated from each other. Again, the Epistle is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment; it was in Marcion's Canon, and there is no evidence that it was absent from any list of N.T. books or any collection of Pauline letters. Before 175 A.D. the evidence is not copious, but it is distinct. The letter to Diognetus (v. 12) quotes chap. vi. 8-10; and the elders cited by Irenæus, who represent (at latest) the generation preceding him, quote chap. xii. 4 (Ιαρ., V., v., 1). Finally, Polycarp (ad Phil., ii., 4, and vi., 1) quotes chap. iv. 14 and viii. 21, thus providing proof of the use of the Epistle before the year 120. That it seems to have been used by the Sethites and Ophites would point to a similar conclusion.1

1 It is somewhat remarkable that the Epistle is not quoted by Clement of Rome when writing to the Church at Corinth. He cites (§ xlvii.) the First Epistle, and the Second, if known to him, would have supplied him with many apposite texts, powerfully supporting his appeal for unity. But no solid argument can be based on Clement's silence, especially when it is remembered that we should look in vain in his letter for traces of Galatians, Colossians, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, as well as of 2 Corinthians. These letters may not have been known in Rome at the time; or Clement may have been personally unacquainted with them; or he may not have been familiar enough with their contents to quote from them. Any of these explanations is adequate, without resorting to the hypothesis (cf. Kennedy, 2 and 3 Corinthians, p. 142 ff.) that Clement does not quote the canonical 2 Corinthians because it was not yet in existence as a whole, but only survived in the form of fragments of the great Apostle's correspondence with Corinth.
2. External evidence is, however, of little importance in the case of a letter which so clearly betrays its authorship as 2 Corinthians does. It is unmistakably Pauline, in the tone and character of its teaching, no less than in its style and vocabulary. No Epistle lets us see more of the working of the Apostle’s mind, or gives us a clearer view of his personality (see above, chap. i., § 1). It is distinctively a letter rather than an epistle; that is, it was written to meet an emergency that had arisen at Corinth, and there is no trace that the writer was conscious that it would take a permanent place in literature. Herein lies at once its charm and its difficulty; and herein, too, is the explanation of the absence of systematic and consistent arrangement, such as might fairly be expected in a formal treatise. It reflects the varying moods of the writer; and the broken constructions and frequent anacolutha show that it was written at a time of mental agitation and excitement.

3. We count it unnecessary to produce here the proofs of the Pauline character of the style and diction of the Epistle. They are apparent throughout, and the marginal references to the text have been specially prepared with a view of bringing out the linguistic parallels between 2 Corinthians and the other Pauline letters. Among the words peculiar in the N.T. to this Epistle are the following: ἀβαρῆς, ἀγανάκτησις, ἀγνότης, ἀγνωστία, ἀδράτης, ἀμετρος, ἀνακλύτειν, ἀνεκδήηγητος, ἀπαρασκεύαστος, ἀπειπεῖν, ἀπόκριμα, ἀρρητος, ἀδύτειν, ἀθανατοποιεῖν, ἀκρικεῖα, ἀκατανάκριθα, ἀκριμαινεῖν, ἀκροβατεῖν, ἀλαφρία, ἀντιποιύ, ἀπειράσθει, ἀπεράσμενον, ἀποθημεῖα, ἀκατάστασις, ἀκατάρρευσις, ἀκαταβάρεια, ἀκατάκριτος, ἀποκαταρτίζεσθαι, μετοχή, μολυμόδος, μομείσθαι, νυχθήμερον, ὁχύρωμα, παραφυκτικα, παραφροσυνειδεῖν, πεντάκες, πέρασμα, προοιμισθήρεται, προενεργεῖαι, προκαταρτίζει, προσαναπληροῦν, προσκοπη, πτωχεύειν, σαργάνος, σκήνος, σκόλος, στενοχωρείσθαι, συγκατάθεσις, συνήλ, συμφέρεις, συμφωνης, συναποστέλλειν, συνυποτρεπεῖς, συνυποτρεπόμενος, ύπερέκεια, ύπερεκτείνει, ύπερλαίον, ψευδομάντις, φωτισμὸς, ψευδαπόστολος, ψιθυρισμὸς.

4. That the Epistle falls of itself into three parts is evident to the most casual reader. (1) From i. 1 to vii. 16 the writer is

---

1 Those who desire to learn what has been urged against the Pauline authorship may be referred to Dr. Knowling’s Witness of the Epistles, chap. ii., “Recent Attacks upon the Hautbriefe”; see especially p. 192. But it is quite outside the plan of this commentary to take notice of every extravagance of criticism. (See also vol. ii., p. 753 above.)

2 Note that in the marginal references the LXX numbering of the Psalms and of the other O.T. books has been followed; and that “here only” means that the word so designated does not occur again in the N.T.
occupied with the reflections which are suggested by the report brought by Titus as to the response of the Corinthian Church to the injunctions of the First Epistle in the matter of the incestuous man. In this section there is a digression of great doctrinal importance on the Ministry of the New Covenant (iii. 7-iv. 15), followed by some profound thoughts about the life after death (iv. 16-v. 10); and a minor digression (vi. 14-vii. 1) about the dangers of intermarriage with the heathen; but the main topic of these chapters is his thankfulness at the news he has received, which consoles him in his many troubles. Again and again he bids them be sure of his sincerity and single-mindedness. 

(2) Chapters viii. and ix. deal with the collection which was being made for the poor Christians in Judæa, a subject which had been much in his thoughts during the preceding year. 

(3) The last four chapters are taken up with a vindication of his apostolic authority, which was necessary to put forward plainly before his next visit to Corinth. There was a party in that city calling themselves by the name of Christ (x. 7), who made light of St. Paul's apostolic claims and were trying to undermine his authority. The Church as a whole had acquiesced in St. Paul's directions given in 1 Cor. v.; but a minority of malcontents were troublesome and calumnious, and needed repression. A detailed analysis of the letter is subjoined.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

I. The obedience of the Corinthians to the instructions of the First Epistle.

Introductory—
Address (i. 1, 2).
God's consolations and the sympathy of sorrow (i. 3-7).
His recent peril (i. 8-11).

His sincerity of purpose—
They must acknowledge it (i. 12-14).
His change of plan was not due to fickleness (i. 15-22).
The real reason of the postponement of his visit (i. 23-ii. 4).
The offender has been sufficiently punished (ii. 5-11).
He rejoices to hear that his reproof has been loyally received (ii. 12-17).
The Corinthians are his "Letter of Commendation" (iii. 1-3).
His success, however, is due to God (iii. 4-6).

Digression on the Ministry of the New Covenant—
It is more glorious than that of the Old (iii. 7-11).
It is more open (iii. 12-18).
He, accordingly, delivers his message plainly (iv. 1-6).
INTRODUCTION

His bodily weakness does not annul the effects of his ministry (iv. 7-15).

He is sustained by a glorious hope (iv. 16-18).

His expectation of a glorified body hereafter, and his desire to survive until the Second Advent (v. 1-5).

In any case to be with Christ is best (v. 6-8).

We must remember the Judgment to come (v. 9, 10).

He reiterates his sincerity of purpose (v. 11-13).

The constraining power of his ministry (v. 14-16).

In Christ all is new (v. 17-19).

As Christ's ambassador he prays them to be reconciled to God (v. 20-vi. 3).

The conditions and characteristics of his ministry (vi. 4-10).

He affectionately declares his sympathy and claims the same from them (vi. 11-13).

[Parenthetical warning against familiar association with the heathen (vi. 14-vii. 1).]

He claims their sympathy again (vii. 2-4).

He repeats his joy that his reproof has been loyally received (vii. 5-12).

Titus also rejoiced to bring such tidings (vii. 13-16).

II. The Collection for the Judaean Christians.

The liberality of the Macedonian Churches (viii. 1-7).

He counsels, though he will not command, the imitation of it (viii. 8-15).

The mission of Titus and his two companions (viii. 16-24).

Its purpose, that the collection may be made ready (ix. 1-5).

Liberal giving is (a) blessed of God (ix. 6-11), and (b) calls forth the blessings of the recipients (ix. 12-15).

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority.

He entreats them not to force him to use his authority (x. 1-6).

Despite all appearances it is weighty and is Divinely given him (x. 7-18).

He begs them to bear with the statement of his claims at length (xi. 1-4).

He is in no way inferior to his adversaries (xi. 5-15).

His Apostolic labours and trials (xi. 16-33).

His vision, of which he could boast, if he chose (xii. 1-6).

His " thorn in the flesh " (xii. 7-10).

This testimony should have proceeded from the Corinthians (xii. 11-13).

That he did not claim maintenance was disinterested (xii. 14-18).

The purpose of this "glorying" is their edification (xii. 19-21).

If he comes again, he will not spare (xiii. 1, 2).

Christ is his strength: let them see to it that He is theirs also (xiii. 3-10).

Conclusion—

Final exhortations (xiii. 11).

Salutations and benediction (xiii. 12, 13).
CHAPTER IV.

THE TEXT.

1. The uncial manuscripts whose readings are cited, in all important cases, in the critical notes are the following:

N. Codex Sinaiticus (sæc. iv.), now at St. Petersburg, published in facsimile type by its discoverer, Tischendorf, in 1862. The symbol Ν is used to indicate the corrections introduced by a scribe of the seventh century, Ν° denoting the autograph of the original scribe.

A. Codex Alexandrinus (sæc. v.), at the British Museum, published in photographic facsimile by Sir E. M. Thompson (1879); it is defective from chaps. iv. 13 to xii. 7 of our Epistle.

B. Codex Vaticanus (sæc. iv.), published in photographic facsimile in 1889 under the care of the Abbate Cozza-Luzi.

C. Codex Ephraemi (sæc. v.), the Paris palimpsest, edited by Tischendorf in 1843. The text of our Epistle is wanting from chap. x. 8 to the end.

D. Codex Claromontanus (sæc. vi.), a Græco-Latin MS. at Paris, edited by Tischendorf in 1852. Dᵇ and Dˢ denote the readings introduced by correctors of the seventh and ninth centuries respectively. The Latin text is represented by d; it follows the Old Latin version with modifications.

E. Codex Sangermanensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., now at St. Petersburg, formerly belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Its text is largely dependent upon that of D. The Latin version, e (a corrected copy of d), has been printed, but with incomplete accuracy, by Belsheim (1885).

F. Codex Augiensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Trinity College, Cambridge, edited by Scrivener in 1859. Its Greek text is almost identical with that of G, and it is therefore
not cited save where it differs from that MS. Its Latin version, f, presents the Vulgate text with some modifications.

G. Codex Boernerianus (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Dresden, edited by Matthæi in 1791. Written by an Irish scribe, it once formed part of the same volume as Codex Sangallensis ($) of the Gospels. The Latin text, g, is based on the O.L. translation.

H. Codex Coislinianus (sæc. vi.), fragments of which survive in several libraries. Of our Epistle chap. iv. 2-7 is at St. Petersburg, and chaps. x. 18-xi. 6 and xi. 12-xii. 2 at Mount Athos. These latter fragments were edited by Duchesne in 1876; the readings of the former are given by Tischendorf.

K. Codex Mosquensis (sæc. ix.), edited by Matthæi in 1782.

L. Codex Angelicus (sæc. ix.), at Rome, collated by Tischendorf and others.

M. Codex Ruber (sæc. ix.), at the British Museum; it derives its name from the colour of the ink. It contains of this Epistle chaps. i. 1-15 and x. 13-xii. 5.

O. This is a fragment (sæc. vi.), at St. Petersburg, containing chaps. i. 20-ii. 12.

P. Codex Porphyrianus (sæc. ix.), at St. Petersburg, collated by Tischendorf. Its text is deficient for chap. ii. 13-16.

R. Codex Cryptoferratensis (sæc. vii.), a palimpsest fragment containing chap. xi. 9-19, edited by Cozza in 1867, and cited by Tischendorf.¹

The tendency of these MSS. to fall into groups will be apparent on a cursory inspection of the apparatus criticus. The readings of DEG are, as a rule, "Western"; while NB represent (as usual) a weight of authority that cannot be rejected without much hesitation. The lacunæ in A and C prevent the affinities of the "Alexandrian" group ΝACL from being as apparent here as in other Epistles (cf. Sanday-Headlam, Romans, p. lxxi).

¹ The following uncial authorities for our Epistle are as yet inedited:—

S. At Mount Athos (sæc. viii. ?), contains, inter alia, chaps. i. 1-xi. 23 .
Ψ. A ninth-century Codex at Mount Athos. It is said to be complete.
 ללמוד. Codex Patiriensis (sæc. v.), at Rome (Vat. Gr. 2061). It contains chaps. iv. 7-vi. 8 and vii. 15-x. 6 of our Epistle.
2. The minuscule or cursive manuscripts are very numerous, and only a few of special interest are occasionally cited in the critical apparatus. 17, the “queen of cursive” (sæc. ix.), is at Paris; 37 (sæc. xv.) is the well-known Leicester Codex = Ev. 69; and 73 (sæc. xi.) is at Upsala.

3. Versions. Of these the Latin claims special attention. The versions d, e, f, g have been described above. We have also of the Old Latin the fragmentary Codex Frisingensis (r) of the sixth (?) century, containing of our Epistle chaps. i. 1-ii. 10, iii. 17-v. 1, vii. 10-viii. 12, ix. 10-xi. 21, xii. 14-21, xiii. 2-10. The symbol m marks the readings found in the Speculum, which represents the text of the Spaniard Priscillian. The Vulgate (vg) of the Pauline Epistles differs but little from the prae-Hieronymian Latin.

In Syriac we have the Peshitto (sæc. iii.?) and the Harclean version (sæc. vii.). The margin of the latter often preserves better readings than are found in its text.

Of Egyptian versions we have the Bohairic or the North Coptic, and the Sahidic or South Coptic, the language of Upper Egypt. These versions are to be dated probably about the third century.

It has not come within the scope of this edition to cite the patristic authorities for the variants recorded; for a full conspectus the student must be referred to Tischendorf’s Novum Testamentum Graece (8th edit.), on which the following apparatus criticus is based.

4. In accordance with the general plan of the Expositor’s Greek Testament the “received text” (see vol. i., p. 52) is printed at the head of the page; but the commentary follows the reading, which has appeared to the editor to be, on the whole, most probably original.

Among the Patristic Commentaries on the Epistle perhaps the most important are those of Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster and Primasius. Modern commentaries are very numerous. Stanley’s notes are often illuminating and picturesque; Alford is careful and thorough, as usual; and Waite (in the Speaker’s Commentary) provides a useful discussion of the main questions which the Epistle suggests. Of German commentaries Schmiedel’s (in the Hand Kommentar) is by far the most complete. It is a brilliant and scholarly piece of work, and is indispensable to the student who wishes to have detailed information as to the various schemes by which St. Paul’s history has been reconstructed for the years 53-55 a.D. Schmiedel’s general view (see p. 19 above) that chaps. x-xiii. constitute part of a letter distinct from and later than chaps. i.-ix. has not commended itself to the present editor; but his notes are full of
learning and suggestiveness. Schnedermann's edition of the Epistles to the Corinthians (in Strack-Zöckler's *Kommentar*) has also been found useful at some points. Bengel's *Gnomon* and Field's detached *Notes* have, of course, been diligently consulted.\(^1\)

In this edition the interpretation which has seemed on the whole the best has been set down, without (as a rule) discussing at length the rival theories. It would have been easy to crowd the notes with references to other editors; but it has seemed better to economise space in this direction, and so to find room for a larger number of references to St. Paul's other writings.

September, 1900.

\(^1\) See also Prof. Findlay's account of the Commentaries on *I Corinthians* vol. ii., p. 752 above).
CHAPTER I. ADDRESS, vv. 1, 2.—The usual form of address at the beginning of a Greek letter was Ά. Β. χαίρετε (see Acts xxiii. 26); and this is adopted by St. James in his Epistle (Jas. i. 1), and is followed, among other Christian writers, by Ignatius in his letters (πλείστα χαίρετε is his ordinary formula). St. Paul, original in this as in all else, struck out a form for himself. He replaces χαίρετε by χαίρετε καὶ εὐρήκη (1 Thess.), which in subsequent letters is expressed more fully, as here, χαίρετε καὶ εὐρήκη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. (In 1 and 2 Tim. he adds ἔλεος.) The simple greeting of ordinary courtesy is thus filled with a deep religious meaning. Grace is the keynote of the Gospel; and peace, the traditional and beautiful salutation of the East, on Christian lips signifies not earthly peace merely, but the peace of God (Phil. iv. 7). The first instance of the combination of χάρις with εὐρήκη is noteworthy, viz., they are coupled in the Priestly Benediction at Num. vi. 24.—ἀπόστολος Ἰ. χαίρετε: St. Paul's letters are all semi-official, except perhaps that to Philemon; and thus they usually begin with the assertion of his apostolic office. This it would be especially necessary to emphasise in a letter to Corinth, where his authority had been questioned quite recently (x. 10 ff.), and where the names of Apollos and Peter had formerly been set in opposition to his (1 Cor. i. 12).—διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ: he is ever anxious (see ref.) to explain that his apostleship was not assumed of himself; it is a mission from God; he is a ἐκβολής ἐκλογής.—καὶ Τιμόθεος δ ἀδελφός: Timothy now occupies the place at St. Paul's side which was filled by Sosthenes when 1 Cor. was written (1 Cor. i. 1). Timothy had been despatched to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22) to go on to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), but St. Paul seems to have had a suspicion that he might be prevented from arriving there (1 Cor. xvi. 10). From the facts that we now find him in Macedonia, and that there is no mention of him in chap. xii. 16-18, it is likely that he was prevented from reaching Corinth by some causes of which we are unaware.—τῇ εὐκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.: the letter is addressed primarily to the Christian congregation at Corinth, and secondarily to the Christians throughout Achaia. It is thus a circular letter, like that to the Galatians or Ephesians, and so at the end we do not find salutations to individuals, as in 1 Cor. and in the other letters addressed to particular Churches. The words τῇ ὁσιᾷ ἐν Κορίνθῳ suggest the idea of settled establishment; the Church at Corinth had now been for some time in existence.——ἐν δλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ: the
Roman province of Achaia included the whole country which we call Greece (excluding Macedonia), and it is in this large sense that the name is used here (cf. ix. 2 below).

Ver. 2. ἄνδρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς κ.τ.λ.: this coupling of the names of God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ as alike the source of grace and peace is most significant in its bearing upon St. Paul's Christology (cf. xiii.13).

I. The Obedience of the Corinthians to the Instructions of the First Epistle (i. 3—vi. 16). This is the main topic of the first section of this Epistle. Vv. 3-7: Thanksgiving; God's Consolations and the Sympathy of Sorrow. St. Paul's habit is to begin his letters with an expression of thankfulness for the Christian progress of his correspondents. The only exceptions are the Epp. to Titus and to the Galatians (in this case he had received bad news from Galatia). In 1 Tim. i. 12 the cause of his thankfulness is the exhibition of the Divine mercy to himself; and this Epistle begins with a like thought, from which he passes (ver. 14) to his confident belief that the Corinthian Christians are still his καυχήμα. It was especially important that a letter which was so largely taken up with rebuke and with the assertion of his apostolical authority should begin with a message of sympathy and hopefulness (vv. 11 ff.).

Ver. 3. εὐλογητός ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.: blessed is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Note that τοῦ Κυρίου is dependent on ἐκείνος as well as on παρῆσα; cf. Eph. i. 17, and John xx. 17, Rev. i. 6. This is the starting-point of the Christian revelation, that the Supreme is "the God and Father" of Jesus Christ; He is εὐλογητός (τῷ ὧν), the Object of His creatures' blessing. The verb is not expressed, but the analogy of 1 Pet. iv. 11 would indicate that εὐλογεῖ rather than εὐλόγησε should be understood. A doxology is not a prayer, but (cf. Matt. vi. 13, and John xii. 13, a close parallel) a thankful and adoring statement of the Divine goodness and power.— ὁ πατήρ τῶν ἀνθρωπών: the Father of mercies, sc., from whom merciful acts proceed; ἀνθρωπόμος, compassion, is the very characteristic of a Father's Providence; see ref. and Luke vi. 36.— καὶ Θεὸς πάθες παρακλήσεως, and God of all comfort, sc., from whom every consolation proceeds. We have παρακλησίας applied to God in O.T., e.g., in Ps. xcv. 19, εἰς παρακλησίας του μὴ γίνονται την ψυχήν μου; and the word is adopted in the N.T. for the Divine comfort not only by St. Paul (see ref.), but by St. Luke (ii. 25 and Acts ix. 31), and by St. John, who describes alike the Spirit (John xiv. 16, xv. 26, xvi. 7) and the Son (1 John ii. 1) as the παρακλήτος.

Ver. 4. ὁ παρακάλων ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.: who comforteth us in all our affliction (the def. art. indicating trials actually existing). The verb παρακάλων has three shades of meaning, (a) to beseech, eighteen times in St. Paul, (b) to exhort, seventeen times, (c) to comfort, thirteen times, of which seven are in this Epistle, where the word occurs altogether seventeen times. Cf. ver. 6, ii. 7, 8, v. 20, vi. 1, vii. 6, 7, 13, viii. 6, ix. 5, x. 1, xii. 8, xiii. 2. This is the comfort wherewith we ourselves are being comforted by God. ἃς, for ἤς, has been attracted into the case of παρακλήσεως (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 19, chap. x. 13, Eph. ii. 10).

Ver. 5. ἐν δόξῃ περιστερεῖν κ.τ.λ.: for as Christ's sufferings flow over abundantly to us, our comfort also aboundeth through Christ. That the Christian is a fellow-sufferer with Christ is frequently urged by St. Paul (Rom.
παρακαλοῦμενα οὐτοί ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 5. ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, οὕτω διὰ Χριστοῦ περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν. 6. εἶτε δὲ θαλαμόθεν, ὅπερ τῆς ὁμον. παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας, τῆς ἐνεργουμένης εἰς ὑπομονή τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων δν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν. εἶτε παρακαλοῦμενα, ὅπερ τῆς ὁμον. παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας. 7. καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν γεβαία ὑπὸ ὁμον. κἀνωτέρος εἰσὶν τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτω

1 DE have to παθήματα.
2 The uncials have τον Χριστον; τον is omitted by a few minuscules only.
3 B 17 omit the first καὶ σωτηρίας.
4 The order of clauses in the latter part of the verse is variously given in the MSS. The received text (followed by the A.V.) is devoid of MS. authority and was manufactured by Erasmus. The choice lies between (1) καὶ τακράκαλεμεν ὑπὸ τῆς ὁμον. παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐνεργουμένης εἰς ὑπομονήν τῶν παθημάτων καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν παθημάτων καὶ σωτηρίας, which is attested by ΜΑ, ΚΜΠ, τ, the Peshitto and Bohairic vss.; and (2) τῆς ἐνεργουμένης εἰς ὑπομονήν τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς τῶν παθημάτων καὶ σωτηρίας, which is the order of ΒΔΕΓΚΛ, d, e, f, g, and the Harclean. We follow (1), which is adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the R.V.
5 For ὀντός (DbcKL, etc.) read ὄντως, with ΝΑΒCD*Ε*ΜΡ, etc.

viii. 17, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24; see esp. chap. iv. 10, 11 below, and cf. Matt. xx. 22. Here he dwells on the thought that this fellowship in suffering implies also the consolation and strength which flow from union with Christ; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 13.

Vv. 6, 7. We follow the reading of the Revisers (see crit. note) and translate: But whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which works in the patient endurance of the same things which we also suffer: and our hope for you is steadfast; knowing that as ye are partners of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort. This is an expansion of the εἰς τὸ δύναματα κ.τ.λ. of ver. 4: the Apostle's afflictions and consolations alike are for the sake of his converts; and he and they have a common fellowship in Christ, with all which that involves of sympathy with each other. The nearest parallel (see reff.) is Eph. iii. 13, ὁ δὲ άνθρωπος μη ταπεινὸς εἰς ταῖς ὁλίγοις μονο ὑπὲρ ὁμον. φθορά τῶν δόξων. For the construction, see chap. v. 13 and 1 Cor. xii. 26. Note that ἐνεργεῖσθαι is always in the N.T. middle, not passive, and is used intransitively (see Rom. vii. 5, chap. iv. 12, Gal. v. 6, Eph. iii. 20, Col. i. 29, 1 Thess. ii. i. 13); when the verb is used of God it is always in the active voice (1 Cor. xii. 6, Gal. ii. 8, etc.).—ἐν ὑπομονή: ὑπομονή means expectation or hopeful waiting in the canonical books of the LXX; but is often used for steadfast endurance in Ecclus. and in 4 Macc. (see 4 Macc. xvii. 12). It is a favourite word with St. Paul in this latter sense, in which it is always used in the N.T. (cf., e.g., Luke xxii. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 11); for the juxtaposition of ἐνεργεῖσθαι and παράκλησις see Rom. xv. 5.—τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων: the sufferings which the Corinthian brethren must endure are here represented as the same as those of the Apostle; i.e., the reference is not to any special affliction such as that alluded to in ver. 5, but to the troubles which came upon him in the general discharge of his Apostolic office and upon all those who were engaged in the struggle against Judaism on the one side and heathendom on the other.

Ver. 7. καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ.: and our hope for you is steadfast, knowing (we should expect καὶ τε, but cf. Rom. xiii. 11) that as ye are partners of the sufferings (see reff. for κοινωνίας with a gen. object), so also are ye of the comfort. The main idea of this section is well given by Bengel: "Communio sanctorum . . . egregie representatur in hac epistola".

Vv. 8-11. His Recent Peril. Ver. 8. οὐ γὰρ θλομένων κ.τ.λ.: for we should not have you ignorant, brethren, about (for ὑπὸ with gen. in this sense, cf.
chap. viii. 23, xii. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 1) our affection which happened in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life. Having spoken in general terms of the Divine comfort in times of trouble, he goes on to mention his own particular case, the “affliction which befell him in Asia”. What was this? Asia almost certainly means Ephesus, where he had lately been exposed to many adversaries (1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 9). We naturally think of the tumult recorded in Acts xix. 23 ff.; but the language here used is so strong that he must have been exposed to something worse than a temporary riot. He was “weighed down beyond his power” (εανακρησται), a phrase which he never uses elsewhere, and which is specially remarkable from the pen of one who always gloried in the Divine δωρας granted to him, of which he said θανατωρικα δωρα τω ονκαλομενου μου, Phil. iv. 13); he “despaired of life,” and yet he describes in this very Epistle (iv. 8) his general attitude in tribulation as “perplexed, yet not despairing”. Nor have we knowledge of any persecution at Ephesus so violent as to justify such language, though no doubt the allusion may be to something of the kind. Whatever the “affliction” was, the Corinthians were acquainted with it, for St. Paul does not enter into details, but mentions it only to inform them of its gravity, and to assure them of his trust in his ultimate deliverance. On the whole, it seems most likely that the reference is to grievous bodily sickness, which brought the Apostle down to the gates of death (see ver. 9, and cf. chap. iv. 10 and xii. 7 ff.). Such an affection would be truly εανακρησται; and it would be necessary to contemplate its recurrence (ver. 10). St. Paul in this Epistle, with unusual frequency, uses the plural δωρας when speaking of himself; sometimes this can be explained by the fact that Timothy was associated with him in the writing of the letter (i. 1), but in other passages (e.g., ver. 10, v. 13, 16, x. 7, 11, 15, xi. 21) such an explanation will not suit the context, which demands the individual application of the pronoun.

Ver. 9. ἄλλα αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.: nay, we ourselves had the sentence of death in ourselves; i.e., the danger was so great that the sentence of death had been already pronounced, as it were, ἀνακρησταί might mean “answer,” as the Revisers translate it (they give sentence, with the A.V., in their margin); cf. the verb ἀνακρῄσω. But in the other places where this rare word is found (e.g., Jos., Ant. xiv. 10, 6, and an inscription of 51 A.D., quoted by Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien, p. 85) it stands for an official decision or sentence. Cf. κρίμα θανάτου, “the sen-
tence of death" (Ecclus. xli. 3). The tense of *ευχήκαμεν* is noteworthy; it seems to be a kind of historical perfect, used like an aorist (cf. chap. ii. 13, xi. 25, Rev. v. 7, viii. 5, for a similar usage).—

Ver. 10. *σάλων καὶ* *νυμι* : who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver (reading ζευκτα). The form of words recalls Rom. xv. 31 and 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, which would give some support to the theory that the great peril in question was persecution at the hands of opponents; but (as we have said on ver. 8) it seems more probable that the Apostle's deliverance was from a dangerous illness. It is possible, indeed, that we have here a reminiscence of Job xxxiii. 30. Ἰρώτατο τῇν ψυχὴν μου ἐκ θανάτου, which would confirm this interpretation. Note that the preposition is ἐκ, not ἐν; ἐν would only indicate *delirium* from the neighbourhood of a danger: ἐκ indicates *emergence* from a danger to which one has actually been exposed (see Chase, *Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 71 ff.). Cf. with the whole phrase 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, Ἰρώτατο ἐκ στομάτων λέοντος, ἤρωτατο μὲ κύριος κ.τ.λ.—ἐπὶ *δέ* ἑρώταμεν: towards whom we have set our hope, as with the acc. (see reff.) expresses the direction towards which hope looks; ἐπὶ with the dat. after ἀνεύσει (1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17) rather indicates that in which hope rests. Cf. Ps. iv. 6, *ανεύσατε ἐπὶ κύριον* The perfect ἑρώταμεν here has its full force, *via*., "towards whom we have set our hope, and continue to do so"; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 19, 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17,—και οἵ τινες προσώπου: the force of ἐπὶ (if indeed it be part of the true text: see crit. note) is to carry the mind on to the perils of the future, as distinguished from those of the present: *He will continue to deliver us*.

Ver. 11. *συντυχουσών καὶ θανάτων* κ.τ.λ.; ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication; i.e., apparently, "helping me". St. Paul claims that the sympathy of his converts with him shall be exhibited by their prayers for him. *Συνεργός* is prayer for a particular object, as contrasted with the more general *προσευχή* (Eph. vi. 18).—*σάλων καὶ* *νυμι* : *προσώπων* κ.τ.λ.: that from many faces (i.e., as if upturned in thanksgiving) thanks be given on our behalf through many for the gift bestowed on us. *Προσώπων* came to mean "person" in later Greek, but it never can be thus translated in the N.T., save in the phrase ἄλματεν προσώπων (Luke xx. 21, Gal. ii. 6) or θαυμάζειν προσώπων (Jude 16), "to respect the person" of anyone. Even in these passages ἄλματεν προσώπων is a Hebraism which originally meant "raise the face" (see Plummer on Luke xx. 21). *Προσώπων* is used ten times elsewhere in this Epistle in its ordinary sense of "face" (chap. ii. 10, iii. 7, 13, 18, iv. 6, v. 12, viii. 24, x. 1, 7, xi. 20; cf. also 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xiv. 25, Gal. i. 22). Hence we cannot follow the English versions in translating *ἐκ*.
and the image in the writer's mind is that of faces upturned in prayer, the early Christian (and the Jewish) attitude of prayer being one of standing with uplifted eyes and outstretched arms (cf. Ps. xxvii. 2, Matt. vi. 5, 1 Tim. ii. 8, and Clem. Rom., § 29). The general thought, of the united thanksgivings of many persons, is found twice again in the Epistle in somewhat similar contexts (see reff.). x<^PLcrHLa and tuxapurrciv (the passive is found here only in N.T.) are favourite words with St. Paul, the former occurring sixteen times in his Epistles and only once elsewhere in the N.T. (1 Pet. iv. 10).

Vv. 12-14. They must Acknowledge his Sincerity of Purpose. He claims that he has always been frank and open in his dealings with the Corinthian Christians: cf. 1 Thess. ii. 3.— f\(\text{yip Kavx^tris} \), not Kavxt|p.a, as at ver. 14, which is rather the thing boasted of than the act of boasting. Kavxdopai and its cognates are peculiarly frequent in this Epistle (see Introd., p. 27).— ri (iop-tvpiov ttjs <rwcL8^crtti>st||iuv: viz., the testimony of our conscience. papTvpiov is the thing testified to by conscience, as contrasted with papTupfa, the act of testimony. ctuhiStio-is, "conscienza," represents the self sitting in judgment on self, a specially Greek idea, and taken over by St. Paul from Greek thought; the word is a favourite one with him, both in his Epistles and in his speeches (Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16).—Av<\(\text{Ττψ πα<\(\text{τής} \text{συνεδρίες} \text{ημών}: \text{vis.}, \text{the testimony of our conscience.} \) is the thing testified to by conscience, as contrasted with <\(\text{μαρτύρια}, \text{the act of testimony.} \)"}

is uncertain; but the meaning is not doubtful. The force of the genitive του Θεου is somewhat the same as in the phrase δικαιοσύνη Θεου (Rom. iii. 21); the holiness and sincerity which St. Paul claims as characterising his conduct are Divine qualities, and in so far as they are displayed in men they are God's gift, as he goes on to explain.—ον\(\text{κν ἐν σοφίᾳ} \) σαρκεί\(\text{κα κ.τ.λ.}: \) not in fleshly wisdom, but in God's grace, sc, which had been vouchsafed to him for the due discharge of his apostolic office (Rom. i. 5, 11; 2 Cor. ii. 3, xiv. 15, 1 Cor. iii. 10, Eph. iii. 2). Especially in the Corinthian letters does St. Paul insist on this, that his power is not that of human wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 4, 13, chap. x. 4). The word σαρκεί\(\text{κος is found five times in his letters, and only twice elsewhere in N.T. It signifies that which belongs to the nature of the σαρξ of man, as contrasted with σάρκιον (to make of flesh), which is the stronger word (cf. iii. 3 below).—ἀναντράφημεν \(\text{ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: did we behave ourselves in the world, sc, the heathen world (cf. 1 Cor. v. 10, Phil. ii. 15).—παρεστάθη ἐν πρὸς θρόνος: and more abundantly to youward, sc, perhaps because his opportunities at Corinth had been greater than elsewhere of displaying the holiness and sincerity of the Christian life.}

Ver. 13. \(\text{ού γάρ ἄλλα κ.τ.λ.}: \) for we write none other things unto you than what ye read (ἀναγινώσκετε always means "to read," in St. Paul's Epp. and throughout the N.T.) or even acknowledge; i.e., there is no hidden meaning in his letters; he means what he says, as to which doubts seem to have been prevalent at Corinth (chap. x. 10, 11). The play upon words ἀναγινώσκετε . . . ἐπειγόνσετε cannot be reproduced in English. St. Paul is fond of such paronomasia; e.g., γινωσκόμενον . . . ἀναγινωσκόμενον, chap. iii. 2; φωνείν, ὑπερφωνείν, σύ-φωνείν, Rom. xii. 3; συνεκρινώ, ἀνακρίνω, 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; ὑπαγορεύω, . . . περιγραφόμενον, 2 Thess. iii. 11; cf. for other illustrations 1 Cor. vii. 31, xi. 31, xii. 2, Phil. iii. 2, Eph. v. 15, and chaps
Ver. 15. *πρὸ τοῦ τελευταίου ἐπισκεύασμα* : *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; cf., e.g., Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end, sc., unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

Ver. 14. καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε κτλ.: *as also ye did acknowledge us in part;* i.e., some of them made this acknowledgment, but not all (1 Cor. iii. 4).——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: *that (not "because") we are your glorying (cf. v. 12);* that is, the Corinthian Church was proud of its connexion with the great Apostle, and still "gloried" in him.—καθώς καὶ ὅμως οἴδατε κτλ.: *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; cf., e.g., Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end, sc., unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

Ver. 16. *πρὸ τοῦ τελευταίου ἐπισκεύασμα* : *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; cf., e.g., Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: *that (not "because") we are your glorying (cf. v. 12);* that is, the Corinthian Church was proud of its connexion with the great Apostle, and still "gloried" in him.—καθώς καὶ ὅμως οἴδατε κτλ.: *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; cf., e.g., Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end, sc., unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

Ver. 14. καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε κτλ.: *as also ye did acknowledge us in part;* i.e., some of them made this acknowledgment, but not all (1 Cor. iii. 4).——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: *that (not "because") we are your glorying (cf. v. 12);* that is, the Corinthian Church was proud of its connexion with the great Apostle, and still "gloried" in him.—καθώς καὶ ὅμως οἴδατε κτλ.: *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus.* Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; cf., e.g., Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.——οἵ τινες μὲν ὅτι κτλ.: and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end, sc., unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.
of speeding fellow-Christians on their journeys, of "seeing them off" in safety, is often mentioned in Acts, and is inculcated more than once as a duty by St. Paul (see ref.).

Ver. 17. τοῦτο ὁ διὸ βουλεὐμένος κ.τ.λ.: when therefore I was thus minded, did I shew fickleness? The article τῇ before ἀλλοφης can hardly be pressed so as to convey the meaning "that fickleness which you lay to my charge"; it is merely generic.—Δὲ βουλεὐμέναι κ.τ.λ.: or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that there should be with me the Yea, yea, and the Nay, nay? That is, "Are my plans made like those of a worldly man, that they may be changed according to my own caprice, Yes to-day, No to-morrow?" His argument is that, although the details of his original plan had been altered, yet in spirit and purpose it was unchanged; there is no room for any charge of inconsistency or fickleness. His principles of action are unchangeable, as is the Gospel which he preaches. He had promised to go to Corinth, and he would go. For a similar use of the phrase κατὰ σφραγα see ref., and cf. chap. v. 16. The reduplication ταῖς ταῖς . . . ὃς ὅς is not altogether easy to explain; but we have ταῖς ταῖς repeated similarly in Matt. v. 37, and perhaps we may also compare the ἀμήν, ἀμήν of St. John's Gospel (e.g., x. 1). Some critics (e.g., Steck) have regarded ταῖς ταῖς . . . ὃς ὅς here as an actual quotation from Matt. v. 37. But apart from the fact that this opinion rests on a quite untenable theory as to the date of this Epistle (see Introd., p. 13), the context of the words will not lend itself to any such interpretation (see above).

Ver. 18. πιστὰ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς δὴ κ.τ.λ.: but as God is faithful, our word, etc. For the construction, cf. the similar forms of asseveration ἐπὶ κύριος δὴ, "as the Lord liveth" (1 Sam. xx. 3, 2 Sam. ii. 27), and ἐστὶν ἄλληλον Χριστὸν εἰ δὲν δῆται, "as the truth of Christ is in me" (xi. 10). For πιστὰ as applied to God, see Deut. vii. 9, 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13, 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 13, and cf. 1 Sam. xv. 29.—ὁ λόγος ἣμων ὁ πρὸς υἱὸν ὃς ἐστὶν Ναῦ καὶ Οὐ: our word (i.e., my personal communications about my journey, as well as the message of the Gospel) towards you is not Yea and Nay. I do not deceive you or vacillate in my purpose: cf. ii. 17.

Ver. 19. He has appealed to the faithfulness of God, and this suggests the thought of the unchangeableness of Christ.—ὁ τοῦ Ἰησοῦς κ.τ.λ.: for the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was proclaimed among you by us. The position of τοῦ θεοῦ before υἱὸς (as in the true text) brings out the sequence of thought better, as it brings Θεοῦ (the connecting word) into prominence.—δὲ ἵμαρτο καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμοθέου: even by me and Silvanus and Timothy. These three brought the Gospel to Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), and were closely associated during the Apostle's labours in that city (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1). Silvanus is only another form of the name Silas; he was a prophet (Acts xv. 32), and apparently, like St. Paul, a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37), and shared the
Apostle's perils during the whole of his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40—
 xviii. 18). We hear of him again at Rome (1 Pet. v. 12)—σα ν κε ην ναλ
 και ον επί άτελ. 11 ναλ—was not Yea and Nay, but in Him is (sc., has
 been and continues to be) Yea. There is no doubtfulness or vacillation in
 the words of Christ (Matt. vii. 29, John xii. 50); and He continually emphasised the
 positive and certain character of His
teaching by the introductory formula
 Αυτόν, ἦν. More than this, however,
is involved here. Christ, who is the
 Object and Sum of St. Paul's preaching,
is unchangeable (Heb. xiii. 8), for He is
 not only "true" (Rev. iii. 7), but "the
 Truth" (John xiv. 6); and so it may be
 said that an Eternal "Yea" has come
 into being (γέγονεν, through His incarnate
 Life) in Him.

Ver. 20. δια γέγονεν κ.τ.λ.: for how many soever be the promises of
 God, in Him is the Yea. Not only was
 Christ a διδάσατος προφήτης . . . εἰς τὸ
 βεβαιότατον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν
 (Rom. xv. 8), but He is Himself, in His
 own Person, the true fulfilment and re-
capitulation of them all (cf. Gal. iii. 8).—
 δια και δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ Αµήν κ.τ.λ.: where-
 fore also through Him is the "Amen,"
to the glory of God, through us.
The reading of the received text conceals
the force of these words. It is because Christ is
the consummation, the "Yea" of the
 Divine promises, that the "Amen" is
 especially fitting at the close of doxolo-
gies in public worship (1 Cor. xiv. 16).
The thought of the fulfilment of God's
promises naturally leads to a doxology
(Rom. xv. 9), to which a solemn "Αµήν,
the Hebrew form of the Greek ναλ, whose
significance as applied to Christ has just
been expounded, is a fitting climax. δι' ἦν
in this clause includes, of course, both St. Paul and his correspondents;
and the passage here refers, indeed, to the general profession of
Christians in their private devotions.

Ver. 21. ο καὶ ο σφός κ.τ.λ.: who
also sealed us (sc, all Christians), and
have us the earnest of the Spirit in our
hearts. The aorists, ο σφός . . . θυμία
have the stronger support of NABCGP 17; the Peshitto and the Bohairic.

Ver. 22. ἐκ δια Γερμανίας κ.τ.λ.: when
the Holy Spirit is repeatedly mentioned
as consequent on baptism (Acts ii. 38,
xix. 6); and the σφός, or "seal of
baptism, is a common image in early
Christian literature (e.g., [2 Clem.], § 8,
The "seal" of the Church is given by St. Paul (2 Tim. ii. 19) as "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (Num. xvi. 5), and "Let every one that nameth the Name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness" (Isa. iii. 10; cf. Num. xvi. 26, Isa. xxvi. 13). The ἄφθασις (see an exhaustive note in Pearson, On the Creed, viii.), i.e., ἑαυτῷ, is a first instalment, given in pledge of full payment in due course; see reff. and cf. Rom. viii. 16, τὸ πνεύμα συμπαρτέρει τῇ τενέματι ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐγὼ τῶν τέκνων Θεοῦ: here is the ἀπαρχή τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom. viii. 23). For the constrict. ἔθησαν cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 26, John iii. 35, Acts iv. 12, chap. viii. 16.

Ver. 23—ii. 4. The Real Reason of the Postponement of his Visit to Corinth was that he did not wish his next Visit to be Painful, as the last had been.—Ver. 23. γὰρ δὲ κακώσας ἡμᾶς: but if I make you sorry, who then is he that makes me glad, but he who is made sorry by me? His argument is: When I make you sorry, it is that you may repent (see chap. vii. 9), and so gladden me: my change of purpose was not prompted by the desire of giving pain, but on the con-
I. 1-5.
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1 B 17, the Bohairic and Harclean have yap; D* has τι; all other authorities οὐ.
2 Ν*ABCCKLOP place ἐδειν after υμᾶς; DEG and the Peshitto read ἐδειν πρὸς υμᾶς, and the Bohairic has τὸ μὴ ἐδειν πρὸς υμᾶς ἐν λύπῃ (omitting ταῦτα). The received order is found in a few cursives only.
3 Ν*DEGKLOP, etc., give ἐστιν; om. Ν*ABC and the Bohairic.
4 ΝcDEGKL, the Syriac and (most) Latin vss. have υμᾶς, which is omitted by Ν*ABC*OP 17 and the Bohairic.
5 CO give αὐτο τοῦτο; A and the Bohairic omit αὐτο.
6 DEG and a few other authorities have λυπην ἐπὶ λυπην (from a reminiscence of Phil. ii. 27).
7 Καὶ ΝcDEGL; better σχε, Ν*ABOP (see on i. 15).
8 G has ἵνα γνωτε τὴν ἄγαπην.

Ver. 4. ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως κ.τ.λ.: for out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears. This describes the state of mind in which he wrote 1 Cor., if the view of the situation which has been adopted in this commentary be correct (see Introd., p. 13).—

Διὰ τοῦτο διακρίνομεν: we have διακρίνομεν used, somewhat similarly, with the genitive of the attendant circumstances, in Rom. ii. 27, iv. 11, vii. 25, xiv. 20, chap. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1, Rev. xxii. 24, etc.—ὁ λοιπὸς ἅπαντι κ.τ.λ.: not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye should know the love which I have so abundantly to you. ἄγαπη, as a grace especially to be exhibited in Christian intercourse, is repeatedly dwelt on by St. Paul. The word has been described as "ecclesiastical" and as having been first introduced to literature in the LXX. But it has been recently found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period (Deissmann, Bibelstudien, p. 81), and it thus appears that the LXX only took over a word already current in the speech of Greek Egypt. Here the position of ἄγαπην before ἵνα gives it special emphasis; cf., for a like order, Acts xix. 4, Rom. xi. 31. περισσότερος may mean "more abundantly," αὐτοῖς, than to other Churches; but it is
The Offender has been sufficiently punished: the Apostle acquires in their remission of the penalty of the majority. The directions given by the Apostle for dealing with the offender had probably been carried out with harshness and severity; he now suggests that the punishment might be remitted, and the guilty man forgiven. Authority to bind and loose had been committed to the Apostles; St. Paul had exercised the former function (1 Cor. v. 5), and he now discharges the latter.

The various meanings of τερακαλέω include:

- sufficient to such an one (the word used in 1 Cor. v. 5 to indicate the offender) is this punishment (which was inflicted) by the majority. The directions given by the Apostle for dealing with the offender had probably been carried out with harshness and severity; he now suggests that the punishment might be remitted, and the guilty man forgiven. Authority to bind and loose had been committed to the Apostles; St. Paul had exercised the former function (1 Cor. v. 5), and he now discharges the latter.

- wherefore I beseech you (or "exhort you," see on i. 4) to confirm your love toward him. Authority "to bind" and "to loose" had been committed to the Apostles (Matt. xviii. 18); St. Paul had exercised the former function (1 Cor. v. 5), and he now discharges the latter.
The better reading is και γνωγων εις το κεχαρ., with ΝΑΒΚΟΣ, etc.; received text ΔβΚΛ 17, the Harclean, etc.

2 G and the Latin vss. have δια την ευαγγελίων; DE δια την ευαγγελίων.

Ver. 9. εις τούτο γάρ κ.τ.λ.: for to this end also did I write, vis., that I might know the proof of you, whether ye were obedient in all things; i.e., his object in writing the former letter (1 Cor.) was not only the reformation of the offender, but the testing of the Corinthians' acceptance of his apostolic authority (cf. vii. 12). For the constr. εις τούτο γάρ . . . ινα . . . cf. Rom. xiv. 9. It is hard to decide between the readings εις, "whether," or ο, "whereby" (see crit. note); but the general sense is the same in both cases. A comparison of this verse with vii. 12 has led some critics to doubt whether chaps. ii. and vii. really refer at all to the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1; for the expressed object of St. Paul's communication was to prove the loyalty of the Corinthians to himself. And thus it is supposed that the individual in view is some bitter personal opponent of St. Paul (see Tertullian, de Pudic. xiii.f.). But vv. 5-9 seem quite consecutive, and we find it more natural to distinguish διακατέχεις from St. Paul himself (see Introd., p. 15).

Ver. 10. εις τινι ερημεθείς κ.τ.λ.: but to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for what I also have forgiven (if I have forgiven anything) for your sakes have I forgiven it in the face of Christ. This is not a general principle, but a statement of the Apostle's feelings at the present juncture; if they are willing to forgive the offender, so is he. Whether he advocates punishment or forgiveness it is always δι' όπως, "for your sakes," and it is in προσώπων Χριστοῦ, "in the sight of Christ". πρόσωπων (see on i. xi) is a "face," and so εις προσω. Χρ. is a stronger way of saying εις προσωπόν Χριστοῦ (cf. chap. iv. 2, viii. 21, Gal. i. 20); the Apostle claims that his acts of condemnation and forgiveness are done as "in the presence of Christ". Both A.V. and R.V. render "in the person of Christ," which would mean that St. Paul had acted as Christ's delegate. But the usage of πρόσωπων in 2 Cor. is against this interpretation.

Ver. 11. άνα τολμητηθῶμεν κ.τ.λ.: lest we, sc., you and I together, be robbed by Satan; i.e., lest we drive sinners to despair and so let Satan capture them from us. "The offender was to be delivered over τῷ Σατάνας εἰς διαθέμα τῆς σωμάτος (1 Cor. v. 5)—care must be taken lest we εἰς τοῦ Σατάνας, and his soul perish likewise" (Alford). Observe that in St. Paul's writings (except chap. xii. 7; see reff.) Σατάνας takes the article, "the Satan," the adversary; it has not yet come to be regularly used as a proper name (but cf. Matt. iv. 10, Mark ii. 23). —εις γάρ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.: for we are not ignorant of his devices. νόημα (see reff.) is generally (always in this Ep.) used in a bad sense, of the thoughts of man's unregenerate heart. Here τα νόημα are the designs of the adversary of souls.

Vv. 12-17. He was disappointed at not meeting Titus in Troas, but he rejoices now to learn that his message of reproof has been loyally received in Corinth.—Ver. 12. Εἴδον ἃ εἰς κ.τ.λ.: but (the particle ἃ marking the resumption of his original subject) when I came to Troas, for the purposes of the Gospel of Christ (cf. ix. 13). He stayed there seven days preaching and teaching on his return from Greece (Acts xx. 6-12). We are not to press the article and translate "the Troad"; cf. Acts xx. 5, 6, where we have ἀν Τρῳάδας and εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα used of the same
place in consecutive verses. Troas would be a natural place of rendezvous, as it was the point of embarkation for Macedonia (see Acts xvi. 8); and here St. Paul had expected to meet Titus, who had been sent from Ephesus to Corinth, with an unnamed companion, as the bearer of 1 Cor. (see Intro., p. 9).— itoi ovpas p.01arcifryi?iv Kvpiu: and a door was opened for me in the Lord. This is not the "door of faith" (Acts xiv. 27), but the door of opportunity at Troas (see ref. above), which he describes here as "opened," a phrase which he had used a short time before of his prospects of usefulness at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 9). It is open ενΚυψω; that is the sphere, as it were, of his apostolic labours (see ref.).

Ver. 13. οὐκ ἐσχήκα ἁλατόν τοῦ πν.: I had no relief for my spirit. So he says again (vii. 5) ὅθεντοι ἦμεν εἰς Μακεδόνια ὁδηγοῦν ἐσχήκας ἁλατόν ἡ σκέφτημα. We are not to lay much stress on νεύμα being used here and σκέψει there (yet cf. chap. vii. 1); σκέψει in the later passage is used of the whole mortal nature of man, which is subject to distress and disappointment; and νεύμα here is a general term for the "mind" (cf. Rom. i. 9, viii. 6, xii. 11, Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, xiv. 14, chap. vii. 1, 13, etc., for St. Paul's use of νεύμα for the human spirit, and see on iii. 6 below).

For the tense of ἐσχήκα, see on i. 9. — τῇ μη εὐφέρειν κ.τ.λ.: because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my lease of them (sc., the disciples at Troas) I went forth into Macedonia. ἔβρισκομαι is used in this sense in Acts xvi. 10, xx. 1 of "going out" of Asia to Macedonia; cf. viii. 17.

Ver. 14. τῇ Θεῷ χάρις κ.τ.λ.: but thanks be to God, etc. Instead of giving details of the information which Titus brought to him in Macedonia (chap. vii. 6), he bursts out into a characteristic doxology, which leads him into a long digression, the main topic of the Epistle not coming into view again until vi. 11.— τῇ πάντοτε θραμβέοντοί: who always, sc., even in times of anxiety and distress, leadeth us in triumph in Christ. θραμβέοντο, "to lead as captive in a triumphal procession," occurs again in this sense Col. ii. 15. The rendering of the A.V., "which causeth us to triumph," though yielding a good sense here (and despite the causative force of verbs in -cwv), must be abandoned, as no clear instance of θραμβέοντο in such a signification has been produced. The splendid image before the writer's mind is that of a Roman triumph, which, though he had never seen it, must have been familiar to him as it was to every citizen of the Empire. He thinks of God as the Victor (Rev. vi. 2) entering the City into which the glory and honour of the nations (Rev. xxi. 26) is brought; the Apostle as "in Christ"—as a member of the Body of Christ—is one of the captives, by means of whom the knowledge and fame of the Victor is made manifest. He rejoices that he has been so used by God, as would appear from the tidings which Titus has brought him.— οἱ πόλεμος τῶν γνῶσεως κ.τ.λ.: and maketh manifest through us the savour of the knowledge of Him (sc., of Christ) in every place, sc., at Corinth as well as in Troas and Macedonia. It is possible that the metaphor of the δομή is suggested by and is part of that of the triumph; e.g., Plutarch (Emil. Paul. c. 33) says that the temples were "full of fumigations" during the passage of the procession. But δομή εὐφέρεια is a frequent LXX phrase (see ref.).

Ver. 15. διὰ Χρ. εὐφέρεια κ.τ.λ.: for
13—17. 

**ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Β**

...we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God. Not only "through us" is the doxa made manifest; we ourselves in so far as we realise and manifest our membership of Christ are, in fact, that cvwSia.

The influence of the lives of the saints is sweet and penetrative, like that of incense. From this verse comes the phrase "the odour of sanctity". — «v tois o-tu-pcvois Ka'i k.t.X.: among them that are being saved and among them that are perishing. It is difficult to understand why the American Committee of Revisers objected to this rendering, and translated "are saved ... perish". The force of the present participles ought not to be overlooked (see reff.); men in this world are either in the way of life or the way of death, but their final destiny is not to be spoken of as fixed and irrevocable while they are in the flesh. Free will involves the possibility alike of falling away from a state of grace, or of repentance from a state of sin. But for men of either class is a Christian life lived in their midst, a cvwSia Xpiarov.

Ver. 16. ois mnev doxa k.t.a.: to the one a savour from death unto death; to the other a savour from life unto life; and yet it is the same doxa in both cases; cf. Luke ii.34. 

The Rabbinical parallels given by Wetstein and others show that the metaphor of this verse was common among Jewish writers; they called the Law an aroma vitae to the good, but an aroma mortis to the evil.—καὶ πρὸς ταύτα τις λαοῦς: who then is sufficient for these things? sc., to fill such a part as has been just described (for καὶ ... τίς see on ver. 2 above). St. Paul's answer is not fully expressed, but the sequence of thought is this: "it might be thought that no one is sufficient for such a task; and yet we are, for we are not as the many," etc.; an answer which he is careful to explain and qualify in ver. 5 of the next chapter, lest he should be accused of undue confidence.

Ver. 17. o ὅποι ισχύς εἰς κ.τ.λ.: for we are not as the many, viz., the ordinary teachers with whom you meet. The indirect reference is to his opponents at Corinth, though they are not named. At least he is more worthy to fill the high office of which he has been speaking than many who would be only too glad to usurp his authority; cf. chap. iv. 2, I Thess. ii.3, 5 for similar comparisons. — καταλυότας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ: who adulterate the word of God, i.e., the Divine message as revealed in the Gospel (the usual sense in the N.T. of αὐτός τοῦ Θεοῦ; cf. iv. 2 and 2 Tim. ii. 15).

κάτιπας (Ecclus. xxvi. 29) is "a huckster," and is used in Isa. i. 22 of one who adulterates wine; so the primary sense of καταλύων is "to make merchandise of" (R.V. margin), which readily passed into "to corrupt" or "adulterate" for the purposes of trade. — ἀλλ' ὅς εἰς εἰλικρίνειας κ.τ.λ.: but as of sincerity (our subjective attitude of mind), but as of God (the objective source of our message).
and of our commission to speak), in the sight of God (sc., in the consciousness of His presence; cf. ver. 10 above), speak we in Christ, sc., as members of Christ's Body, in fellowship with Him. This solemn and impressive confirmation of what has been said is repeated, chap. xii. 19, τεταυτεύχομαι το Χριστόν λαλομένης.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-3. The Corinthians are St. Paul's "Epistle of Commendation".—Ver. 1. ἀφίημι ἡμῖν συντάγματα; all other authorities συνιστάναι. — Ver. 2. ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμῖν ἐστή, ἡ γεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις συνιστάναι. — Ver. 3. ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἑαυτῶν ἡμῶν: written in our hearts, i.e., in the heart of me, Paul (cf. vii. 3); a somewhat unexpected, and, as it were, parenthetic application of the metaphor, suggested by the memory of and of our commission to speak).
4. "PepoîðhÁNv ð' tolaútvn ëçòvùv ñiá toû Ïrostatou prôs toû k. Reûf. i. 13, 1 Reûf. ii. 6, 5. oðy ñi 'iakonv ëçovùv âf' ëﻻvov lóγioi-ávdi.âf' ti, ð' ëç 5 in Here only. ð' ëﻻvov, âl' ë 'îakonv ëhùv ëk toû Ïrostatou, 6. ëå ñi 'îakonv ëxv Ex. Col. i. 12 only. ëhùv ëîakonvùv ë xainíkís, ð' ãyámamátov, Ùllá ïuvê-â. Cf. Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23.

p Mt. xxvi. 28; Lk. xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Heb. viii. 8 (Jer.xxxi. 31), ix. 15. q Rom. ii. 29, vii. 6.

1 A has Íxhô.

2 âf' ëxâvwv is placed as in text by KL and the Harclean, and after lógiastoçti ti by ADEGP and the Latins; its true place is before ëkxovùvs ëçovùv with ëBC 73 and the Bohairic; 17 and the Peshitto omit ãf' ëxâvwv altogether.

3 CDEG give òî-yitco-ôaîv Xovito-ôaîv ñfîABKLP.

4 B om. ti; P has the order ti Xovito-ôaîv.

5 C om. mn as unnecessary for the sense.

6 avrcuv BG for cavruv.

7 17 has õ yiyâwvoùv Ùllá ïuvê-â, which the Latin vss. follow.

his labours among them which had left an indelible impression upon his heart.—

γνωστ. καλ άναγινωσκ. κ.τ.λ.: known and read of all men. This is the legitimate application of the metaphor, and is expanded in the next verse. The letter written on St. Paul's heart was not open to the world; but the letter written on the heart of the Corinthians by Christ through St. Paul's ministry was patent to the world's observation, as it was reflected in their Christian mode of life. Facts speak louder than words. For the jingle yivuo*ko|Uvt| . . . &vavivuo-K. k.t.X.: cf. Acts viii.30, ymio-Kcis & dvaviviio-kcis, and see the note on i.13 above.

Ver. 3. φανερώμενοι ñi ëîtv k.τ.λ.: being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ (sc, written by Christ), ministered by us (the Apostle conceiving of himself as his Master's amanuensis).—

γγεγραμμηθ. ñi ûhâluv k.τ.λ.: written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone but in tables that are hearts of flesh. This "writing" which the Corinthians exhibit is no writing with ink on a papyrus roll, but is the mystical imprint of the Divine Spirit in their hearts, conveyed through Paul's ministrations; cf. Jer. xxxi. 33, Prov. viii. 7. And this leads him to think of the ancient "writing" of the Law by the "finger of God" on the Twelve Tables, and to contrast it with this epistle of Christ on tables that are not of stone but are "hearts of flesh" (see reff.). For ñhânuvs (cf. &hânuvs, ñhânuvnuvs) see on i. 12 above.

Vv. 4-6. His success in the Ministry of the New Covenant is altogether due to God.—Ver. 4. pepoîðhÁNv ð' tolaútvn ñiávùv k.τ.λ.: and such confidence have we through Christ towards God (cf. Rom. iv. 2, v. 1 for a like use of prôs toû Ïrostatou). That is "we are sufficient for these things" (see ii. 16, 17); but he hastens to explain the true source of his confidence.

Ver. 5. õy @îtv ìkavov k.τ.λ.: not that we are sufficient of ourselves to judge anything as from ourselves; sc, to judge rightly of the methods to be followed in the discharge of the Apostolic ministry; there is no thought here of the natural depravity of man, or the like. For the constr. õy 8ri . . . cf. i. 24 and reff. lógiastoçti is here used in its widest sense of carrying on any of the ordinary processes of reasoning (cf. x. 7, xii. 6). The repetition âf' ëxâvwv . . . ð' ëxâvwv emphasises the statement of the need of God's grace. St. Paul's habit of dwelling on a word and coming back to it again and again (an artifice which the Latin rhetoricians called traductio) is well illustrated in this passage. We have ìkavov, ìkavótîs, ìkávovov; yìpaivma (following ìγγεγραμμηθ. in ver. 2); ìkávovìsìs, ìlávov; ìkávovìs; and ìgèa eight times between vv. 7-11. With the sentiment ìkavotîs ëhùv ëk toû Ïrostatou, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 10 and chap. xii. 9.

Ver. 6. ð' ñi ìkávovov k.τ.λ.: who also ("qui idem"; cf. 1 Cor. i. 8) made us sufficient as ministers of the New Covenant—{ministers] not of the letter (i.e., the Law), but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life. The Apostle's opponents at Corinth were probably Judaisers (xi.22), and thus the description of his office as the ìkávovìs ìkavótîs diâhèns is leads him to a comparison and a contrast of the Old Covenant and the New. The "covenants" (Rom.
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πρὸς κορίνθιούς β

1 John vi. 63; Rom. viii. 11; Cor. xv. 45; cf. Pat. iii. 10, and Rom. ix. 10.

viii. 10. Here only.

1 Esd. xxxiv. 29-35. u Acts i. 10, iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 55, xi. 6, xiii. 9.

B has ἀποκτείνει; but NGBK 17 have ἀποκτανεῖ, and ACDEL ἀποκτανεῖ; Lachmann conjectured ἀποκτανεῖ.

2 BD*G and the Peshitto have γράμματι.

3 N=DK=EKL, d, c, f support ev λόγος; om. ev N*ABCD*GP 17, g.

4 The more accurate spelling is Μωνοτεύ (NBCGKL, etc.); and so at vv. 13, 15.

ix. 4, Eph. ii. 12) between Jehovah and Israel were the foundation of Judaism. They began (not to speak of the Covenant with Noah) with the Covenant of Circumcision granted to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 2) and repeated more than once (Gen. xxii. 16, xxvi. 3), which is often appealed to in the N.T. (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, etc.). This was not abrogated (Gal. iii. 17) by the Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xix. 5), which is often appealed to in the N.T. (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, etc.). This was not abrogated (Gal. iii. 17) by the Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xix. 5), which is often appealed to in the N.T. (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, etc.).

The phrase had been consecrated to the Gospel, through its employment by Christ at the Institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvii. 28, Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25); and in that solemn context it bore direct allusion to the Blood of Sprinkling which ratified the Old Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 8). It is of this "New Covenant" that St. Paul is διάκονος (Christ is its μεσίτης, Heb. ix. 15); i.e., he is a διάκονος of γράμματος ἄλλην γνώμην, not of the letter of the Law (as might be wrongly inferred from his statement in ver. 3 that the ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ was "ministered" [διακονηθήσεται] by him), but of the "Spirit of the living God" (ver. 3). This is a much more gracious διακονία, inasmuch as the Law is the instrument of Death (cf. Rom. v. 20, vii. 9, vii. 2, in all which passages the Apostle brings into closest connexion the three thoughts of the Law, Sin, and Death), but the Spirit of God is the Giver of Life (see ref. and cf. Gal. iii. 21, where he notes that the law is not able, ἀνεφεύρηκεν, "to give life"). It will be observed that the article is wanting before κατὰ διαθήκην, as it is before γράμματος and πνεύματος; but we need not on that account with the Revisers translate "a new covenant". The expression "New Covenant," like the words "Letter" (for the Law) and "Spirit" (for the Holy Spirit), was a technical phrase in the theology of the day; and so might well dispense with the article. The contrast between "letter" and "Spirit" here (so often misunderstood, as if it pointed to a contrast between what is verbally stated and what is really implied, and so justified an appeal from the bare "letter" of the law to the principles on which it rests) is exactly illustrated by Rom. vii. 6, where St. Paul declares that the service of a Christian is ἐν κατάντησι πνεύματος καὶ σωτηρίας γράμματος, i.e., "in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter". And (though not so plainly) the same contrast is probably intended in Rom. ii. 29. In St. Paul's writings πνεῦμα, when used for the human spirit, is contrasted with σῶμα (1 Cor. v. 3), σῶρος (2 Cor. vii. 1) and νοῦς (1 Cor. xiv. 14), but never with γράμμα. This is a technical term for the "Law" (like γραφή, Scripture; cf. ver. 7, ἐν γράμματι), and is properly set over against the "Spirit" of God, whose office and work were first plainly revealed in the Gospel.

Vv. 7-11. Diggession on the Ministry of the New Covenant. It is (a) more glorious than that of the Old. — Ver. 7. 11 εἰ ἐν διαθήκῃ κ.τ.λ.: but if the Ministration of Death (see ver. 6), written, and engraved in stones, came into existence in glory, etc. The reference is to the glory on the face of Moses (see reff.) when the Tables of the Law were brought down from Mount Sinai.
St. Paul argues that for two reasons the glory of the New Covenant is greater, (i.) the former διακονία was one of condemnation, the latter of righteousness (ver. 9), and (ii.) the glory of the former was only a transient gleam, while that of the latter abides for ever (ver. 11).

Of the first Tables which Moses broke in anger it is said that the writing was γραφή ἡθοῦ κεκολαμμένη ἐν τοῖς πλαζέν (Exod. xxxii.16); it is merely said of the second Tables that Moses wrote upon them "the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments" (Exod. xxxiv.28). Nevertheless the tradition (see Philo, Vit. Mos., iii., 2) was that the second Tables, like the first, were not only "written" but "engraven" (ἐπτετυμνόμενον), as the Apostle has it—δύνασθαι νῦν κ.τ.λ.: so that the Children of Israel could not (sc., through fear, Exod. xxxiv. 30) look steadfastly upon the face of Moses on account of the glory of his face, transient as it was. καταργοῦμαι is nearly always, if not always (for 1 Cor. ii. 6 is doubtful), passive in St. Paul (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 2, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xv. 4), and as it must be taken passively in ver. 14 below, there is a good deal to be said for regarding it as passive here and in vv. 11, 13 (as the A.V. does; note, however, that the translation "which was to be done away" in this verse is wrong). Yet the sense seems to require the middle voice "which was passing away," sc., even as he spoke to the people. The position of τὴν καταργοῦμαι gives it emphasis. Pfleiderer is guilty of the extravagant supposition that the whole story of the Transfiguration (cf. Luke ix. 28 ff.) is built up on the basis of this passage (cf. μεταμορφώμεθα, ver. 28), the disappearance of Moses and Elijah, leaving Jesus alone with His disciples, indicating that the glory of the Old Covenant was passing away (καταργοῦμαι)!  

Vv. 8, 9. τὸς οἵτινες μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.: how shall not rather the Ministration of the Spirit be with glory? For if the Ministration of Condemnation be glory (if we read την διακονια we must render, with the American Revisers, "has glory"), much rather doth the Ministration of Righteousness exceed in glory. Cf. Rom. v. 16, τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἄνω εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάριμα ἐκ πολλῶν παράτησιν εἰς δικαίωμα, and Rom. viii. 1, ὡς ὁ γὰρ κατὰ κρίμα τοῖς ἐν Χρ. ἑτ'. The phrase διακονίας is used again at xi. 15, as descriptive of the ministers of the New Covenant; it is an essential point of Pauline theology that "righteousness" is not of the "law" (Gal. iii. 21). The argument is a minori ad maius.

Ver. 10. καὶ γὰρ τὸ δεδέσθαι: for that which hath been made glorious, sc., the Ministration of the Old Covenant, hath not [really] been made glorious in this respect, viz., on account of the surpassing glory (of the Ministration of the New Covenant); i.e., the surpassing glory of the second made the glory of the first seem nought. The phraseology of Exod. xxxiv. 35 (τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσοῦ . . . δεδέσθαι) is still in the Apostle's mind. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει has been otherwise explained as equivalent to "in this
stance of Moses;" but it seems (see ref.) to be merely a redundant phrase, added for the sake of emphasis, introducing ἐνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβολῆς. θέλη.

Ver. 11. εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργ. κ.τ.λ.: for if that which passes away was with glory, much more that which abideth is in glory. The difference of prepositions ἄκα τῆς... ἢ τῆς... should not be overlooked; the Ministration of the Old Covenant was only with a transient flush of glory, that of the New abides in glory (cf. esp. Heb. xii. 18-27). It is true that St. Paul sometimes changes his prepositions in cases where we find difficult to assign a sufficient reason (e.g., ἄκα and ἢκ, Rom. iii. 30, Gal. ii. 16); but that is no reason for confusing the force of ἄκα and ἢκ, when the preservation of the distinction between them adds point to the passage (cf. Rom. v. 10, where ἄκα and ἢκ are again confused in the A.V.). See further on vi. 8.

Vv. 12-18. THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW COVENANT is (b) OPEN, NOT VEILED, AS WAS THAT OF THE OLD. The illustration from the O.T. which is used in these verses has been obscure for English readers by the faulty rendering of the A.V. in Exod. xxxiv. 33. It would appear from that rendering, viz., "till Moses had done speaking with them he put a veil on his face," that the object of the veil was to conceal from the people the Divine glory reflected in his face. But this is a misrepresentation of the original Hebrew, and is not the rendering given either by the LXX or by modern scholars. The R.V. substitutes when for till in the verse just quoted, thus bringing out the point that the veil was used to conceal not the glory on the face of Moses, but its evanescence; it was fading even while he spoke, and this by his use of the veil he prevented the people from perceiving. When he "went in unto the Lord" again he took the veil off. The Apostle applies all this to the Israel of his day. Still a veil is between them and the Divine glory—a veil "upon their hearts" which prevents them from seeing the transitoriness of the Old Covenant; yet, as it was of old, if they turn to the Lord, the veil is removed, and an open vision is granted. St. Paul is fond of such allegorising so of the history of the Exodus; cf., e.g., 1 Cor. x. 2, Gal. iv. 25.

Ver. 12. ἔχοντες ὄντων τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.: having therefore such a hope (sc., of the glorious Ministration of the Spirit, ver. 8; cf. ver. 4) we use great boldness of speech. The verses which follow are parenthetical down to ver. 18, where the subject is again we, i.e., all Christian believers, as contrasted with Jews.

Ver. 13. καὶ ό ναθάνεμα κ.τ.λ.: and (we put no veil upon our face) as Moses put a veil upon his face. The construction is broken, but the sense is obvious; cf., for a somewhat similar abbreviation, Mark xv. 8, δῆλος ἐξαίτιον καθώς ἐποίηκεν αὐτῷ.—πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑπερβολῇ κ.τ.λ.: to the end that the children of Israel should not look steadiness on the end of that which was passing away, sc., the evanescence of the glory on Moses' face. The A.V., "could not steadfastly look to the end of that which
was abolished," evidently takes τίλος as standing for Christ, the fulfilment of the Mosaic law (Rom. x. 4). But this is not suitable to the context. ἐπὶ τὸν καθιστ. aὐτὸν κεῖται. 16. ἥνικα 8' 4 δὲ ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Ἰ. 16. ἤνικα τὸ κάλυμμα. 17. ὦ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἑαυτοῦ, τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦ Κυρίου. 15. ἄλλοι δὲ σήμερον, ἥνικα τὸ ἀναγινώσκεται. 2. Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα τὸ καθιστ. 16. ἥνικα 8', ἐπὶ τὴν καθιστ. aὐτὸν κεῖται. 16. ἦνικα τὸ κάλυμμα. 17. ὦ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Ισραήλ, τοῦ Κυρίου.
spoken of in the preceding quotation, is the Spirit, the Author of the New Covenant of grace, to whom the new Israel is invited to turn (cf. Acts ix. 35). It is quite perverse to compare 1 Cor. xv. 45 (where it is said that Christ, as " the last Adam," became πνεύμα Χειρος) or Ignatius, Mag., § 15, διάδαιμον πνεύμα δε ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, and to find here an "identification" of Christ with the Holy Spirit. δ Κρισος is here not Christ, but the Jehovah of Israel spoken of in Exod. xxxiv. 34; and in St. Paul's application of the narrative of the Veiling of Moses, the counterpart of δ Κρισος under the New Covenant is the Spirit, which has been already contrasted in the preceding verses (vv. 3, 6) with the letter of the Mosaic law. At the same time it is true that the identification of "the Lord" (i.e., the Son) and "the Spirit" intermittently appears afterwards in Christian theology. See (for ref.) Swete in Dict. Chr. Biog., iii., 115a.—οδ δὲ τὸ πνεύμα κ.τ.λ.: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; sc., in contradistinction to the servile fear of Exod. xxxiv. 30; cf. John viii. 32, Rom. viii. 15, Galv. iv. 16, in all of which passages the freedom of Christian service is contrasted with the bondage of the Law. The thought here is not of the freedom of the Spirit's action (John iii. 8, 1 Cor. xii. 11), but of the freedom of access to God under the New Covenant, as exemplified in the removal of the veil, when the soul turns itself to the Divine glory. "The Spirit of the Lord" is an O.T. phrase (see ref.). We now return to the thought of ver. 12, the openness and boldness of the Apostolical service.

Ver. 18. ὑμεῖς δὲ πάντες κ.τ.λ.: but we all, sc., ye as well as I, all Christian believers, with unveiled face (and so not as Moses under the Old Covenant), reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, sc., of Jehovah (see ref.), which is the glory of Christ (cf. John xvii. 24), are transformed into the same image, sc., of Christ (see ref.), from glory to glory (i.e., progressively), and so like the transitory reflection of the Divine glory on the face of Moses; cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 7, and on chap. ii. 16 above), as from (not "by") as the A.V. the Lord the Spirit; sc., our progress in glory is continuous, as becomes the work of the Spirit from whom it springs (John xv. 14, Rom. viii. 11). The meaning of κατοπτριζόμεθα (which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible) is somewhat doubtful. (i.) The analogy of 1 Cor. xiii. 12, of Philo, Leg. All., iii., 33 (a passage where Exod. xxxiv. 18 is paraphrased, and which therefore is specially appropriate here), and of Clem. Rom., § 36, would support the rendering of the A.V., "beholding as in a glass" (i.e., a mirror). This is also given in the margin of the R.V., and is preferred by the American Revisers. But such a translation is not appropriate to the context, for the Apostle's thought is not of any instrumental vision of the Divine glory, but of our freedom of access thereto and of perception thereof. It seems better therefore (ii.) to render with the R.V. (following Chrysostom) reflecting as in a mirror. And so the image conveyed is "that Christians having, like Moses, received in their lives the reflected glory of the Divine presence, as Moses received it on his countenance, are unlike Moses in that they have no fear, such as his, of its vanishing away, but are confident of its continuing to shine in them with increasing lustre (cf. iv. 6 below); and in this confidence present themselves without veil or disguise, inviting enquiry
IV. 1—3. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Β

καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος. IV. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο έχουσες τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, καθόλου ἐλεημομένης, ὡς ἀνακούσας. 2. ἀλλ' ἀπει-
πάμενα τα ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν παραμυθεί.

μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνιστάτες. 3 ἐν αὐτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν συνεδριάν ἄνθρωπον καὶ σπουδαστὴν τοῦ Ἱσο
c. Ῥωμ. ii. 16; 1 Κορ. iv. 5, 14; 2 Τιμ. iv. 1; cf. chap. viii. 21. m τὸ Θεοῦ. 3. μὲν δὲ καὶ ἄπτεται καθαράμενον τὸ ἐνα
to 25; 1 Πετ. iii. 4. d Φιλ. iii. 10; Τιμ. 13; cf. Ῥωμ. vi. 21; Εφη. v. 12. e Acts xxii. 21; Ῥωμ. vi. 4; Εφη. v. 2; Κολ. iii. 2, etc. f Χαπ. xi. 3; 1 Κορ. iii. 19; Εφη. iv. 14; cf. chap. xii. 16. 2 Here only; Ps. xiv. 2, xxxv. 3. h 1 Κορ. xii. 7 only. i Chap. vi. 4, vii. 11; cf. chap. iii. i. v. 13. 1 Here only; 1 Κορ. vii. 12; γαλ. i. 20; 1 Τιμ. v. 2; 2 Τιμ. iv. 1; cf. chap. viii. 21. m 1 Κορ. iv. 7; cf. chap. iv. 16; v. 16, vii. 8. n 1 Θεσσ. i. 5; 2 Θεσσ. ii. 14; cf. Ῥωμ. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 1 Κορ. v. 1; 2 Τιμ. ii. 8.

1 B has καθάπερ. 2 The better orthography is εγκακομεν ΝΑΒDG 17.

instead of deprecating it, with nothing to hold back or to conceal from the eager gaze of the most suspicious or the most curious" (Stanley). The words Κυρίου Πνεύματος will bear various renderings: (a) the Lord of the Spirit, which is not apposite here, (b) the Spirit of the Lord, as the A.V. takes them and the Latin commentators generally, (c) the Spirit, which is the Lord, the rendering of Chrysostom, which is given a place in the R.V. margin, and (d) the Lord, the Spirit, being placed in apposition to Κυρίου, neither word taking the article, as the first does not after the prep. ἀπὸ. We unhesitatingly adopt (d), the rendering of the R.V., inasmuch as it best brings out the identification of Κυρίου and πνεῦμα in ver. 17. It is worth noticing that the phrase in the " Nicene " Creed to πνεῦμα... to Κυρίου Θεοῦ, is based on the language of this verse and of ver. 6 above.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-6. He delivers WITH FRANKNESS HIS MESSAGE OF CHRIST the True Light.— Ver. 1. καὶ ἐνα πρὸς ἡμῖν τὴν ἀπειπάμεα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, ὡς ἀνακούσας. 2. ἀλλ' ἀπειπάμενα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν παραμυθεί. 3. μὲν δὲ καὶ ἄπτεται καθαράμενον τὸ ἐναπάμενα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν παραμυθεί.

Ver. 2. αλλ’ ἀπειπάμεα τὰ ἑκρυπτα. 2 The better orthography is εγκακομεν ΝΑΒDG 17.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-6. He delivers WITH FRANKNESS HIS MESSAGE OF CHRIST the True Light.— Ver. 1. διὰ τοῦτο έχουσες τὴν ἀπειπάμεα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, ὡς ἀνακούσας. 2. ἀλλ' ἀπειπάμενα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν παραμυθεί. 3. μὲν δὲ καὶ ἄπτεται καθαράμενον τὸ ἐναπάμενα τὰ ἑκρυπτα τῆς ἀεικήνης, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν παραμυθεί.
IV.

Ver. 3. If a kal k.t.l.: but even if our gospel (sc., the good news we preach; see reff.) is veiled (returning again to the metaphor of iii. 12-18), if it is veiled in them that are perishing; i.e., the fault lies with the hearers, not with the preacher (cf. vi. 12, and see Rom. i. 28). Blass (Gram. of N.T. Greek, § 41, 2) points out that ἐν τοῖς ἄπολλυμένοις is almost equivalent to "for them that are perishing" (cf. chap. viii. 1 and 1 Cor. xiv. 45 for a like use of ἐν).

Ver. 4. ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος: among whom the god of this world, sc., Satan. αἰὼν is an "age," a certain limit of time, and so ἀἰὼν οὐρά: (1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6) is "this present age," over which the devil is regarded as having power (cf. Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12). We have the expression αἰὼν ἡμῶν τοῦτον in Ignatius (Rom., 6). Wetstein quotes a Rabbinical saying, "The true God is the first God, but Samael (i.e., the evil angel who was counted Israel's special foe) is the second God". Many early writers, beginning with Origen and Irenæus, through dread of Gnostic speculations, dissociate ὁ Θεὸς from τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον, which they join with τῶν ἀπιστῶν. But this is a mere perversity of exegesis, suggested by controversial prejudice. Beliar is twice called "the ruler of this world" in the Ascension of Isaiah (ed. Charles, pp. 11, 24).—ἐφάρμοσα τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπιστῶν: hath blinded (the "ingressive aorist" again; cf. ver. 2) the minds (cf. iii. 14) of the unbelieving. Out of sixteen occurrences of the word ἀπιστῶν in the Pauline Epistles, fourteen are found in the Epp. to the Corinthians; it consistently means "unbelieving," and is always applied to the heathen, not to the Jews (except, perhaps, Titus i. 15).—

Ver. 5. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.: for we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus...
as Lord (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit"), and ourselves your slaves for Jesus' sake (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 19 and chap. i. 24 above; see also xi. 20 καταθυμολ).—Ver. 6. δυτίς Θεός κ.τ.λ.: seeing it is God who said "Light shall shine out of darkness" (a paraphrase of Gen. i. 3; cf. Ps. cxii. 4), who shined in our hearts to illuminate (others) with the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Christ. That is to say, there is nothing secret or crafty in the Ministration of the New Covenant; it is the proclamation of a second Fiat Lux (St. John i. 4, viii. 12) in the hearts of men (2 Pet. i. 19). The image of iii. 18 is thus preserved in this verse; we reflect the light which shines upon us from the Divine Glory, as manifested in Christ.

Vv. 7-15. His Bodily Weakness does not annul the effects of his ministry.—Ver. 7. Νόχομεν δὲ τὸν θεσμὸν κ.τ.λ.: but, sc., in contrast to the glowing and exultant phrases of ver. 6, we have this treasure, sc., of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God," in earthen vessels. The comparison of man, in respect of his powerlessness and littleness in God's eyes, to an earthen jar made by a potter for his own purposes and of any shape that he wills is common in the O.T. (Job x. 9, Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xix. 11; see 2 Esdras iv. 11), and St. Paul works out the idea in Rom. ix. 20 ff. He also distinguishes here and at 2 Tim. ii. 20 between different kinds of σκέπασμα, illustrating thereby the difference between men; while he himself is elsewhere called σκέπασμα ἡμῶν, and St. Peter calls woman σκέπασμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (see reff.). In the present passage σκέπασμα seems to be used specially for the human body (cf. 2 Esdras vii. [88], χρυσός), illustrating thereby the difference between men; while he himself is elsewhere called σκέπασμα ἡμῶν, and St. Peter calls woman σκέπασμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (see reff.). In the present passage σκέπασμα seems to be used specially for the human body (cf. 2 Esdras vii. [88], χρυσός), as the thought in the Apostle's mind is (mainly) of his own physical infirmities; the figure being derived from the ancient custom of storing gold and silver in earthenware pots. The treasure of the Gospel light is contained in an "earthen vessel," a frail body which may (seemingly) at any moment succumb (cf. Job iv. 19 and see v. 1 below). This may appear surprising, that so great a treasure should seem to be exposed to the mishaps which may befall the perishable jar in which it is contained; but yet (though St. Paul does not pursue this line of thought here) it is the very principle of the Incarnation that the heavenly is revealed and received through the earthly, for "the Word became flesh" (St. John i. 14).—Ἰνα ἡ ἐναρκτολή τῆς δυνάμεως κ.τ.λ.: that the exceeding greatness of the power, sc., which triumphed over all obstacles, may be God's and not from ourselves. The weakness of the instru-
ment is to demonstrate the Divinity of the power which directs it (cf. chap. xii. 9 and 1 Cor. ii. 5). with a sudden change of metaphor, the Apostle now thinks of himself as a soldier engaged with an apparently stronger foe, and at every moment on the point of defeat; and in four pairs of antithetical participles he describes his condition: in every direction pressed hard, but not hemmed in; bewildered, but not utterly despairing; pursued, but not forsaken (i.e., abandoned to the pursuing foe); struck down (as by an arrow; cf. Xen., Cyr., i, 3, 14 for this use of καταβάλλειν), but not destroyed. The general sense is much like that of Prov. xxiv. 16, Mic. vii. 5; cf. also chap. xi. 23-30. οἰκονομία is nearly always (in N.T.) coupled with ἐστί (cf. Rom. ii. 9, vii. 35, chap. vi. 4, and Isa. viii. 22, xxx. 6). With the play on words ἐστὶν οἰκονομίαν... ἐστὶν οἰκονομίαν, which it is difficult to reproduce in English, see on i. 13 above. The phrase ἐν σώματι occurs no less than nine times again in this Epistle (see chap. vi. 4, vii. 5, 11, 16, viii. 7, ix. 8, 11, xi. 6, 9), though only once elsewhere (1 Cor. i. 5) in St. Paul's writings.

Vv. 10, 11. The climax of the preceding antithesis is now reached: "Dying, yet living" (cf. vi. 9). πάντα τὴν νεκρωσιν κ.τ.λ.; always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body; for we which live are ever being delivered over to death (cf. xi. 23 below) for Jesus' sake, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh. The key to the interpretation of ver. 10 is to observe that ver. 11 is the explanation of it (ἀλλὰ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.); the two verses are strictly parallel: "our mortal flesh" of ver. 11 is only a more emphatic and literal way of describing "our body" of ver. 10. Hence the bearing about of the νεκρωσις of Jesus must be identical with the continual deliverance to death for His sake. Now the form νεκρωσις (see ref.) is descriptive of the process of "mortification"; and the νεκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ must mean the νεκρωσις to which He was subject while on earth (gener. subjecti). The phrase περιφέρει τὴν νεκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ conveys, then, an idea comparable to that involved in other Pauline phrases, e.g., "to die daily" (1 Cor. xv. 31), "to be killed all the day long" (Rom. viii. 35, a quotation from Ps. xliii. 22), "to know the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10), "to fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh" (Col. i. 24), the conception of the intimate union in suffering between Christ and the Christian having been already touched on in i. 5. And such union in suffering involves a present manifestation in us of the Life of Christ, as well as ultimate union with Him in glory (Rom. viii. 17, cf. John xiv. 19). The phrases "if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection," and "if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom. vi. 5, 8), though verbally similar, are not really parallel to the verse before us, for they speak of a death to sin in baptism, while this has reference to actual bodily suffering in the flesh. And the inspiring thought of vv. 10, 11
of the present chapter is that Union with Christ, unto death, in life, has as its joyful consequence Union with Christ, unto life, in death. It is the paradox of the Gospel over again, o αἱρέσεις τῶν πνευμάτων (Matt. x. 39). It will be observed that the best MSS. give in ver. 10 to τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. It is worth noticing that while in the Gospels the proper name Ἰησοῦς generally takes the article, in the Epistles it is generally anarthrous. In addition to the example before us, the only other passage where St. Paul writes o Ἰησοῦς is Eph. iv. 21 (cf. Blass, Gram. of N.T. Greek, § 46. 10).

Ver. 12. The manifestation of Christ’s Life in the Apostle’s daily νερώμως is thus visible to the world and especially to his converts.—ισωρόμενος: but, sc, despite our bodily weakness and the “working of death in us” of ver. 12, having the same spirit of faith, sc, as the Psalmist, according to that which is written, “I believed, and therefore I spoke,” we also believe, and therefore also we speak, sc, as the Psalmist did. The exact meaning of Ps. cxv. 1 in the original is hard to fix; but the context would not naturally suggest the beautiful thought here read into it. That faith must find expression, that it cannot be silent, is the Apostle’s adaptation of the words. With τοῦ πνεύματος cf. Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. iv. 21, Gal. vi. 1, Eph. i. 17, 2 Tim. i. 7, etc. Deissmann (Neue Bibelstudien, p. 78) illustrates the introductory formula of citation here employed by the legal formula κατὰ τὸ προγεγραμμένον which occurs in a Fayyum papyrus of 52 A.D.

Ver. 14. Despite the contrast between death in us and life in you (ver. 12), we trust that we too shall share in that Risen Life of Christ. ισωρόμενος: knowing that He who raised up the Lord Jesus (see reff.) shall raise up us also with Jesus, sc, on the Day of the general Resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 14), and shall present us with you (see reff.). Observe that the A.V. “shall raise up us also by Jesus” depends on a wrong reading, and perverts the sense. It would appear from this passage that the Apostle did not hope to be alive at the Second Advent of Christ (cf. i. 8, 1 Cor. xv. 52), although at an earlier period he seems to have cherished such an expectation (1 Thess. iv. 15).
IV. 16—18.

He is sustained by a Glorious Hope. — Ver. 16. 64

Ver. 16. οὖν οὐκ ἔκκακομεν ἡμῶν τῷ Θεῷ: 16. διότι οὐκ ἔκκακομεν ἡμῶν τῷ Θεῷ: 16. διὸ εἰ καὶ ἐὰν ἔστω ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπους ἀναλύεται, ἀλλ' ἐὰν θυσιν ἄνακανοῦται ἡμᾶς καὶ ἡμῶν. 17. τὸ γὰρ παραπάτωμα ἡδρόφως τῆς ἡλίχρεος ἡμῶν καθ' ἐπερδηλήν εἰς ἄνακανοῦται ἅπασας 17. τὸ γὰρ παραπάτωμα ἡδρόφως τῆς ἡλίχρεος ἡμῶν καθ' ἐπερδηλήν εἰς ἄνακανοῦται ἅπασας βάρος δύνασθαι κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, 18. μὴ σκοποῦντων ἡμῶν τα βλέπωμεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλέποντες: τὰ γὰρ βλέπομεν πρὸς καρπὰ, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλέπο—

1 See crit. note on iv. 1. 
8 DeEKL support o ευθωνεμ; better o συν ἡμῶν with ΝΒCD*GP. 
9 D*EG, the Latins and Peshitto have προσκαίρων καὶ ἐλαφρῶν. 
* BC* and the Peshitto omit ημῶν. 
* Ν*C*K, the Bohairic and Harclean omit εἰς ἑπερδηλήν. 
* D*G, d, e, g have σκοποῦντες (an anacolouthon) for σκοποῦντων ημῶν. 
7 G, g, s give προσκαίρα πασίν.
ver. 1—2.
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μενα αλονια. V. 1. οιδαμεν γαρ, οτι εαν δι επιγειους ημιαν αικα

John iii. 12; 1 Cor. 15. 45, 49;

Phil. ii. 10, iii. 21; Jan. iii. 13

υς ix. 15 only; Matt. xxii. 2; Mk. xiv. 58; Acts vi. 14; Gal. ii. 18, etc. d Mk. xiv. 58; Col. ii. 11 only; cf. Acts xvii. 24. e Ver. 4 only; cf. John xxi. 7. b Rom. i. 17; chap. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8, ii. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4.

1 DEG, d, e, f, g have στις οἰκοδομην.

2 Ver. 18. u. το σκεπασματα των βλεστωμεν κ.τ.λ.: while we look not at the things which are seen (cf. chap. v. 7), but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal, sc., for the moment, but the things which are not seen are eternal, sc., for the ages; cf. Rom. viii. 24, Heb. x. 1. Wetstein quotes a good parallel to this splendid sentence from Seneca (Ep. 59): "Ista imaginaria sunt, et ad tempus aliquam faciem ferunt. Nihil horum stabile nee solidum est . . . mittamus animum ad ea, quae aeterna sunt."

Chapter V. — Vv. 1-5. His expectation of a Glorified Body hereafter; and his desire to survive until the Second Advent. — Ver. 1. οιδαμεν γαρ κ.τ.λ.: for (in explanation of iv. 17) we know, sc., we Christians (cf. Rom. vii. 14, 1 Cor. viii. 1), that if our earthly (δειπνουμεν, as contrasted with ορυγινατον; see ref.) tabernacle-house be dissolved, etc. Despite the fact that he was himself a σπερματικος (Acts xviii. 3), this is the only place where St. Paul employs any of the terms correlative to o-tnvEI.It is natural to think of the temporary character of the σκηνατος used by the Chosen People in the desert wanderings, an idea which is probably present in 2 Pet. i. 14, η παιδευς του σκηνατος μου; but the use of σκηνας as a depreciatory term for the "bodily frame" (R.V. mg.) is borrowed, as Field has shown, from the Pythagorean philosophy. It is the "tenement house," the "earthen vessel" (see iv. 7), and is called in Wisd. ix. 15, το κοιλάδε ανθρωπος. καταλειν (see ref.) is often used of the "destruction" of a house; and the application of the word "dissolution" for death is probably derived from this passage. — οἰκοδομην ευ γαρ ου ημας ανθρωποιν κ.τ.λ.: at the very moment of bodily dissolution, when the Resurrection takes place, according to the Apostle's thought here; see Charles' Eschatology, pp. 395, 400) a building from God, sc., not built up by the natural processes of growth but the direct gift of God, a house not made with hands (this being added to emphasise its "supernatural" character; the σκηνας of the natural body is also, of course, δειπνουμεν, and so the idea is not as fitly in place as at Heb. ix. 11, 24, but it is suggested by the word ολοκληρωμα. It is just possible that his own trade of tent-making may have been in his mind at the moment), eternal, in the heavens. Cf. Luke xvi. 9, ανωτερωσι σκηνας; as he has just said (iv. 18) τα βλεστωμεν ανωτερω. It will be observed that here ανωτερω is used with the special intention of emphasising the permanent character of the heavenly house, in contrast with the earthly house which is dissolved; it is therefore not accurate to say (as is sometimes said) that ανωτερω never connotes length of time, although it is true that in St. John it is a "qualitative" rather than a "quantitative" term.

Vv. 2, 3 and ver. 4 form two parallel sentences, both introduced by καὶ γαρ, of which either may be used to elucidate the other. Both bring out the Apostle's shrinking from death, i.e., the act of dying, and his half-expressed anxiety that he may survive until the Day of Christ (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15).

Ver. 3. καὶ γαρ εν τοοτε κ.τ.λ.: for indeed in this, sc., in this tabernacle (cf. ver. 3), we grow, sc., being weighed down by the body, longing to be clothed upon, i.e., to have the heavenly body put on in addition, like an outer garment over our mortal flesh, with our habitation which is from heaven, sc., which is brought thence by the Lord at His Coming (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16, Rev. xxii. 2, and Ascension of Isaiah (ed. Charles), iv. 16, ix. 17). The verb ενωθεθείν always expresses in St. Paul a yearning for home; here it is used of the heavenly home-sickness of the saints.

Ver. 3. εγε καί ενωθεθείνεται κ.τ.λ.: if so be that (ει γε = siquidem; cf. Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, Col. i. 23) we shall be found...
also clothed, sc., with the heavenly body (note ὑπόθαι, not ὑπήθαι, which would only be appropriate of the body to be "superinduced" in the case of one surviving to the Second Advent), not naked, sc., disembodied spirits at the Day of His Appearing, a condition from the thought of which he shrinks. γυμνὸς was commonly used in this sense in Greek philosophy; Alford quotes Plato, Cratyl., p. 277c., ὡς φυσική γυμνή τοῦ σώματος (see 1 Cor. xv. 37); cf. also Philo de Hum., 4, τῆς φυσικῆς ἀπογυμνομένης.

Ver. 4. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὄρθρος κ.τ.λ.: for indeed we who are in the body (see ver. 1) groan, being burdened (cf. Wisd. ix. 15, γραμμ. καί σώμα βασιλέως φυσικῆς) not for itself (cf. 2 Esdras ii. 45) but clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life, i.e., that the mortal body may, without passing through death, be absorbed, as it were, in the heavenly body which is to be superinduced (cf. Isa. xxxv. 8). The double metaphor in these verses from that of a house to that of a garment is quite in St. Paul's manner. Stanley finds the explanation of both "in the image which both from his occupation and his birthplace would naturally occur to the Apostle, the tent of Cilician hair cloth, which might almost equally suggest the idea of a habitation and of a vesture" (cf. Ps. civ. 2). The truth is that no single metaphor could possibly convey to the mind a true conception of heaven or of the condition of the blessed. We may speak of the heavenly home as a place (ἐλαγρίων), but we have to remind ourselves that it is rather a state here expressed by the image of heavenly vesture.

Ver. 5. ὁ ἐκατέργασάμενος κ.τ.λ.: now He that worked us up for this very thing, sc., the change from mortality to life, is God (cf. iv. 6 and especially i. 21 for the form of the sentence), who gave to us the earnest of the Spirit; cf. Rom. viii. 11. The "Holy Spirit of promise" is "an earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. i. 14; see above on i. 22).

Some theologians, e.g., Martensen, take a somewhat different view of vv. 1-5, and interpret them as implying St. Paul's belief in a body of the intermediate state between death and judgment, distinct at once from the "earthly tabernacle" and the "heavenly house," which latter will be "superindued" at the Second Advent. But (a) there is no hint elsewhere in the N.T. of such an ad interim body; (b) the "house" which "we have" at death is described in ver. 1 not as temporary, but as "eternal." This it is which enables him to face death with courage; he would shrink from any γυμνότης or disembodied condition, and—so far as the "body" is concerned—he does not contemplate any further change at the Day of Judgment. If so be he is reverently anxious to live until the Parousia, and then to be "superindued"; but even if he is to pass through the gate of death he is content. See Salmond's Christian Doctr. of Immortality, p. 565 ff.
Vv. 6-8. In any case to be with Christ is best.—Ver. 6. evpovvrec ovv k.t.X.: being therefore, sc. on account of “the earnest of the Spirit” (ver. 5), always, sc. in any event, whether we die before the Day of Christ or survive to see it in the flesh, of good courage, and knowing that whilst we are at home in the body (see reff.) we are absent from the Lord, sc. from Christ, our true home. The O.T. phrase that man is a sojourner only (παρεσθειον) on the earth (Ps. xxxviii. 13; cf. Heb. xi. 13) is verbally comparable with this evpovvrec . . . evpovvrec; but the idea here is rather that of the body as the temporary habitation of the man’s self (cf. ver. 1). We are citizens of earth, but our true σοιλιας is in ουρανου (Phil. iii. 20).

Ver. 7. Dia πίστεως γάρ κ.τ.λ.: for we walk by faith (cf. John xx. 29, and chap. iv. 18), i.e., in a state of faith (see note on dia with the gen. of attendant circumstances ii. 4), not by appearance (εἶδος, as the reff. show, must be thus translated = good aspicitur; but nevertheless the rendering of A.V. and R.V. “not by sight,” though verbally inexact, conveys the sense. Cf. Heb. xi. 1, ὡς τόν διὰ πίστεως . . . πραγμάτων θεογονίας τῶν βλασπητῶν, and 1 Cor. xiii. 12). The verse is parenthetical and explanatory of the sense in which we are “absent from the Lord”.

Ver. 8. θαρροῦμεν δι κ.τ.λ.: nay (the δι is resumptive of the thought in ver. 6, which has been interrupted by this, the grammatical structure involving an anacoluthon), we are of good courage (for this is demanded even of the most faithful by the prospect of death) and are well-pleased (see reff. for cases where οὖκ ἐστί used of men, not of God) rather to be away from the home of the body and to be at home with the Lord (cf. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. ὥστε καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: wherefore also we make it our ambition (see reff.), whether at home or away from home, sc. for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (cf. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. ὥστε καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: wherefore also we make it our ambition (see reff.), whether at home or away from home, sc. for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (cf. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. ὥστε καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: wherefore also we make it our ambition (see reff.), whether at home or away from home, sc. for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (cf. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. ὥστε καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: wherefore also we make it our ambition (see reff.), whether at home or away from home, sc. for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (cf. Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.
dead) must be made manifest. The A.V. "appear" weakens the force of the word; the Day of Judgment is to be a day when men's characters shall be made patent to the world, and to themselves, as they have always been to God; cf. Mark iv. 22, Rom. ii. 16, xiv. 10, 1 Cor. iv. 5, xiv. 4, xv. 12; cf. also Deut. xxv. 13; Gal. v. 13; 1 Tim. v. 14 only; Prov. ix. 9; 3 Macc. ii. 13. 1\\DE\K\ support yap; om. all vs. and \B\C\D\G. 2 B*, d, e support \eiv dow; better \eiv\ with all other authorities. 3 \NB\ 17 have (wrongly) \eiv\; \eiv\ all other authorities.

Vv. 11-13. Reiteration of his sincerity of purpose.—Ver. 11. \eiv dow ouv tou \phi\bdon k.t.l.: knowing, therefore, sc., because of the conviction expressed in ver. 10, the fear of the Lord, sc., as Judge (cf. Heb. x. 31), we persuade men, sc., of our sincerity, but we have been (already) made manifest to God, as we shall be at the Day of Judgment (see ver. 10). To regard \\e\bdowm\ (cf. Acts xxii. 20; Gal. i. 10) as referring to a "persuading" of the truths of Christianity is to depart from the context. He is now returning to the question at iii. 1, and he has explained the motives of his ministry and the obligations to sincerity of speech which bind him. We should expect (in classical Greek) \d\Sp\ui\ro\vs piv ireiO. k.t.l., but the omission of piv does not destroy, though it obscures, the antithesis. It would be out of place to speak of "persuading" God of our sincerity; to Him we are "made manifest" whether we will or no. —\\d\x\p\w\v?\k\ t\l\: and I hope (as we say, "I trust") we have been made manifest also in your consciences; see iv. 2 for a similar appeal. Ver. 12. \d\x\p\v?\ piv ouv k.t.l.: we are not again (see iii. 1, and the note there; he takes up this theme again after a long digression) commending ourselves to you, but [write these things] as giving you occasion of glorying on our behalf. We must understand in the latter clause some such words as \y\p\o\w\t\v tov: there are similar anacolutha at vii. 5, viii. 18.—\\d\x\w\t\v e\p\w\w\t\o\v tou k.t.l.: that ye may have it, sc, some \e\p\o\w\t\v or matter of glorying, against those who glory in outward appearance and not in heart, sc., against his opponents at Corinth.
The phrase προσώπων οὐ καρδία occurs in 1 Thess. ii. 17 in the sense of πνευμάτων οὐ φόρμας (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 40, Col. ii. 5); but a better parallel for the present passage is 1 Sam. xvi. 7, where Samuel is told that while man looks on πρόσωπων, God looks on καρδία. So St. Paul here refers to teachers who lay stress on the outward appearance and the "face" (see note i. 11) of things, such as a man's enthusiasm and visions (xii. 1 and ver. 13), or his eloquence (chap. x. 10), or his letters of commendation (iii. 1), or his Jewish birth (xi. 22), or his personal intimacy in the flesh with Christ (ver. 16)—rather than on the inward motive and "heart" of his message.

Ver. 13. ἐκείνη γὰρ ἐξαιτίας κ.τ.λ.: for whether (see on i. 6 for constr.) we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you (note the dat. commodi). At a later period Festus told Paul that he was mad (Acts xxvi. 24), so impressed was he with the Apostle's enthusiasm; and it is probable that the anti-Pauline party at Corinth were not slow to point to the "visions and revelations of the Lord" which St. Paul claimed for himself (chap. xii. 1-6), as proofs of his madness. A similar accusation was made against his Master (Mark iii. 21). But St. Paul bids them (ver. 12) look a little deeper, and not judge by mere outward phenomena such as these. He repeatedly asks them to bear with him in his foolishness (chap. xi. 1, 16, 17, xii. 6, 13). It is possible that a charge of a contrary nature had been also made by his opponents, and that his regard for other men's prejudices (1 Cor. ix. 20), and the "craftiness" with which he caught the Corinthians "with guile" (chap. xii. 16), were urged as savouring more of worldly wisdom than of true piety. His answer to both charges is contained in this verse. If he has exceeded the bounds of moderation, it is in his moods of highest devotion, when he is pouring out his soul to God and not to man; if he has exercised a sober prudence in his dealings with his converts, it is all for their sakes, and not for selfish ends.

Vv. 14-16. It is not the Knowledge of Christ in His Earthly Life, but the Love which Christ has for Man that is the constraining power of Paul's Preaching.—Ver. 14. Ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ.: for the Love of Christ restraineth us, sc. within the limits laid down in ver. 13. The words are often quoted as meaning that the love which Christians bear to Christ is the supreme motive of the Christian life; but however true this is in itself, it is not the meaning of the Apostle here. The genitive of the person after ἀγάπη is in St. Paul's Epistles always subjective (cf. ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. v. 5, viii. 39, chap. xiii. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 5, and cf. also Rom. xv. 30, Eph. ii. 4, Col. i. 13, and for ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ref. above); i.e., "the Love of God" and "the Love of Christ" signify with him the love which God and Christ bear towards (ἐλπίς) man. (St. Paul often uses the verb ἀγαπᾶω to express man's love to God, but never the substantive ἀγάπη). St. John sometimes being objective and sometimes subjective (cf. John v. 42 and i John ii. 5, 15, 17, iv. 9, v. 3;
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V.

16. **Τότε ἡμεῖς ἀπέπεσαν ταῖς ἐναρεύοντας καὶ ἐγερθήσατε.**

The best supported reading is εἰ καὶ Μ*BD* 17; G, the Latins and the Peshitto have καὶ εἰ; Μ*CD* EKL and the Harclean εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγερθῆκατε καὶ τὰ σάρκα ἔριζεν,

DE, δὲ and the Bohairic have ἔριζεν κατὰ σάρκα.

1 The best supported reading is εἰ καὶ Μ*BD* 17; G, the Latins and the Peshitto have καὶ εἰ; Μ*CD* EKL and the Harclean εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγερθῆκατε καὶ τὰ σάρκα ἔριζεν,

2 DE, δὲ and the Bohairic have ἔριζεν κατὰ σάρκα.

see also Luke xi. 42), but St. Paul’s is not doubtful. The “Love of Christ” here, then, is the love which Christ has for us, not the love which we bear to Him; the constraining power of Christian ministration and service is more effective and stable than it would be if it sprang from the fickle and variable affections of men (cf. John xv. 16).

Ver. 15. καὶ τὰς τουτέως ἐν εἰς πάντες ἡμέρας: judging this; that One died for all (cf. Rom. v. 15), therefore all died, and was raised for all, that they who live (see iii. 11) should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who died and rose again for them. To die εἰς τὸν φίλον αὐτοῦ is the greatest proof that anyone can offer of his love (John xv. 13). The proof to us of the Love of Christ to all is that He died εἰς τὸν φίλον αὐτοῦ. Of this Death two consequences are now mentioned: (a) one objective and inevitable, quite independent of our faith and obedience; (b) another subjective and conditional. (a) Ἑραὶ τὰς τουτέως ἐκπαθήσας, then all died, sc., in Him who is the “recapitulation” of all humanity, Jew and Gentile, bond and free, faithless or believing. We must not weaken the force of εἰς τὸν φίλον: the Incarnation embraces all men (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 22). The A.V. “then were all dead” (the same mistranslation occurs Rom. vi. 2, Col. iii. 3) does not bring out the sense, which is that the Dying of Christ on the Cross was in some sort the dying of all mankind. But (b) the purposes of the Atonement are not completely fulfilled without the response of man’s faith and obedience; He died for all, εἰς τὸν φίλον κ.τ.λ. This is the frequent exhortation of St. Paul (Rom. vi. 11 and see 1 Pet. iii. 18); the purpose of Christ’s Death is to lead us to Life, a life “unto God” (cf. Rom. vi. 11, xiv. 7, 8)—the “life indeed” (1 Tim. vi. 19) which must be begun here if it is to be perfected hereafter. The preposition εἰς, “on behalf of” (cf. chap. xii. 10), employed in these verses is the one usually employed in the N.T. to express the relation between Christ’s Atoning Death and our benefit: it was “for our sake,” “on our behalf” (e.g., Luke xxii. 19, 20, John x. 15, xi. 51, Rom. v. 6, 1 Cor. i. 13, Gal. iii. 13, Eph. v. 2, Heb. ii. 9, 1 John iii. 16). It is not equivalent to εἰς, “instead of” (although in Phil. 13 its meaning approximates thereto), and ought not to be so translated; although the preposition εἰς is used of our Lord’s Atoning Work in three places (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, 1 Tim. ii. 6), and the implied metaphor must have a place in any complete theory of the Atonement. But here εἰς is (as usual) used, and the rendering “instead of,” even if linguistically possible (which it is not), is excluded by the fact that in the phrase εἰς τὸν φίλον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν φίλον αὐτοῦ is governed by both participles.

Christ rose again “on our behalf”, He is never said to have risen “instead of us.”

Ver. 16. Τότε ἡμεῖς ἀπέπεσαν ταῖς ἐναρεύοντας καὶ ἐγερθήσατε: so that, sc., because of our conviction, that we should not live unto ourselves but unto Christ (ver. 15), we, sc., Paul as contrasted with his opponents at Corinth. From henceforth, sc., this conviction having mastered us, know no man after the flesh, i.e., are quite in different as to his mere external qualifications as a preacher of the Gospel, his eloquence, Jewish birth, etc.: we are not like those who glory in παροικία and not παρέκκλισις (ver. 12); cf. Gal. ii. 6—εἰ καὶ ἐγερθῆκατε κ.τ.λ.: even though we have known (the distinction between οἰκοδομής and ἐγερθῆκατε is hardly to be pressed) Christ after the flesh, i.e., though there was a time in my life when I, like my Judaizing opponents now, laid great stress on the local and hereditary, and, so to speak, fleshly “notes” of the Messiah who was to come, yet now we know Him so no more, i.e., I know better now, for I have learnt since my conversion that the national Messiah of the Jews is Himself the Incarnate Word, to whom every race of men is alike related, for He is the Christ of the Catholic Church of God. In per-
sonal religion the merely historical must yield precedence to the mystical element; it is of great interest and of real value to learn all that can be known about the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, but it is the present Life of Christ, "in whom" we may be found if we will, that is of religious import, as is further explained in ver. 17. This "is the same feeling which appears in the fact . . . that no authentic or even pretended likeness of Christ should have been handed down from the first century; that the very site of His dwelling place at Capernaum should have been entirely obliterated from human memory; that the very notion of seeking for relics of His life and death, though afterwards so abundant, first began in the age of Constantine. It is the same feeling which, in the Gospel narratives themselves, is expressed in the almost entire absence of precision as to time and place" (Stanley).

Byeschlag and others (see Knowling, Witness of the Epistles, p. 2) conclude from the words καὶ ἠλώθη καὶ τοῖς Χριστῷ that St. Paul had seen, and possibly heard, Jesus during His public ministry at Jerusalem (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1); on this interpretation the words would be introduced at this point to indicate that, however much stress the other Apostles and their adherents might lay on such outward knowledge, yet to St. Paul, though he could lay claim to it as well as they, this did not seem the essential matter. But (a) the words do not necessarily imply this; it is noteworthy that he says Χριστῷ, not Ἰησοῦν, which we should expect on Byeschlag's hypothesis. (b) The explanation given above is quite in accordance with the usage of καὶ σήμερα with a verb (see reff.), and the order of the words here and in the preceding clause does not allow us to take καὶ σήμερα with εἰςδένα in the one case and with Χριστῷ in the other. But if (a) and (b) are pressed on us, St. Paul really had had personal experience of the public ministry of Jesus, he would hardly have failed to mention it in the great apologetic passage, chap. xi. 22-33. Other writers, e.g., Jowett, explain the latter clause of this verse by supposing that the Apostle is contrasting his more mature preaching with his preaching at an earlier stage of his Christian ministry when he had not yet emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices. But of his consciousness of such a "development" in his views, subsequently to his conversion, there is no trace in the Epistles. The contrast is really between Saul the Pharisee and Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Vv. 17-19. In Christ all is new, as from God who reconciled the world to Himself in Christ.—Ver. 17. εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦν: so that (a consequence of the higher view of Christ explained in the last verse) if any man (note the universality of the doctrine which he expounds) be in Christ, there is a new creation. To be in Χριστῷ is a very different thing from claiming to be Χριστῷ "of Christ," sc, of the Christ-party (1 Cor. i. 12, chap. x. 7); this indeed is exactly the distinction which St. Paul has had in mind in the last verse. The expression "a new creation" was a common Rabbinical description of a converted proselyte (see Wetstein in loc.) ; but its meaning was enriched in the religion of the Incarnation (cf. John iii. 3, Rom. vi. 4, Eph. ii. 10, iv. 23, Col. iii. 10, etc.). The Vulgate "si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura," which takes τοῦ with κτισμοῦ, is plainly a mistake.—τὰ ἀρχαία θαυμάζει κύριλλοι: the old things have passed away; behold, they are become new, sc, not only the ancient customs of Jewish ritual observance, but the old ways of conceiving of the Messiah who was to come; more generally, the old thoughts of God and of sin and salvation have received fresh colouring—they are "become new" (cf. Heb. viii. 13). The words of Isa. xliii. 18, 19 offer a close verbal parallel; τὰ γὰρ διάλογον ἐκτὸς τῶν παλαιῶν (cf. Isa. lxv. 17, Rev. xxii. 4, 5), but the parallel is rather in words than in sense.
The thought of the new interpretation of life offered in the Incarnation carries us a step beyond the prophets of the Old Covenant. St. Paul's words show how completely he regarded "the Death of Christ as a new epoch in the history of the human race. Had he foreseen distinctly that a new era would be dated from that time; that a new society, philosophy, literature, moral code, would grow up from it over continents of which he knew not the existence; he could not have more strongly expressed his sense of the greatness of the event than in what is here said" (Stanley).

Ver. 18. to εποιεῖν κ.τ.λ.: but all things, sc, all these new things, are of God. See reff. St. Paul is especially anxious in this Epistle to trace up spiritual blessings to their true source; see chap. i. 21, iv. 6, v. 5, and cf. 1 Cor. iii. 23, ἐμείς δὲ Χριστός, Χριστὸς δὲ θεός. —τοῦ καταλάβατος κ.τ.λ.: who reconciled (note the aorist) us, sc, all mankind, to Himself through Christ. The words καταλάβας, καταλάβη should be studied (see reff.) in all the contexts where they occur. The verb signifies (i.) to exchange and (ii.) to reconcile, i.e., to establish friendly relations between two parties who are estranged, no matter on which side the antagonism exists. Thus in Matt. v. 24 it is the brother who has given offence (not he who has received it) that is spoken of as "being reconciled" to the other (cf. also 1 Sam. xxix. 4). And so too St. Paul's usage is to speak of man being reconciled to God, not of God being reconciled to man; but far too much has been made of this distinction. In fact, in 2 Macc. (see reff.) the usage is the other way, for God is there always spoken of as "having reconciled" to His servants. It is, no doubt, more reverent in such a matter to keep as close to the language of the N.T. as we can, and to speak nately of God "being reconciled" to man might readily suggest false and unworthy views as to the Supreme. But that St. Paul would have felt any difficulty in such a phrase is very unlikely. The important point to observe in the present passage is that it is God Himself who is the ultimate Author of this Reconciliation; cf. Rom. v. 8, viii. 31, 32, and especially John iii. 16. That the Reconciliation is "through Christ" is the heart of the Gospel of the Atonement (cf. Rom. iii. 24, Col. i. 20, etc.). —καὶ δόθησαν κ.τ.λ.: and gave to us, sc, to me, Paul (he is not now thinking of others), the Ministry of Reconciliation; cf. chap. iii. 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς διακοινωνίας, the genitive in both cases being, of course, of the thing ministered.

Ver. 19. ὑπὲρ τῆς θεατρίας τοῦ κ.τ.λ.: viz., that God was reconciling the world, sc, the whole human race (cf. Rom. iv. 13, xi. 12, and note the absence of the article), to Himself in Christ (cf. Gal. ii. 17). The pleonastic ἡ δὲ is not classical, but it is found in late authors (see reff.). The A.V., "God was in Christ, reconciling," etc., is not accurate; τῆς goes with both Καταλάβας κ.τ.λ. and τῆς, with a participle being more emphatic than a simple imperfect (cf. Luke iv. 44). If we take τῆς with ἐν Χριστῷ, we should have to treat δόθησαν κ.τ.λ. as a parallel clause to λογιζόμενοι κ.τ.λ., which it is not. —καὶ λογιζόμενοι αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.: not reckoning unto them their trespasses, a parenthesis sentence explanatory of καταλάβας; cf. Rom. iv. 8 (Ps. xcvii. 2). —καὶ θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.: and had placed in our hands (cf. 1 Thess. v. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12; the verb is specially used of the Divine purposes) the Word of Reconciliation, i.e., the Divine Message which speaks of reconciliation to God; cf. Acts xii. 26. Λόγος τῆς αὐτοτρπίας ταύτης, 1 Cor. i. 18, 1 δόγμα τοῦ οὐτοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Phil. ii. 16, λόγος [εὐαγγελίου], etc.

Vv. 20–vi. 3. As Christ's Ambassador he entreats the Corinthians to be Reconciled to God.—Ver. 20. ἐφερ̃
18—21.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Ὁ

τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. 20. ὅτερ Ἑρωτοῦ ὑπὲρ πρεσβεύων, x Eph. vi. 20; Phil. i. 20. ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος ἡμᾶς. 21. δεμβῖσα ὁ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ Θεῷ. τὸν γὰρ μὴ γνώσαmination ἀμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐτοίησα, ὅταν ἡμῖν γινόμεθα ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ Θεοῦ.

iv. 12; i Thess. iii. 10. a Rom. i. 17, iii. 5, 21, 22, x. 3; Jas. i. 20; b Pet. i. 1 only

1 D*EG, g have (tov) εναγγελίων τον λόγον.
2 D*G, d, e, g have ανατρέπει Χρ. for ανατρέπει Χρ. ανων.
3 D*G, d, e, g have διομένοι.
4 D*G, d, e, g and the Harclean margin give καταλλαγητα.
5 D*G, d, e, g and the Syriac vss. insert γαρ; better om. γαρ with N*BCD*G 17, the Latins and Bohairic.
6 Only a few minuscules give γινόμεθα; all the uncials have γινόμεθα.

Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ πρεσβεύων κ.τ.λ.: we are ambassadors therefore; sc., because to us has been committed the Ministry of Reconciliation, on behalf of Christ, as Christ's representative (see on ver. 15 above for the force of ὑπὲρ), as though God were entreating by us (cf. i. 1 and see on i. 4). The construction of ὑπὲρ followed by a genitive absolute is found also at 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Pet. i. 3—δεμβῆ ανατρέπει. xπ. κ.τ.λ.: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, Be ye reconciled to God. The imperative καταλλάγητε is much more emphatic than the infinitive ἔτοιησα would be; all through we perceive the Apostle's anxiety that the Corinthians should turn from the sin which beset them, whatever it might be in any individual case (cf. ii. 16, iv. 1, vi. 1, xi. 3). Note that the appeal, "Be ye reconciled to God," is based on the fact (ver. 18) that God has already "reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ." The very purpose of the Atonement was that men should turn from sin, —τοῦ μὴ γνώσαmination ἀμαρτίαν κ.τ.λ.: Him who knew no sin (observe μὴ rather than ό, as it is not so much the bare fact of Christ's sinlessness that is emphasised, as God's knowledge of this fact, which rendered Christ a possible Mediator) He made to be sin on our behalf. Two points are especially deserving of attention here: (i) That any man should be sinless (cf. Eccl. viii. 5) was an idea quite alien to Jewish thought and belief; and therefore the emphasis given to it by St. Paul, and the absolutely unqualified way in which it is laid down in a letter addressed to a community containing not only friends but foes who would eagerly fasten on any doubtful statement, show that it must have been regarded as axiomatic among Christians at the early date when this Epistle was written. The claim involved in the challenge of Christ, τίς ἡμῶν ἀληθεύει μετα ἱμάρτιος (John viii. 46), had never been disproved, and the Apostolic age held that He was ἥρωι ἱμάρτιος. οὖν ἃ παρεχόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν ἵμαρτιων (Heb. iv. 15, vii. 26), and that ἱμάρτης ἐν αὐτῷ ὦν ἢμεν (1 John iii. 5; cf. St. Peter's application of Isa. liii. 9 at 1 Pet. ii. 22). That He was a moral Miracle was certainly part of the primitive Gospel. (ii.) The statement ἱμάρτης ἐτοίησα is best understood if we recall the Jewish ritual on the Day of Atonement, when the priest was directed to "place" the sins of the people upon the head of the scapegoat (Lev. xvi. 21). ἱμάρτης cannot be translated "sin-offering" (as at Lev. iv. 8, 21, 24, 34, v. 9-12), for it cannot have two different meanings in the same clause; and further it is contrasted with δικαιοσύνη, it means "sin" in the abstract. The penalties of sin were laid on Christ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, "on our behalf," and thus as the Representative of the world's sin it becomes possible to predicate of Him the strange expression ἵμαρτης ἐτοίησα (τούτο being used here as at John v. 18, viii. 33, vii. 33). The nearest parallel in the N.T. is γενομένος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα (Gal. iii. 13); cf. also Isa. liii. 6, Rom. viii. 3, 3 Pet. ii. 24.—ο λαοῦς γενομέθα κ.τ.λ.: that we might become, sc., as we have become (note the force of the aorist), the righteousness of God in Him (cf. xxii. 6, 1 Cor. i. 30, Phil. iii. 9, and reff.). "Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God Himself. Let it be counted folly or frenzy or
Chapter VI. — Ver. 1. o-vépvoótécr Si koA irapaicatcov k.t.X.: and working together (that is, with God, as is plain from chap. v. ao, and also in connexion with 1 Cor. iii.9; cf. Acts xv. 4), we, sc, I, Paul, entreat also (cf. chap. v. 20, 6cov -rapaxaXovvTOf Si' ^|puv) that ye receive not the grace of God (a general phrase, frequently used by St. Paul to express the favours and privileges offered to the members of the Church of Christ, not to be limited to grace given at any special moment, as, e.g., at baptism) in vain (see rerT. and cf. Heb. xii.15). Note that "the grace of God" may be "received" in vain; it is offered, independently of man's faith and obedience, but it will not profit without these. The choice in the Anglican Liturgy of vv. 1-10 as the Epistle for the First Sunday in Lent, when the Ember Collect is said on behalf of those to be ordained in the next week, is especially happy; the magnificent description of the characteristics and the conditions of a faithful Christian ministry (w. 4-10) being prefaced by the solemn warning of vv. 1-3.

Ver. 2. Xayci Y*P> Kaipw Sen™ k.t.X.: for He, sc, God, saith (cf. Rom. ix. 15, Gal. iii. 16), "As an acceptable time I hearkened to thee, and in a day of salvation did I succour thee" (Isa. lxi. 2). The whole verse is parenthetical, and is introduced to remind the Corinthians that the present dispensation is that dispensation of grace of which the prophet speaks; Stanley pointed out that Sf^acrSai of ver. 1 may well have suggested δεκτός, which in its turn suggested the quotation. The words in their original context are addressed by Jehovah to His Servant, while St. Paul takes them as addressed by God to His people; but, inasmuch as the Servant in the latter portion of Isaiah is the Representative of Israel, the application made by the Apostle is easily explicable.—ISoi viv —ccupbstiirpdo-SiKTos k.t.X.: behold now is the "Acceptable Time," behold now is the "Day of Salvation." This is St. Paul's comment. Observe that he does not say φημεν (cf. Heb. iii. 7 if.), but φην—not "to-day," but "the present dispensation." His point here is not (as it is often represented) that the only day of grace which we can reckon on is the present (gravely true though this is), but that the Christian dispensation is the one spoken of by the O.T. prophet in familiar words. It will be remembered that Christ applied to Himself and His ministry in like manner the words of Isa. lxi. 2, Kαλλάσαν ενιαυτόν Κύριον δεκτόν (Luke iv. 19). We are not to draw any distinction here between δεκτός and εντεύθεντος; the latter is the usual word in secular authors, and (see reff.) is always used by St. Paul, except (Phil. iv. 18) in a quotation from the LXX.

Ver. 3. p.T|Sep.(aviv u.i)Scvt k.t.X.: giving no occasion of stumbling (see reff.; Alford aptly quotes Polybius, xxvii., 6, 19, διδάσκατον ἰδίως τοὺς προσκυνήτας) in anything, that our ministration be not blamed. The clause is parallel with ver. 1, and διδάσκατον corresponding to σεβασμός, both being descriptive of the way in which παρακαλοῦμεν, etc.; cf., for like sentiments, 1 Cor. vii. 13, ix. 12, 22, x. 33. We have μηδεμίαν . . . μηδεμίαν rather than οδηγεῖν . . . οδηγεῖπ, as it is the thought or intention of the preacher which is the point to be brought out.
4. ἂλλὰ ἐν παντὶ συνιστώντες ἰδιωτικὸς ὡς Θεοῦ διάκονος. 2 k See on iv. 8.
5. ἐν ᾠδημορίᾳ πόλει, ἐν ὀλίγεσι, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις, ἐν ἀνθρώπωι,
6. ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν ἁλαστῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῇ, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν ἀρετῇ,
7. ἐν ἀνεμίστησι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν ἀνεμίστησι, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν ἀνεμίστησι, ἐν ἀνεμίστησι,
8. ἐν ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἐν ἀραχνίᾳ, ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἡ στενοχωρίᾳ ἡ ἀκολουθία

ηστίν νομικὸν καὶ κοινὸν, in watchings, sc., in nights rendered wakeful by anxiety or press of work (Acts xx. 31) or urgency of prayer (Acts xvi. 25 and cf. Eph. vi. 18 ἀγρυπνούσιν), in fastings. Some expositors explain these ἀγρυπνούσιν as the voluntary fastings of religion (so Hooker, Eccl. Pol., v., xii., 8; and cf. Acts xii.

Vv. 4-10. The Conditions and the Characteristics of his Apostolic Ministry. We have in this noble description of his service a characteristic outburst of impassioned eloquence on a topic in which the Apostle felt an intense personal interest. But its fervour has not been permitted to interfere with the careful choice of words: the balanced antitheses, the rhythmical cadences and assonances, which abound throughout, betray the literary training of the writer, and recall at once such passages as Rom. viii. 31-39, 1 Cor. xiii.1-13. Indeed many of the phrases which follow suggest an acquaintance with the Stoic paradoxes expressive of the αὐτάρκεια of the ideal sage. Compare also chap. xi. 22-28, where he recounts in more detail the trials of his Apostolic ministry.

Ver. 4. ἐν πάση συνεστάσει: but in everything (the details being given in the following verses) commending ourselves (see note on iii. 1) as God's ministers do. We now come to the description of the conditions under which and the means by which God's minister commends himself to those to whom his message is addressed. The description naturally divides itself into four sections: he commends himself (i.) in outward hardships, vv. 4b, 5, (ii.) in inward graces, vv. 6, 7a, (iii.) by the armour of righteousness, whether he be well or evil spoken of, vv. 7b, 8ab, (iv.) having indeed a character the reverse of that ascribed to him by his opponents, w. 8c-10.

(i.) The general description here is ἐν ᾠδημορίᾳ πόλει: in much patience (see note on i. 6 and cf. xii. 12); and this is further amplified and explained in the three triplets which follow. (a) ἐν ᾠδημορίᾳ πόλει: in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses (see ref. and cf. Acts ix. 16), i.e., such trials as sickness (see i. 6, xii. 7), or loss of friends (2 Tim. iv. 10), or perplexity (iv. 8, where see note), or any of the thousand chances (as we call them) of a troubled and anxious life. "The prevailing idea is that of pressure and confinement: each stage narrower than the one before, so that no room is left for movement or escape" (Stanley).

Ver. 5. (b) These outward hardships are next more definitely exemplified from the opposition and persecution which St. Paul encountered from opponents during his missionary experiences, ἐν ἁλαστῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν ἀνεμίστησι: in stripes, in Labors, and in watchings, sc., probably his labours in preaching the Gospel (see ref., but cf. 1 Thess. ii.9, 2 Thess. iii.8, where kottos is used of the manual labour he underwent in working for a livelihood; see also 1 Cor. iv. 11 ἀσκητάμενοι καὶ κοινοῦμεν), in watchings, sc., in nights rendered wakeful by anxiety or press of work (Acts xvi. 25 and cf. Eph. vi. 18 ἀγρυπνούσιν), in fastings. Some expositors explain these ἀγρυπνούσιν as the voluntary fastings of religion (so Hooker, Eccl. Pol., v., xii., 8; and cf. Acts xii.
And it is true that μνηστεία (see ref.) and προσευχή are always (outside this Epistle) used of fasting as a devotional observance. But in the parallel passage xi. 27 μνηστεία is clearly used of involuntary abstinences from food; and this meaning seems better to suit the context here also (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12) (§ 23). The triplet (c), then, means “in toil, in sleeplessness, in hunger”.

Vv. 6, 7, (ii.) The inward gifts and qualities by the display of which the Christian minister commends himself are now enumerated, (a) We have, first, four graces, each described by a single word: ιερότης, in knowledge, sc., of Divine things (the λόγος γνώσεως is one of the gifts of the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 8), in long-suffering (a grace specially needful for a Christian missionary; in Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22, 1 Tim. i. 16, St. Paul speaks of God’s μακροθυμία, but generally he applies it to man; see Prov. xxv. 15), in kindness (see ref.; it is a Divine attribute in Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22, Eph. ii. 7, Tit. iii. 4; cf. Matt. xi. 30).— (b) We have next four qualifications, each described in two words: εὐαγγελίζων γὰρ, in the Word of Truth, sc., the message of the Gospel (see ref. and cf. chap. ii. 17, iv. 2), in the Power of God, which (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18) he declares the Gospel itself to be. This, of course, is not the force of the phrase here; nor are we to think solely of “miraculous” powers (Acts viii. 6, 10, Cor. ii. 5), which were “signs of an Apostle” (Rom. xv. 19, chap. xii. 12), but of the Divine grace given him for his special work (see ref.). “In verbo veritatis, in virtute Dei” may still stand for the watchword of Christian preaching. (iii.) We have now three clauses beginning with ιερότης; the proposition in the first of them being instrumental, in the other two expressing a state or condition.

Ver. 8. (b) ιερότης καὶ ἀτίμας, in knowledge and unfeigned love, in the Word of Truth, and in the Power of God, which (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18) he declares the Gospel itself to be. This, of course, is not the force of the phrase here; nor are we to think solely of “miraculous” powers (Acts viii. 6, 10, Cor. ii. 5), which were “signs of an Apostle” (Rom. xv. 19, chap. xii. 12), but of the Divine grace given him for his special work (see ref.). “In verbo veritatis, in virtute Dei” may still stand for the watchword of Christian preaching.
II. To στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέγγις πρὸς ὄμος, Κορίνθιοι, ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν ἐπελάγησαι. O o στενοχωρεῖται ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἐπελάγχουσι ὄμοις. Τῇ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀντιμισθίαν ὑστερεῖται ἐν τοῖς στενοχωρείσιν ὄμοις ἡμῶν.

Ver. 10. ὡς ἠντυσομένοι, ἀλλὰ στόμα ἡμῶν: as sorrowful (this charge in one sense was no doubt quite true), yet always rejoicing. This, which is frequently spoken of by the Apostle as a Christian duty (see ref.), is specially prominent in this Epistle: cf. chap. i. 24, vii. 4, and the note on ii. 2, 3. St. Paul's words are an echo of the farewell words of Christ (John xvi. 22), ὡς ὄντων τῆς ἐκκλησίας συμπεριλαμβάνεται αὐτός συμπεριλαμβάνεται: as poor, sc. as having nothing and yet possessing all things; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22, “all things are yours”. κατάλησις (see ref.) is a stronger word than ἀνέγγις; it is “to hold fast” or “to possess”, as, e.g., the land of promise (Josh. i. 11).

Vv. 11-13. Affectionate declaration of his frankness and sympathy, and an appeal that the Corinthians should show the same.—Ver. 11. τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν κ. τ. λ.: our mouth is open (ἀνέγγις = ἀνέγγιμαι, as often in later Greek; observe its present signification, as at 1 Cor. vii. 9) unto you, O Corinthians, i.e.,I am speaking quite candidly and freely to you (see ref.). Only here and at Gal. iii. 1, Phil. iv. 15, does St. Paul call his correspondents by name; here it emphasizes the affectionate nature of his appeal, and it singles out the Corinthians from the wider circle to whom the letter was addressed (i. 1).—ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κ. τ. λ.: our heart is enlarged, which is indeed the reason of his freedom of speech, for τὸ στέφανον τῆς καρδίας τὸ στέμα λαλεῖ (Matt. xiii. 34). By enlargement of heart is meant here a widening of sympathy, and not the expansiveness of joy (Isa. lx. 5) or an increase in intelligence and wisdom (1 Kings iv. 29).

Ver. 12. ὡς στενοχωρεῖται ἐν ἡμῖν κ. τ. λ.: ye are not straitened in us (this carries on the metaphor of πεπλάγησαι), but ye are straitened in your own affections; i.e., his adversaries at Corinth may have said that he was a man of narrow sympathies, and that there was no room in his heart for his Corinthian converts, but, in fact, the lack of sympathy was on their side— it is they that are “narrow-minded”. τὰ συναίσθημα = τὰ συναίσθημα: the upper viscera, i.e., the heart, lungs and liver, the vital parts, and so may be rendered “the affections”.

Ver. 13. Τῇ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀντιμισθίαν κ. τ. λ.: now for a recompense in like kind (an accus. abs.)—I speak as unto children, sc., who should respect and imitate their parents (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 14)—be ye also enlarged, sc., in heart.

Vv. 14-vii. 1. Parenthetical.—He warns them against too familiar association with their Heathen neighbours. These verses are somewhat perplexing, inasmuch as they seem to interrupt the appeal of vv. 11-13 by...
the introduction of an irrelevant warning. If they be omitted, the argument is quite consecutive, vii. 2 f. being in close and evident connexion with vi. 11-13. And it has been supposed that the whole section is an interpolation either (a) added by St. Paul after the arrival of Titus, in consequence of the news he had received as to the state of the Corinthian Church; or (b) belonging to another Pauline letter (possibly the Lost Epistle of 1 Cor. v. 9), and inserted here at a later date when a collection of Pauline letters began to be made; or (c) it has been regarded (e.g., by Heinrici) as a fragment of an ancient homily, not by St. Paul, which has found a resting place here. It has been urged in favour of the non-Pauline authorship of the section that (a) it contains a considerable number of words which do not occur elsewhere in St. Paul, e.g., "Be ye enlarged in heart," but he is reminded that this phrase has a bad meaning in the Law (Deut. xi. 16; see Chase, Classical Review, 1890, p. 151), where it is applied to that excessive tolerance which should permit the worship of other gods beside Jehovah; and so he hastens to give a warning (parenthetically introduced) to the Corinthians that he does not mean by enlargement of heart any undue tolerance of or contaminating association with their heathen neighbours (see on iv. 4 above for aireia).
you were yoked with unbelivers. The most obvious application of such a prohibition would be to intermarriage with the heathen, which was continually forbidden to the chosen people (see Deut. vii. 3, Josh. xix. 2, Neh. xiii. 25), and this is probably the main thought here (see ref. Lev. for ἑλέλθη). But to indulge in any excessive familiarity of intercourse would be "to be enlarged in heart" in a way which the Apostle strongly deprecates (cf. 1 Mace. i. 15). He enforces this by five contrasts which illustrate the incongruity between Christianity and heathendom. — τίς ἦν ὑμῖν: for what fellowship have righteousness and lawlessness? or what communion has light with darkness? Cf. Eph. v. 7, μή συν γίνεσθε συμμόδοιοι ἐν θέματι, ὡς φίλοι ἐν Κυρίῳ, and cf., for the same image, Acts xxvi. 18, Rom. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5 and chap. iv. 6, xi. 14.

Ver. 15. τίς ἦν συμφώνως κ.τ.λ.: and what concord has Christ with Belial? or what portion has a believer, sc., a Christian (see Acts xvi. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2, etc.), with an unbeliever, sc., a heathen (see on iv. 4 above)? οὐκ ὄντως = worthlessness is frequently rendered παράνομος (Deut. xiii. 13, 1 Kings xx. 13) or ἀνόητος (Ps. xvii. 5) by the LXX; they never treat it as a proper name, although TheodoretSo does at Judges xix. 22, and it is so regarded in later literature (e.g., Test. xii. Patriarch. and Orac. Sibyll., iii., 63, 73). Here it is the personification of ἀνόητος, just as Christ is the personification of δικαιοσύνη; the contrast is that between Christ and Satan (cf. 1 Cor. x. 21). See Charles' Ascension of Isaiah, pp. lv. ff., for the identification of Belial with Satan. The Hebrew form, Belial, with x substitution of r for l, is written Beliar in the best Greek MSS. (see crit. note).

Ver. 16. τίς ἦν συγκαταθήκης κ.τ.λ.: and what agreement has the Temple of God with idols? It is quite unnecessary to mark the absence of the article by translating "a temple of God": ψαλμ ἔθεος has become anarthrous, as a quasi-technical phrase, and in the Apostle's thought there is only one such Temple, which is built up by the whole body of believers (see ref.). — ἡμεῖς γάρ κ.τ.λ.: for we are the Temple of a God who is alive (see ref.); note that ἡμεῖς as the emphatic word is placed last. — καὶ ἐστήκατε ἐν Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.: as God said, "I will dwell in them" (these words are only a paraphrase of Lev. xxvi. 11; the quotation begins with ver. 12) and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people" (cf. Exod. vii. 7, Jer. xxxii. 33, Ezek. xi. 20, 2 Chron. viii. 12, etc., where the promise is reiteratet). Several passages of the O.T., viz., Lev. xxvi. 12, Isa. lii. 11, Ezek. xx. 34 and 2 Sam. vii. 14 are here combined; and it is worth noticing that the first, second and fourth of these are marked as distinct quotations by the introductory formulae which precede them in the O.T. in each case, viz., καὶ ἐστήκατε ἐν Θεῶ διὰ λόγου αὐτούς from Lev. xxvi. 12, ἔστηκαν Κύριος from Isa. lii. 5 (or Ezek. xx. 33), and ἔστηκαν Κύριος παντοκράτωρ from 2 Sam. vii. 8.
V. 1. Therefore having these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all contamination of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God, so that the fear that man ought to feel towards God (see v. 11), which is, indeed, one of the gifts of the Divine Spirit (Isa. xi. 3), and which was repeatedly commended to the chosen people (Deut. vi. 2, Ps. cxxi. 1). The practical issue of belief in the promises of the Old Covenant (which have a yet larger meaning under the New) is positive as well as negative, sanctification as well as separation. St. Paul's word for man's sanctification is ἀγιωσύνη, the result of which process is here expressed by ἀγιωσύνη (see reff.); this is essentially an attribute of God in the O.T. (Ps. xcvi. 12, xcv. 6, xcviii. 5, 2 Macc. iii. 12).

Vv. 2-4. He claims their sympathy again. He now resumes the appeal which is interrupted at vi. 13 by the parenthetical warning vi. 14-vii. 1. —Ver. 2. καὶ ἐφοβήθησαί τούτων : make room for us, sc, in your hearts, i.e., let there be no ὀξυροπία (vi. 12) ; we wronged no man, we corrupted no man, we took advantage of no man. Apparently accusations of this sort had been laid to his charge (see esp. chap. xii. 16, 17), and he is, as ever (chap. ii. 17, Acts xx. 33), careful to assert their baselessness. It is an excessive refinement of exegesis which finds here distinct charges hinted at in the three words ἐφοβήθησαί, ἐφοβήθησαί, ἐφοβήθησαί. They are used quite generally, the only one that offers any ambiguity being the second, ἐφοβήθησαί, often (see reff.), though not always, carrying a reference to bodily defilement through lust; here (as at 1 Cor. iii. 17) it seems to connote injury of any sort.

Chapter VII. —Ver. 1. οὖν ἐξοτερίζεται κ.τ.λ.: having therefore these (note the emphasis given to οὖν) promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all contamination of flesh and spirit (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 11, John iii. 3). We find the construction καθαρίζων λέγω again in Ecclus. xxxviii. 10 and Heb. ix. 14 (see also Deissmann, Neue Bibelstud., p. 44). We have already pointed out (on vi. 14) that μετανοεῖσθαι is always used of the defilement which springs out of evil (and especially heathen) associations; this may affect the πνεύμα (see on ii. 13) as well as the σώμα—ἐπικαθαρίζων ἀγιωσύνην κ.τ.λ.: perfecting
I.—7. ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Β

οδὼν ἐπελευκτησάμεν. 3. 6. oι πρὸς κατάκρισιν λέγω. προειλ. 1 Ref. ii. 11. 1. 3. 2. 8. ἐπεὶ...καὶ τοῦτον οὐκ εἰσ ἐτελευτηθησάμεν. 4. τολᾶ μοί ἡ ἀποθεώση πρὸς τὸ όμος, πολλῆ μοί καὶ ὑπέρ ὑμῶν πεπληρώθην τῇ παρακλήσει, ὑπερτεροποιοῦσαν ἐκατὸ εἰς τῇ ἐπίταχτᾳ τῆς θλίψεως ὑμῶν. 5. καὶ γὰρ ἠλθότων ἡ νόμος ἡ ἐκαθαρίσθην ὑμῶν εἰς Ἐκαθαρισμούς, ὑπερτεροποιοῦσαν ἐκατὸ ἡ σάρξ ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ πατρὸς. 6. ἀλλὰ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει παρεκάλεσαν ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Τίτου. 7. ἐκ τοῦ μόνου ἔδοθεν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦτον. 8. τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦτον. 9. καὶ ὑπεκάλεσα τῇ παρακλήσει ἐπὶ παρεκαλὸν ἐρήμων, ἀναγγέλλων ὑμῖν ἥ ὁμοίως τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιποίησεν, τὸν ὑμῶν ὑποφήγη ξειλοῦν. 10. καὶ ἡ πρὸς κατακραπ. ἐπιμένεις καὶ συναπτυγμάτως.

Ver. 4. γενεῖται μοὶ παραγηγὴ κ.τ.λ.: great is my boldness of speech towards you (cf. vi. 11), great is my glorying on your behalf, sc., on account of the good news of their conduct (cf. i.14, iii.2), I am filled with comfort (for the constr. cf. Luke ii.40, Rom. i.29, 2 Macc. vii.21), sc., with the comfort (note the article) which Titus had brought, I overflow with joy (cf. Phil. ii.17, Col. i.24) in all our affliction (see vi.10).

Vv. 5-12. He was comforted to learn from Titus that his rebuke had been profitable. Cf. throughout 1 Thess. iii.1-8, a passage strikingly like this in its human sympathy and kindliness. — Ver. 5. καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία κ.τ.λ.: for even when we were come into Macedonia (he has explained in ii.12 his anxiety when he was at Troas, but it remained with him even when he had crossed into Europe) our flesh had no relief (see note on the similar phrase, ii.13), but we were afflicted on every side. Note the anacoluthon, the participle ἀληθεύομαι being used as if it were a finite verb (cf. v.12 for a like constr.)—εἰδέναι μάχαι κ.τ.λ.: without were fightings, sc., with adversaries (cf. 1 Cor. xv.32), within were fears, sc., the anxieties which the Apostle would feel for his converts, especially those at Corinth (cf. chap. xi.28). It will be noticed that the familiar cadence "fightings within and fears without" is a misquotation.

Ver. 6. ἀλλὰ ἐν παρακλήσιν κ.τ.λ.: but He that comforteth the lowly (see ref. Isa.), even God (to whom he is especially careful in this Epistle to trace up all grace and consolation), comforted us by the coming of Titus. θαυμάστηκεν is often used for the Advent of Christ, but also (see reff.) for the advent of St. Paul or his companions. This is the first explicit mention of St. Paul's meeting with Titus in Macedonia (but cf. ii.13) which was the occasion of the letter being written.

Ver. 7. οὐ γὰρ ὑπερασπεῖται κ.τ.λ.: and not by his coming only, but also (see reff. for constr.) by the comfort wherewith he was comforted in respect of you (cf. 1 Thess. iii.7 for constr.), i.e., "I was comforted, not only by his coming, but by the good news which he brought; while he told us your lowing, sc., he comforted us, and we were comforted, sc., by the rebuke which I sent you, your seal on my behalf." Χαλός may either mean "zeal," in a good
DE have ῥαλλον με; G ῥαλλον χαρην με; K om. με.

10. if yap Kara 9cov Xwv; now, sc. to them would not have been written, now that Titus is come, and I have learnt the effect of my letter, I rejoice, etc. We follow the punctuation adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the American Revisers, the second clause softening the apparent harshness of the first, and δεῦν γάρ . . . δεῦν being a parenthetic explanation.

Ver. 8. δεῦν εἰ καὶ δύνησαι κ.τ.λ.: for though I made you sorry with my epistle (sc., esp. 1 Cor. v.; cf. Introd., p. 14), I do not regret it; though I did regret it (for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season), yet now I rejoice, etc. We follow the punctuation adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the American Revisers, the second clause softening the apparent harshness of the first, and δεῦν γάρ . . . δεῦν being a parenthetic explanation.

Ver. 9. νῦν γάρ κ.τ.λ.: now, sc. now that Titus is come, and I have learnt the effect of my letter, I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry unto repentance (of which there was no sign when he wrote; see 1 Cor. v. 2), for ye were made sorry according to the will of God, sc., in God's way as contrasted with man's way (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 32 and see reff.), so that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing, i.e., the sorrow caused by my rebuke was divinely ordered for your good, so that my severity did not hurt but rather benefited you. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written. The word μετάνοια occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" (see esp. for this use clause softening the apparent harshness reff., Acts and Matt. iii.2, iv.17, Acts of the first, and ρξίπλη α. . . μπανα ii.38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written.
spectantis et sequentis '\'), *worketh repentance* which leads to salvation, *a repentance which bringeth no regret.* \(\alpha i\) may be taken with \(\omega u\) (see R.V. margin), but there would be no point in applying such an adj. to \(\omega u\), where-as it is quite opposite as applied to \(\mu e\) (as by Chrys., R.V., etc.).——

Ver. 11. \(\lambda o\,\gamma a\,\gamma a\,\kappa t a\,k t a\lambda a\,: for behold, this same thing, viz., that you were made sorry after a godly sort, what diligence it wrought in you, ye (sc, "not only so, but also," \(\alpha l a\) introducing an accessory idea) what a defence, sc., of yourselves to me through the mediation of Titus, ye what indignation, ye what fear, sc., of St. Paul's rebukes, ye what longing, sc., that he should come to them (see ver. 7), ye what zeal, sc., on behalf of God's avenging, sc., the heavy punishment solemnly inflicted on the offender in God's name (chap. ii. 6). Observe that \(\kappa t a\lambda a\) and \(\kappa t a\lambda i\) are always (see ref. and Luke xviii. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 14, etc.) used of God's avenging of sin, not of man's retaliation.—\(\tau a\) \(\kappa t a\,k t a\lambda a\,: in every-thing ye approved yourselves to be pure in the matter, i.e., not that they were quite free from gross sins of the flesh (see xii. 21), but that by their ready compliance with the Apostle's directions they had cleared themselves from the guilt of 

Ver. 12. \(\lambda o\,\gamma a\,\gamma a\,k t a\lambda a\,: consequently, although I wrote to you, i.e., wrote a severe letter, it was not for his cause that did the wrong, sc., the inces-
tuous son of 1 Cor. v. 1, nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, sc., his father, but that your diligence on our behalf might be made manifest to yourselves (\'chez vous,' so \(\varphi o\,\varphi a\,\kappa t a\), 1 Thess. iii. 4) in the sight of God. He does not mean that this was the only reason for writing (cf. ii. 9), and that the more obvious reason was not in his mind; but he states strongly (expressing himself by an idiom common in the O.T., e.g., Jer. vii. 22) a principal cause of his writing, viz., that the Corinthian Church might be recalled to a true sense of what was due to its founder, as if it were the only cause. See on ii. 9, and, for a discussion of the whole question, see Intro., p. 10 ff.

Ver. 13. \(\i a\) \(\tau a\) \(\tau o\,\tau a\) \(\tau a\,k t a\lambda a\,: wherefore we have been comforted. With Tisch., W.H. and modern editors gene-

Vv. 13-16. The Joy of Titus in the Tidings he brought. Chrysostom notes the tact which leads St. Paul to communicate this so emphatically; Titus was going back to Corinth on the business of the collection (viii. 6, 16, 23), and it was very desirable that he should be well received there.—\(\i a\) \(\tau a\) \(\tau o\,\tau a\) \(\tau a\,k t a\lambda a\,: and in addition to this comfort of ours we rejoiced the more exceedingly (cf.ver. 7, and for the double comparative cf. Mark vii. 36, Phil. i. 23) at (for the constr. \(\chi a l k e\,\tau a\,\kappa t a\) cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17, etc.) the joy of Titus, because his spirit hath been refreshed by you all (or the some-what similar use of \(\chi a l k e\) in chap. ii. 3, Matt. xi. 19, Acts ii. 22). Both here and at ver. 15 \(\tau a\) \(\tau a\) is emphasised by its position before \(\kappa t a\); Titus was well received by all at Corinth, and it seems to be implied at xii. 18 that he left a favourable impression upon them all.
VII. 14—16.

Chap. viii. w. 1-7. The liberality of the Macedonian Churches—An example to Corinth.—Ver. 1. *TvupΟίoην θηάηα k.t.X.: moreover (for this is the force of the Στεφάνινα την κόσμον, marking the transition to a new subject; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xv. 1, chap. x. 1, etc.), brethren, we make known to you the grace of God, sc, the special grace of liberality in giving, which has been given in, i.e., given to and exhibited in (see on i. 22), the Churches of Macedonia, e.g., Philippi, Thessalonica and Beroea (Acts xvi. and xvii.), which places we may presume he revisited on this journey.

Ver. 2. ἧτας τής εὐαγγελίας κ.τ.λ.: I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage (not as A.V. “I have confidence,” which would be πεποίηθαι concerning you.

VI. The Collection for the Judean Christians (viii. i-ix. 15). We have now come to the second main topic of the Epistle, viz., the collection to be made at Corinth, as in all the Christian communities which the Apostle had founded, on behalf of the poor Christians at Judea (chaps. vii. and ix.). We first hear of this great undertaking at 1 Cor. xv. 1, but it is plain from that passage as well as from 2 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 2, that it had been organised some time before 1 Cor. was written. (See Intro., p. 6.) The poverty of the Christians at Jerusalem, however caused, was evidently acute; and when St. Paul first parted from the Twelve on his mission to the Gentiles, one of the stipulations made with him was that he should “remember the poor” (Gal. ii. 10). This stipulation he faithfully observed, and it was to convey the money thus entrusted to him to its proper recipients that he paid his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxiv. 17). See further the excellent discussion in Stanley’s note on 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

Chap. viii. vv. 1-7. The liberality of the Macedonian Churches—An example to Corinth.—Ver. 1. *TvupΟίοην θηάηα k.t.X.: moreover (for this is the force of the Στεφάνινα την κόσμον, marking the transition to a new subject; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xv. 1, chap. x. 1, etc.), brethren, we make known to you the grace of God, sc, the special grace of liberality in giving, which has been given in, i.e., given to and exhibited in (see on i. 22), the Churches of Macedonia, e.g., Philippi, Thessalonica and Beroea (Acts xvi. and xvii.), which places we may presume he revisited on this journey.

Ver. 2. ἧτας τής εὐαγγελίας κ.τ.λ.: I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage (not as A.V. “I have confidence,” which would be πεποίηθαι concerning you.

VI. The Collection for the Judean Christians (viii. i-ix. 15). We have now come to the second main topic of the Epistle, viz., the collection to be made at Corinth, as in all the Christian communities which the Apostle had founded, on behalf of the poor Christians at Judea (chaps. vii. and ix.). We first hear of this great undertaking at 1 Cor. xv. 1, but it is plain from that passage as well as from 2 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 2, that it had been organised some time before 1 Cor. was written. (See Intro., p. 6.) The poverty of the Christians at Jerusalem, however caused, was evidently acute; and when St. Paul first parted from the Twelve on his mission to the Gentiles, one of the stipulations made with him was that he should “remember the poor” (Gal. ii. 10). This stipulation he faithfully observed, and it was to convey the money thus entrusted to him to its proper recipients that he paid his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxiv. 17). See further the excellent discussion in Stanley’s note on 1 Cor. xvi. 1.
VIII. 1—6.

PROS KORINTHIOUS

VIII. 1. ΤΝΠΙΖΟΜΕΝ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Μακεδονίας. 2. οὖν ἐν πολλῇ δοκίμῳ ἡ ἐπισκοπεῖα τῆς ἡγεμονίας τῆς κατὰ δάκτυλόν τινα ἐπερείσκευαν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἀπολύπτησιν ἀυτῶν... 3. διὸ κατὰ δίκαιον, καὶ πρῶτον ὁ δύναμιν ἀνοίγειται... 4. μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεδομένης ἡμῖν, τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὴν καθολικά ἡγεμονίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τὸν ἁγίων δέδωκεν... 5. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 6. εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, ἦν, καθὼς ἡ προφητεία, οὗτοι καὶ εἰς εἰρήκες εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς... 7. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 8. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 9. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν...

1. ΝΔΕΓΚΛ support ἐν τὸν πλούτον; better to πλούτον with Ν* BCP 17 (cf. the same variant Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16, Phil. iv. 19, Col. ii. 2; in later Greek there is a tendency towards the neuter form; see crit. note on ix. 2).

2. μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεδομένης ἡμῖν, τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὴν καθολικά ἡγεμονίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τὸν ἁγίων δέδωκεν... 3. διὸ κατὰ δίκαιον, καὶ πρῶτον ὁ δύναμιν... 4. μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεδομένης ἡμῖν, τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὴν καθολικά ἡγεμονίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τὸν ἁγίων δέδωκεν...

1. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 3. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 4. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν... 5. καὶ οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων, ἀλλ' οἱ καθὼς ἡπισκόπων πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ημῖν...
on his meeting with St. Paul in Macedonia after accomplishing his first Mission to Corinth; παρακεισθαι, is the word used throughout of the Apostle's directions to Titus (see chap. ii. 4; ix. 5; xii. 17, and on chap. i. 4), that as he made a beginning before, sc., in the matter of the collection, during the Mission from which he has now returned, so he would also complete in you this grace also, i.e., the grace of liberal giving in addition to the graces of repentance and goodwill which rejoiced him so much to observe (vii. 13, 14). έπιτυχείν is to bring to a successful issue a work already begun; see v. 11 below.—αλλ' δισταπόμενον εν κ.τ.λ.: ye rather (δισταπόμενον having an ascensive force as at i. 9, v. 7 being strictly parallel to and explanatory of v. 6) that as ye abound (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 58) in everything (so he had said of the Corinthians in 1 Cor. i. 5, in παρακαλεσθαι, in faith (see chap. i. 24 and 1 Cor. xii. 8, where πυματις is named as one of the gifts of the Spirit exhibited among them), and utterance, i.e., of Divine things (λόγους and γνώσεως are conjoined, as here, at 1 Cor. i. 5, and γνώσεως is also mentioned with πυματις at 1 Cor. xii. 8; at 1 Cor. viii. 4 he points out with marked emphasis that γνώσεως is not comparable in importance to διάθεσις as shown in condensation to a brother's intellectual weakness), and all earnestness (see ref. and cf. vii. 11, where he mentions the στοχασθείν that the Corinthians had exhibited when they received his message of reproof, and in your love to us (cf. 1. 11 and vii. 24; the variant reading εἰ ημῶν εἰ ἔμαθε would disturb the sense all through he is speaking of the graces of the Corinthians, not of his own), so ye may abound in this grace also (cf. ix. 5). The English versions and comm. take τῶι with the subj. here as a periphrasis for the imperative, and understand some verb like βλέπετε, "See that ye abound, etc.," but this usage of τῶι is unexampled. We follow Kennedy in taking v. 7 in close connexion with v. 6, although we do not agree with the inferences which he draws (2 and 3 Cor., p. 122). V. 7 seems "to have been added by St. Paul," he rightly observes "to avoid any appearance of depreciating the work which Titus had already accomplished among the Corinthian Christians, by the description of it in v. 6 as a beginning". Cf. the shrewd remark of Grotius, "non ignoravit Paulus artem rhetorum, movere laudando".

Vv. 8-15. He counsels (though he will not command) that they follow the example of the Macedonian Churches, according to their ability.—Ver. 8. οί κατ' αὐτάκατα ιδιωτά: I speak not by way of commandment, i.e., I do not give you an authoritative and formal command (as I might do), but as proving through the earnestness of others, sc., the example of the Macedonian Churches (ver. 3), the genuineness also of your love (ver. 7). For the constr. τὸ γνησίως τῆς διάθεσις see on iv. 17.

Ver. 9. γνῶσται γάρ κ.τ.λ.: for ye know the grace, i.e., the act of grace, of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich, sc., in His pre-existent state before the Incarnation, yet for your sakes (cf. Rom. xi. 3) He became poor, sc., in that καταλαμβάνειν.
7—13.

ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Β

διν, ἵνα ὁμοίως τῇ ἕκεινον "πτωχεύειν" πλουτῇσθητε. 10. καὶ γνώμην Ref. ver. ἐν τούτῳ διδώμεν· τούτῳ γὰρ ὤμοιον συμφέρει, οὕτως καὶ οὐδὲν τῷ ποιήσατο. 3 ἀλλὰ καὶ τό θέλειν προενέχθανεν ἀπὸ τέρματι. 11. νῦν δὲ καὶ τῷ ποιήματι εἰπτέλεσατε, ὅπως καθάπερ ἐπροθυμία τοῦ θέλειν, οὕτω καὶ τό εἰπτέλεσατε ἕκ τού ἔχειν. 12. Εἰ γάρ ἐπροθυμία πρόκειται, καθὸ ἐκεῖν ἔχει τούτων, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθό ὅκ τέχνην. 13. οὖ γὰρ ἦν ἀλλατισ ἁμασίας, ὥμοιος ἐξ ἰδίᾳ ἀλλ' ἐξ ἔξω διὸ ἢστήττος, εἰν τῷ νῦν ἱκανῷ τῷ ὑμῶν περισσεύμα εἰς τὸ ἕκεινον.

2 Ver. 6 only. a Chap. ix. 3 only. b Ref. vii. 1. c Ver. 19. chap. ix. 2. Acts xvii. 11 only. d Here only in Paul. e Ref. vi. 2. f Ref. ii. 13. g Ref. i. 4. h Col. iv. 1 only. i Rom. iii. 26. viii. 18. xi. 5 only. Gen. xxx. 20. k Here only in Paul.

1 DEG have αὐτοῦ. 2 G, f, g and the Peshito give στὶ for ὀποίου. 3 The Peshito (mistaking the sense) interchanges ποιήσατο and ἔπληξεν. 4 D*G have ἀναθημάτων (cf. ver. 6). 5 BCD*EK* read εἰσάγει; N*D*GL have αν. 6 CIL and the Bohairic support τὰς, but N*BC*DEGKP and the Latins omit it. 7 DEG, g add τὰς after ἕκειν. 8 N*DEGKL*P, f, g, vg. and the Harclean support μνήμες; N*BC 17, d, e om. θα.

which the Incarnation involved (Phil. ii. 5, 6), (the aor. marks a def. point of time, "He became poor," not "He was poor"), in order that ye by His poverty, i.e., His assumption of man's nature, might be rich, i.e., in the manifold graces of the Incarnation (cf. 1 Cor. i. 5). This verse is parenthetical, introduced to give the highest example of love and self-sacrifice for others; there is nowhere in St. Paul a more definite statement of his belief in the pre-existence of Christ before His Incarnation (cf. John xvii. 5). It has been thought that the primary reference cannot be to this, for the ἐπροθυμία of Jesus Christ by which we are "made rich" is not the mere hardship and penury of His outward lot, but the state which He assumed in becoming man.

Ver. 10. καὶ γνώμην κ.τ.λ.: and here in I give my opinion, for this (i.e., that he should offer them an opinion rather than give a command in this matter, cf. ix. 2) is better, i.e., is morally profitable, for you, inasmuch as you (see Rom. i. 25, 32, etc., for οὕτως = γάρ καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν πρώτων, ἐπροθυμίας, "as thy substance is, so give alms of it according to thine abundance; if thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little").

Ver. 12. αἱ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία κ.τ.λ.: for if the readiness is there it is acceptable according as a man has, not according as he has not; cf. ix. 7, Mark xii. 43, and Tobit iv. 8. "As thy substance is, give alms of it according to thine abundance; if thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little": for if the readiness is there it is acceptable according as a man has, not according as he has not; cf. ix. 7, Mark xii. 43, and Tobit iv. 8. "As thy substance is, give alms of it according to thine abundance; if thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little":

Ver. 13. τοῦ ἔχειν κ.τ.λ.: for the collection is not made in order that there may be relief to others, i.e., to the Judean Christians, and pressure to you, but by...
equality, your abundance at the present season being a supply for their want, that their abundance also may prove to be a supply for your want, sc, at some future time, that there may be equality, i.e., reciprocity. There is no thought here of Jerusalem giving spiritual benefits in return for the material benefits given by Corinth (cf. chap. ix. 14 and Rom. xv. 27); what is meant is that if it ever came to the turn of Corinth to be poor, then it would be for Jerusalem to contribute for her support. Such an idea as that of the transference of the merits of the saints is, of course, quite foreign to the context.

Ver. 15. καθὼς γέγραπται κτλ.: as it is written, sc, in the words of Scripture, "He that gathered (we must understand συλλέξας from Exod. xvi. 17) much had nothing over; and he that gathered little had no lack," sc, because each gathered enough manna for his own needs and no more. That each Christian Church may have enough for its necessities, not its luxuries, is what St. Paul contemplates as desirable and possible by mutual generosity in giving. The true text (ABF) of the LXX in Exod. xvi. 18 has τὸ δαινον for τὸ δαῖον, which however is found as an early correction in A, and also in Philo.

Vv. 16-24. He commends to them Titus and two unnamed companions, who, bearing this letter with them, are sent to gather the collection at Corinth.—Ver. 16. Χάρις σῇ τῷ Θεῷ κτλ.: but thanks be to God, who gives (note the pres. tense) to (lit., "in"; see on i. 22 for constr.) the heart of Titus the same earnest care for you, sc, the same that I myself feel.
persons so important as (e.g.) Apollos or Silas; and, again, that, as he was apparently not a Macedonian (ix. 4), he cannot be any of the prominent members of the Macedonian Church (see on ver. 5 above). Trophimus the Ephesian is not impossible (see Acts xx. 4, xxii. 29), but it is idle to speculate where the evidence is so scanty. The important point about this unnamed brother is that he was selected not by St. Paul, but by the Churches who took part in the work of collecting money as their representative as is now explained.

Ver. 1). (idvovSi dXXa k.t.X.: and not only so, but who was also appointed (xcipo-rovfiv is, strictly, to vote by a show of hands, and hence it came to mean “to elect”) by the Churches, i.e., all the local congregations interested, as our fellow traveller in the matter of this grace (reading iv.; see crit. note), sc., this contribution of money (see vv. 6, 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 3), which is being ministered by us to exhibit the glory of the Lord (cf. iv. 15), and our readiness. The MS. evidence requires us to read ἕμων, but it must be confessed that ἕμων is rather what we should expect, especially as προστάτιον in ver. 11 and in ix. 2 is applied to the Corinthians and not to St. Paul; a plausible conjecture would be κατὰ προστάτιον ἕμων for κατὰ προθ. ἕμων, but the words give an intelligible sense as they stand (see Gal. ii. 10).

Ver. 20. στελλόμενοι τούτο κ.τ.λ.: avoiding this (στελλέθαι might mean “to prepare” as at Wisd. xiv. 1, 2 Macc. v. 1, but Mal. ii. 5 and reff. make us decide for the Vulgate rendering deviantes; the metaphor is a naval one, of shifting sail so as to avoid an enemy’s pursuit), that any man should blame us in the matter of this bounty (see xii. 18; δ哕φες = full, ripe, rich, in v. 5, and so δ哕φες stands for a considerable and liberal— a “fat”— contribution) which is being administered by us. For the broken constr. στελλόμενοι κ.τ.λ. cf. v. 12, vii. 3.

Ver. 21. προσωνομοῦμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: for “we provide things honest” not only “in the sight of the Lord,” but also “in the sight of men,” an injunction in the Proverbs which the Apostle quotes again at Rom. xii. 17. Where other people’s money is in question, one cannot be too careful; and the prudence of the method pursued in this collection, whereby the contributing Churches appointed colleagues to accompany St. Paul and to check his accounts, is worthy of close imitation in the ecclesiastical finance of a later age (cf. vi. 3).

Ver. 22. προσετέμεμεν δὲ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ.: and we have sent with them our brother, whom we have many times proved earnest in many things, but now much more earnest because of the great confidence which he has in you (cf. Gal. v. 10, πεποίησεν εἰς ἁμας), i.e., which was inspired by the account that Titus brought
of their good conduct. It is as impossible
to identify this “brother” as him of ver.
18; like the first named he was an envoy
of the contributing Churches (ver. 23),
and further (what is not said of the first
named) he was on terms of personal inti-
macy with St. Paul, as appears from this
verse. The guess that he was Tychicus
is a plausible one (see Acts xx. 4, Eph.
vi.21, Col. iv.7, 2 Tim. iv.12, Tit. iii.
12), but it is only a guess and is incapable
of verification. A few cursives (see on
xiii.13) give the name of Barnabas with
those of Titus and Luke in the subscrip-
tion at the end of the Epistle, and this
may represent an early tradition.

Ver. 23. εἰτὲ ὑπὲρ Τίτου κ.κ.: whether you ask about Titus (cf. on i.
8 for this use of ὑπέρ), he is my colleague
and my fellow worker to you ward (for
him St. Paul will be personally re-
sponsible), or our brethren, they are the
envoys of Churches, i.e., they were duly
χειροτονηθέντες (ver. 19). The term
ἀπόστολος is generally used by St. Paul
as a technical term; but occasionally, as
here, and at Phil. ii.21 (of Epaphroditus)
and in 1 Kings xiv.6. These men are further described
as ἡγεῖται Χριστοῦ, the glory of Christ, per-
haps because their work is so specially
Χριστοῦ Dei gloriam (see ver. 19 and
this verse).

Ver. 24. τὴν οὖν ἐνδείκνυσι κ.κ.: show
ye therefore (if we read ἐνδείκνυσιν the
exhortation is indirect, as at Rom. xii.
9-21) unto them in the face of the Churches
the demonstration of your love, sc., to us
(cf. ver. 7), and of our glorying on your
behalf, sc., to make void (cf. esp. 1 Cor.
ix.15) the exhortation to give (cf. vii.
4, 14, and ix.2, 3).

CHAPTER IX.—Vv. 1-5. He is con-
fident of their readiness to give;
but Titus and his Companions have
been sent on, that the Collection
may be ready when he arrives at
Corinth. — Ver. 1. ἃπορεύεται εἰς τὴν
κατ' ὑμᾶς. 23. εἰτὲ ὑπὲρ Τίτου, ὁ κοινωνὸς ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἡμῶν οὕτως
ἐσπευσμένος. εἰτὲ ἄλληθοι
ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίας, δύο Χριστοῦ. 24. τὴν οὖν ἐνδείκνυσιν
τῇ ἡγεῖται ὑμῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν κακουχόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, εἰς οὕτως
ἐσπευσμένοι. 1 Ref. i. 15.
g: Cor. xiii. 8.
2 Ref. i. 15.
3 IX. v. 10. Philm. 17; Col. i. τῆς ἡγεῖται ὑμῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν κακουχόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, εἰς οὕτως εσπευσμένοι.

1 DE, d, e, the Peshitto and Bohairic give ὠντος ὑμῶν. 2 Cf. i.7. 1 Rom. xi.25,26; Phil. i.28 only. k Keff.i.12.

Ver. 2. εἴδα νῦν τὴν προθήκην κ.κ.: for I know your readiness, of which I
glory (for constr. cf. xi.30, Prov. xxvii.1)
on your behalf (cf. vii.14) to the Mace-
donians, that Achaia (not ἡμῖν, he re-
ports the actual words in which he made
his boast; for Acts xx.4, Eph. vi.21, Tit.
iv.23; cf. on xiii.13) has been prepared since last year (see on
viii.10 above), i.e., to make its contribu-
tion. It would seem that the Apostle
feared that he had somewhat overstated
the case, as he is evidently anxious about
the Corinthian collection. The use of
the present tense, κακουχίμησα Μακεδόνων,
shows that he is writing from Macedonia
(see Introd., p. 12).— καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἥξιον
κ.κ.: and your seal (see on vii.7) has
provoked the majority of them (see on ii.
6), sc., to contribute (cf. viii.10).

Ver. 3. εἴπετε δὲ τούτῳ τοῖς ἄθω κ.κ.: but (the ὅποι corresponding to μοι of ver.
1) if any of Macedonia (not “they of Mace-
donians,” A.V.; it is probably a fair
inference from this verse that the un-
named “brethren” of viii.18, 22 were not
Macedonians), and find you unprepared,
i.e., with the collection still in complete,
see—that we say not, ye (which is what
he really wishes to convey to them)—
should be put to shame in this confidence,
i.e., should be shamed because of our

1 DE, d, e, the Peshitto and Bohairic give ὠντος ὑμῶν. 2 D*G, g give ὠντος ὑμῶν.

of saints, i.e., the collection (see on viii.4),
it is superfluous (cf. 2 Macc. xii.44) for
me to write, sc., this letter (note the force
of the art. before γράφων), to you, who
“were the first to make a beginning”
(viii.10).
IX. 1—5.  Paxx KOPINIOUOY S B

1. enveiçósteû, 1 Kai 2 éis = prósoypwcn twv exklysinwv. IX. 1. Peri mwn 1 Rom. ii 15, ix. 11

gar tîs diakonias tîs eli twv Aigwv perisool n o eî tw 3 gráfein 2 Reffl. viii. 11.

1. 2. oida gar tîn 4 prothmian tîmaw, hî epér tîmaw kaukómaia 2 Reffl. viii. 4.

Makedónes, diî 'Achala parexeuosestai b apô 8 pérwv 6 Kai 16 d 6 b Reffl. viii. 10.

óumaw 1. ímios 1 4 pîrskhe toûs 5 pleiozaw. 3. ëpmepat 6 de toûs aðel- 5 Kol. iii. 21 only.

foûs, iâ mi toû 1 kaukóma ëimaw 7 toû 8 ëpper tîmaw 4 kenwv 6 de tî 16 méres 8 toutv 2. iâ, káthos ëgnow, parexeuosestai ëne 4. mú 10 wv 11 ëlbwvoun ëmioi Makedónes kai eðrowso tîmaw 1. ápàra-

skêuostau, 2 kaukóma ëimaw 2. iâ, iâ léwme 12 ëmaw, 13 en tî 16 òpòstastei toutv tîs 14 kaukóswwv. 5. 1 nanagkaiou ouv 17 ëgisawmaw

parakalêuai toûs aðelwos, iâ 15 proelwoswv eis 15 tîmaw, Kai 10 pro-

kataîswv tîn prokataîswv 10 éulogian ëmaw 17 toutv 17 étoimvwv; Here only.

1. Chap. xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14. m Phil. ii. 25; 2 Macc. ix. 21. n Here only in Paul; cf.

Acts xx. 5, 13. o Here only. p Chap. x. 6, 16; Tit. iii. 1.

1. NCDbcE**KLP, f, vg. the Syriac and Bohairic support enveiçósteû; BD*E*G

17, d, e, g give enveiçósteû (preferred by Tisch.).

2 kai before ein prosw is found in a few cursives only, and should be omitted.

17 C om. to before grafeiû; G has toû.

3 Better to . . . ëlbwvoun with ìN 17 (see on viii. 2).

4 Better om. ëlbwvoun with ìN B 17, f,vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

5 DE and the Bohairic give epempsawv.

6 G, g om. to vep epempsawv.

B* has kaukóma ëimaw.

7 D*, d, e, f, g, vg. om. epempsawv.

8 Better om. c$ before vepv with ìN BCP 17, f,vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

9 B* has kaukóma ëimaw.

10 Better om. c$ before vepv with ìN BCP 17, f,vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

11 DBb and the Peshitto om. evaw.

12 C*DEG, d, e, g give lewv.

13 B* has lewv. ëmaw.

14 The kaukóswwv is found in NCDcEKLP and the Syriac vss. (from xi. 17); better om.

15 NCKL support ein ëmaw; BDEG have prosw.

16 KL support prokataîswv 10; better prokataîswv (Rom. i. 2 only) with 

17 NCDcEKLP and the Syriac vss. (from xi. 17); better om.

BDEG.

18 exaggerate statements. ëndôstos of substratum or substance (Heb. i. 3, xi. 1) is

sometimes used in the LXX as = "ground of hope" (Ruth i. 12, Ps.

xvii. 6, Ezek. xix. 5), and thus it came to mean = "confidence," as here (see ref.);

Ver. 5, nanagkaiou ouv ëgisawmaw, etc.: therefore, sc., because of the

reason in ver. 4, I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren (inasmuch as two of those "brethren" were not chosen by St. Paul, but were the delegates of the contributing Churches, the rendering "entreat" of the R.V. conveys well the meaning of parakalêuai; but see on viii. 6) that they should go beforehand unto you, sc., before the Apostle should

himself arrive at Corinth, and make up beforehand your bounty which was pro-

mised beforehand, sc., to the Macedonians. "Bis dat qui citodat" is what he would

impress upon the Corinthian Christians. ëulogywv, elsewhere used in the N.T. as = "blessing" (e.g., Rom. xv. 29, 1 Cor.

x. 16, Gal. iii. 14), is here = "gift," a meaning which as the rendering of

11 in the East (as still to a great extent) accompanied by a gift' (Stanley),

Cf. the similar ambiguity in the word

kara:— toutâv en toûmaw enai k.t.l.: that
IX. nPOS K0P1NGI0Y2 B

q Rom. i. 29: "I am come, 
Eph. iv. 15, v. 29, iii. 5; 
Col. iii. 5: 
1 Thess. ii. 5.

1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. 
vi. 7. Here only.

3 Col. vii. 12. 
Prov. xxii. 8. 
Ps. iv. 7.

1 *G, d, e, f, g, m, vg. and Peshitto om. kai after eulogy. 

2 ins. NCBDEKLP, the Harclean and Bohairic.

3 f, m, vg. and the Bohairic supply λγυς after δε.

4 D*G, d, e, g, m and the Bohairic give eulogia for the first eulogias, and for the second D*, d, e have εφε ευλογια, and G has εφε ευλογια.

5 D*E om. και.

6 DEKL support προαιρεται; G 17 have προηρεται; better προηρεται with NBCP.

7 CD*DEKL support δωνοις; better δωνοι with NBC*DG*.

8 D* and the Peshitto give γαρ for δε.

(according as he hath purposed) (we must supply δουτε as at Col. iv. 6) (the same might be ready as a bounty (οὕτως is marks the exact mode in which the thank-offering is desired ; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 1, ix. 26), and not as an extorsion, κατα, a matter of covetous grasping on my part (cf. xii. 17). The A.V. rendering of πλεονεξίαν = "covetousness," seems to mean "niggardliness, such as a covetous man would exhibit," and this would fall in well with the verses which follow; but it is not agreeable to the general meaning of the word or to St. Paul's usage elsewhere (see ref.).

Ver. 6-11. LIBERAL GIVING IS BLESSED OF GOD.—Ver. 6. τοῦτο δε, ὅ στιν, κ.τ.λ. : but (sc, although I am not pressing you to give, cf. ver. 1) this I say (understanding φιλά; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 29, xv. 50). He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly, and he that soweth bountifully (lit., "on the principle of bounties"; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 10, ευ λαβήσας, for a similar dative of condition) shall also reap bountifully. A similar principle of spiritual husbandry is laid down in Prov. xi. 24, 25, where its application is plainly to the temporal prosperity of the "liberal soul"; cf. also Luke vi. 38. Here, too, this is, no doubt, the main thought (cf. viii. 14); but St. Paul else where extends the principle to the future harvest which each soul shall reap according to its sowing (Gal. vi. 7; cf. chap. v. 10).

Ver. 7. ἐκατόστοι καθές κ.τ.λ.: let each man give (understanding διδότω) according as he hath purposed (note the perf. ; he implies that they had already made up their minds to give, προαιρεται is Aristotle's formal word in Nic. Eth., iii. 3, 19, for a free act of moral choice) in his heart (cf. Exod. xxv. 2, "of every man whose heart maketh him willing, ye shall take my offering"); not grudgingly or of necessity, for "God loveth a cheerful giver." In this quotation from Prov. xxii. 8, St. Paul substitutes (perhaps to avoid the cognate of οὐχομαι) οὐρπρετέοις for χαιρετείας, the LXX reading as it has come down to us, but the sense is not altered. The duty of almsgiving played a large part in Hebrew ethics, and that it should be carried out ungrudgingly is often insisted on in the O.T. and Apocrypha, a point specially to be emphasised in the case of a people who have always had the repute of being over-fond of money — e.g., "Thine heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him" (Deut. xix. 10); "Let not thine eye be envious" (Tobit iv. 7); "In every gift show a cheerful countenance" (Ecclus. xxxv. 9). These precepts St. Paul commends to the Corinthians (cf. Rom. xii. 8). (Note that the practice of having "all things common," which was initiated by the enthusiasm of the first converts (Acts iv. 32 ff.), did not last long; it was a noble attempt to express in outward deed the brotherhood of men as revealed in the Incarnation, but was, in fact, impracticable).

Ver. 8. δωνοι δε κ.τ.λ.: and God is powerful (see ref. xii. 3) to make
all grace, i.e., every gift, temporal as well as spiritual, abound unto you (see reff. iv. 15 for περιποιούω in a transitive signification), in order that ye, having always all sufficiency, sc., of worldly goods and gifts (for πόσην see reff. viii. 7), may abound unto every good work. Note the paronomasia, εν ταύτῃ τινες τάσιν, πάντα περιποιούμενοι.

Vv. 9 and 10 are parenthetical, containing an illustrative quotation and its application.—Ver. 9. καθὼς γέγραπται "Ἐκάθισαν κ.τ.λ.: as it is written, sc., in the image of sowing and reaping which recalled the word Εκάθισαν, "He, sc., the liberal man, hath scattered abroad (cf. Prov. xi. 24), he hath given to the poor, his righteousness, i.e., his beneficence (as at Matt. vi. 1; St. Paul, when using his own words, never uses δικαιοσύνη in this old Hebrew sense), endureth for ever."

Ver. 10. ὁ δὲ ἐκατοργάζεσθαι στέρμα τῆς αἰματος, "the fruit of the vine" in the Gospels (e.g., Mark xiv. 25). This verse is the application, as it were, of the quotation in ver. 9, the connecting link being the word δικαιοσύνη.

Vv. 11-15. Liberal giving will call forth the blessings of the Recipients.—Ver. 11. οἱ δὲ ἔφηκαν τῆς λειτουργίας κ.τ.λ.: ye being enriched in everything unto all, i.e., all kinds of, liberality, which worketh through us (he goes on in the next verse to explain how this is) thanksgiving unto God; cf. i.n, iv.15.

Vv. 12-15. Liberal giving will call forth the blessings of the Recipients.—Ver. 12. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ τῆς λειτουργίας κ.τ.λ.: for the ministration of this service (λειτουργία, which originally stood for any public service, came to be restricted to the service of God; cf. Num. viii. 22, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21) is not only filling up (note the constr. ἐν ταύτῃ with a participle) the wants of the saints, but is abounding also through many thanksgivings unto God (cf. iv. 15).

Ver. 13. καὶ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακ. κ.τ.λ.: inasmuch as they, i.e., the Judean Christians, through the proof, sc., of you, afforded by this ministration (cf. viii. 2 for a similar gen. after δοκιμή), glorify God (cf. Matt. v. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 12) for the obedience of your confession in regard to
the Gospel of Christ (cf. ii. 12). The sentence is an anacolothon; δοξάζωνς cannot be taken as in apposition with πλούσιοι of ver. 11, for the persons referred to are different. It would be grammatically admissible to take δοξάζωνς τον Θεόν with εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χρ., but the order of words and the sense both support the connexion ὄμων εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χρ. as an apposition to εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ., inasmuch as it is the manifestation to the world of belief in Christ's Gospel; ὄμων is a "confession" or "vow," and so (as in Deut. xii. 17, Amos iv. 5) = "a free will offering."—καὶ ἀπλώτητι τὴν κοινωνίαν κ.τ.λ.: and for the liberality of your contribution and the free-will offerings. This would suggest that the rich Corinthian Church had been liberal to other Churches besides that of Jerusalem, but we have no knowledge of anything of the sort.

Ver. 14. καὶ αὐτῶν ἀδελφοὶ κ.τ.λ.: This is again an independent sentence, beginning with a gen. abs. : while they also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you (sc., apparently, long to see you) by reason of the exceeding grace of God upon you; i.e., you have the prayers of those whom you are helping, who feel the yearnings of affection for their benefactors in whom the working of God's grace has been so signal displayed.

Ver. 15. χαράς τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.: thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift. θανάτως is always in the N.T. (see ref., etc.) used of the gifts of God, not of men; and the "unspeakable" gift (cf. Rom. xi. 33, Eph. iii. 20) for which the Apostle bursts out here into a characteristic doxology is the gift of Christ Himself (John iii. 16) and of salvation in Him, thankful appreciation of which had borne such fruit in Christian lives.

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority. It would appear that while Titus had brought favourable news as to the loyalty with which the Corinthians had received St. Paul's message of reproof in the matter of the incestuous person (vii. 9-11), he had also brought distressing intelligence as to the depreciation of the Apostle's authority by certain active Judaisers at Corinth. The case is so serious that it requires immediate attention, and the third (and last) section of the latter is occupied with St. Paul's reply in vindication of his claims. See Introd., p. 22.
The better spelling is πρατητής with Ῥ*BG*P 17.

P and the Latins give εν υμιν for εις υμιν.

C* and the Bohairic add ταυτή (cf. i. 15) after την πέρπτη.

1 The better spelling is πρατητής with Ῥ*BG*P 17.

P and the Latins give εν υμιν for εις υμιν.

C* and the Bohairic add ταυτή (cf. i. 15) after την πέρπτη.

1 The better spelling is πρατητής with Ῥ*BG*P 17.
Spirit and of power"; he ever regards the Gospel as a revelation, not a body of doctrine which could be reasoned out by man for himself from first principles—not, to be sure, an irrational system, but one which is beyond the capacity of reason to discover or to fathom to its depths, and every high thing (carrying on the metaphor by which the "towering" conceits of speculation are represented as fortifications erected against the soldiers of the Cross) that is exalted, or "elevated," "built up," against the knowledge of God, sc, which is revealed in Christ, and leading captive (for αἱκαλωτῖσαι the more correct Attic form is αἰκαλωτὺσεως) every thought into the obedience of Christ (cf. ix. 13). All through this passage the Apostle has directly in view the opposition of gainsayers at Corinth, and so it is not safe to interpret his phrases as directed without qualification against the claims of the intellect and conscience in the matter of doctrine. Yet it must be remembered that he regarded the message which he preached as directly revealed to himself, and not derived from tradition or interpretation, and hence as possessed of a certainty to which the demonstrations of philosophy, however cogent, could not attain. All Truth must be loyal to "the obedience of Christ," who was Himself "the Truth" (cf. xiii. 8).

Vv. 7-18. Despite all appearances, his Apostolical Authority is weighty; his Mission to the Greeks is a Divine Trust.—Ver. 7. τα κατὰ προσωπ. κ.τ.λ.: ye look at the things which are before your face; i.e., you pay too much attention to outward appearances (cf. Rom. ii. 11, Gal. ii. 6, Eph. vi. 9), and on a man's bodily presence and powers of speech (ver. 10), even on his own self-commendation (ver. 12). The rec. text places a note of interrogation after προσωπ., but it seems preferable to treat the sentence as a simple categorical statement (see esp. on ver. 12, and cf. John vii. 24).—εἰ τις πεποίηθη κ.τ.λ.: if any man (this is his usual vague way of referring to opponents; cf. xi. 4, 20) trusteth in himself that he is Christ's, prides himself on specially belonging to what he regards as the "party" of Christ, which had unhappily grown up at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12), let him consider this again (he has often heard it before, but has forgotten it) with himself (or, reading διὰ cαθόρως, "let him think this out for himself"—it does not need any prompting from without), that even as he is Christ's, so also are we (1 Cor. iii. 23).

Ver. 8. ἐὰν τε γὰρ καὶ παριστάτηρον κ.τ.λ.: for even if I should glory somewhat abundantly (or, perhaps, "something more abundantly," sc., than I have already done in vv. 3-6; but the comparative need not be pressed; cf. ii. 4), concerning our authority (which the Lord gave for building you up, and not for casting you down), I shall not be put to shame, i.e., my confident words can be amply justified. He returns here to the image of the tower of the Cross, and he repeats this again in the same words at xiii. 10) extends not solely or chiefly to the overthrow of the fortresses of mis-
guided imagination, but also to the positive and more congenial work of construction, of "building up" (cf. Jer. i. 10).

Ver. 9. ημεις k.t.X.: that I may not seem as if I would scare you by my letters. It is best to take these words with εἰς αἴκοδομίαν of the preceding verse; his purpose in writing so severely is not to terrify them, but to build them up in holiness and obedience. είς τε = τεκνικόν, with the infin., is only found here in the N.T. The plural τῶν ἐκστατικῶν suggests (what we know from 1 Cor. v. 9) that at least one letter of rebuke had been written before this.

Ver. 10. δι' αυτοῦ κτόσον μὲν, φασίν k.t.X.: for "his letters" they say "are weighty and powerful but, etc. The reading is doubtful (see crit. note); if we follow the rec. text φασίν = "one says" or "he says" (cf. Wisd. xv. 12), the reference will be to an individual opponent (the τοιούτος of ver. 11) who would be readily recognised by the Corinthians; but we must then suppose ταύτα to have dropped out. It is simpler therefore to read φασίν with the A.V. and R.V., and to take the words as reproducing the charge against the Apostle commonly made by those who were disaffected at Corinth. They are "remarkable as giving a contemporary judgment on his Epistles, and a personal description of himself" (Stanley).—η δὲ παροντά τῶν ἑσπάματος k.t.L.: "but his bodily presence is weak (see chap. xii. 7, Gal. iv. 14, and Acts xiv. 12, where the Lystrans called Barnabas "Zeus," and evidently therefore counted him as of more dignified presence than his companion) and his speech contemptible": cf. 1 Cor. i. 17. Persuasive speaker as St. Paul must have been (the Lystrans called him Hermes as "the chief speaker"), he probably had not the arts of a trained rhetorician (1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4, chap. xi. 6), and this would appear a grave defect to these clever and shallow Greeks. According to the second century Acts of Paul and Thecla (§ 3) the Apostle was a low-sized man, bow-legged, of a healthy complexion, with eyebrows knit together (the Armenian version adds that his eyes were blue), and an aquiline nose. The description of him in the piece called Philopatris (§ 13), ascribed to Lucian, is very similar.
12. Οἱ γὰρ τολμῆμεν ἵνα γρηγορῆσαι ἡμεῖς συγκρῖναι ἡμῶν τις τῶν ἡμῶν. Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς ἐμπεριβάλλοντες, ἀλλὰ ἕνωμεν ἐν ἡμῶν ἡμῶν ὑποκρίνεις, καὶ συγκρίνετε ἡμᾶς ἡμῶν ἡμῶν, ὡς τινὲς.

PROS KOPINIOYUS B

Χριστὸς 15. ὅτι εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχόμεθα εἰς "ἄλλοτροῖς κόσμοις," ἔνδειξα δὲ ἐξοντες, αδιαφορώδης τῆς πάσης μισέως ὠμῶν, 1 εἰς ὠμῶν μεγα- 2 λυθήσαι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν εἰς "περισσεῖαν, 16. εἰς τὰ ἐπερέκειν ωμῶν εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ὁδὲ ἐν ἄλλοτρῳ κανόνι εἰς τὰ 3 ἐπερέκειν ωμῶν "Εν Κυρίῳ κα- 4 χάσωμεν. 17. ὁ δὲ "καυχόμεθας εἰς "Κυρίῳ κα- 5 χάσωμεν. 18. ὁ γὰρ δὲ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν συνιστῶν, ἐκεῖνος ἐστὶ 4 "δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὑμᾶς κύριον συνιστήσῃν.

1 B has ἦμων for ἦμων. 2 N has ἦμων for ἦμων.

ΔεΚΛ support συνιστῶν; better συνιστῶν with ΝΒΔ*ΕΓΜΠ (cf. crit. notes on iii. 1, iv. 2).

δικαίωμαν τῆς ἐπιτυχίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα, and so here represents the "province" or sphere in which St. Paul conceives himself as appointed by God to proclaim the Gospel. He especially emphasises this here; to Corinth he has a "mission," as the Apostle of the Gentiles; his authority over the Corinthian Church is not usurped, but has been divinely given him.

Ver. 14. οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ κτλ.: for we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you (ὡς μὴ indicating that the case is only a hypothetical one; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 18); for we came (ἡδὲν being used as in modern Greek; see ref.) as far as unto you in the Gospel of Christ. Corinth was the westernmost point that he had reached. This verse, it will be observed, is parenthetical, and is introduced to make it clear that Corinth was part of his appointed sphere; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 15, ix. 1.

Ver. 15. οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κτλ.: not glorying beyond our measure (the argument is resumed from ver. 13), that is, in other men's labours. This he steadily avoided (cf. Rom. xv. 20); even Rome itself was to be visited en route to Spain (Rom. xv. 24). But his Corinthian opponents were not so scrupulous about intruding into another man's sphere (1 Cor. iii. 10, iv. 15). ἀπείρησα δὲ ἡκτός κτλ.: but having hope that, as your faith grew (see Eph. ii. 21, iv. 15, Col. i. 10, ii. 19, for intras. use of ἀπείρησα, and cf. chap. ix. 10), we shall be magnified in you (cf. Acts v. 13) according to our rule, i.e., our "line," our apportionment of Apostolic work, unto further abundance, so as, etc.

Ver. 16. εἰς τὰ ἐπερέκειν κτλ.: so as to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, i.e. (if we are to press the idea of direction in ἐπερέκειν), the western parts of Greece, Rome and Spain, which were "beyond," if viewed from Jerusalem, the home of Christianity, whence St. Paul, like the other early preachers, received his "mission" (more probably, however, ἐπερέκειν is used quite vaguely as ἐκάστῳ is in Amos v. 27, where the idea of direction cannot be read into it), and not to glory in another's "line" about things made ready to our hand. This is what the intruders had done at Corinth, whose Church St. Paul had founded (1 Cor. iii. 6).

Ver. 17. ἀλλα ἐκαυχόμενος κτλ.: but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord, a quotation from the O.T. (see ref.) used before by St. Paul (cf. also Rom. xv. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 7). For not he that commendeth himself is approved (cf. Prov. xxvii. 2), but whom the Lord commendeth (cf. Rom. ii. 29, 1 Cor. iv. 5). And the Corinthian Church itself is his "letter of commendation" (iii. 2).

CHAPTER XI.—Vv. 1-4. HE BEGS THEM TO BEAR WITH HIM IF HE STATES HIS CLAIMS AT LENGTH; IT IS NECESSARY TO DO SO BECAUSE OF THEIR READINESS TO ACCEPT NOVEL TEACHING. —Ver. 1. ἀπείρησα δὲ ἡκτός κτλ.: would that ye could bear with me in a little (μικρῶν τι only here and ver. 16; cf. Heb. ii. 7) foolishness, "nonsense" (see ref. and cf. Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 36, Eph. v. 17). He thus deprecates his insistence on his claim to apostolic authority, and at the same time introduces with great skill a passionate statement of it.—ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνεξαν.: not indeed bear with me; i.e., he not only utters a wish, but entreats them directly. Others (e.g., R.V. marg.) take ἀνεξαν. as indic., i.e., "but indeed ye do bear with me":
XI. 1. “Ophelov • deikeethi & mou meivn tay f aprouynh • alla
2. • ezhis gav apous theou • ezhis • hirmosmmi
3. gav apous eiv anphri, parados • anphn • parastasai tay Xristof • 3.
c 1. Cor. xi. b fofoumai de b 5 • 10, de 1 tis Eiean 1 i eipasthen en 7 tay
4. vii. 17. k paroufrh otoy, ouv • 1 tharph tay • noymata omwn apo tis
d Ref. vii.
5. Here only. f Ref. viii. 11. g Ref. iv. 14. h Chap. xii. 20; Gal. iv. 11. i Gen. iii.
6. i Ref. iv. 2. j Ref. vii. 11. m Ref. iv. 11.

1. DeEGKL have ophelov (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 8); ophelov NNBMP.
2. A few minuscules have ophelov nayeksest.
3. KLP support tay aprouynh; NBDEM 17 have (preferably) tis aprouynh, and
4. there are minor variants.
5. X has alla kai anagwaste.
6. For muqei G has muqei and D* has mu.
7. DEKL, the Harclean, d, e, f, g, v, support the order Ev. eipw.; but NNBGMP 17,
g and the Bohairic give eipw. Ev.
8. D* omits ev.
9. D*EKL, f, v, and the Syriac support ouv • tharph; better om. ouv (as a
10. marginal gloss) with NBD*GP 17, d, e, g, r and the Bohairic.

Ver. 2. • ezhis gav apous k.t.l.: for I
11. am jealous over you with a godly jealousy
12. (cf. Zech. i. 14, and for theou ezhis cf. Acts xxii. 3, Rom. x. 2; this “jealousy”
13. of St. Paul is on behalf of God); for I
14. espoused you to one husband, that I might
15. present you as a pure virgin to Christ, sc,
16. at His Coming. The figure of Israel as a
17. Bride presented to Jehovah as the Bride
18. groom was frequently used by the O.T.
19. prophets (Isa. liv. 5, lixi. 5, Hosea ii. 19); and,
20. according to the Rabbis, Moses was the
21. bridesman or paranymph. Here St.
22. Paul conceives of himself as the para
23. nymph (cf. John iii. 29) who presents the
24. Church as a pure Bride (cf. Rev. xxi. 2)
25. to Christ, the heavenly Spouse, the “one
26. husband” to whom she is bound to
27. remain faithful. Some critics have found
28. here an echo of Christ’s words at Matt.
29. ix. 15, xx. 12; but the similarity does not
30. extend further than the employment of the same image demands. "αρέσκω in
31. the act. is regularly used of the father of the
32. bride; in the pass. of the bride herself (Prov. xix. 14); and in the mid.
33. generally of the bridegroom, but sometimes (as here) of others.

Ver. 3. • deiksetai• 5 µ µ πες Κ.Τ.Λ.: but I fear lest by any means, as “the
34. serpent beguiled” Eve in his craftiness (in Gen. iii. 1 the serpent is called
35. φρονιμωτατος, but St. Paul changes the
36. word to indicate the baseness of the serpent’s wisdom. Aristotle uses phroum
37. yantos (Nich. Eth., vii., 12), your minds should be
38. corrupted from the simplicity and the
39. purity (cf. chap. vi. 6) that is toward
40. Christ. It would appear that the belief
41. of the synagogues was that the serpent
42. literally “seduced” Eve (cf. 4 Macc. xvii. 6-8, and Iren., contra Haer., i., 307),
43. and it is probably in reference to this that St. Paul substitutes the stronger word
44. ἔξαφνεσσα (as he does at 1 Tim. ii. 14) for the
45. simple verb ἐναχν. of Gen. iii. 13.
46. Carrying on the metaphor of ver. 2, he
47. expresses his anxiety lest the Corinthian
48. Church, the “Bride of Christ, should be
49. seduced by the devil from her singleness of affection (cf. 1 Mace. ii. 37, 60, and see
50. on viii. 2 for ἐκλωκνης) and her purity, and
51. so should be guilty of spiritual fornication. He assumes that “the serpent”
52. is to be identified with Satan, the tempter of mankind, as he does also at Rom.
53. xvi. 20; the earliest trace of this identification, which has become so familiar, is
54. Wisd. ii. 24. cf. Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2. He now
55. gives the reason of his anxiety, lest they
56. should fall away; viz., they were show
57. ing themselves too willing to listen to
58. strange teachings.

Ver. 4. • de µ µ γαρ ὁ δρακώνως κ.τ.λ.: for if he that cometh (he 
59. ὁ δρακώνως may point to some one conspicuous opponent, but it would not be safe to press this, or
to lay stress on the verb as indicating one who
60. comes without authorised mission, as at
61. John x. 8; it is probably a quite in
62. definite phrase, “if any one comes and
63. preaches,” etc.) preachei another Jesus
64. whom we did not preach (not “another
65. Christ,” “a new Messiah,” for of this
66. the false teachers at Corinth were not
1—6. PΩΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

"Δισλότητος τής εἰς τόν Χριστόν. 4. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν ἄλλον οὐ ζητεῖν
d εἰς τῇ τῇ Μοίρᾳ ἢ τῇ ἐπειδὴ οὐχ ἔχει ἢ οὔτε καὶ πνεύμα ἢ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ
cαλὸς ήμείναιτο. 5. λογίζωμαι γὰρ μὴν διαφιλον ὑποθεκαῖσθαι τῆς ὑποτέλεως.
6. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἄλλ' οὖν 

1 Μ* BG 17, g and the Harclean (with asterisk) give ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγγέλωρ, which is adopted by W.H. and R.V.; DcKLMP, f, vg. and the Peshitto have only ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλ. of the rec. text.
2 BDEKLP support εἰς τὸν Χρ.; ΝΓΜ omit τὸν.
3 G, f, g, vg. give Χριστόν for ἰδιώτων. 4 G, g add ἐμπανεῖται after εἰς τοῦ. 5 BD* 17 have ἀνεκέχοθο; but DcEGKLMP have ἀνεκέχοθο; the rec. ἀνεκέχοθο is found in cursive only.
6 B has διὶ for γὰρ, probably in mistaken reference to μὲν of ver. 4.
7 D*E, d, e, r, etc., add εν μὲν after νοστήρ.
8 D*, d, e, f, g give εἰ καὶ.
9 D*E, d, e, g give εἰς ἀμφ.

Guilty; but "another Jesus," i.e., a different representation of the historical Person, Jesus of Nazareth, from that which St. Paul put forward when at Corinth; see ref.), or if ye receive a different Spirit which ye did not receive, sc., a Spirit different from Him whom you received at your baptism (ἐμπανεῖται is the regular verb with πνεύμα; cf. John xx. 22, Acts viii. 15, x. 47, xix. 2, Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 12, Gal. iii. 2... for "superfine Apostles" is thus, as at xii. 11, an ironical description of the ὄσινα ἀπόστολοι, "these superfine Apostles" is thus, as at xii. 11, an ironical description of the ὄσινα ἀπόστολοι (ver. 13) against whom he is contending.

Ver. 6. cl 8ι καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ.: or did I commit a sin (note the irony) in abasing myself (cf. Phil. iv. 12), that ye might be exalted, sc., in spiritual privileges (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 11), because I...
preached to you the Gospel of God for nought?

Ver. 8. ἔλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐνύληθα κ.τ.λ.: I robbed other Churches, e.g., Philippi (Phil. iv. 15). He expresses himself hyperbolically to bring out his meaning; σαλάμι is a very strong word, see Acts xxvii. 28, where it is used of the Tarsians taking wages of their men, as a proverbial expression for being paid for their services. SiaxévCa is not used here in special reference to the collection for the Judæan Christians, as it was at viii. 4, ix. 1, 13, but in its most general sense; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 11, Heb. i. 6. — kal παρών κ.τ.λ.: and when I was present with you, i.e., during his first visit to Corinth (see Acts xviii. 1 ff.), and was in want (a condition which he recalls again, Phil. iv. 12), I was not a burden on any man. νάρκη is the torpedo-fish, which paralyses its victims by contact, and then preys upon them; so καπαναρκών signifies "to oppress heavily". The compound verb is not found elsewhere in Greek literature (we have ναρκέων in Gen. xxxii. 25, Job xxxiii. 19); Jerome says (Ep. cxxi. ad Aligastam) that it is a Cilicianism, like ναρκάω in 1 Cor. iv. 3.

Ver. 9. τὸ γὰρ ὄστρεμ, μου κ.τ.λ.: for the brethren, when they came from Macedonia (very likely Silas and Timothy; see Acts xviii. 5, Phil. iv. 15), supplied the measure of my want; and in everything I kept myself from being burdensome unto you (cf. xii. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 6), and so will I keep myself.

Ver. 10. οὐδέρθει Χριστῷ εὐδόκησέν με, κ.τ.λ.: as the Truth of Christ (we have ἡ ἀλήθεια τ. Θεοῦ, Rom. i. 25, iii. 7, xv. 8; cf. John xiv. 6, Eph. iv. 21) is in me (for the form of the asseveration see on i. 18; Rom. ix. 1 is not a true parallel to the constr. here), this glorying, sc., in my independence, shall not be stopped, as far as I am concerned, in the regions of Achaia (see on i. 1); cf. vii. 14. The true reading is ἄφασαίμη; ἄφασσω is "to fence," but in N.T. (Rom. iii. 19, Heb. xi. 33; cf. also Dan. vii. 22) is used with στάμα in the sense of "to stop" the mouth.

Ver. 11. Βατι; διὶ οὐκ ἅγι. κ.τ.λ.: wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth, i.e., that I do love you.

Ver. 12. δὲ θεὸς κ.τ.λ.: but what I do, that I will do that, by refusing to accept maintenance gratis at your hands,
I may cut off the occasion (τὴν ἀφορμήν, the definite opportunity for attack which my opponents desire) from those who desire occasion that in the matter of their boast, that as of Apostolic rank free maintenance was their rightful due, they may be found even as we, i.e., they desire that I and they may be equal so far as the taking of money is concerned. It is better to regard the second ἵνα, not as in apposition with the first, but as dependent on τὰς ἀφορμὰς and as expressing the desire of St. Paul's opponents, not his own. The situation seems to have been as follows: St. Paul held that the "labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7, 1 Tim. v. 18), and in 1 Cor. ix. 11-13 he gives a clear exposition of the principle as applied to preachers of the Gospel. On these grounds he more than once (Phil. iv. 15, 16) accepted money from the generous Church of Philippi. But it was not his usual practice. He reminds the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 9) that when with them he had worked for his living. So too he did at Corinth (Acts xvi. 2), any help he then accepted coming from Macedonia (chap. xi. 9); and he did the same at Ephesus (Acts xx. 34). Now his Corinthian opponents were very ready to take money for their teaching (1 Cor. ix. 12); indeed they prided themselves on doing so, as it was the privilege of "apostles". This determined St. Paul that it should never be truly said of him that he was a hireling teacher, and so he was especially careful at Corinth (1 Cor. ix. 15-19) to avoid even the appearance of grasping after money (cf. Gen. xiv. 23). This honourable independence, however, created a difficulty in two directions. On the one hand, it gave his opponents a handle for saying that he was not really of Apostolic rank, inasmuch as he dared not claim Apostolic privilege; and, on the other hand, it hurt the feelings of his Corinthian friends that he should refuse maintenance at their hands. His reply is contained in vv. 7-12 of this chapter. And the point of ver. 12 is that his action is necessary, for if he were to take money as his opponents did, it would speedily be made a matter of cavil, and would tend to bring him down to their level (see also xii. 14).

Ver. 13. οἱ γὰρ τοιούτοι κ.τ.λ.: for such men (this explains the ground of his determination in ver. 12 not to give opportunity for cavil) are false apostles (cf. Rev. ii. 2. This speedy appearance of false teachers was one of the most remarkable features of the Apostolic age; cf. Gal. ii. 4, iii. 18, Tit. i. 10, 2 Pet. ii. 1, 1 John iv. 1), crafty workers (cf. Phil. iii. 2), fashioning themselves into Apostles of Christ, i.e., laying special claim to that great title (cf. chap. x. 7). μετασχηματίζοντας ἐστιν to change the outward appearance (σχῆμα) of a thing, the thing itself in essence (μορφή) remaining unchanged (see ref.).

Ver. 14. καὶ οἱ διάκονοι κ.τ.λ.: and no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light. Light is the symbol of God (1 John i. 5, 1 Tim. vi. 16) and His messengers (Matt. xxviii. 3, Acts xii. 7), as darkness is the symbol of Satan (Luke xxii. 53, Eph. vi. 12, Col. i. 13). The μετασχηματίσεως of Satan has just before been in the Apostle's mind (ver. 3), and perhaps such passages as Gen. iii. 1, Job i. 6, 1 Kings xxii. 19-23 sufficiently account for the image. But it is more probable that some Rabbinical tradition lies behind the word used by St. Paul; cf. Apoc. Moysis (v. 17) τὸν δὲ σωτῆρα ἐνέπελεν ὑπὸ τοῦ διάκονου. A reference has been here found by Ewald to Matt. iv. 1-11, but while it is not improbable that the Apostle had heard the story of the Lord's Temptation, there is no clear trace of it in his Epistles.

Ver. 15. οὐ μέγα οὖν κ.τ.λ.: it is no great thing therefore, if his ministers also,
XI.
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n Rom. ii. 104

XI. 16. XalXiv Xtyu k.t.X.: I say again (the first time having been in ver. 1), let no man think me foolish, i.e., senseless with the διπόσσεν of self-praise; but even if ye do (for εἰ δὲ μὴ γε γε cf. Matt. vi. 1, ix. 17, Luke xiii. 9, xiv. 32), yet receive me as foolish (there is a somewhat similar ellipse in Mark vi. 56, Acts v. 15), that I also, sc., as well as they (cf. ver. 18), may glory a little (μικρὸν τι = "a trifle," "a little bit").

Ver. 17. διὰ λαλήμ κ.τ.λ.: I speak not after the Lord, i.e., Christ (he refuses to claim Divine inspiration for his self-glorying; cf. i Cor. vii. 25), but as in foolishness, in this confidence of glorying (see on ix. 4 for ἐνθύμησις).

Ver. 18. Ἰταλὸν πολλὰ κανονίζω κ.τ.λ.: seeing that many, sc., of the Corinthian Judaisers against whom this whole polemic is directed (cf. ii. 17, where they are also alluded to as ὁ πολλὸς, glory after the flesh, i.e., in external circumstances which are really no fit subject for glorying (see, e.g., x. 12, and reff.), I too will glory, sc., after the flesh; i.e., he proceeds to explain how much better external grounds he has for boasting than his Judaising rivals.

Ver. 19. ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ.: for ye bear with the foolish, i.e., the false teachers, gladly, being wise yourselves, the latter clause being, of course, ironical, although (see reff.) it was true that φόνος was a quality which he had seriously ascribed to the Corinthians in a former letter. His point is that, as they have borne with the self-commendation of the pseudo-apostles, they should extend the same indulgent toleration to him. He then goes on to remind them of the insolence and ill-treatment which they had endured at the hands of these self-constituted spiritual guides.

Ver. 20. ἄνεχεσθαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: for ye bear with a man if he (we cannot press τι so as to point to any special individual; cf. x. 7) enslave you (in contrast to any such tyranny, St. Paul describes himself as the Σωτήρ of the Corinthians; see iv. 5, and cf. Acts xv. 10); if he devour you, i.e., robs you of your substance by greedily demanding maintenance, as these "superfine Apostles" did (see on ver. 12, and cf. Rom. xvi. 18, Phil. iii. 19); if he take you captive (ξαύφισει thus used of catching fish, Luke v. 5; cf. chap. xii. 16). Field defends the A.V. "taketh of you," i.e., takes money, by appealing to the Peshitto, and also by the usage of good Greek writers; if he exalt himself (cf. x. 12, xi. 18); if he smite you on the face. A blow in the face was, and is, a common form of insult in the East (cf. i Kings xxii. 24, Matt. v. 39, xxvi. 67,
Acts xxiii. 2, 1 Cor. iv. 11); and the despotic teachers whom the Corinthians tolerated had very likely inflicted this last indignity upon them. Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. i. 7, where it is forbidden to the ἀσκόντας to be ' strikers '. "Such are your teachers," he says to them, "I am but weak in comparison with these strenuous spiritual directors."

Ver. 21. κατὰ ἄμεθα λέγω κ.τ.λ.: by way of disparagement, sc., humbly of myself, I say that we, i.e., I myself, ήμεις being ironically emphasised, have been weak, i.e., I have not attempted to enforce my authority in any of these directions (cf. x. 10 and 1 Cor. ii. 3). He now changes his tone from irony to direct and masterful assertion, and in the splendid passage which follows he makes the "boast" which he has been leading up to with such prolonged explanations,—ἐν γένεσιν κ.τ.λ.: and yet whereinsoever any man is bold (I speak in foolishness—this he is careful to add once more; see ver. 17), I am bold also. His whole life will justify him.

Ver. 22. Ἐβραίοι εἰσί; καίγω: are they Hebrews? so am I. At a later period the term Ἐβραῖος was no longer confined to Palestinian Jews (Eus., H.E., ii., 4, 2, iii. 4, 2), but expressed mere nationality. However in the N.T. it is used in contrast with Ἑλληνιστὴς (Acts vi. 1; cf. Phil. iii. 5), and denotes a Jew who retained his national language and customs. Jerome states (de Vir. ill.) that St. Paul was born in Giischala of Galilee, but this cannot be true in the face of his own statement that he was born in Tarsus (Acts xxii. 3).—σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ κ.τ.λ.: are they the seed of Abraham? so am I. This is the highest dignity of all, to be an inheritor of the Messianic promises given to Abraham (cf. for the phrase Isa. xli. 8, John viii. 33, Rom. ix. 7, Gal. iii. 29). In the two parallel passages, Rom. xi. 1, Phil. iii. 5, he adds that he is of the tribe of Benjamin—a fact which probably accounts for his name "Saul" (1 Sam. ix. 1). It shows how strong the Judaising party were at Corinth that he thinks it important to put this proud statement of his descent in the forefront of his apology.

Ver. 23. διάκονοι Χρ. κ.τ.λ.: are they Christ's ministers? (as they specially claimed to be; cf. x. 7)—I speak as one beside himself (sc., as if he would say "this is mad boasting indeed; for what office can be higher than this?"); I am more, i.e., I am that in a higher degree than they (ἐφεξήγορημαι being used adverbially), as is proved by my trials in the service of the Gospel. The summary which follows is of deep interest for the student of St.
XI.

Paul's life; he goes into more definite detail than elsewhere (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 11-13, chap. iv. 7-10, vi. 4-10), and gives us a more vivid picture of his extraordinary labours than would be possible to form from the narrative in the Acts alone. It will be remembered that his missionary career lasted for ten or eleven years after this Epistle was written, and that therefore we cannot regard these verses as giving us a complete list of his trials. —

Ver. 24. ὦτο δ᾽ Ἰουδαίων  τεσσαράκοντα 24. ὅταν Ἰουδαίων τεσσάρακοντα

Ver. 25. τρίς ἐρραβδίσθην 25. τρίς ἐρραβδίσθην, ἃ ἀπειλήθην, τρίς ἐναγύνησα, 26. δούλουρίας τολάκια.

1 The preferable spelling is τεσσεράκοντα with ΗΒ’ΔΕ.

2 The preferable spelling is ἐρραβδίσθην with all the uncialss except M.

D*, d, e and the Peshitto give πολλὰς for πολλάκια.

Ver. 25. τρίς ἐρραβδίσθην κ.λ.: thrice was I beaten with rods, i.e., "virgin cases" of Perga, and distinct from the Jewish, method of scourging—distinct too from flagellation with thongs (Matt. xxvii. 26). It was forbidden in the case of a Roman citizen by the Lex Porcia, but nevertheless St. Paul had endured it at Philippi (Acts xvi. 23, 37), and barely escaped it at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 25). We do not know the other two occasions alluded to.— ἀπειλήθην κ.λ.: once was I stoned, i.e., at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19, and almost at Iconium, ver. 5), thrice I suffered shipwreck, of the circumstances of which we have no record, for the shipwreck on his voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii.) was subsequent to this, a night and a day have I been (there seems to be no special reason here for the perf. in preference to the aorist) in the deep, probably after one of the shipwrecks (cf. Acts xxvii. 44). For πολὺς with words of time cf. Acts xv. 33, xx. 3, Jas. iv. 11.)

Ver. 26. δούλουρίας πολλὰς κ.λ.: in journeys often (of the extent of which the Acts gives us some idea; their dangers are now enumerated), in perils of rivers, sc., from swollen torrents dangerous to ford (Stanley notes that Frederick Barbarossa was drowned in the Calycadnus, not far from Tarsus; see Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, p. 23, for several illustrations of the dangers of the Pisidian highlands), in perils of robbers, on account of whom travelling in Asia Minor was, and still is, dangerous (the district of Perga and Pamphylia which St. Paul traversed on his first missionary journey was notorious for brigands; see Strabo, xii., 6, 7), in perils from my kin, i.e., persecutions at the hands of the Jews which he had suffered (see Acts ix. 23, 29, xiii. 50, xiv. 5, xvii. 5, 13, xviii. 12, 2 Thess. ii. 14), and from which he was yet to suffer more (Acts
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xx. 3, xxi. 31, xxiii. 12, xxv. 3), in perils from the Gentiles, as, e.g., at Iconium (Acts xiv. 5), at Philippi (Acts xvi. 20) and at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23), in perils in the city (Acts xxii. 31 and passim), in perils in the sea, i.e., in town and country, by land and by water, in perils among false brethren, i.e., probably the Judaisers who were his bitter opponents (cf. ver. 13 and Gal. ii. 4).

Ver. 27. κοπῶ καὶ μόχθος κ.t.l.: in labour and travail, in watchings often (see on vi. 5), in hunger and thirst (cf. i Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12), in fastings often, i.e., plainly, in involuntary deprivation of all food (the idea of voluntary devotional fastings is quite foreign to the context here, and to bring it in spoils the rhetorical force of the passage; see on vi. 5), in cold and nakedness (cf. i Cor. iv. 11).

Ver. 28. χειρὶ τῶν παρ. κ.t.l.: besides the things which I omit (see ref.), and cf. Heb. xi. 32; the A.V. "those things that are without" = vulg. quae sunt extrinsecus, is wrong), there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches (see on vii. 18). ἐπιστεύσας of the rec. text means a combination for hostile purposes, and is used of Korah's rebellion in Num. xvi. 40, xxvi. 9, in which latter place we have the same textual variants as here (cf. also 1 Ead. v. 73). This may be the true reading, both here and at Acts xxiv. 12, for the syllable συν might readily drop out in transcription. If it be adopted here it would refer to the cabals of the Apostle's adversaries = "the daily combination against me," and would thus indicate a trial distinct from "the care of all the churches," which is next mentioned. But, although this gives a good sense, we prefer to read ἐπιστεύσας as better supported both here and at Acts xxiv. 12 (the only places of its occurrence in N.T.). Polybius uses the word as = "attention," "close observation," but this will not suit Acts xxiv. 12. It is found in 2 Macc. vi. 3 as = "visitation" or "pressure," and the latter rendering seems best to satisfy the context here. We have therefore followed the Revisers in adopting the Vulgate rendering instantia = "that which presseth," and in taking μέριμνα κ.t.l. as in apposition with ἐπιστεύσας.

Ver. 29. τὸς ἀσθενὴς κ.t.l.: who is weak, sc., in prejudice (as at Rom. xiv. 1, 1 Cor. viii. 11), and I am not weak, i.e., in Christian sympathy (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 22), and I burn not? i.e., with the fire of righteous indignation (cf. ἐκβόλεα = "inflamed" at 2 Macc. iv. 38). The word ἀσθενή now suggests to him a new thought, that it is in his weakness as supported by God's grace rather than in any strength of his own that his real boast may be made.

Ver. 30. εἷς καὶ πάντως κ.t.l.: if I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my weakness (cf. chap. xii. 5, 9), such as are the perils and indignities which he has recounted in the preceding verses.

Ver. 31. ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κ.t.l.: the God and Father of the Lord Jesus, who is blessed for evermore (see on i. 3, and for ἐν as applied to God, "the self-existent one," cf. Exod. iii. 14, Wisd. xiii. 1, Rev. i. 8), knoweth that I lie not (cf. xii. 6). This solemn asseveration belongs (see ref.) to what follows, and not to the statements which precede
it. If the text is not corrupt, it would seem that the Apostle intended now to illustrate in detail the providence which overruled his life, the "strength which was perfected in weakness," and that, beginning with one of the earliest and least dignified perils of his career as a Christian missionary, he then is led off through some train of ideas which we cannot trace into the quite different subject of his "visions" and "revelations," which diverts him from his original intention.

If, on the other hand, we might suppose vv. 32, 33 to be a marginal gloss (founded on Acts ix.23-25, and perhaps introduced in reference to the κλοσανδρος λέγωνς of ver. 26) which was not part of the original text—though possibly an autograph addition made after the letter was finished—the argument would be quite consecutive. He feels the remarkable account in xii. 2-4 to be so incredible that he thinks it right to prefix the strong asseveration of ver. 31 that he is telling the truth. But there is no MS. authority for this treating vv. 32, 33.

Ver. 32. ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐξ θν. κτ.λ.: in Damascus the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes, sc., by placing a watch at the gates, to take me; and through a window (i.e., an aperture in the city wall, or the window of a house overhanging the wall) was I let down in a basket (σφυρόμενος) anything twisted, and so here probably a rope basket; ἐφύτευσα is the word used in Acts ix. 25 by the wall, and escaped his hands. The incident took place on St. Paul's return to Damascus from Arabia (Gal. i. 17) and is narrated in Acts ix. 23-25. The date of it is important in the chronology of the Apostle's life. It could not have been before a.d. 34, for coins of Tiberius prove Damascus to have been under direct Roman administration in that year. Tiberius was unlikely to have handed Damascus over to Aretas (fourth of the name), the hereditary chief (cf. 2 Mace. v. 8) of the Nabathaean Arabs; for up to the close of the reign of Tiberius military operations were being carried on against Aretas by the legate of Syria. Hence Damascus was probably not ceded to Aretas until the reign of Caligula, and consequently this episode in St. Paul's life cannot have taken place before the middle of a.d. 37. Instigated by the Jews (Acts ix.23), the "ethnarch," or provincial governor of Damascus under Aretas (cf. i Mace. xiv.47), laid a plan for the arrest of the Apostle which was frustrated by St. Paul's escape in the manner described (cf. Josh. ii.15, 1 Sam. xix. 12).

Chapter XII. — Vv. 1-6. The Apostle's Vision: if he chose, he could boast of it.— Ver. 1. With Tisch., W.H. and the R.V. we adopt the reading (see crit. notes): τιμὴν ἔχων ἡ μητέρα μου τὴν αἰενῶς μου τὸν Κυρίον ἡμῶν ἀγαπάω: I must needs glory, though it is not expedient (sc., my opponents drive me to it); but I will come to visions such as were seen by Daniel (x. 1), which were predicted as to be granted in the New Dispensation (Joel ii. 28 f., quoted in Acts ii. 17), which were seen by St. Peter (Acts x. 10), and by St. John (Rev. i. 10, iv. 1), as well as by St. Paul him-
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XII. 1. Καυκάσσων 1 δή 2 οὐ συμφέρει 3 μοι· διεύσομαι γὰρ 4ς Luke i. 22, xiv. 23; Acts xxvi. 19 only.
εἰς ἀπασίας 5 καὶ ἀποκάλυψις Κυρίου. 6 2. οἶδα ἄνθρωπον 3 ἐν 6 Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων (εἰτέ ἐν σώματι, 7 οὐκ οἶδα· εἰτέ δὲ Ref. v. 17, E Ref. v. 6. 4 έκτὸς 8 τοῦ 8 σώματος, οὐκ οἶδα· ο Ἰησοῦς 19 οἶδαν· 1 ἀρπαγεῖται τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐς τρίτον οὐρανοῦ. 3. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, ες Chap. xi. 11. (εἰτέ ἐν σώματι, εἰτέ έκτὸς τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ 10 οἶδα· ο Θεὸς οἶδεν·) f Acts viii. 4. ὅτι ἠρέτη ἐς τὸν παράδεισον, καὶ ήκουσεν 2 ἀρρητά ἡμάτα, ἡ. 

1 Νc, f, vg. prefix before καυκάσσων (from xi. 30).
2 KM support δή; BD* and the Bohairic give δέ; BD* EGLP 17, 37, the Latin and Syriac vss. have δέ.
3 DEKL and the Harlecan support συμφέρει μοι; D* and the Peshitto give συμφέρει without μοι; better συμφέρειν μεν with NBGP 17, 67**, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.
4 yap is read by DEKL and the Syriac vss.; better δέ with NB (which adds καί) GP 17, 73, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.
5 GP have εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς.
6 G, g give Χριστοῦ for Κυρίου.
7 D* E* have εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς.
8 B om. τοῦ before σώματος.
9 NB*GKLMP support εκτός (from ver. 2); BD*E* have χωρίς, which is perhaps preferable.
10 B om. οὐκ οἶδα, and accordingly W.H. bracket the words.

self (Acts ix. 3, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1, Acts ix. 12, xxii. 17) and revelations of the Lord, sc., revelations granted by Christ (Rev. i. 1). St. Paul repeatedly insists that he received his message διὰ ἀποκάλυψεως τῆς Χρ. (Gal. i. 12, Eph. iii. 3; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 3); on one occasion he went up to Jerusalem κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (Gal. ii. 1); and he claims to have the power of speaking ἐν ἀποκάλυψει (1 Cor. xiv. 6), as had also some of his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. xiv. 26). He now mentions one signal instance of such a “vision and revelation” which was vouchsafed to him.

Ver. 2. οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χρ. κ.τ.λ.: I know (not “I knew” as the A. V. has it) a man in Christ, i.e., a Christian (see reff.), fourteen years ago (for the constr. πρὸ ἐτῶν, see John xii. 1)—whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not (the words distinctly indicate St. Paul’s belief that perception is possible for a disembodied spirit); God knoweth—such an one caught up to the third heaven. Cf. Ezek. viii. 3. “The Spirit lifted me between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem.” The date of this experience must have been about 41 or 42 A.D., years of which we have no details so far as St. Paul’s life is concerned; probably he was then at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30, xi. 25; cf. the reference to St. Paul in the dialogue Philopatris, § 12: ἐς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀρρητά δήθεν). The mention of “the third heaven” raises interesting questions as to Jewish beliefs. There is no doubt that a plurality of “heavens” is recognised all through the O. T. (see, e.g., Deut. x. 14, 1 Kings viii. 27, Neh. ix. 6, Ps. lxviii. 33 and cxlviii. 4); but it has been matter of dispute whether the Rabbinical schools recognised seven heavens or only three. However it is now fairly well established that, in common with other ancient peoples (e.g., the Parsees, and probably the Babylonians), the Jews recognised seven heavens. This view not only appears in the pseudoepigraphical literature, but in some of the Fathers, e.g., Clement of Alexandria. Its most detailed exposition is found in the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, a Jewish apocalypse written in Greek in the first century of our era (now only extant in a Slavonic version). In chap. viii. of this work we find that Paradise is explicitly located in the “third heaven,” which is the view recognised here by St. Paul (see Charles’ Slavonic Enoch, pp. xxxi. f.).

Vs. 3, 4. οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον κ.τ.λ.: and I know such a man (he speaks with such caution and reticence of this
momentous event in his spiritual life that he will not even describe it in the first person . . . how that he was caught up into Paradise (see previous note), and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter; such words are reserved for the Divine voice which speaks to man, although this restriction does not apply to all Divine words.

Ver. 5. ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου κ.τ.λ.: on behalf of such an one will I glory, but on mine own behalf, i.e., of myself in my normal state, I will not glory save in my weaknesses, as he has already done, xi. 23 ff.

Ver. 6. ἐὰν γὰρ ἠθέλησεν κακῷ, κ.τ.λ.: we must supply a suppressed clause: "And yet, as you see, if I did choose to boast, I should keep within the truth" is the sense. For if I should desire to glory, I shall not be foolish (cf. xi. 1 and ver. 11), for I shall speak the truth (xi. 31); but I forbear, lest any man should account of me above that which he seeth me to be or heareth from me. He is anxious that he should be judged, not by his report of his own spiritual experiences, but by his laborious and painful life in the service of the Gospel. It is instructive to notice that he does not bring forward this vision as evidence of the truth of doctrine; he only mentions it incidentally and with reserve as a Divine manifestation of which he might legitimately boast, if he chose. On the other hand, he appeals to the fact that he had seen the Risen Christ
LXX (see Num. xxxiiii. 55, Hosea ii. 8, Ecclus. xiii. 19) σκόλης undoubtedly means "thorn," not "stake" (Ezek. xxvii. 24, with others, doubtful). Illustrations of its use in this sense also occur in Artemidorus, Babrius and the medical writers (see Field in loc. and Hermathena, xix., p. 390); e.g., of the pain of cutting a tooth it is said ὄμωσα προσφέραντος κεφαλῆς ἃ σκόλης σαρκί (Comm. in aph. Hippocr., 25). We hold, then, that σκόλης here certainly means "thorn," and that St. Paul's trial is compared to the vexatious irritation of a thorn rather than to the agonising and fatal torture of impalement on a stake. We have no knowledge as to what this trial was. It is a mere fancy, and not a happy one (probably suggested by the Latin stimulus carnis), that it consisted in violence of sensual passions (cf. contra 1 Cor. vii. 7-9 and ver. 9 below). That the σκόλης is an individual opponent who was a "thorn in his side" (cf. x. 7, xi. 14) was held by Chrysostom; Ephraim Syrus identifies him with Alexander the coppermith (2 Tim. iv. 14). But this guess hardly explains σαρκί; the trial was not of the spirit, but in the flesh. It seems likely on the whole that it was a bodily infirmity, probably the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός of Gal. iv. 13. Jerome (Gal., iv. 13) and Ter- 

tullian (de Pudic., 13) mention the tradition that it was headache; this was probably (if there be any truth in the tradition) only a symptom. Another view (supported by the Celtic name for the disease) is epi-

lpsia, a disease to which "visionaries" are said to be prone, but which afflicted two such strong men as Napoleon and Peter the Great. Those who hold this view generally point to the circumstances of St. Paul's conversion as illustrating an attack of the disorder. But this at least is excluded by the Apostle's own words; the "thorn in the flesh" was "given" him after the "vision" of fourteen years before; i.e., this infirmity came upon him after the year 41. Another plausible conjecture (see Farrar, St. Paul, Excurs. xi., but cf. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, p. 39) is that the Apostle suffered from ophthaimia (cf. Acts ix. 9, Gal. iv. 15, vi. 11), a very common disease in the East. Prof. Ramsay (loc. cit., p. 94 ff.) thinks it was chronic malarial fever. Whatever his infirmity was, it was apparently affected the dignity of his outward appearance (Gal. iv. 14), and was evident to the eye. For a full discussion of the various theories on the subject see Lightfoot, Galatians, p. 186 ff.

Ver. 8. τουτον τον τρισ τ. L.: concerning this thing (or "this angel"); for τουτον = "concerning" see on i. 8) I besought the Lord, i.e., Christ (see ver. 9), thrice that it (or "he") might depart from me. "Thrice" seems to point to three special occasions, when his prayers for the removal of his trial were specially urgent. Like Another who prayed thrice that the cup of suffering might pass from Him (Matt. xxvi. 44), St. Paul did not receive the answer his spirit longed for. But he did receive an answer abundantly sufficient to strengthen and to console. Ver. 9. καὶ εἶπεν μοι ὁ Κ. L.: and He hath said (note the perf. as expressing the abiding validity of the Divine promise; so often in quotations from the O.T., e.g., Acts xiii. 34, Heb. iv. 4, x. 9) to me, "My grace is sufficient for thee (cf. Isa. xliii. 2), for My power is being made perfect (πεπληρωθήκει is found here only; the tense indicates a continuous fact in St. Paul's life) in weakness." So it is said of Christ that He was "made perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii. 10);
and of the power which He communicates from Himself the same law holds good.

Cf. Isa. xl. 29-31.—The δύναμις is the glory which was the symbol of the Divine presence in the Holy of Holies, descending upon the faithful (cf. John i. 14, Rev. vii. 15, xxi. 3). The two renderings (“strength” and “power”) of καρδιας in the A.V. of this verse are preserved (although interchanged) in the R.V. by a curious inadvertence on the part of the Revisers, who are generally scrupulous even to pedantry in maintaining uniformity in such matters.

Ver. 10. ἐν σήμειά τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατεργάσθη: wherefore I am well content in my weaknesses, in insults, in necessities, in persecutions and distresses, for Christ’s sake (cf. Matt. v. 11); for whenever I am weak, then am I strong. Wetstein compares Philo’s τὸ ἀνθρώπινον δύναμιν ὑπάρχοντα (Vit. Mos., i., § 13). St. Paul’s words are more than a verbal paradox: they express the fact, to which history abundantly testifies, that the world’s throne is the Cross.

Ver. 11. η εὐαγγελία ἡ δύναμις ὑπαρχοντας τοῦ Χριστοῦ οἱ ἑορταί, ἡ δύναμις, ἡ δύναμις, ἡ δύναμις. This direct assertion, made as if it were indisputable, that miracles had been wrought at Corinth through his agency (see also Rom. xv. 19, 1 Cor. ii. 4) is noteworthy. The three words used should be distinguished. τέρας is something anomalous, outside the ordinary course of nature. This, however, is not the prominent idea in the N.T. miracles; τέρας is never used in the N.T. (save in the quotation Acts ii. 19) except in combination with ὑποτεύχους, a “sign” of the Divine purpose. σήμεια καὶ τέρατα is the regular phrase both in O.T. (Exod. vii. 3, etc.) and in the N.T. for
"miracles": but it is their signal rather than their wonderful character upon which stress is laid. To describe them as σαρκός (Matt. vii. 22, Acts xix. 11, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28) directs attention to the Omnipotent Being to whom they are due.

Ver. 13. τί γὰρ ἦσθιν δ' ἡσυχ. κ.τ.λ.: for what is there wherein ye were treated as inferior (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 19) to the rest of the churches, except indeed that I myself did not burden you? Cf. Acts xx. 33, 1 Cor. ix. 12 and ver. 16. The emphatic αὐτὸς εἰς may indicate that it was only he himself (and not his colleagues) who refused maintenance (see on xi. 12). This was the only σημέων τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which he did not exhibit at Corinth, and he ironically adds, Forgive me this wrong.

Vv. 14-18. That he did not claim maintenance at Corinth was disinterested on his part.—Ver. 14. Εἴποι τρίτον τούτο κ.τ.λ.: behold this is the third time that I am ready to come to you. While these words only express that he had been ready to go twice before, they are quite consistent with the hypothesis, required by xiii. 1, 2 and ii. 1 (see Introd., p. 5), that he had actually paid two previous visits to Corinth, the first of which is described in Acts xviii. That we have no details of the second is no argument against its having taken place.—καὶ οὗ καταναγκάζω κ.τ.λ.: and I will not be a burden to you, following in this my practice on the two former occasions: for I seek not yours but you; for the children are not bound to lay up for the parents, in which relation he stands to them (1 Cor. iv. 14 f., cf. Gal. iv. 18), but the parents for the children (cf. Prov. xix. 14). See on xi. 12. For Paul's principles of action in this matter.

Ver. 15. Εἴποι δὲ ἄβαστα κ.τ.λ.: and I will most gladly spend and be wholly spent for your souls' sake (cf. chap. i. 6, 2 Pet. ii. 19 for the like expressions of unselfish devotion). ἡσυχ. is here used (as at Heb. xiii. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 11) of the spiritual part of man, the interests of which are eternal.—αἱ περισσοτέρας ἄγαπας κ.τ.λ.: if I loved you more abundantly, i.e., than I love other Churches of my foundation (cf. xi. 11), am I loved less (sc., than I am loved by other Churches)? Is it thus that you requite my affection?

Ver. 16. Εἴποι δὲ κ.τ.λ.: but be it so!
I did not myself burden you (cf. xi. 9 and ver. 13). This the Corinthians grant as indisputable, but they allege a sinister reason, *vis.*, being crafty (for ἐπαρχῶν see on viii. 17) I caught you (see on xi. 20) with guile (cf. iv. 2, μὴ περιπατῆσαι ἐν πανούργει μηδὲ δολούντες κτλ.). That is, his adversaries hinted that, although he did not accept maintenance directly, yet the collection made for the Judean Christians was under his hand, and that he was not above suspicion in his disposal of it. To this he returns an indignant denial, and appeals directly to their own observation of the messengers whom he had sent, of whom Titus (at least) had met him in Macedonia with a report (vii. 6) and was sent back to Corinth with two companions to complete the business, carrying this letter (viii. 6, 18 ff.).

Ver. 17. μὴ τινὰ δέν κτλ.: of those whom (by attraction for ἐκάθεν οἵ) I have sent, was there one by whom I took advantage of you? The constr. is broken, and the resulting anacoluthon is one of the most striking in St. Paul's writings (cf. Rom. viii. 3, Gal. i. 20).

Ver. 18. παρακάλεσα Τίτον κτλ.: I exhorted Titus (see on viii. 6), and I sent the brother with him. This was the mission from which Titus' return is recorded above (vii. 6). We do not know the name of his companion; but it is highly probable that Titus and this ἄλλος were the bearers of the former letter to Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 12). —μὴ τι ἐπαλούντος κτλ.: surely Titus took no advantage of you? walked we not (i.e., Titus my emissary and I myself) by the same spirit and in the same steps? It is plain that Titus' first mission had been admirably fulfilled, and that the Corinthians had recognised his single-mindedness and sincerity (see vii. 13). To their good opinion of him St. Paul might fairly point, for Titus, after all, had only carried out his instructions.

Vv. 19-21. His Glorying has not been by way of Apology, but to edify them unto Repentance. — Ver. 19. ἐπάλλαξεν δοκεῖτε κτλ.: ye are thinking this long time (i.e., since they read xi. 1 ff.; for ἐπάλλαξα cf. Matt. xi. 21, Heb. i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 9) that we are excusing ourselves to you, which is very far from his intention (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 3). On the contrary, in the sight of God speak we in Christ (as he had said before, li. 17). But all the things, sc., which we speak, beloved, are for your edifying, sc., of which you sorely stand in need.

Ver. 20. φοβούμασι γὰρ κτλ.: for I fear lest by any means, when I come, I should find you not such as I would, and should myself be found of you such as ye would not, i.e., indignant to severity at their backsliding (cf. x. 2), lest by any means there should be strife (cf. 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 3), jealousies, rages (this seems to be the force of the plur. ἐρωταί; cf. Wisd. vii. 20), factions (ἵπποις is derived from ἵππος, a hired labourer, and signifies a
mercenary cabal), backbitchings, whisperings (i.e., open and secret defamation of character), swellings, i.e., insolences, tumults (see on vi. 5). Cf. Jas. iii.16, δι' ου δακτασταί.

Ver. 21. μή τάλιν εἶλθόντος μου κ.τ.λ.: lest when I come, my God should humble me again before you, sc., because of the scanty fruit of his preaching (as had been the case on his second visit), and I should mourn for many (observe, not "all") that have sinned heretofore, i.e., before my second visit (as at xii.21), and I do say beforehand, as when I was present the second time (cf. ii.1, xii.14), so now being absent, to them that have sinned heretofore, i.e., before my second visit (as at xii.21), and to all the rest, i.e., any more recent offenders, that if I come again I will not spare. It was "to spare" them that he had paid hither to no further visit after his second (i.23). He proceeds to give the reason why he will not "spare" if such a visit should be necessary; viz., they have challenged his Apostolic authority.

Ver. 2. προείρηθη καὶ προκ. κ.τ.λ.: I have said beforehand (at chap. x. 6, 11, xii.21), and I do say beforehand, as when I was present the second time (cf. ii.1, xii.14), so now being absent, to them that have sinned heretofore, i.e., before my second visit (as at xii.21), and to all the rest, i.e., any more recent offenders, that if I come again I will not spare. It was "to spare" them that he had paid hither to no further visit after his second (i.23). He proceeds to give the reason why he will not "spare" if such a visit should be necessary; viz., they have challenged his Apostolic authority.

Ver. 3. ἵπτειν κ.τ.λ.: seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me (cf. Matt. x. 20), i.e., a proof that I am really an "Apostle" with a "mission" from Christ to speak in His Name. This last thought leads him into a short digression. "He who has thus commissioned me is not weak, but strong, and this paradoxical strength in weakness is mine also" (vv. 3b, 4).—δς αἰτὶ ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.: who is not weak in relation to you, sc., as you think me to be (x.10, xi.21), but is powerful in your midst. And this is true for two reasons: (a) because of His Resurrection, as the Victor over Death; (b) because of the strength with which He empowers us in the discharge of our duty to you. Each of these reasons is now introduced by καὶ γερ.
Ver. 4. (a) καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ. τ. λ.: for He was crucified through weakness (cf. Phil. ii. 8, 1 Pet. iii. 18); ἐκ indicating that it was His self-assumed ἀθηνία which made the Passion possible, but ἔνθρευσιν, the opposite (cf. again indicating the ultimate condition) the Power of God (see reff. and cf. Rom. viii. 11, Eph. i. 20, Phil. ii. 9.)—(b) καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ. τ. λ.: for we also are weak with Him (the reading ἐν αὐτῷ might be explained from such passages as i. 5, iv. 12; but it is so startling that we hesitate to adopt it, when the MS. evidence is so evenly balanced; σὺν αὐτῷ means simply “we are weak, as He was weak, in the world’s eyes”; see xii. 10), but we shall live with Him, not only in the Resurrection Life of believers (John xiv. 19, Rom. v. 10, vi. 8), but through the Power of God toward you, i.e., through the powerful sanctions with which He will confirm our exercise of Apostolic discipline at Corinth (cf. 1 Cor. v. 5). The thought is that already expressed in xii. 10. He now resumes the argument of ver. 3a, sc., you are claiming to test my claims; you should look to yourselves; your faith is a witness to mine—that Christ dwells in you is a proof that He dwells in me, who preached Him to you. Cf. chap. i. 24, iii. 2.

Ver. 5. ἐγώ οὖν προεξήγησα κ. τ. λ.: try your own selves (προεξήγησα generally has a sinister sense in the N.T. = “to tempt,” as at 1 Cor. vii. 5, x. 9, Gal. vi. 1, 1 Thess. iii. 5; but see reff.) whether ye be in the Faith, sc., the objective Christian Creed (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 13); prove your own selves (προεξήγησα goes back to προεξήγησα of ver. 3; cf. also ὑποτάσσω at the end of this verse). Or know ye not as to your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you? (cf. Rom. viii. 10, Gal. iv. 19) unless indeed, sc, which is certainly not the case (for ἐν μὴ τι cf. Luke ix. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 5) ye are reprobate. ἀδικίας is that which will not satisfy a test, and so = reprobate. Their own consciousness of the power of Christ’s grace is the best proof that his preaching to them was Divinely authorised; he “begat them in Christ Jesus” (1 Cor. iv. 15).

Ver. 6. ἔλεγεν ὁ θεός κ. τ. λ.; but, however it may be with you, I hope that ye shall know that we are not reprobate, that...
we can confidently submit to any testing of our apostolic authority.

Ver. 7. εὐχαρίστης ἡ π.λ.: now we pray to God (for εὐθεία, πᾶς cf. Num. xi. 2) that ye do no evil; not that ye may appear approved, i.e., the motive of his prayer was not that his ministry should be accredited by its success, but that ye may do that which is honourable (see ref. and mark the contrast between τὸ κακὸν and τὸ καλὸν), even though we be as repro-bate. That is, his prayer was for their sakes, and it was sincerely offered although, if it were fully answered, there would be no occasion for the exercise of his apostolic authority, and so the δοκιμή or "proof" which the malcontents were asking for (ver. 3) would not be manifested. And he gives two reasons for this disinterestedness of his intercessions for them: (i.) he could not exercise his authority, even if he would, except in conformity with the facts (ver. 8), and (ii.) their moral growth is a real joy to him (ver. 9).

Ver. 8. οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεως π.λ.: for we can do nothing, exhibit no Apostolic power, against the truth, i.e., against the facts of the case, but for the truth (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 1 for the elliptical constr.). The principle here laid down is of far wider application than an accurate exegesis can assign to it in its context. It is a general principle, which Christian theology has not always sufficiently remembered, that to fight against truth, whether ethical or historical or scientific, is to fight against Him who is the Truth, and so is to court defeat. We can do nothing, even if we would, against the truth (cf. 1 Esdr. iv. 38).

Ver. 9. χαίρομεν γὰρ π.λ.: for we rejoice when we are weak and ye are strong, i.e., in Christian graces. The primary reference is to that weakness which the non-exercise of Apostolic authority would seem to suggest to them (ver. 4, xi. 21), and of which his opponents were very ready to accuse him (x. 10); but in all weakness of his he repeatedly declares his contentment, if it ministered in any way to their edification (see iv. 12,
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1. TYPOS KOPIN0IOY B

10. Βιβλία τοῦ Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὸ γραφῆς, ἵνα τὸ γέρον ἡμῶν ἀποτρέψῃ καὶ ἰσαρίσῇ, καὶ καθὼς οἱ γραφὴς τῶν ἔνδοκων ἔλευθερίαν μὴ ἐκχάρισωμεν τῷ θεῷ γιὰ τὸ πλῆθος εἰς τὸ κεκυκλωμένον καὶ τὸ ἔκερασται.

11. Λοιπον, Κύριε, ἔρρεθέ, καταρθήσον, παρακαλέσθε, ἵνα ἐλπίδωμεν εἰς ἄγνωστον ἔλογον καὶ ἐφικτά δικαίωμα.

12. Ἀποσάσασθε ἄλληλους εἰς ἀγίαν φίλημα.

13. Ἐφεσι. i. 13

14. εἰς ταῦτα διῳγμένων εἰς ἡσυχίαν παρ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐν χωρίῳ καὶ ἐν δυναμεῖς τὰ καθαίρεσιν εἰς τοῦτον θείον ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἔκκλησιᾷ τῶν τε θεοῦ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ ἐφικτά δικαίωμα.

15. Ἐφ. i. 3, 5, 6; Phil. ii. 2, 14, 16, 17; Col. i. 19, 28; 2 Thess. i. 9, 16, 24; 1 Thess. v. 13, 24, 25, 27, 28; cf. Eph. iv. 23, 24; Col. i. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 11, 12, 14; Phil. iv. 6, 7; 1 Thess. v. 24, 25, 27, 28; cf. 1 Pet. v. 14.

16. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.

17. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.

18. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.

19. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.

20. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.

21. Θείοι, εἰς ταῦτα διῃροῦμεν εἰς τῇ ἀγίαν φίλημα.
After Korinou, some cursives, f, m, vg., the Peshitto and Bohairic add ἡμών.

B om. Χριστοῦ.

2 Ν<DEP, d, e, vg., the Syriac and Bohairic add αὐθεν; better om. with Ἡ<ABG 17, f, g, etc.

as to embrace the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Possibly the phrase the “God of Love” in ver. 11 has suggested here mention of the “Love of God,” i.e., the love which God has for man; and a prayer for the “Fellowship of the Holy Spirit,” i.e., the κοινωνία which is the Spirit’s gift, is a fitting conclusion to a letter addressed to a community agitated by faction and strife and jealousy (xii. 20). But whatever were the thoughts which suggested this triple benediction (cf. Num. vi. 23 ff.), it remains, as Bengel says, “egregium de SS. Trinitate testimonium.” It offers a devotional parallel to the Baptismal Formula (Matt. xxviii. 19); and the order of its clauses receives its explanation in later words of St. Paul:

πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐθέλησεν τὴν προσευχήν... ἐν ἐνεπερίαν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα (Eph. ii. 18). It is the Grace of Christ which leads us towards the Love of God, and the Love of God when realised through the Spirit’s power promotes the love of man (1 John iv. 11), the holy fellowship fostered by the indwelling Spirit.

πρὸς Κορ. κ.τ.λ. This subscription is found (in substance) in KL, the Harclean and Bohairic vs. and in many cursives, but has no real authority. The mention of Titus and Luke is plainly derived from chap. viii. 18. A few cursives add the name of Barnabas; the Peshitto mentions Titus only. The form of subscription in the best MSS., Ἡ<AB 17, is simply πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐθέλησεν τὴν προσευχήν...
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

GALATIANS
INTRODUCTION.

Text. The text of this Epistle has been constructed with due regard to the traditional text (*Textus Receptus*) on which our Authorised Version was based. But the discovery of MSS. not then known, and the critical study of ancient authorities since that time, necessitate careful revision and extensive alteration of that text. For this purpose the editor has relied mainly on Tischendorf's collation of MSS. The *Apparatus Criticus* is based on his authority and follows his notation. It contains all the MS. evidence which appears really important for determination of the text. The following letters are used to designate uncial MSS.:

- N Sinaiticus
- A Alexandrinus
- B Vaticanus
- C Ephraemi
- D Claromontanus
- E Sangermanensis
- F Augiensis
- G Boernerianus
- H Coislinianus
- K Mosquensis
- L Angelicus
- P Porfrianus

Corrections of ancient date, inserted in the uncial MSS., are indicated by small letters or numerals (a, c, 1, 3) attached to the capital letters. Cursive MSS. are denoted by the numerals generally accepted for their designation.

The readings, punctuation, and division of paragraphs differ here and there from those adopted by Westcott and Hort. The reasons for these variations may be gathered from the notes.

Pauline Authorship. Widely different opinions are entertained by critics with regard to the date of the Epistle and the locality of the Galatian Churches. But its authorship has never been seriously questioned. This unanimity of tradition is probably due to the nature of its contents. For it is stamped throughout with characteristic features of the Pauline mind and spirit. Matter and style alike attest the personality of the Apostle to the Gentiles. It unites dialectic skill in criticising the language and history of the Old Testament,
and a comprehensive philosophy which assigns to law, to the spirit, and to the flesh their several functions in God's government of the world, with intense spirituality and absolute devotion to the Lord Jesus. The Apostle Paul alone of the Apostles and their contemporaries exhibited this rare combination of mental and spiritual qualities. None of his Epistles is more certainly genuine, none gives so vivid a picture of his mind and character during the most active stage of his apostolic career.

ANTICIPATED TESTIMONY. The adoption of its language by Fathers of the Church in the second century proves its antiquity and high reputation in their time. Polycarp borrows ἐπὶς ὁ δὲ τοῦτον πάντων ἠμῶν from iv. 26, and θεὸς οὖ μικτηρίζεται from vi. 7; Irenæus gives a Latin version of iii. 19, referring to the Epistle by name; Justin Martyr reproduces ἱδοθεί ὃς ἐγώ, ὃς καὶ τοῦ (ἡμῶν) ὃς ὑμεῖς from iv. 12, and ἐχθραὶ ἐρείς ζηλος ἐρείας θύμω... καὶ τὰ δοματά τούτας from v. 20. Its canonicity is established by its insertion in every Canon of Scripture. Marcion also placed it at the head of his catalogue of Pauline Epistles.

ANTECEDENTS OF THE GALATIAN CONVERTS. Throughout the Epistle the author assumes the position of Founder, he addresses the Galatians as his own converts and claims special authority over them in the name of Christ who had made him Apostle and committed to him the ministry of the Gospel among them. One passage in the Epistle brings into prominence the diverse elements which entered into their composition, reminding us that, like other Pauline Churches, they were mixed bodies comprehending a minority of Jewish Christians (iii. 28). But the circumcised minority are in general ignored (iv. 8), for the Epistle is specially addressed to the Greek converts, who had not yet accepted circumcision, but had of late been urged by agitators to submit to it for the sake of the covenanted blessings attached to it at its institution. These uncircumcised Greeks formed apparently the mass of the Galatian Churches: there is at the same time no doubt that they had been for some time regular attendants on the teaching of the synagogue, for the Epistle assumes throughout their familiarity with the patriarchal history, the Law, the Psalms and Prophets, as well as expositions of Scriptural topics by Jewish teachers. They had belonged, in fact, to the body of devout Gentiles who frequented Jewish synagogues, studied Jewish Scriptures, and found many points of sympathy with their theology and morality, but repudiated their ceremonial law, and so formed a distinct class apart from the Jewish congregation.
Locality of the Galatian Churches. The locality of these Churches demands attentive consideration, for on the determination of this depends not only the date of the Epistle, but the whole of its historical connection with the life of Paul. The theory that these Churches were situated amidst the Keltic population in the north-east of Asia Minor, though it wraps much of their early history in darkness, requires us to assume that they were founded during the missionary journey of Paul and Silas across Asia Minor and revisited by Paul three years later: otherwise it could not be reconciled with the narrative of the Acts. The reaction therefore towards Judaism, which evoked the Epistle, cannot be dated before the commencement of his Ephesian ministry. Now before that time Paul had openly broken with the synagogue at Corinth and established Churches in Achaia practically independent of Judaism. Is it reasonable to conclude that a Pharisaic reaction in some of the Pauline Churches was then for the first time started with success and excited in his mind the lively apprehension which is here expressed? In my judgment the history of Greek Christianity precludes it, for a very real and formidable agitation on this very subject had once already run its course, and been so decisively checked in Syria and Palestine after the success of Paul and Barnabas in Southern Galatia as to render its renewal quite hopeless. A demand was made at Antioch by a Pharisaic party for the circumcision of all Christians, the authority of Paul and Barnabas was openly challenged, and the peace of the Church was endangered by conflicting views. But the decisive condemnation of this agitation at Jerusalem led to its speedy collapse; there is no trace, outside this Epistle, of its subsequent revival in any Greek Church. On the contrary the career of Paul within the next two or three years irrevocably established the independence of Greek Christianity; hence I conclude that the two intrigues of the Pharisaic party, first at Antioch, next in the Galatian Churches, recorded in this Epistle were but a later stage of the movement recorded in the Acts—last expiring efforts of Judaism to arrest the growing freedom of Greek converts.

But putting aside for the present the question of date, is there ground for supposing that these Churches were planted in the cities of Northern Galatia, Ancyra Pessinus and Tavium, as the late Bishop Lightfoot persistently contended, rather than in those of Southern Galatia, the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, as Professor Ramsay maintains? Great weight is deservedly attached to the opinion of Bishop Lightfoot; but it must be remembered that
it was formed more than a generation ago, when comparatively little was known of the internal geography of Asia Minor, or of its condition under the Caesars: whereas Professor Ramsay's advocacy of the opposite view is founded on intimate acquaintance with the geography and history of the country during the first century. Again, Paul's foundation of the four southern Churches and subsequent visits to them are well-attested facts, while he is not known to have visited the northern division at all. It had indeed little attraction for an educated Greek as a sphere of missionary enterprise, and held out little promise of success, for it was then inhabited mainly by an imperfectly civilised population of Keltic herdsmen and shepherds. If the authenticity of the Acts be admitted, the earliest occasion on which Paul was within reach of Northern Galatia, and can have founded Churches there, was on his way to Troas and Macedonia. It has accordingly been suggested that he may then have turned aside to preach amidst that people. But every stage of that journey was accomplished under the immediate guidance of the Spirit, and the silence of the narrative, written as it was by a fellow-Christian who accompanied the apostolic party from Troas onwards, is conclusive against that theory. That history leaves the reader virtually no choice but to identify the Galatian Churches with the four whose foundation it records. It is futile to object that the instability which the Epistle reproves in the Galatians was characteristic of a Keltic people, for it belonged as certainly to the populace of the southern cities, or that there may have been Jews and Greeks in the northern cities when history establishes the special preponderance of these elements in the southern. The further contention that the name Galatia was not extended to the southern division of the province save in official language ignores the fact that the province had been seventy-five years in existence and really furnished the only collective name for the heterogeneous races incorporated in it under the previous rule of Galatian kings. If it be urged again that Paul would not have designated his Churches by the name of the province, the answer is that throughout his Epistles he invariably groups his Churches according to provinces, whether Syria or Asia, Macedonia or Achaia. His reference in this Epistle to the Churches of Judaea and to his ministry in Cilicia can hardly be reckoned an exception, for these were quasi-provinces governed independently by imperial procurators. Nor was this practice a mere accident of language: it faithfully reflected his deliberate policy of Church extension, suggested perhaps by the example of the Jewish Dispersion, who had before
planted their synagogues in the principal centres of commerce and civilisation. It was certainly his practice to establish groups of Churches round the several capitals of provinces, and link those centres together by chains of Churches along the main roads, and so to create an ecclesiastical organisation closely corresponding to the existing divisions of the Empire. We find for instance that he made the provincial capitals Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus successive centres of Church life as they were of imperial administration, and surrounded each with its group of dependent Churches. But for Jewish malice he might have done the same for Thessalonica; and his eager aspiration to visit Rome reveals still wider projects for multiplying these federations of Churches until they became coextensive with the Empire.

Hence I conclude that in this Epistle also the name Galatia denotes the province, as it clearly does in 1 Peter i. 1, and that the Galatian Churches were those in its southern portion whose foundation is recorded in the Acts. This conclusion is confirmed by the leading part assigned to the Galatian Churches in the collection for the Saints (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It is further supported by the previous course of Galatian history.

Galatian History. The Greek name Galatia denoted originally, like the Roman Gallia, the country of the Gauls or Kelts (Γαλαται). About b.c. 278 a considerable detachment of warriors, roughly estimated at 20,000, broke off from three of the Keltic tribes that poured down on Greece, and made their way across into Asia Minor with wives and children. As war was their trade and only means of subsistence, they scoured the country far and wide, sometimes plundering on their own account, sometimes allying themselves with various kings and cities, or taking service under them as mercenary soldiers. Eventually they formed permanent encampments under native chieftains in the north-east of Phrygia, south of Bithynia and Pontus, speaking their own language and dwelling apart from the older Phrygian inhabitants. This district became consequently known as Galatia: its broad stretches of upland afforded pasture for their flocks and herds, and their families found safe homes in their cantonments. But the limits of their territory were still unsettled, depending continually on the fortune of war: for the tribesmen retained their predatory habits and were hardly ever at peace with all their neighbours. At last, however, in b.c 189 they were forced by a crushing defeat which they encountered at the hands of the Romans to respect the peace of their neighbours, and began to cultivate home industries within their own
borders. Gradually they mingled more freely than at first with the Phrygian population, adopted their religion, though they retained their own language, and dwelt among them as a dominant race, so that Northern Galatia became the home of a settled people.

But a century later the Mithridatic wars swept to and fro across their country, obliterating the old landmarks and opening a new chapter in Galatian history. Many of their chieftains distinguished themselves on the Roman side, and were rewarded with large grants of territory outside the old borders: one in particular, Deiotarus, became by the favour of Pompey the most powerful monarch in Asia Minor. He and his successors were enabled by the active part which they took in the ensuing civil wars of Rome, or by judicious desertion of the losing cause, to enlarge and consolidate their kingdom until it embraced Southern Phrygia with parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia, and extended to the range of Taurus. This was the kingdom which the last native ruler Amyntas bequeathed to the Romans at his death in a.c. 25. A Roman province was formed out of it, and retained the name Galatia which had belonged to it under its Galatian king. There is nothing in this history of gradual expansion to justify the arbitrary restriction of the name to the northern division alone.

Still less reasonable does this appear in the light of its subsequent history. For seventy-five years before this Epistle was written Galatia had formed a single province of the Empire. Now the unity of an imperial province was not merely official, but affected all the relations of life. A system of centralised despotism prevailed under the Cæsars which concentrated all authority—military, civil, judicial alike—in the hands of the governor; commercial and financial matters were regulated by him; his court was the centre of social life. The name Galatia therefore in the N.T. can only mean the great central province of Asia Minor which bore that name.

But in the middle of the first century there was a wide difference in language, occupation, nationality, social organisation, between the northern and southern portions of the province. The northern was still mainly Keltic and pastoral with comparatively little commerce and few roads. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was full of flourishing cities, and enriched by the constant flow of commerce across it. This was the natural result of its geographical position and political history. In ancient times it formed the highway along which the Asiatic monarchs of the interior maintained their communication with the western coast. When Greek monarchs ruled in Syria and Asia Minor, the high-road between their two capitals...
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Antioch and Ephesus passed through it and it became a principal channel for the flow of Greek commerce and civilisation eastwards. They were careful accordingly to plant and foster colonies of Greeks and Jews along the line of route. Hence came the mingled population of Greeks and Jews amongst whom Paul found so congenial a soil for planting Christian Churches. Augustus Caesar in due time inherited the policy of the Syrian monarchs together with their dominions in Asia, planting fresh colonies in that region in order to secure the important high-road to the east for his legions and for the interchange of commerce. The citizens of these various colonies and municipalities had but one collective name—the name of the imperial province to which they belonged. So also the Galatian Christians, though for the most part of Greek or Jewish origin (as the tenor of previous history suggests), could hardly be addressed by any other name than that of Galatians.

Joint Mission of Paul and Barnabas. Throughout the early history of Greek Christianity no more important event is recorded than the conversion of Southern Galatia. The area of Christendom had not till then been extended beyond Syria, Roman Cilicia, and the island of Cyprus. The successful ministry of Paul and Barnabas in Galatia added a new province to the kingdom of Christ, drove a wedge deep into the heart of an idolatrous region, and established a valuable outpost for further advance into Asiatic and European Greece. And the special character impressed by the circumstances of that ministry upon the new Churches gave additional importance to their foundation beyond the material extension which it effected in the area of Christendom. There for the first time Paul made a direct appeal to his Gentile hearers against Jewish opposition, and met with an enthusiastic response. These Churches started in consequence with an overwhelming majority of Gentile converts. In them for the first time the Jewish Christians, who had hitherto held an undisputed initiative in the Church, found themselves in a decisive minority. This altered relation of Greeks and Jews produced a crisis in the history of Greek Christianity, and in the apostolic career of Paul himself. For the Greeks had previously occupied a subordinate position in the Church, and the Apostle to the Gentiles had played a secondary part in the ministry of the Gospel. When, however, he boldly denounced the Jewish people and their rulers in the Galatian synagogue for the murder of Christ, proclaimed him the light of the Gentiles, and overruled the claims of the Law in favour of purely spiritual doctrines of divine forgiveness and grace, of human faith and repentance, the Greeks recognised in Jesus the...
Saviour of the whole world rather than the promised Messiah of the Hebrews, and rallied round the Apostle as the foremost champion of Greek freedom in Christ. It was the commencement of a veritable revolution. Hitherto Christianity had been regarded for the most part as a national religion, it was now perceived to be a world-wide revelation, and an irreconcilable antagonist to the narrow formal creed of the Jewish synagogue. Gentiles had indeed been admitted to the Church many years before, when Peter baptised Cornelius and his friends; and the assembled Church had then solemnly ratified his act. The right of believing Gentiles to Christian baptism had thenceforth become a fundamental law of the Church, sealed to them in perpetuity by a divine charter which none could gainsay. But the acceptance of this principle had wrought little visible effect upon the structure or government of the Church. No sudden influx of Gentile converts flooded the existing Churches; they only grew insensibly by continual adhesion of individual Gentiles or groups of Gentiles to older congregations of Jewish Christians. The process of conversion was too silent and gradual to exercise material influence over the prevailing spirit of the community or to remodel its ministry and organisation. Christian teachers retained in those early years the stamp of their Jewish training, partly because the Hebrew Scriptures continued to be the only written Canon of faith and practice (though they had learned to interpret them in a new spirit), but still more because the Apostles and older disciples had grown up to manhood before they had known Jesus, had accepted the Law for their rule of life, and drawn their inspiration from the writings of Hebrew prophets; they prided themselves on their descent from Abraham and the patriarchs, rested on God’s ancient covenants with Israel, and fixed their hopes on the future kingdom of the national Messiah, which had a deeper significance for them than for other Jews because their faith was concentrated on the person of a living Lord who had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. Again, the outward environment of the Church was no less Jewish than the spirit of its teaching, for the synagogue was still the only centre of public ministry open to Christian teachers. Thither the brethren resorted regularly for reading of the Scriptures, for united prayer and praise, and for religious instruction; there they delivered addresses to mixed congregations of Jews and Christians, basing their doctrine on the Jewish Canon. They claimed, in fact, to be a reformed branch of the ancient national Church, and were long regarded by the Greek world as a purely Jewish sect.
Accordingly, the conversion of the Gentiles made at first but slow progress; few came within touch of the Christian ministry but those who had already become regular attendants on the worship of the synagogue, the devout Gentiles who clustered round Jewish congregations in Greek cities. These were not proselytes, for they shrank from circumcision with all the ceremonial bondage and social exclusiveness which it entailed; but they had become familiar with the language, the history and the spirit of the Old Testament, and had accepted much of its theology and morality. They were pre-disposed by these antecedents to listen gladly to a Gospel which placed the love of God and man above ritual observance and taught the brotherhood of all mankind: and so embraced the faith in considerable numbers. But these Greeks had no rights whatever in the Jewish congregation; though their attendance was tolerated, if not encouraged, they were only admitted on sufferance. They were therefore at first content, after having occupied so subordinate a position in the synagogue, to fill a secondary place in the Church, and to acquiesce willingly in the leadership of Jewish Christians.

These considerations account for the tardy growth of Gentile Christianity, which lingered for several years on the eastern coast of the Levant without an attempt to raise its voice in the Greek cities to the west. Even in Antioch, afterwards the mother-city of Greek Christianity, the Greeks were slow to vindicate their independence of Judaism. The prompt response however of that Church to the call of the Spirit for special labourers in the Lord’s vineyard attested at last the growing strength of their spiritual life and their hopeful confidence in the future of the Kingdom. The diffusion of the faith had up to that time been due more to providential circumstances than to spontaneous effort; refugees had been driven by persecution to seek safety in distant cities, and had carried their faith with them in their flight. But the mission of Barnabas and Saul was a purely missionary enterprise despatched for the express purpose of extending the Gospel to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean. The two Apostles were necessarily invested with wide discretion in regard to the conduct of their mission;

1 Thirteen years elapsed between the conversion of Saul and the Apostolic Council. The baptism of Cornelius took place before Christian refugees from Jerusalem had settled in Caesarea or Philip had taken up his abode there; so that it coincided more or less closely with the beginning of this period, whereas the mission of Paul and Barnabas belongs to its latter years; for the special object of the Apostolic Council was to allay the heart-burnings aroused among Jewish Christians by its success, and to restore the peace of the Church.
neither their route nor their methods could be fully determined in advance, for they depended on future openings that might present themselves, and were therefore in large measure left to their own judgment. But the direction in which it was launched gives a clear intimation of the desires and hopes that animated its authors; it turned its back on Palestine and the East, and set its face toward Asiatic Greece and the famous centres of Greek civilisation; it was, in short, a message from a Greek Church to their Greek brethren in other lands.

The condition of Western Asia at that time held out an exceptional promise of success to Christian Apostles. Thanks to the universal peace and settled order which the Caesars had established throughout the Empire, that region had attained a high pitch of industrial activity and commercial prosperity. In spite of the social corruption and luxurious vices which riches brought in their train, the consequent exuberance of life, social, intellectual and spiritual, afforded a favourable opening for religious reform. The region had been in former centuries a frequent battlefield between Greek and Asiatic races, and still formed a border-land between eastern and western thought. But the religion which the people had inherited from ancient times was more Oriental than Greek, and its degraded type of sensuous worship could hardly satisfy the conscience even of a heathen community to which the influences of western civilisation had penetrated. Greek philosophy and Roman morality combined to create a nobler ideal of human duty and divine government than could be reconciled with the popular religion, so that all the better feelings of educated men and women were stirred into revolt against the debased superstition of the masses.

The religious ferment produced by this collision was specially aggravated by the multiplication of Jewish colonies in the principal cities of Asia Minor, systematically planted and fostered long ago through the wise policy of Syrian kings for the encouragement of trade and promotion of intercourse between these two races of their subjects. These settlements were particularly thriving in Southern Galatia, along the direct line of communication between the two capitals Antioch and Ephesus. Nowhere else are recorded such conspicuous traces of their religious influence over the surrounding population. They formed, of course, distinct communities of their own, divided from the Greeks by unsociable habits as well as ritual obligations and religious scruples. Yet their Scriptural teaching proved so attractive to seekers after God that a considerable number of Greeks frequented their weekly services in the Pisidian
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Antioch and in Iconium, and these, like the devout Gentiles everywhere, were disposed to give a cordial welcome to the preaching of Christ. Accordingly, it was in those cities that His Apostles gained their first conspicuous success; there Asia Minor first awoke to the call of the Gospel, and the first fruits were reaped of an abundant harvest. It was, perhaps, inevitable that this hearty reception of the new doctrine by Greeks should provoke intense jealousy on the part of the Jews, and arouse bitter opposition from them. The vehement appeal of Paul to his Gentile hearers at Antioch brought that opposition to a head, and stirred the passions of both parties to fever heat. The Jews heard the impotence of their law for salvation denounced in their own synagogue, the Gentiles heard the offer of a new way of salvation by repentance and faith in Christ alone.

From that hour both alike recognised in that Apostle the foremost champion of Gentile rights and the most formidable adversary of Judaism.

Let us now, therefore, turn to his personal history and review the chain of circumstances which landed him with his colleague in the interior of Asia Minor. The record of the joint mission during its first few months was uneventful; they traversed Cyprus from end to end, preaching in all the synagogues by the way without achieving any success that the historian counted worthy of record. Barnabas, himself a native of the island, naturally took the lead in virtue of his older standing in the Church and of his superior position at Antioch as the chosen representative of the Twelve, but failed apparently to elicit any enthusiastic response. It was not till they reached Paphos, the western port and the seat of the Roman government, that the spirit of Paul was stirred within him to carry his appeal to Gentile hearers. He procured by some means an audience of the proconsul, and after a signal manifestation of his spiritual power in smiting Elymas with blindness, succeeded in converting Sergius Paulus himself. This success was fruitful in results: it established Paul's virtual leadership; for Barnabas, though he retained the nominal dignity of head, was content to submit the further guidance of their policy to the more determined counsels of his energetic colleague.1 A new spirit of enterprise speedily mani-

1 The historian chooses this occasion for dropping the Hebrew name Saul and adopting the Greek name Paul, indicating that he then entered on his special ministry to the Greeks. In relating the voyage from Paphos he ignores Barnabas altogether, and in the subsequent narrative assigns him throughout a secondary part. The language of the Lycaonian populace furnishes an apt illustration of
fested itself in their proceedings. Paul and his Company (as they are designated in Acts xiii. 13), crossing to the mainland, struck at once across Pamphylia and the Pisidian highlands into the interior. The desertion of John Mark at this critical moment is significant. He was warmly attached to his cousin Barnabas, and had undertaken the office of minister to the Apostles; yet so reluctant was he to embark with them on their new enterprise that he did not hesitate to incur a well-grounded charge of disloyalty by withdrawing from the mission immediately on touching the coast of Pamphylia, and leaving them to pursue their way without him to the Pisidian Antioch. This faint-hearted desertion serves by way of contrast to bring out in stronger relief the resolution with which the Apostles pressed forward from the coast. But on their arrival in Galatia their journey was arrested and came to an apparently premature termination. For many months they settled down permanently—first in Antioch, then in Iconium—with an absolute determination not to depart until they were either expelled by authority or driven to flight by imminent peril of life. Even then they did but take refuge in neighbouring cities for a while until the storm had passed, and eventually revisited the scenes of their former ministry, and so retraced their steps to the coast from which they had started, after firmly planting the faith of Christ in the region of Southern Galatia. The narrative does not explain this sudden arrest of the onward movement which had carried them with such determined energy into the interior, it simply records the fact that they stopped short in Antioch, without any intimation that a change had occurred in the apostolic policy. The reader might well gather from it the impression that Galatia had been all along their destined sphere of labour. This, however, could hardly be: it can scarcely be conceived that they contemplated the cities of Galatia as their final objective when they started with such resolute purpose from Paphos; for those cities had neither ancient fame nor present importance to attract special attention. Nor, again, would Mark have found that brief expedition into the interior so alarming as to desert his post if he had known how short a distance they were about to travel. What then, were the subsequent circumstances that prompted Paul and Barnabas to abandon their more ambitious designs and take up their residence at Antioch? The history and character of Paul quite their mutual relations to each other: they recognised the superior dignity of Barnabas by identifying him with Jupiter, but called Paul Mercury because he was the chief speaker.
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forbid any suspicion that the change was owing to caprice or to irresolution on his part. Nor was it due to the immediate and unexpected success of their ministry in that city; on the contrary, his recorded address in their synagogue furnishes ample evidence of his previous failure to touch the consciences or win the hearts of his Jewish hearers. He, doubtless, had begun his ministry there, as elsewhere, by offering the Gospel to the Jews, and his bitter denunciation of their prejudice against Christ shows how stubborn had been their resistance to his Gospel before he turned to his Gentile hearers with this despairing appeal.

On the whole therefore I conclude from a survey of the historical narrative that Paul and Barnabas embarked at Paphos on an ambitious project of missionary enterprise, which for some unknown reason they failed to realise, though they pursued it steadily without a pause as far as Antioch. It further appears that their first efforts after their arrival in that city were foiled by the persistent opposition of the Jews, but that their perseverance was at last rewarded by signal success amongst the Greeks.

It is time now to turn to the Epistle and compare these conclusions with the incidental reference there made to the circumstances of the conversion. In Gal. iv. 13 the Apostle reminds his converts that he had not originally preached the Gospel to them by his own deliberate choice, but on account of an illness which deprived him of all option in the matter. They knew (he writes) that his preaching had been due to infirmity of the flesh, i.e., to bodily illness. This language plainly intimates that he altered his plans in consequence of the illness, and undertook their conversion instead of carrying out his previous intention. Neither the time nor the place of the attack are specified, but the context supplies materials for determining both. It shows that the Galatians were quite aware of his previous design, that they had been eyewitnesses of the illness, had watched its progress and seen enough of its repulsive symptoms to provoke natural contempt and disgust, but had on the contrary exhibited heartfelt sympathy and intense desire to alleviate his sufferings. It is quite certain therefore that it ran its course after his arrival in their country. It may have been contracted on the way; if it was (as his language in iv. 15 and vi. 11 suggests) an attack of virulent ophthalmia which permanently impaired his sight, it is probable that he caught the infection in the lowlands of Pamphylia, where that malady was notoriously prevalent. But whatever its specific character, it was in Galatia that it prostrated him, and by incapacitating him for continuing his journey
left him no choice but to prolong his stay in the country, and so occasioned the conversion of the Galatians as its eventual result. Evidently the illness beset him so soon after his arrival that he had no time before the attack either to resume his journey or to entertain any plan for preaching where he was. It was, however, so tedious and protracted in its operation that it altered his whole scheme of travel. And whereas he was but a passing stranger when he broke down, and had not attempted to make a single convert, he found himself before its close surrounded by a devoted band of friends who were zealous to make any sacrifice for his relief. The pathetic language of the Epistle shows how intimate an affection had grown up between the Apostle and his Galatian hosts, and makes it clear that the nucleus of a future Church was formed by the ministrations of his sick chamber. No mention is made of this illness in the Acts, for it belonged to the personal history of the Apostle rather than to the history of the Church; but the record dovetails with subtle harmony into the narrative of the Acts, explaining at once why he stopped short at the first stage of his intended journey, and how it came to pass that so many of his hearers afterwards rallied round him with enthusiasm on his appearance in the synagogue of Antioch.

A consideration of the geographical condition of Asia Minor in the middle of the first century brings out still more clearly the thorough agreement of the two narratives. The Epistle implies, as we have seen, that the foundation of the Galatian Churches was due to an interrupted transit through their country. Now this conception is fatal to the idea of a northern site for those Churches. What possible object could the Apostle have for visiting Northern Galatia at all unless it was for the conversion of its people? It lay quite away from his recorded track, and it is inconceivable that he intended to traverse it on his way to some still more distant field of labour. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was traversed from end to end by a great highway along which he is known to have travelled four times, visiting the cities through which it passed. According to the Acts the first of these cities visited by the Apostle was the Pisidian Antioch in the extreme south of the Galatian province. There his journey was for some reason arrested, and there he succeeded after a prolonged sojourn in founding the first Galatian Church. These facts identify Antioch as the scene of his involuntary detention, and its position gives at once a definite clue to the original purpose of the apostolic expedition from Paphos. It was a Roman colony planted by Augustus Cæsar on the main road which
ran from Syria to the western coast of Asia and so linked the eastern provinces of the Empire with Greece and Rome by way of Ephesus. It was besides in direct communication with the southern coast of Pamphylia, and so with Cyprus; for a system of military roads, studded with colonies, converged upon it from the south. For full half the year this was the only regular means of communication between Paphos and the province of Asia; for even in autumn the persistency and violence of the Etesian winds out of the Ægean Sea made it difficult and dangerous for the best found vessels to round the Cnidian promontory, as was proved by Paul's subsequent experience. There is also good reason to calculate that Paul and Barnabas, starting from Syria after the reopening of navigation in the spring, spent the summer in traversing Cyprus from end to end and did not arrive at Paphos before the autumn. Their only means of proceeding westward at that season was to cross to the mainland in such coasting craft as they could find at Paphos and strike across Pamphylia to the main road at Antioch, as they did. This raises a presumption that their original object in making so eagerly for the Pisidian Antioch was to reach Ephesus and the province of Asia. On arriving at that city they had the option of three routes only: (1) to proceed northward by local roads into the heart of Phrygia, which was obviously not their intention when they started from Paphos; (2) to move eastward to Iconium and other Galatian cities, but these are expressly excluded from his original purpose by the language of the Epistle in iv. 13; (3) to pursue their journey westward by the high-road to Ephesus. This was Paul's project on his next visit to the Galatian Churches, and was doubtless his design on this occasion, had it not been hindered by illness, as it was afterwards by the voice of the Spirit. It was, in fact, ordained that the conversion of the Galatians should form the first step to that of Asia Minor, and that Ephesus and the famous cities of the western seaboard should be reserved for the final consummation of his apostolic labours amid the Asiatic Greeks. The outcome of his public ministry with Barnabas in Southern Galatia is recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. His successful appeal to the conscience of his Greek hearers provoked intense jealousy on the part of the unconverted Jews, who proceeded to hunt the Apostles with determined malice from every city in succession. They were enabled with the support of influential partisans at Antioch, by secret plots at Iconium, and by mob-violence at Lystra, to put the Apostles everywhere to flight, but not before they had planted in each place the seed of a future Church, which had become so firmly established before the final departure of Paul and Barnabas.
from the country that they were able to organise a permanent framework for the government of the several Churches. According to their own report of their mission, its most conspicuous feature had been the door of faith which God had opened to the Gentiles. The widespread alarm raised in the Churches of the Circumcision by the number and ritual independence of these Greek converts produced a crisis in the Church and threatened a dangerous schism between its Jewish and Greek sections. Christians from Judæa raised a standard of open revolt against Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, disputing their right to concede this freedom to the Gentiles. Thanks, however, to the intervention of the older Apostles these agitators were decisively condemned at Jerusalem, the apostolic authority of Paul and Barnabas was triumphantly vindicated, and the liberty of Gentile converts in the matter of circumcision was finally established, while the religious prejudices of Jewish Christians against communion with the unclean were mitigated by prudent concession to Jewish sentiment.

Second Ministry of Paul in Galatia. The apostolic conference at Jerusalem was followed by a gathering at the Syrian Antioch of Christians from Jerusalem. Besides Judas and Silas, who were deputed by the Church of Jerusalem to proceed to Antioch as their representatives, Peter himself repaired thither with Mark and others, whose influence so seriously undermined that of Paul in the mind of Barnabas that they agreed to separate. Paul accordingly enlisted Silas as his companion for a fresh mission to the cities of the Greeks. His first object was to revisit his Galatian converts and communicate to them the terms of union between Jewish and Gentile converts which had been ratified by the Churches at Jerusalem and Antioch. He hastened apparently to carry tidings of that decision in person, probably crossing the mountain-passes from Cilicia as early as they were open in the ensuing spring, and to recommend its observance to his disciples. During this visit he also made choice of Timothy for his minister, and decided in consequence to circumcise him, lest the Jews should take offence in the cities he was about to visit. His visit was otherwise uneventful. He traversed the whole country, confirming the Churches everywhere, but only on his way to the new sphere which lay before him; and did not revisit Galatia till three years later on his way from Syria to Ephesus.

Motive and General Scheme of the Epistle. The opening

1It appears from Cicero's letters that at the time of his government of Cilicia these passes were absolutely closed during the winter months (Cic. ad Att., v., 21), even for important despatches.
verses of the Epistle throw a clear light on the motive which prompted it. In i. 1 he vindicates his own apostolic commission, in i. 6-9 the truth of his Gospel, against an attack which was troubling the peace of the Galatian Churches in his absence. The movement was not spontaneous, but due to an intrigue set on foot by foreign emissaries. Alarming tidings had, however, reached the Apostle as to the progress of the agitation. Its nature becomes apparent from the whole tenor of the Epistle; it was an attempt of the Pharisaic party to revive Judaism within the Church. For this purpose it was necessary for its authors to impugn the truth of the Apostle's doctrine, and they sought accordingly to undermine his personal influence and depreciate his apostolic authority. Some had even ventured to impeach the sincerity and the consistency of his teaching by accusing him of an inordinate desire to please (i. 10). He had perhaps given specious occasion for this charge by his avowed principle of becoming all things to all men, but he dismisses it lightly with scorn, for the friends and converts to whom he was writing knew well that his real motive had always been to win men to Christ. He does not apparently feel it needful to defend his motives, but concentrates attention on two points, the truth of his Gospel, and the reality of his commission from God. He begins with an indignant denunciation of the new heresy, which he declares to be a spurious perversion of the one true Gospel. But he perceives the necessity for vindicating his own right to speak in the name of Christ before grappling with the main issue and developing the fundamental divergence of the Gospel in its essential basis and spirit from the Law. For the result of the conflict depended practically more on the personal than the doctrinal factor. He had been himself the foremost champion of Gentile freedom in Christ; the doctrine of free grace in Him had won its way mainly through the advocacy of Paul and owed its triumph in Galatia, at Antioch, and in Jerusalem, to his eloquent support. This was why his antagonists had endeavoured to depreciate his position in the Church, and to set up the Twelve as the real interpreters of Christ on earth, that they might thereby discredit his authority as a teacher. The circumstances of his life furnished opponents with plausible ground for questioning the soundness of his doctrine. He had neither listened to the voice, nor seen the face, of Christ on earth; he had not attended on His ministry like the Twelve, nor been sent forth like them by His express command. He was, in short, to use his own words, an Apostle born out of due time. This made it easy for them to contend that he had not received
the Gospel by direct revelation from Christ, but gathered it at second-hand from the Twelve. To meet this insidious policy, he was forced to place on record the true history of his conversion and subsequent ministry in Christ. He relates accordingly God's revelation to him of His Son from heaven, his secret communion with God apart from all human intercourse, his entire independence of the Twelve, the full recognition of his Apostleship to the Gentiles by the three pillars of the Church at Jerusalem, and his public rebuke to Peter at Antioch. Incidentally this autobiography is of the utmost historical value: while it is in perfect harmony with the outlines of the historical narrative, it adds to it a rich store of personal details, and reveals the inward motives and policy of the chief actors in successive scenes. It relates, however, only certain events which bore on the immediate object of the author, viz., the vindication of his own position in the Church.

The remainder of the Epistle (with the exception of a few personal appeals and practical exhortations) is devoted to a scrutiny of the divergent principles of the Law and the Gospel. The intruders, belonging manifestly to the Pharisaic party, had been urging the Greek converts in Galatia to embrace circumcision, not as an absolute necessity for salvation, but as a counsel of perfection which would invest them with superior holiness to their uncircumcised brethren, would entitle them to a higher place in the Kingdom of God, and secure to them the covenanted blessings promised to the children of Abraham. By this arrogant pretension to superiority in the sight of God these Jewish Christians were in fact pouring dishonour on baptismal grace, reopening the quarrel between Jews and Gentiles and destroying the unity of Christ. The Apostle combats this delusive persuasion by setting forth the true function of the Law in the divine economy. It had proved in practice impotent to bless, for it stipulated for a perfect obedience to which flesh could not attain as a condition precedent to acceptance before God, so that Israelites had in fact fled to Christ for refuge from the curse of a broken law: it was *prima facie* inconsistent with the unconditional promise of God to Abraham, and the Mosaic dispensation was really an exceptional provision against the lusts of the flesh, designed like the preparatory discipline of childhood to last only during years of immaturity before the advent of the true Seed of Abraham. He argues that the Law was a bondage imposed on the children of Abraham after the flesh, whereas Christians are the true seed of Abraham and heirs like Isaac of God's ancient promises. By union with Christ in His death they have died to the condemn-
tion of the Law, by union with His life they have become partakers of His Spirit. They are therefore freed in Christ from the dominion of the Law unless they wilfully submit themselves to its yoke afresh by embracing circumcision. For the spirit within them stedfastly resists every sinful lust of the flesh, and brings forth of itself good fruit abundantly.

**Summary of Contents.** The principal heads of the argument are as follows:—

i. 1-5. Address, blessing, ascription of glory to God.

i. 6-9. Rapid defection of the Galatians from their faith; denunciation of spurious Gospels.

i. 10-ii. 14. Repudiation of corrupt motives; attestation of the author's apostolic commission and of his independence of the Twelve and of human teaching; his championship of Gentile rights; and the recognition of his ministry to the Gentiles by the acknowledged pillars of the Church.

ii. 15-21. Israelites had themselves confessed by seeking salvation in Christ through faith that no flesh can attain to the righteousness of the Law. Paul himself had died to Law with Christ that he might be quickened with Him to the new life of Christ within him.

iii. 1-14. Spiritual blindness of the Galatians. Was it faith or obedience to Law that had procured for them the gifts of the Spirit? By faith men become children of Abraham and inherit his blessing. The Law entails a curse and not a blessing, but Christ has redeemed us all from the curse of the Law by bearing it Himself.

iii. 15-iv. 7. The publication of the Law from Sinai could not annul or modify God's earlier covenant with Abraham. It was merely a preparatory discipline like that of childhood and a temporary provision against the lusts of the flesh, ordained for children of the flesh till the world was ripe for the Advent of Christ the true seed. All that are His are one with Him, and so are the seed of promise: they have outgrown the restraints of spiritual childhood and regained their birthright of freedom in the House of God.

iv. 8-10. Protest against the revival of ignorant superstitions.

iv. 11-20. Appeal to the remembrance of former affection.

iv. 21-30. Illustration out of patriarchal history of the mutual relations between Jews and Christians.

iv. 31-v. 12. Assertion of Christian freedom; protest against renewed bondage by circumcision; threats of punishment against these devotees to the flesh.

v. 13-vi. 10. Warning against the abuse of freedom; antagonism of the spirit to the flesh; its perfect harmony with Christ's law of love and excellence of its fruits; practical exhortation.

vi. 11-18. Peroration, and farewell blessing.

**Comparison of Galatians ii. 1-10 with Acts xv. 1-29.** In Gal. ii. 1-10 is recorded a conference of Paul and Barnabas with the Church of Jerusalem and its members. It appears from the narrative that they went up to Jerusalem for the express purpose of vindicating their right in virtue of their office as ministers of
Christ to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision—a right which had been seriously disputed, but strenuously maintained by them. It further appears that James, Peter and John welcomed them as brethren in Christ, and fully recognised their special commission from God to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. In Acts xv. 1-29 is likewise recorded an open revolt at Antioch against the authority assumed by Paul and Barnabas to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision. They were forced in consequence to undertake mission to Jerusalem for the vindication of Gentile freedom in Christ as well as their own apostolic authority, and to enter upon prolonged debates with the Apostles and elders there gathered. In the sequel the Church resolved, on the advice of Peter and James, to repudiate unreservedly the claim for universal circumcision in the Greek Churches, to condemn the agitators, and heartily to commend the services of Barnabas and Paul to the cause of the Gospel. The two records differ in details—it could not well be otherwise if they are really independent—but agree completely about the substantial facts. The same issue is raised in both, viz., the right of Paul and Barnabas to dispense with the obligation of circumcision, the same Apostles take part in the conference. It is true that the presence of John is not noted in the Acts, but the speakers only are there named, and John probably did not speak, but stood silently beside Peter as in earlier days, while Peter spoke for both; the result of the proceedings is the same according to both records. Now, this result was of such vital importance that it decided for all time the relation of Christianity to Judaism, declaring it to be world-wide in its scope, and distinguishing it from the national creed of the Jewish people. As the sanction given by the Circumcision to Peter’s baptism of Cornelius had before stamped their approval on the admission of the uncircumcised to baptism beyond recall, so the Apostolic Council decided finally the union of all the members of Christ in a single Church: the concession once made at Jerusalem in the name of the assembled brethren was final.

There were, in fact, but two occasions on which Paul and Barnabas went up together from Antioch to Jerusalem, and the object of both visits is specified. The earlier occurred in the lifetime of Herod Agrippa, and, therefore, not later than 44, before their successful mission to Cyprus and Asia Minor, whereas the Epistle records the recognition of their special ministry to the uncircumcision in the fourteenth year after the conversion of Saul. Again, it was undertaken merely to carry alms with a view to an impending famine, and they found the Church of Jerusalem on their arrival in
the utmost peril. Herod was hunting down its leaders for death, and they were seeking safety in concealment or flight. Neither they nor Saul could show their faces without imminent danger, much less assemble to discuss the claims of the uncircumcised. The envoys could only depart in haste after depositing their alms in the hands of the elders. On the contrary, the account given in the Acts of their later visit to Jerusalem corresponds entirely (as we have seen) with the apostolic narrative. The historian, of course, reviews the event from the standpoint of Church history, while the Apostle presents the incidents in their personal aspect, and the details vary accordingly in the two narratives. For instance, the Epistle does not state that Paul and Barnabas were deputed by the Church of Antioch to represent them at Jerusalem, though we might well gather this from the circumstances and the history of their reception; it does, on the other hand, record a revelation of the spirit, either to him or to the Church, which prompted the action of both, though for some reason unrecorded in the pages of the history. The statement of Paul, that he took with him a Greek disciple of his own, incidentally confirms the statement of the Acts that other Christians were deputed to accompany the Apostles. The account given in the Acts of a personal collision between the Apostles and certain agitators at Antioch, on the subject of circumcision, explains the reference made in the Epistle to a demand for the circumcision of Titus, which Paul had steadfastly resisted. Whatever semblance has been found of divergence in the two accounts is really due to misconception of the language. Many critics have argued, for instance, as if the struggle over Titus took place at Jerusalem, but a careful student of the Greek text may perceive that it really occurred at Antioch before the mission, and is in perfect harmony with Acts xv. 1, 2. Again, James, Peter and John have been represented as at first lukewarm and hesitating in their support of Paul and Barnabas; but the Greek text places their brotherly cordiality in strong contrast with the prejudices and coldness of other Christians who had once been of high repute in the Church.

The silence of the Epistle about the injunctions of the Council to abstain from ceremonial uncleanness is easily understood. They were indispensable for harmonious intercourse between Greeks and Jews in one communion; they were of real value until the Church was able to promulgate a new law of uncleanness based on true principles and distinguishing real from ceremonial pollution. Paul had therefore recommended their observance, and had, partly in
consequence of this deference to the Mosaic law, been charged with preaching circumcision (v. 11). But the two questions were really distinct, and he is careful in this Epistle to confine himself to the subject of circumcision.

HISTORICAL CONNECTION OF THE EPISTLE WITH THE LIFE OF PAUL. The Galatian Epistle belongs obviously to the same group as the Thessalonian, Corinthian and Roman, but critics are by no means agreed as to its position amidst them in point of time, some placing it before, some between, some after, the others. All were written during the seven years in which Paul was engaged in founding and organising successive Churches on both sides of the Aegean Sea, there was considerable uniformity in the circumstances of his life throughout this period of apostolic activity, and this uniformity is reflected in a certain family likeness which runs through all the Epistles of that date. All except the Roman sprang out of the needs of infant Churches beneath his care. These depended largely on his personal example and authority for guidance in faith and morals; accordingly the personal element looms large in all, in none more so than in this. He was throughout in continual contact with Jewish influences, utilising the synagogue everywhere while it was possible for the conversion of devout Gentiles as well as Jews, and everywhere encountering opposition and persecution from the Jews. There was, however, little occasion to combat Judaism in the Thessalonian Epistles, for that Church was at the time suffering grievously from Jewish persecution; in the Corinthian Church again the Greek element predominated, and the most pressing dangers arose from the contamination of heathen license and idolatry. Therefore the antagonism between Pharisaic Judaism and Christianity comes into prominence in the Galatian and Roman Epistles alone. Both employ almost identical language in contrasting the Law and the Gospel, the former based entirely on the holiness of God and man's duty of absolute obedience, the latter adding the revelation of God's love even for sinners, and His offers of forgiveness and grace to all that believe in Christ. But the coincidence is not due to any similarity in the circumstances of the two communities. In the Galatian Church the Apostle was combating a survival of Judaism amidst his own converts, in the Roman Church he was laying down principles for a community who had hitherto had no Apostolic guidance. Still less can the identity of language be fairly urged to prove an approximation in the date of the two Epistles. For these fundamental truths formed without doubt the staple of the Apostle's teaching throughout the years of continuous transition
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from Jewish to Christian doctrine, and his language in regard to them could not fail to become in some measure stereotyped.

We tread on far safer ground when we rely on historical considerations for determining the occasion of the Epistle. During the seven years of continuous transition from Jewish to Christian doctrine a radical alteration was effected in the position of Greek Christianity and of Paul himself. At the beginning no Greek Churches existed outside Syria except those which he and Barnabas had founded: the two stood on the same level, and rival teachers had fair show of reason for ranking him below the Twelve; at its close a multitude of Churches in Europe and Asia recognised him as the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and he might have replied to his detractors with scorn by pointing to the visible tokens of divine blessing stamped on his apostolic labours in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia. That he did not do so in his Galatian Epistle furnishes conclusive proof of its early date. When Paul, after his second visit to Galatia, departed for an indefinite time to an unknown destination in the west, there was still a reasonable chance of inducing many Galatian converts to submit to circumcision in his absence, but with every fresh Greek Church added to the communion the hope must have steadily faded. The growing strength, number, and independence of these Churches soon after made a revival of Judaism in one of them hopeless. But the attempt made at Antioch after the Council (as the Epistle records) to affix a stigma of uncleanness on the uncircumcised shows that the Pharisaic party, though defeated in their efforts to enforce circumcision on all members of Christ, had not then abandoned the hope of persuading their Greek brethren to adopt it, and had little scruple about putting unfair pressure upon them for this object by withdrawing from their communion. Their partial success at Antioch in obtaining the adhesion of Peter and Barnabas to their practice encouraged them to hope much from fresh efforts in the absence of Paul. The moment was otherwise favourable for a renewed attempt to advocate circumcision in the Galatian Churches. Jewish influence was strong in the country; the people were impulsive and excitable, easily swept to and fro by capricious currents of religious emotion; the vacillation of Peter and Barnabas had made it easy to claim their sanction and set up the authority of the Twelve against that of Paul. He had himself during his recent visit furnished his adversaries with a fresh handle for misrepresentation, for he had circumcised Timothy and had recommended his converts to abstain from the forms of ceremonial uncleanness most offensive to the Jews, so that he was even said to be now preaching...
The imputation seems absurd in view of his later life, and would have been so after he had openly broken with the synagogue, but was plausible enough when he was bent above all things on promoting harmony between the two sections of the Church by some voluntary sacrifices of Greek freedom in Christ. I contend therefore that the recent warnings to which i. 9 refers (see notes on that verse) were delivered on the occasion of his second visit to Galatia after the Apostolic Council, that the agitation in the Galatian Churches was a sequel of the intrigue at Antioch, some of the Pharisaic emissaries having probably followed the receding steps of the Apostle that they might renew their insidious schemes behind his back, and that the Epistle followed speedily on this agitation. Its language certainly implies a close connection between the two movements; for the remonstrance spoken at Antioch passes insensibly into the written argument without any clear line of division. If a later date be assigned to the Epistle, the abrupt termination of the autobiography on the eve of the second visit becomes unintelligible. The earlier date explains also the motive which prompted him to record his personal collision with Peter. It is inconceivable that he raked up this story out of a distant past. But if the example and authority of Peter and Barnabas had been employed by his rivals in Galatia to undermine his position, it became necessary for him in his own defence to give a true version of the events that had occurred at Antioch.

Assuming therefore that the reactionary movement in Galatia followed closely on his departure, where and when was the Epistle written? It may be presumed that he lost no time after he was informed of it before writing to counteract it; but the tidings could not reach him without considerable delay, for his destination was unknown until he himself opened communications from Philippi. Probably therefore he could receive no news from Galatia till after his arrival at Thessalonica; there was not however very frequent intercourse then between that city and Galatia, and his stay there was cut very short by persecution. The absence of Silas and Timothy at the time of writing points distinctly to the early days of his ministry at Corinth, for they were with him in Macedonia, but did not rejoin him afterwards till some weeks after his arrival in Corinth. That they were absent is morally certain. Their names, which appear conspicuously in the Epistles to the Thessalonians written about the same time, are here absent in spite of Timothy's Galatian home, and in i. 9 the writer expressly refers to the united warnings delivered by him and his colleagues Silas and Timothy, to fortify
the appeal which he now makes in his own name (as we have forewarned you of late, I say again). This date explains also the absence of any greeting from a Christian Church by name, for at the time the Apostle had only begun to gather round him the nucleus of the future Church of Corinth in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. I conclude therefore that the Epistle was written from Corinth before the arrival of Silas and Timothy, in which case it is the earliest Epistle of Paul now extant, being written before the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The previous outrage at Philippi and the subsequent persecutions which he encountered in Macedonia make the references to persecution and to the marks of Jesus branded on his body peculiarly appropriate.

Result of the Epistle and Subsequent History of the Churches. The Pharisaic reaction came upon Paul as an unwelcome surprise after the enthusiastic reception they had originally given to the doctrine of free grace in Christ, and the recent confirmation of their faith by personal intercourse. He gives vent, accordingly, in forcible language to his indignation at the disloyal intrusion of false teachers into his own fold. Their readiness to listen with itching ears to strange doctrines, and to be fascinated by the charms of religious novelty, even though the doctrine was incompatible with the spirit and the cross of Christ, and in spite of attacks aimed at the position of their own well-proved Apostle, distressed him sorely for they argued unsoundness in their faith, and shook his confidence in the permanence of their loyalty to Christ. But ought we, therefore, to conclude that they were permanently estranged from their great Apostle? Are we to infer the depth and strength of the reaction from its suddenness? It seems to me that the balance of evidence in the Epistle inclines the other way and tends to suggest their substantial loyalty in spite of some temporary estrangement. For the agitation is declared to be but a little leaven, dangerous in principle and fraught with possibilities of evil, but only just beginning to work; no mention is made of Greek converts having actually adopted circumcision. Paul expresses his confidence that they will all be of one mind with him; he does not hesitate to threaten the intruders with the judgment of the Churches if they persist (v. 10); he longs indeed to come amongst them and assure himself by a fresh visit of their fidelity to Christ and His Apostles, but he lays down his pen with an assurance that henceforth no man will trouble him. And the evidence of history confirms this favourable impression; it would seem that the Epistle did really succeed in re-establishing the faith of the Galatians. For we hear no more of any anxiety about
their state; the Apostle was in no hurry to make his voice heard among them—he let three years pass before he revisited them, and then only on his way to Ephesus. Yet an incidental reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 attests his confidence in their unshaken loyalty. It appears from that passage that when he appealed to all his Greek Churches for a joint contribution for the poor brethren in Jerusalem, the Galatians were the very first to receive his instructions, even before the Corinthians. It is a slight but sufficient testimony to the unbroken strength of the tie that bound them to their own Apostle.
ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ. 1

I. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος, (οὐχ ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων,
ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτόν

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-5. Apostolic Address, Benediction and Doxology.—The Epistle opens with the author’s name and the designation of his office, Paul, an Apostle. So far it follows the regular practice of Apostolic Epistles in advancing at the outset a claim to attentive hearing. But circumstances gave in this case a special significance to this opening; for in the Galatian Churches rival agitators had seriously challenged the author’s right to this title of Apostle, so that the bare mention of his office involved a distinct protest against the slanders which had been circulated in regard to his office and his person. He proceeds, accordingly, to an emphatic vindication of his divine commission, not from men, neither through man. He raises here a twofold issue, evidently corresponding to two specific points in his qualifications for the office, which his adversaries had on their side selected for attack. The transition from the plural in the first clause, to the singular in the second, is significant, and helps to furnish a key to the two particular points in his career on which his enemies had fastened. His mission to the Gentiles had apparently been disparaged on the plea that it had emanated from men, i.e., from the Church of Antioch only. Again, the validity of his commission was impugned on the ground that he had originally received the Spirit through a man, i.e., through the agency of Ananias, who had been deputed to lay his hands upon him at Damascus. By these insinuations an invidious comparison was instituted between Paul and the original Apostles who had been sent forth by Christ Himself, and had received the Spirit by a miraculous outpouring from Heaven on the day of Pentecost. It was obviously impossible to confute these aspersions by alleging any specific act of the risen Lord. Accordingly Paul contents himself for the moment with an indignant repudiation of the calumnies, reserving his full vindication for the historical review of his conversion and Christian life (i. 10-ii. 14). The tokens by which the risen Lord had attested His presence and His commission to His servant Paul had been very real and certain to the eye of faith; but they had, from the nature of the case, been less tangible than the evidence of His living voice and presence during His earthly sojourn; they had been granted at successive stages of the Apostle’s life, and had often taken the shape of visions, personal revelations, and spiritual communion. At his conversion he had been declared a chosen vessel for future ministry; three years later the Lord had replied to his prayer in the temple, bidding him depart from Jerusalem, for (He said) I will send thee for hence unto the Gentiles; afterwards, at Antioch, the Spirit had given command, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;
thereupon God had visibly sealed his appointment by the abundant blessing bestowed upon his labours, as the Galatians themselves could amply testify.— διὰ ... πατρὸς. The previous combination of ἄνευ and διὰ in the negative clauses invites a corresponding combination here in the antithesis, ἀλλὰ διὰ ἵππον Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀνεὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, declaring, on the one hand, the instrumentality of the Son in the appointment of His Apostle, and, on the other, tracing back the authority with which he was invested to God the Father as its original source. But Paul prefers here, instead of contemplating his apostleship to the Gentiles by itself as a single act of the Divine Head of the Church, to connect it with the larger design of building up the Church of Christ, for which the united action of the Father and the Son was indispensable. The Father set that design in motion by raising Him from the dead, and is here accordingly associated with the Son as directly co-operating in the government of the Church. In the subsequent review of his own personal life, Paul in like manner perceives the immediate hand of God in his pre-Christian life, setting him apart from his mother's womb, and training him under the law for his future work as an Apostle, before he was brought to Christ at all.

Ver. 2. oἱ σὺν ἡμοί. No name is mentioned: neither Timothy nor Silas, nor any other companion of Paul known to the Galatians can have been with him when he wrote. Nor is the name mentioned of any Christian congregation; probably he was residing in some Greek city in which no Church had yet been formed. The phrase oἱ σὺν ἡμοί seems, from its use in Phil. iv. 21, to describe a small group of brethren immediately surrounding the Apostle; for the salutation from them is there followed by a separate salutation from the Roman Church in general. The position of the Apostle during his first few weeks at Corinth, before Silas and Timothy rejoined him, corresponds closely to the circumstances indicated by this phrase (see Introd., pp. 146-147).—ἐπικήρυκας.

There were four Churches in Southern Galatia, but they formed a single group, being all bound together by the great imperial highway that ran through them, and gave facility for constant intercourse. All would, therefore, respond speedily to any religious impulse, like the wave of Pharisaic reaction which the Apostle is combating in this Epistle.

Ver. 3. The apostolic blessing is here as elsewhere summed up in the comprehensive words grace and peace. These include the lifegiving power of the spirit as well as the assurance of God's forgiving love in Christ and peace with an accusing conscience. This verse affirms once more the co-operation of the Father with the Son in devising and carrying out the scheme of man's redemption.

Ver. 4. ἀποτελέσθαι. The sin offerings of the Law were designated ἀποτελέσθαι (cf. Heb. x. 8), but ἀποτελέσθαι and ἀποτελέσθαι were equally applicable with reference to Christ's offering of Himself for our sins; the former fixing attention on the effect of His sacrifice in doing away sin, the latter on the motive which prompted Him, vis., love for sinners. The two prepositions are combined in 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is often difficult to decide which is the genuine reading owing to the variation of MSS.: but here they are greatly in favour of ἀποτελέσθαι, which is also more appropriate to the context: for in this clause a comparison is intended between the sin-offerings of Christ and the typical sin-offerings of the Law; while the next express the motive of the Saviour by the addition ἀποτελεσθαι ... ἀποτελεσθαι. In early Greek this word denoted the appointed lifetime of man, and so combined the thought of an overruling destiny with the course of human life. From the conception of individual life was developed that of corporate life, whether of families, nations or societies, and the idea of divine appointment was more distinctly fastened on the word in Scripture, so that every successive dispensation of God was designated as an ἀλών. In this place ἀλών denotes the world which Jesus found existing at the time of His coming, out of which He chose His disciples.
World is the nearest English equivalent to **alw** in this sense, if only it be understood to mean a particular phase of human society, as in the phrases *religious world*, *scientific world*, etc., and not the material universe.— *ἐνεργόν* : existing. This participle is twice elsewhere applied to things existing by way of contrast to things future (προκείμενον), in Rom. viii. 38 and 1 Cor. iii. 22. A similar contrast is here suggested between δυσεργάς and δυναμώς **alw**, i.e., between the world which Christ found existing on earth and the Messianic world whose coming Hebrew prophets had foretold.— **πονηρός**. This sweeping condemnation of the existing world corresponds to the language of the Baptist and to Christ's own denunciations of the evil generation to which He came. In spite of all that revelation and conscience had done to leaven it, He found the faithful few in number, and evil predominant in the mass.— *διάλεγμαι*. Here, as in Acts xxvi. 17, this verb coupled with **ἐν** can only denote *choice out of* the world, not *deliverance from* it, which would require the addition of **ἐκ** **χωρίς**, as in Acts xii. 11, or some equivalent. The clause describes the process of selection begun by Christ on earth, and still continued by the risen Christ as He calls fresh disciples into His Church continually.

Ver. 5. *ὁ χάρις τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. Our versions supply **Io-tu** and turn the clause accordingly into an invocation of praise. But the insertion of the article points rather to an affirmation, *whose is the glory*. The verb is usually omitted in the doxology, but διὰ τὸν χάρις is added in 1 Pet. iv. 11. *The glory consists in the manifestation of the Father's character throughout all the ages in the continual redemption of mankind according to His will*. Hereby is revealed His union of perfect wisdom, holiness, and love.— **ἐλέες** *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. **alw** denotes in the Apostle's context an appointed period (see note on ver. 4). The larger of these divine dispensations comprehends within them other shorter periods, and are therefore designated *χρονικά* *χρόνια*. The phrase in the text ascribes the glory to God for the whole term of these dispensations, *i.e.*, for all the ages of human life, since these together make up the sum of man's existence. The full form is used by the Apostle in Phil. iv. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 18, but he uses elsewhere the shorter form *ἐλέες* *τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. This Amen crowns the previous declaration of the glory of God by an invitation to the Churches to join in the ascription of praise.

Ver. 6-9. **THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES SURPRISE AT THE SUDDEN DEPARTURE OF HIS CONVERTS FROM THE ONLY TRUE GOSPEL, AND PRONOUNCES ANATHEMAS ON ALL PERVERTERS OF THE TRUTH.**— Paul is evidently startled at the tidings of a sudden revolution in Galatian feeling. His intense indignation is evinced by the vehemence of his language and the solemnity of his anathema. There could be but one true Gospel; this new doctrine was no Gospel at all, but only a heretical perversion of the truth by foreign agitators. They were probably emissaries of a Pharisaic party in the Church, which advocated circumcision and legal observances for all converts alike.

Ver. 6. *μετατίθεσθε* : ye are removing (not removed as in A.V.). The agitators had not yet achieved any decisive success, though the Galatians were disposed to lend too ready an ear to their suggestions. It was not so much their actual progress, as the evidence afforded of the instability of the Galatian faith, that excited misgivings in the mind of Paul (cf. iv. 20); he regarded the movement as merely a little leaven, and had not lost his confidence in the personal loyalty of his converts and the general soundness of their faith (v. g, 10, vi. 17. See Introd., p. 147).— *τοῦ Καλέσαντος*, *sc.* Θεοῦ. The Gospel call proceeded from God, like those to Abraham and the ancient servants and people of God; the Epistles of Paul invariably attribute it to Him (cf. i. 15), not to His human instruments.— *ἐν χάριν*.  **χάρις** = **ἐν τῷ χάρις** (into the grace of Christ, A.V.), but records the spirit of Divine love which prompted the call. God, of His grace in Christ, sent forth the Gospel to the Galatians by the hands of Paul.
and Barnabas.—ἐρευν. This passage brings out forcibly the different meaning of ἐρευν and ἀλλο. ἐρευν is primarily the other of two, ἀλλο another of several. Hence ἐρευν fixes attention on two objects exclusively (cf. note on τὸν ἐρευν in vi. 4); here it marks the essential difference between the true and the spurious Gospel, distinguishing the latter as quite a different Gospel.

Ver. 7. δόκετι ἄλλο. The translation of this clause in A.V. and R.V. (which is not another) has caused great embarrassment by its apparent identification of the spurious Gospel with the true. Lightfoot pleads ingeniously that ἄλλο may mean another besides the true Gospel, and so interprets the clause to mean that it is no Gospel at all; but this will hardly be accepted by most other scholars. The American revisers suggest the rendering which is nothing else than. But these difficulties arise from making δόκετι the subject of the sentence: surely it is in fact a connecting adverb (touching which, as to which, whereas), as it is again in ii. 10, and probably in ii. 20. If the clause be rendered, whereas there is no other Gospel (i.e., than the true), the sense becomes perfectly clear, and it forms an appropriate introduction to the succeeding anathemas by its emphatic testimony to the one true Gospel.—ἐλ ὑμῖν. This clause qualifies the former “there is no other Gospel,” only a spurious semblance (on the use of ὑμῖν see note on ver. 19).—τίνες. There is a studied vagueness in this and other references to the agitators. They were evidently not Galatian Christians, but strangers from abroad, whom the Apostle treats with real or affected contempt.

Ver. 8. ἄλλα. Paul here associates with himself the colleagues Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, who had combined with him to preach the Gospel. He desires to impress on his disciples that the controversy is not between one teacher and another, but between truth and falsehood: no minister of Christ, not even an angel, can alter the truth in Christ.—ἀνάθημα. The two derivatives, ἀναθημα and ἀνάθημα, are both employed in the LXX and N.T. in different senses. ἀνάθημα serves, as in other Greek authors, to denote a temple offering, statue, or ornament (cf. 2 Macc. ix. 16, Luke xxii. 5), while ἀνάθημα is restricted to the Hebrew conception of an offering devoted under a solemn vow to death or destruction (Lev. xxvii. 28, Josh. vii. 1, Acts xxiii. 14). The Epistles of Paul attach to the word the idea of spirit.

The significant addition ἄλλο τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. ix. 3 associates with it the further idea of separation from Christ, and consequent loss of all Christian blessings and means of grace. It does not, like excommunication, pronounce a judicial sentence on particular offenders, but solemnly affirms general laws of the spiritual kingdom, e.g., in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, any who love not the Lord, here any who tamper with the truth of the Gospel, are pronounced outcasts from the faith, and dead to the Spirit of Christ.

Ver. 9. προειρήγαμεν. The contrast between this plural and the singular λέγω proves that Paul is here referring, not to previous warnings of his own by letter, but to joint warnings given by his companions Silas and Timothy as well as himself during his visit to the Churches. He never speaks of himself in the plural number. ἐμὲ... ἐμὸν ἂμα... ἐμοί: we have also forewarned you of late, I say again. Our versions interpret ἐμὸν we have said before and ἐμὸν πάλιν λέγω so say I now again. But Greek usage forbids this antithesis between ἐμὸν and ἐμὶ. Προειρήγαμεν means to forewarn, not to say in time past (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 2, Gal. v. 21, 1 Thess. iii. 4); while ἐμὸν is used indifferently of recent or of present time. In Matt. ix. 18, 1 Thess. iii. 6 it means of lately, in Matt. xxvi. 53, John xiii. 7, 37, xvi. 12, 31, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xvi. 7 it means now, by way of contrast with the future. ἐμὸν shall therefore be used to contrast the present time with the immediate past. The words καὶ ἐμὶ belong really to the preceding clause, and contain a reminder how recent had been the warnings which the Apostle is repeating. Since the rendering of John ix. 25 Whereas I was blind, now
10. Ἄρτι γὰρ ἄνθρωπον παίδως ἦτο τὸν Θεόν; ἦ δὲ δεν ἄνθρωπος ἔφεκεν; εἰ ἦτο ἄνθρωπος ἱερεῖς, Ἰχθύτι δοῦλος ὦκ ἦν ἡμῖν.

11. Γενομένος δὲ ὡμός, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελιζθην ὑπ' ἑμών, ἦτο ὡκ ἦτο κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. 12. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγώ παρὰ ἄνθρωπον παρέλαβον αὐτό, οὔτε δὲ ἐδοξάσαν, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀποκαλύψας Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν. 13. Ἡκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμήν ἀναστροφὴν ποτε ἐν τῷ

I see appears to contradict this view of ἄρτι, it may be well to point out that ὡμός does not mean whereas I was, but that the speaker’s real meaning was, I being (sc., by nature) blind now see.

The true rendering is of some historical importance, as evidence that warnings on the subject of circumcision had been given to the Galatians by Paul and his companions during a recent visit (see Introd., p. 146).

Vv. 10-24. Repudiation of corrupt motives. Evidence from Paul’s personal history that his conversion was due to God, and that he was taught the Gospel by God independently of the Twelve and of Jerusalem.—Ver. 10. The order of words in the Greek text forbids the stress laid in our versions on the alternative men or God; the meaning of which is besides a little obscure in this connection. The true rendering of ἦ is rather than (ἑνὸς ἦ), as in Matt. xvii. 8, Luke xv. 7, xvii. 2, 1 Cor. xiv. 19: Am I now persuading men rather than God? This language indicates clearly what kind of calumnies had been circulated. His detractors accused him of sacrificing the truth of God for the sake of persuading men. It was, we know, his boast that he became all things to all men, but whereas his real motive was that he might win all to Christ, they insinuated that he was more bent on winning favour with men than on securing the approval of God. During his recent visit he had made two concessions to Jewish feeling: he had circumcised Timothy, and had recommended for adoption regulations tending to promote harmonious intercourse between Gentile converts. It was easy to misrepresented these concessions as an abandonment of his former principles: and they furnished his enemies accordingly with a handle for decrying him as a time-server without fixed principles, now bent on winning Jewish favour, as he had been before on gaining the Gentiles (see Introd., p. 145, and cf. v. 11).—ἆρτι. The Greek text throws the emphasis on this word, and its subtle irony is brought out by the εἰρ. which follows. "Am I now doing this now? Do you charge me now (he says in effect to these partisans of Judaism) with regarding men more than God? There was a time, before I knew Christ, when I did study to please men: if that were still my desire, I should not have been a servant of Christ."

Ver. 11. οὐ μερισμένος. Here, as in 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1, this verb has the force of reminding rather than of making known. In all three passages the author calls attention to forgotten truths, which had once been well known.

Ver. 12. εὖ. The personal pronoun is inserted, because the author is here laying stress on the special education he had received for his ministry of the Gospel. He had not learnt it, like his converts, from human teaching, but by direct communion with God in spirit, as the Twelve had learnt it from Christ’s own teaching. This independence of older Christians is a marked feature in the history of his life. The agency of Ananias was necessary for his admission into the Church, but after his baptism no older Christian appears on the scene at Damascus.

Ver. 13. Ηκούσατε. The Galatians had no doubt heard from Paul himself of his former persecution of the Church. How frequently it formed the topic of his addresses to Jewish hearers may be gathered from his defence of himself at Jerusalem in Acts xxii., and before Agrippa in Acts xxvi. —Ἰουδαϊκός. The rendering of this word in our versions, Jewish religion, is unfortunate: it implies a definite separation between the two religions which did not then exist, for Christians were still habitual worshippers in the synagogue; and it puts
this view into the mouth of Paul, who steadfastly persisted in identifying the faith of Christ with the national religion. The word ὁμοθάμιον denotes the adoption of Jewish habits, language, or policy (cf. ii. 14). So here ὁμοθαμιός denotes Jewish partisanship, and accurately describes the bitter party spirit which prompted Saul to take the lead in the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution of the Church. Incidentally the partisanship was based on a false view of religion, for the narrow intolerance of the Scribes and Pharisees was a prevailing curse of Jewish society at the time; but ὁμοθάμιον expresses the party spirit, not the religion. Still more alien to the spirit of Paul is the language attributed to him in the next verse, I profited in the fews' religion (A.V.): for it indicates satisfaction at the success of his Jewish career, whereas he never ceased to regard it with lifelong remorse. His real assertion here is that he advanced beyond his fellows in sectarian prejudice and persecuting zeal—a statement borne out by the history of the persecution.—πρότερον. This adverb is obviously attached to the preceding substantive ἄναστροφή.

The imperfects ἠφοίηκεν... describe the course of action continuously pursued by Saul down to his conversion. This term is likewise applied in Acts ix. 21 to the havoc wrought by Saul in the Church.

Ver. 14. συνηλικώσας. Saul had been educated at Jerusalem, and this word points to his contemporaries in the schools of the Pharisees.—οὐ ἢ. This term sometimes denotes family, but here ὁ ἀνθρώπου. This term is likewise applied in Acts ix. 21 to the havoc wrought by Saul in the Church.

Ver. 15. ἀφοίηκεν. Paul looks back on his parentage and early years as a providential preparation for his future ministry: this view is justified by his antecedents. By birth at once a Hebrew, a Greek and Roman citizen, educated in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek learning, he combined in his own person the most essential requisites for an Apostle to the Gentiles. He was further moulded by the spiritual discipline of an intense, though mistaken, zeal for the Law of his God, which issued in bitter remorse. By this career he was fitted to become a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentile world. He did not hesitate accordingly to regard himself, like Hebrew prophets of old (Is. xlix. 1, 5. Jer. i. 5), as dedicated from his birth to the service of God.

Ver. 16. ἀποκαλύφθη... οὐκ ἐμοί. These words taken alone might denote either an inward revelation to Paul himself, or a revelation through him to the Gentiles. But the context is decisive in favour of the former: for this revelation is not only associated closely with his personal history between that and the visit to Arabia, but it is expressly stated that it was granted with a view to future preaching (τοῦ...). The context distinguishes this revelation from the former; it cannot therefore be identified with the previous vision of Christ on the way, but (as the words οὐκ ἐμοί import) was an inward and spiritual revelation which followed that appeal to eye and ear. The history corroborates this view: for it relates that Saul, after the ascetical visit of Zealots who preached the sacred duty of revolt from Rome, though he had the persecuting zeal of an orthodox Pharisee.—πατρικών. This differs in sense from πατρίδας. The latter denotes the national law and customs of Israel (Acts xxii. 3, xxviii. 17), the former the hereditary traditions of the family, as the addition of πατρίδας signifies. In Acts xxii. 6 Paul describes himself as a son of Pharisees.

Ver. 15. ἀφοίηκεν. Paul looks back on his parentage and early years as a providential preparation for his future ministry: this view is justified by his antecedents. By birth at once a Hebrew, a Greek and Roman citizen, educated in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek learning, he combined in his own person the most essential requisites for an Apostle to the Gentiles. He was further moulded by the spiritual discipline of an intense, though mistaken, zeal for the Law of his God, which issued in bitter remorse. By this career he was fitted to become a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentile world. He did not hesitate accordingly to regard himself, like Hebrew prophets of old (Is. xlix. 1, 5. Jer. i. 5), as dedicated from his birth to the service of God.
from God Saul had no occasion to seek further advice from man. There is an apparent reminiscence in thought and language of Christ's words, *flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father.*

Ver. 18. *Εἰρήνη. The thrice-repeated *Εἰρήνη in this verse, in ver. 21, and in ii. 1, singles out three events in the Apostle's life bearing on his intercourse with the Church of Jerusalem: his first introduction to them, his departure to a distant sphere of labour, and his return to Jerusalem with Barnabas. The object of this sketch was not to write a history of those years, but to fix attention on certain salient incidents which threw light on the real nature of his intercourse with Jerusalem. — ἀνήλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορήσας.
two visits. But it is clear that both passages alike refer to Paul's first return to Jerusalem, after a prolonged sojourn at Damascus; and the subtle harmony of the two narratives is as conspicuous as their independence in details. The history states the bare fact that Paul, finding his life in imminent danger from the Jews at Damascus, fled to Jerusalem; the Epistle explains why he encountered so obvious a danger; the Epistle states that he prolonged his stay to see Peter; the history explains that he was unable to gain access to the Apostles for a time. The history records the principal events from the historical point of view, e.g., the apprehensions felt by the Christian body, the intervention of Barnabas, the attempts on Paul's life; the autobiography passes these by as foreign to its purpose, but is far richer in personal details, relating incidentally the date, the motive, and the duration of the visit, and particularising the brethren whom Paul saw on the occasion; whereas in the Acts mention is merely made of the disciples generally.

Ver. 19. **el μὴ ἱκανωθῇ.** el μὴ may either state an exception to the preceding negative clause (= except, save), or merely qualify it (= but only), as it does in Luke iv. 26, to none of them, sc., the widows in Israel, but only to Sarepta in Sidon; and in Gal. i. 7, no other Gospel, only (el μὴ) there are some that pervert the Gospel. The latter appears to be its meaning here. If James had been entitled an Apostle, the author would probably have written that he saw no other Apostles but Peter and James. But here he states emphatically that he saw no second (ὑπέρ- θου) Apostle, only James. The Epistle, like the Acts (see xii. 17, xv. 13, xxxi. 18), fully recognises the leading position of James at the local Church (cf. ii. 9, 12); and the ecclesiastical tradition which entitles him Bishop of Jerusalem corresponds to this. All the evidence left of his life suggests that he clung throughout his Christian life to Jerusalem and did not undertake such missionary labours as would entitle him to the designation of Apostle.—τῶν ἀληθῶν . . . James is here described as the brother of the Lord in order to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee, who was living at the time of Paul's first visit; but elsewhere as James: after the death of the other James there could be no question who was meant.

Ver. 20. The solemnity of this appeal to God in attestation of His truth marks at once the importance which Paul attached to his independence of human teachers, and the persistency of the misrepresentation to which he had been exposed.— ἵνα. This imperative is always used interjectionally in Scriptures: the subsequent εὐλογηθῇ depends on εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεόν, which has the force of an attestation.

Vv. 21-23. About ten years of the life of Paul, between his flight from Jerusalem to Tarsus and his return to Jerusalem for the Apostolic Council, are here passed over. They were spent, partly in and around Tarsus and Antioch, partly in the joint mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The Galatians were already acquainted with the leading facts of that period, and it was needless to refer to them here: enough that he spent those years, like those at Damascus, in an independent ministry at a distance from Jerusalem. He did indeed repair thither once with Barnabas to carry alms from Antioch to the Elders; but circumstances prevented any intercourse with the Twelve at that time: for before they reached the city the Herodian persecution had begun, and the leading Christians were in peril of death at the hands of Herod. Paul himself can only have paid a secret and hurried visit to the city, and thought it needless apparently to mention it in this place.—καισαρεία. This word denotes the fringes of coastland sloping down from the mountains to the sea in north-western Syria and eastern, i.e. Roman, Cilicia. It is applied in 2 Cor. xi. 10 to the coastlands of Achaia.

The name Syria is placed before Cilicia, though the ministry at Tarsus preceded that at Antioch: for the latter was by far the more important and prolonged ministry. A further reason for placing
Syria first was the subordinate position of Cilicia: for Roman Cilicia was, like Judaea, only a district of the great province of Syria, separately administered by an imperial procurator at Tarsus.

In Acts xv. 41 Syria and Cilicia are coupled together forming a single region (ἡ Συρία καὶ Κιλικία), no article being inserted before Κιλικία; not so here, for the first ministry at Tarsus was distinct from that at Antioch.

Ver. 22. ἦμεν δὲ ἄγνωστοι τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς ἱουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. 23. μόνον δὲ αὐτοῦ πέρας ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτὲ ἡμῖν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἡν ποτε ἐπόρθησε. 24. καὶ ἐθάδατον ἐν ἐμοὶ τῶν θεῶν. II. I. Εἰςπείτε δὲ διεκατεστάρων ἐτῶν παλιν

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. Narrative of the Author's visit with Barnabas to the Church of Jerusalem, his fruitless negotiations with party leaders, and the brotherly welcome and recognition he received from James Peter and John.—The author has shown by a rapid glance over the first thirteen years of his Christian life how independent he had been of human teaching at his conversion and subsequently. He now proceeds to record the true history of the negotiations which he had undertaken at Jerusalem in conjunction with Barnabas in the fourteenth year of his ministry. (On the identity of this conference with the Apostolic Council, whose proceedings are recorded in Acts xv., see Introd., pp. 141-144). The Galatians were well aware of the position of Paul and Barnabas in the Church of Antioch: it was not therefore necessary to state in express terms that they were deputed to represent that Church. Enough that their first act was to lay before the Church of Jerusalem an account of the Gospel they were preaching to the Gentiles, and that their divine commission to the Gentiles was fully recognised by the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. They knew already the general outline of events: for the resolution adopted at Jerusalem, and subsequently approved at Antioch, had been duly communicated to them by Paul himself. His object in this Epistle is to remove misconstruction as to his own position. His reference of this question to the Church of Jerusalem had been misrepresented as an act of submission and acknowledgment of his own inferiority, whereas he had really procured the condemnation of the false brethren who denied his authority, had silenced his opponents, and met with brotherly fellowship and full recognition at the hands of James Peter and John.

Ver. 1. Σιά Στραυ. Greek usage in calculating intervals of time between two events reckons two years for the two broken years at the beginning and end of the period. Some critics, notably Lightfoot, calculate this period from the meeting with Peter mentioned in i. 18: but this attaches far too much importance to that interview. It is only mentioned and its date loosely indicated in order to show that three full years passed before they had any intercourse. The dominant note of time throughout in the mind of the author is surely the conversion: and the object of specifying a period of time here, as in i. 18, is to show how many years of Christian life had passed before the event.—Τίτων. The names of the Christians who accompanied Paul and Barnabas are not given in Acts xv. 2. It appears that Titus, a Greek Christian,
one of Paul's own children in Christ, was among them, and that Paul was responsible for his selection. His choice of a Greek for his companion evinces the determined spirit with which he started on his mission.

Ver. 2. κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. This statement of Paul's motive is in no way inconsistent with the independent statement in the Acts that he was deputed by the Church. The revelation may have come to Paul himself, and in that case he prompted the decision of the Church, of which he and Barnabas were at that time the ruling spirits; or it may have been made through the Spirit to the Church, in which case Paul would count it right at once to obey his voice.

—ἀνεθημένη ... Two different methods of action are here specified, public addresses describing the nature and result of the Apostle's preaching among the Greeks, and private interviews with individual brethren or groups of brethren. The term κατ' ἰδίαν does not imply secrecy in these communications. The context shows that the point at issue was the circumcision of Gentile converts.

—τοῖς δοκοῦσιν. As this phrase recurs four times in eight verses, it is necessary to determine its true meaning with some precision. δοκεῖν nowhere else conveys the idea of superiority implied in our versions, of reputation (of repute R.V.). The two passages adduced in its support do not stand the test of criticism: in Eur., Hecat., 897 there is an obvious ellipsis of εὐφημεῖ, in Hes., 925 of ἐξερῆς. In the latter indeed δοκοῦσιν appears to be a cynical comment of the deposed queen on the unreality of outward glory.

In fact δοκεῖν, like seem in English, was either a neutral term which expressed according to the context any impression, good or bad, produced by the appearance of an object, or it laid stress on the unreality of the mere outward semblance. The Greeks dwelt often on the contrast between δοκεῖν and εἶναι embodied in the famous line of Ἀeschylus of γὰρ δοκεῖν δὲν ὡς ἔχει, ἐν δὲ οὐκ ἐχεῖ λείγειν. In ver. 6 this contrast reappears in the antithesis between δοκοῦτες εἶναι and τοῖς ἱεροῖς. In ver. 9, on the contrary,
Ver. 4. The narrative returns here, after the parenthetical reference to Titus, to the subject of vv. 1, 2, and the verb ἀνεβην, already repeated in ver. 2, must here also be supplied to complete the sense: But it was because of the false brethren privately brought in that I went up, men who came in... The addition of the article, rightly inserted by the Revised Version before false brethren, shows that they were a particular body of convicted offenders against Christ, of whose guilt the Galatians had been already informed. The force of παρεισόκτονος is well illustrated by Strabo, xvii., p. 794, where it denotes the treacherous introduction of foreign enemies into a city by a faction within the walls. In the next clause παρεισόκτονος describes the stealthy entrance of these secret foes; κατασκοτήτως marks their hostile intent, and likens them to spies who are bent on discovering to an enemy the weak points in a military position: the freedom of the Greek Churches in Christ is further declared to be the object of their hostility. This description brings the Epistle into closest touch with the Acts: for it is there stated that Paul and Barnabas were driven to go up to Jerusalem by the factious opposition of certain foreign emissaries from Judaea who attacked the freedom of the Greek converts from circumcision and disturbed the peace of the Church; also that these men were altogether repudiated and condemned at Jerusalem by the Apostles and brethren, and finally that the document embracing this sentence of condemnation had been placed by Paul himself in the hands of the Galatians. There can be no doubt, in view of this close correspondence, that the false brethren whom the Epistle denounces are identical with the Pharisaic emissaries who stirred up strife at Antioch. — ινα... The motive for firmness was the maintenance of the truth of the Gospel, i.e., of the freedom to which the uncircumcised were entitled in Christ.— ἔστειλα: for you, i.e., with a view to your welfare. The rendering of our versions, with you, would be properly expressed by ἦν ὑμῖν.

Ver. 5. ἐξέλεγκεν. Paul here couples Barnabas with himself in recording the determined resistance offered by both to the demand for the circumcision of all Christians preferred at Antioch. Barnabas was at that time a staunch supporter of Greek freedom. The verse obviously refers to their attitude at Antioch before going to Jerusalem. — ὅπως... The middle voice ὅπως-συνεργασάμενα is five times rendered submit in the Authorised Version, and the force of the original is impaired by its exclusion from the text of the Revised Version. — ἰπα... The motive for firmness was the maintenance of the truth of the Gospel, i.e., of the freedom to which the uncircumcised were entitled in Christ. — ἔστειλα... The rendering of our versions, with you, would be properly expressed by ἦν ὑμῖν.

Ver. 6. The author here resumes the broken thread of the narrative, which he interrupted after ver. 2 in order to show that his conciliatory attitude at Jerusalem was not due to weakness or irresolution. He now proceeds to relate the sequel of the advances which he made at Jerusalem to the Pharisaic party. The repetition of the phrase οἱ δοκούντες, and the fresh transition from the plural ἔλεγκεν to the singular ὅπως, indicate the fresh shifting of the scene from Antioch back to Jerusalem. The first clause is left unfinished, for the mention of these men who seemed to be anything leads the author to interrupt his narrative again that he may challenge their right to be heard; he breaks, accordingly, into the disparaging comment, what manner of men they had once been, makest no matter—a forcible expression of his disappointment at finding so little Christian sympathy or life where he had hoped to find so much. After this parenthesis he remoulds the
form of his sentence; and of δοκοῦντες, the subject of ἵνα, becomes the subject of the verb προσανέθετο. Instead, therefore, of concluding the sentence in its original form, and stating that from those who so seemed he got no response, he writes, to me, I say, those who so seemed communicated nothing further.—τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι. These are identified with τοὺς δοκοῦντας in ver. 2. They are there described as men whom it was thought advisable to approach in private, here as men who were thought to be anything, i.e., to have any weight in the Church. The English version somewhat suggests that they held high office and were in positions of dignity, perhaps Apostles; but the Greek order in that case must have been τί εἶναι, nor can that emphasis be justified in rendering the enclitic τι after εἶναι. They were probably party-leaders, but the Apostle writes of them with scant respect as men who were now little better than a name.  

—ὁποίοι ὁποῖοι ἵνα . . . What manner of men they had once been maketh no matter to me. The margin of the Revised Version rightly renders ὁποίοι as an indirect interrogative dependent on διαφέρει, and gives to ὁποῖος its true sense of formerly, in time past (as in i. 13, 23). Coupled as it is here with ὁποῖος, ἵνα has the force of a pluperfect, and contrasts the character of these men as reported from past time with what Paul actually found them to be: he could get no brotherly help or counsel from them. Therefore he pronounces the adverse judgment upon them (πρὸς τοὺς Ἰδρυμούς . . . λαμβάνει); for, like his Master (Luke xx. 21), he regarded no man's person, if found in the balance and found wanting.—ἐμοὶ . . . προσανέθετο. This clause forms an antithesis to ἄνθρωπης τοῖς δοκοῦνται in ver. 2. Paul had laid before them an account of his successful ministry among the Greeks, but they had no further response to make in the shape of Cæsarea. He had made the argument in justification of their prejudices against him and his teaching.

Ver. 7. The emphatic opening of this verse, Ἀλλὰ τοῦτον τοὺς, gives prominence to the thorough contrast presented by James, Cephas and John to the cold reserve of these suspicious and prejudiced opponents. It is perfectly clear in the Greek text, though unfortunately not in the English versions, that they are the subject throughout vv. 7-9, and that the participles ἰδώντες and γνώσετε refer to them as well as the verb ἴδων. But contrariwise James and Cephas and John . . . when they saw . . . and perceived the grace that was given unto me, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship. They saw in the marvellous success of Paul and Barnabas a visible token of their divine commission and of the grace bestowed upon them. These were doubtless the real authors of the final resolution adopted by the Council; and its hearty appreciation of their beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ coincides with the language of the Epistle.—πέτρος. In this and the next verse the Greek name is used to designate the Apostle of the circumcision, probably because he was already known to the whole Greek world as an Apostle under that name. In Jerusalem, however, and as a man, he habitually went by his Hebrew surname Cephas, and that name is accordingly given him elsewhere in the Epistle.

Ver. 8. ἐνεργήσας. When this verb is applied to the work of the Spirit in the hearts of men, the preposition ἐν is added to it. The absence of ἐν before Πέτρῳ and Ἰακώβ indicates that this verse is not describing the work of grace in the hearts of Peter and Paul, but the work of God for them, i.e., for the furtherance of the Gospel which they preached.

Ver. 9. The name of James is placed before those of the Apostles Peter and John. This was probably because as permanent head of the Church he presided at meetings (cf. Acts xxii. 18). The well-known strictness of his own
legal observance gave special weight to his support of Greek freedom on this occasion; and his address with the subsequent resolution of the Council suggests that he took a leading part in drafting some part of it at least.

—οἱ δοκο汶川ησεις στόλοι εἶναι. The habitual application to the Church of figures borrowed from a temple of God suggested the description of Apostles as pillars. It occurs also in Clement of Rome and Ignatius. The repetition of the phrase οἱ δοκο汶川ησεις is apparently designed to contrast the high estimate formed of the Three with the unfounded and indefinite estimate of others who had proved to be mere names.

The mutual understanding between the two groups of Apostles obviously did not imply an absolute restriction of each to one section of the Church. All converts alike were members of a single united Church: circumstances of themselves forbade any definite division: Paul opened his ministry everywhere in the synagogue, and numbered Jews as well as Greeks amidst his converts. So Peter again is next found at Antioch.

Ver. 10. μόνον . . . ινα. A verb must be supplied out of εὐγενείας expressive of the pledge that the other Apostles exacted from Barnabas and Paul, τῶν τεχνῶν. These words are displaced from their grammatical position after μημονεύωμεν in order to lay stress upon the poor being the central object of the appeal. Judæa suffered often from famine in apostolic times, and Christians were probably the worst sufferers owing to religious ill-will and social persecution. This passage implies chronic poverty. So also does the history of the Pauline contribution, which was not an effort to meet a special emergency, for it took more than a year to collect, but a fund organised to meet a permanent demand for systematic help.—δ. The addition of τῶν after αὐτῷ shows that δ is not the object of τοῦτο, but is used with adverbial force for a connecting particle, as in i. 7, as for which.—καὶ λατρεύσασα, not I also, for this would require καὶ ἵπτο

in the Greek text. The force of καὶ is to intensify the following verb. I was not only willing, but was indeed zealous to do so.

Vv. 11-14. Intrigue at Antioch to affix the stigma of uncleanness on uncircumcised brethren, countenanced by Peter and Barnabas, but openly rebuked by Paul.—The gathering of many Christians at Antioch during the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas in that city is recorded in the Acts, but no mention is made of Peter or of this episode. The omission is instructive, for it bears out the impression which the Epistle itself conveys that the collision was a transitory incident, and had no lasting effect on Church history. The fact, however, that Peter and Barnabas both consented to affix the stigma of uncleanness on their uncircumcised brethren rather than incur the obloquy of eating with them bears striking testimony to the strength of the prejudices which then prevailed among Jewish Christians. Neither of them had any real scruples about intercourse with these brethren: Peter had been taught of God long ago not to call any unclean whom God had cleansed, and had recently protested at Jerusalem against laying the yoke of the Law upon the neck of the disciples; Barnabas had ministered for years to Greek converts, had championed their cause at Jerusalem with Paul, and had like Peter consorted with them freely of late: yet neither of them had the moral courage to act up to their convictions under the eyes of the brethren from Jerusalem. Their vacillation attests the difficulty of retaining Jews and Greeks in one communion, and the wisdom and prudence which guided the decision of the Apostolic Council. But that decision had materially strengthened Paul's position. A basis of union had been formally ratified between the two Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch. The Church of Jerusalem by calling on Greek Christians to consent, as they had done, to certain prescribed forms of abstinence had virtually bound themselves to accept these
as conditions of intercourse, and the withdrawal from the common meal violated therefore the spirit of a solemn treaty. Paul had therefore strong ground for remonstrance, independently of his authority in his own Church, and his protest was evidently effectual, though he refrains from recording Peter's humiliating retreat from a false position. For it is recorded here for the express purpose of exemplifying his successful vindication of his apostolic rights.

The early Fathers shrank from admitting the moral cowardice of which Peter was guilty on this occasion, and made various efforts to evade the plain sense. Clement of Alexandria questioned the identity of Cephas with the Apostle. Origen propounded a theory that the scene was a preconcerted plot between the two Apostles for the confutation of the Judaisers; and this theory prevailed extensively in spite of the discredit which it cast on the character of both until it was effectually exposed by Augustine in controversy with Jerome, who had himself adopted it.

Again, this momentary collision between the two great Apostles was distorted by party spirit into an evidence of personal rivalry. Their preeminence in their two respective spheres has been already noted as early as the Apostolic Council, and this led, perhaps inevitably, to personal comparison. In the Corinthian Church opposite partisans adopted their names for rival watch-words. At a later time elaborate fictions of their lifelong antagonism were invented and circulated in the Clementine literature. But the collision here mentioned was obviously a transitory incident. The language of gratitude and esteem applied to Peter elsewhere in the Epistle precludes any idea of permanent estrangement. — δι' κατεγγυμένος Ἰη.

Our versions are surely wrong in giving a causal force to ἄρα in this clause, for it adduces no clear and reasonable justification of the opposition offered. It is much better to take δι' as declarative: Paul is here stating the ground which he took up against Peter: I withstood him, saying that he had condemned himself. He urged that Peter was condemned by his own inconsistency. By first eating with Gentiles and then pressing upon them observance of the very principles that he had violated he was playing fast and loose with the Law.

Ver. 12. ἡσακαὶ. Any visitors from the Church of Jerusalem might perhaps be said to come from James, who was its permanent head; but these brethren appear to have been in special sympathy with James in regard to their strict observance of the Law, and the respect paid by Peter to their opinion suggests that they were representative men probably deputed for some purpose by their Church. There is, however, no reason to conclude that James prompted or approved the intrigue against Gentile freedom at Antioch. Scrupulous as he was about observing the Law, he had taken a leading part at Jerusalem in shaping the recent contract with their Gentile brethren, and was the last man to sanction an evasion of its terms.

The imperfect tenses οὐστεύλλων, ἀφεί-βρεν give a graphic picture of Peter's irresolute and tentative efforts to withdraw gradually from an intercourse that gave offence to the visitors. — τ. ἐκ περι-τομῆς. The omission of τῆς before περι-τομῆς is conclusive against the rendering of our versions, them . . . of the circumcision. For περιτομῆ without an article does not denote the body of men, but the rite. By τ. ἐκ περιτομῆς are meant the party who based their faith on circumcision, and made that the charter of God's covenant rather than baptism, and not the Jewish Christians in general. It is clear from the context that the Circumcision as a body did eat with their brethren until Peter set the example of withdrawal through fear of this determined minority of partisans. In Acts xi. 2 the phrase obviously singles out a particular party who pressed the claims of circumcision in an assembly consisting wholly of circumcised men. In Acts x. 45 ὁ εκ τοῦ πε-τρωτοῦ distinguishes those who believed after circumcision from the uncircumcised who believed; and in Col. iv. 11 οἱ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνεργῶν designates those men who were my only fellow-workers after circumcision. (For the force of the elliptical phrase ὁ εκ cf. iii. 7, 9, Rom. iv. 14.)

Ver. 13. συναλπήθεσαν . . . ὕποκρι-
The verb νοτοκρίνεσθαι is often used of playing a part as an actor in a play without any invidious meaning; but νοτοκρίωνς corresponds throughout the N.T. to its English equivalent hypocrisy, and fidelity to the Greek text almost demands that rendering here. The men who had hitherto eaten with the uncircumcised and now withdrew because they shrank from giving offence were, in fact, affecting religious scruples which they did not feel, and the Apostle does not hesitate to denounce such insincerity by its true name hypocrisy.—καὶ Βαρνάβας: even Barnabas. The defection of Barnabas was a heavier blow to the cause of Gentile freedom than the vacillation of Peter. With the single exception of Paul himself, Barnabas had been the most effective minister of Christ for the conversion of Greeks; he had been of late deputed to appear with Paul as their representative in Jerusalem, and his withdrawal from social communion with Greek Christians fell upon them with the force of a betrayal. Yet Paul, who had been for many years his most intimate companion, and knew his heart, writes more in sorrow than in anger of his lamentable weakness in being led away by evil example. Jerusalem had been his early home and the place of his earliest ministry. The Twelve had been his first teachers in Christ: his cousin John Mark, who was even then in Antioch, was so dear to him that Barnabas, when driven to choose between him and a Jew, chose Mark for the companion of his future ministry. What wonder then that he was tempted on this occasion for a moment to yield to the influence of Peter and the brethren from Jerusalem.

Ver. 14. ἐπί ταῦτα. Our version renders τιτάνας, and so impugn these men for want of uprightness in their conduct rather than for inconsistency of doctrine. But the censure of the Apostle is really directed to the falsehood of their teaching. They were not dealing straightforwardly with the truth in casting the slur of uncleanness on those whom God had cleansed in Christ.—παρατίθενται. Peter was by his example really putting a severe pressure on Gentile converts to adopt a Jewish rule of life, though perhaps unintentionally.—νοτοκρίων. This participle notes the bearing of antecedents on present action. Peter being a Jew might have been expected to act otherwise.

Ver. 15-21. Jews themselves were driven to resort to Christ as Sinners for Pardon because they could not obtain justification by perfect obedience to the Law—not that they might thereby become more free to sin, but for the sake of new life in Christ, even as Paul himself endured crucifixion with Christ, that Christ might live in him. Ver. 15. As the next verse opens, according to the Greek MSS., with τί οὖν εἰσίν, it is necessary to understand here a finite verb, We are Jews, etc. The personal narrative breaks abruptly at this point. Peter drops out of sight, and the Epistle passes from a protest against his vacillation into an elaborate argument against the doctrinal errors of the Pharisaic party, which forms too integral a portion of the whole Epistle to be detached from it. Yet the new strain of thought springs so directly out of the previous remonstrance that it might well have been addressed then and there to the Jewish Christians at Antioch. The outspoken protest against an insidious attempt to force on Gentiles the Jewish rule of life leads naturally to an enquiry what this rule has done for men who are Jews by birth. Did it justify them before God? We know that it did not: they had to turn to Christ for the peace with God which the Law could not give. In short, vv. 15-21 are connected at once with the preceding matter.
and the subsequent; and apparently reproduce in substance an argument which had already been addressed, via voce, to the circumcision-party at Antioch, whom the Apostle identifies in spirit and policy with the subsequentagitators in Galatia.

—οὐχ ἐν οἴνοι ἀμ. This clause expresses pointedly the insolent contempt of the Pharisaic party for Gentiles, who did not belong to the holy nation nor inherit the Law and the Covenants. Yet in spite of these arrogant pretentionsto superior sanctity (it is added) they were driven by the verdict of their own conscience to embrace the faith of Christ because they knew that no flesh could possibly be so perfect in obedience to Law as to be thereby justified.

Ver. 16. ὁ δικαιούται . . . Two methods of seeking justification in the sight of God are here distinguished. The former took account of nothing but stedfast obedience to the law of God. Before his conversion Paul knew no other: he had been taught by his legal training to base his standard of right and wrong entirely on the revealed law, to find in it the sole guide of conscience, and to measure righteousness by conformity to its commandments alone.

But his view of God's judgment had been profoundly modified by his conversion. He had learnt on the one hand from the teaching of Christ how impossible it was for man to attain to perfect righteousness, seeing that God claims not only obedience to the letter of the law, but an allegiance of the heart too thorough to be attainable by human infirmity. But on the other hand he knew that God is a loving Father in Christ, ever seeking out His erring children that He may win them back, ever ready to temper strict justice with infinite mercy, and waiting only for the first response of imperfect faith and imperfect repentance, so they be at all sincere, to blot out a guilty past, and pronounce a favourable judgment on the sinner. He perceived that there is room in the judgment of God for another element beside strict justice, viz., the mercy of the judge, and that a prisoner however clear may be his guilt on the evidence of his life, may nevertheless be assured of pardon and acceptance by throwing himself in humble trust on that mercy. In the Epistles of Paul accordingly justification acquired a new meaning, becoming equivalent to acceptance before God, and the term righteousness was applied to the merciful acquittal of the guilty but penitent offender.

The clause ἐξ ἔργων νόμου defines an acquittal on the merits of the case alone, based on a life of holy obedience, while ἰδία πίστεως Ἰ. Xp. points to faith in Christ as the appointed channel of God's mercy.—ἐπιστέφασμαν. Here, as in Rom. xiii. 11, this verb denotes the act of embracing the faith. Jewish Christians had by their conversion declared the hopelessness of their position under the Law without Christ. Faith in him was (they saw) the only means of obtaining justification.—διότα . . . This clause corroborates the verdict of conscience and experience by the authority of Scripture, for it adopts the language of Ps. cxli. (cxlii.) 2, ὁ δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, with only some verbal alterations suggested by the context of the Epistle. As two kinds of justification have been mentioned, the clause ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is required here to make it clear that the justification to which the Psalm refers was legal, the words ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ are dropped as needless in this context, and τὰ πάντα τὰ ὁποία τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐμπλήσατε transferred to the clause in order to show that the Psalm referred to earthly life. The passage is quoted with corresponding verbal changes in Rom. iii. 20.

Ver. 17. ἔτι . . . ἀμαρτωλοὶ. The last verse arrived at the conclusion that Jewish converts by their own act con-
denied themselves to be guilty of a broken law. The argument now proceeds on this assumption "If it be true (as has been shown) that we by seeking to be justified in Christ were found to be ourselves also sinners as well as the Gentiles—if our sin was then discovered, and it be admitted that confession of sin lies at the root of all Christian life, what then is the attitude of Christ toward sin?"— ἀρα Χ. λ. διάκονος; This clause is clearly interrogative, and the true reading is ἀρα, not ἀρα (inferential). For here, as always elsewhere in Pauline language, ὑπηρετεῖν repudiates a monstrous suggestion, put forward in the form of a question, the mere statement of which is repugnant to the moral sense.

It was objected to this doctrine of God's free grace in Christ to guilty sinners that it held out a license to sin by doing away the wholesome restraints of the Law, and so encouraged men to continue in sin by its assurance of pardon. The fallacy is here dismissed with scorn on the strength of the very nature of Christ, but is more fully exposed in the sixth chapter to the Romans.

Ver. 18. "If, indeed, I do reestablish the authority of the Law over Christian life, it becomes true that Christ did lead me to transgression." So argues the Apostle as he turns to his own life for an illustration of the incompatibility of allegiance to Christ with the continued supremacy of the Law.

Ver. 19. "Εγὼ. The stress laid on the personal pronoun shows that Paul is here referring to the facts of his personal history. He singles out his own conversion for the sake of the crucial example which it afforded of the difficulty of reconciling the commands of Christ with the traditional law of Israel; for he was actually bearing the commission of the high priest, and carrying out the orders of the Sanhedrim when Christ met him in the way and laid His commands upon him. He had to choose between the two: and at Christ's word he flung up his office and renounced for ever the service of the Law.— διὰ νόμου: though under law. The translation of these words in our versions through the law seems to me fatal to the sense: for the death to Law which is here recorded was not due to the instrumentality of Law, but was the immediate effect of the vision and words of Christ; and the express object of this reference to the conversion of Saul is to show how union with Christ annihilates the authority of an outward law. διὰ νόμου is really akin to διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς in Rom. ii. 27, and to δι' ἀκροβυστίας in Rom. iv. 11. In all these cases διὰ denotes the environment, whether of the letter, of circumcision, of uncircumcision, or of law, which was subsisting at the time. Saul was on official duty, surrounded by the circumstances and machinery of Law when Christ stayed him, and he became at once dead to the claim of Law upon him.— νόμῳ ἀπεθάνων. These words give a vivid description of the spiritual revulsion produced by his conversion in the heart of Saul. Whereas, hitherto, his whole mind had been set on fulfilling the whole Law, and he had counted its obligations all in all to him, he now entirely renounced the duty of obedience to its commands and repudiated its authority. And just as death works a final change, and leaves behind an indelible effect, so did his conversion affix a permanent stamp of lifelong change on all his after years: thenceforth he served another Master, owned absolute obedience to His will, listened for His inward voice or outward revelation, and drank of His Spirit. Law.

The absence of the article before νόμῳ is noteworthy; whereas the Law of Moses, being the one revealed Law, is always designated the Law (ὁ νόμος), νόμῳ denotes law in the abstract, so that this clause comprehends emancipation from all control of external law. The freedom was, of course, purely spiritual: Paul continued fully to acknowledge the duty of outward submission to all duly ordained authority, but maintained the absolute independence of his spirit and conscience from its dictates.— ἐν Θεῷ ζήσεω. This clause adds the motive for this death to Law. It was a veritable death unto life: Saul had striven in vain to obtain life before God by zealous fulfilment of every commandment; he now acknowledged his utter failure, surren-
20. Christ suffered for us, and cast himself in humble trust at the feet of Jesus to receive from Him that precious life which he had sought in vain by his most zealous efforts under the Law.

Ver. 20. Χριστὸς συνετάρματος. The Greek order throws special emphasis on Χριστὸς: union with Christ became from that time the central feature of his life; it entailed in the beginning a fellowship with his crucifixion, a real crucifixion of heart and will. By this figure he describes the intense agony of spiritual conflict, the crushing load of shame and bitter remorse which he underwent during the three days of darkness and silent despair that followed his vision of the Christ.— έν ζωή: And I live. I can perceive no ground for rendering έν... nevertheless (A.V.) or yet (R.V.). There is no contrast here between the life and the previous death: on the contrary, the life is presented as the direct outcome of the death. As the resurrection of Christ was the sequel of the crucifixion, so Paul was joined to Christ in death that he might be joined to Him in spiritual life.— οὐκ... ζωήν: But in that I live. Our versions make this = η εις ζωήν ζωή; but it seems to me more accordant with the context and with Greek forms of expression to make έδώς = in that, as it is rendered by A.V. in Rom. vi. 10. Two instances of this adverbial use of έδώς for a connecting particle have been already noted in this Epistle (i. 7, ii. 10). Paul is here accounting for the fact that he now possesses spiritual life, though still in the flesh and subject to many members: it belongs to him in virtue of his faith in the Son of God.— μόνον: The previous clauses have expressed the intimate personal union between the spirit of Paul and his Divine Master. In harmony with that view an exclusive personal aspect is presented of the love of Christ and of His sacrifice on the Cross, as though Paul himself had been their sole object.

Ver. 21. Christ died in order that men might live before God by His grace in spite of a broken Law; if men could keep the Law of themselves and live, there would be no call for grace, and the death of Christ would be proved a useless sacrifice.— ή εἰς ζωήν. Law was never, like faith, instrumental to justification (cf. ver. 16). Accordingly, Paul never speaks of justification through Law, but either εἰς ζωήν or έν ζωή. Here, as in ver. 19, έν ζωήν really denotes a legal environment, and the verse argues that if righteousness was really within men's reach under a legal dispensation, then there was no occasion for the death of Christ at all.

Chapter III.— Vv. 1-6. What senseless folly is it for you, who had the crucifixion of Christ set plainly before your eyes, to resort now to circumcision! Think only how it was that you received the spirit: was it by obedience to law or by listening in faith? Can you complete a spiritual work by an ordinance of the flesh? Did you suffer all that persecution for nothing? Was it your obedience to Law or your listening in Faith that led to God's imparting to you the Spirit with power, even as the faith of Abraham was reckoned to him for righteousness?— Ver. 1. ἐπησάκαθεν. This word denoted either the fascination of an evil eye or some malignant influence akin to it; the infatuation of some Galatians at this crisis is attributed to the baneful effect of some mysterious powers of evil.

The reading ἐπησάκαθεν has probably found its way into some MSS. from classical usage; most verbs in -σάκαθεν form the aorist in ἐ in the N.T., e.g., λευκάκατο ἐνήμανεν τοιμάνστι. The additions τῇ ἄλλῃ μὴ πείθετεν after ἐπησάκαθεν, and ἐν ὕπνοιν after προεγράφη in the Received Text are evidently
spurious. The former is probably due to a reminiscence of v. 7, where the clause occurs.—προσγράφη. This word is twice employed by the Apostle, once in Rom. xv. 4 with reference to the Scriptures, once in Eph. iii. 3 with reference to a former letter of his own. Probably, it refers in like manner to some document which he had placed in the hands of the Galatians, or some letter he had written for their guidance during his absence, in which the vital truth of the crucifixion had been enforced. That he wrote many apostolic letters to his converts is clear from 2 Thess. iii. 17. The addition κατ' ἐφθαλμόν is in harmony with this view. γράφειν never has the sense of painting in the N.T.—ἐνσωματίζων. The Greek order of words indicates that this participle has the force of a predicate. The fact of the crucifixion with all that the fact involved was the truth which had been so distinctly set before the eyes of the Galatians in black and white.

Ver. 2. The Apostle appeals with confidence to the personal experience of his converts. They were themselves conscious of having received on their conversion gifts of the Spirit. Whence then came the inward change? Was it the result of fulfilling law, or of listening in faith? The question needs no answer: for it was obviously the result of listening in faith. The second clause couples together two essential requisites for conversion: men must not only listen, but listen in a right spirit, desiring to know and do God's will. The genitive πιστεύω adds this essential condition.—τὸ πνεῦμα. The spirit constitutes in this Epistle a definite element in the regenerate nature, due to spiritual creation as the flesh is to natural men. It is an internal organ by which the Holy Spirit operates on the will and prompts the action of man (cf. v. 16-22). It becomes therefore a living human force within the heart, distinct from the personality of the Holy Spirit. But on the other hand it is absolutely dependent for its vital force on the original inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and can neither live nor grow without continual nourishment and sustenance from Him.

Ver. 3. πνεύματα. σουκαλ. These two datives denote the two internal spheres susceptible of moral influence. Conversion had brought about a spiritual change as its immediate result: it was folly to look for a consummation of this change from an ordinance of the flesh like circumcision. This was to exalt flesh above spirit instead of rising from flesh to spirit.—ἐνέργεσθαι and ἐνενεκαλάσθαι are coupled together in 2 Cor. viii. 6 and Phil. i. 6 to express the beginning and consummation of works of mercy and sanctification. Greek authors use ἐνέργεσθαι with reference to the initial ceremony of a sacrifice (Eur., Iph., A. 147, 435, 955), ἐντελεύθερος in Heb. ix. 6 refers to the performance of ritual. The middle voice ἐντελεύθερος is used here because the spiritual process is to be wrought by them upon themselves.

Ver. 4. The persecutions endured by the Galatian converts had all been due to the jealous animosity of the Jews: if they were now to accept the Law after all, they would proclaim their former resistance to have been wanton caprice on their part, which had led them to provoke persecution to no purpose (εἰκῇ) without any sufficient object.

Ver. 5. ἀναγγέλλων. The verb χορηγωτων acquired its meaning from the function of the χορηγός whose duty it was to supply the members of his chorus with all necessary equipment in the course of their training and performance. As men took pride in the liberal fulfilment of this duty, the word came to denote a liberal supply. The compound ἀναγγέλλων denotes apparently an enhancement of this bounty (2 Cor. ix. 10).—δυνάμει. This word is sometimes applied in the Gospels to visible miracles, but in the language of Paul, as elsewhere, it denotes
forces or powers. Here accordingly it refers to the supernatural powers imparted by the Spirit to Christians.

Ver. 6. The faith of the Galatians is likened to that of Abraham, in that it found the same acceptance with God. The quotation of Gen. xv. 6 was reckoned follows the LXX, whereas our version, following the Hebrew text, refers to God, he counted it. This passage is repeatedly commented on by Philo as well as in the N.T. Paul bases his argument upon it in Rom. iv. 3 by way of proof that God imputes righteousness on the ground of faith, not of works, and James guards it against misinterpretation by teachers who degraded faith into a barren assent of the intellect (James ii. 17-23). Obviously Jewish teachers had already concentrated attention on this passage on account of the explicit testimony which it bears to the faith of Abraham and to God's acceptance of that faith; and stress had been laid upon its authority in their schools of theology.

Vv. 7-14. By faith men become sons of Abraham and inherit his blessing, whereas those who claim it on the score of obedience to Law are subject to the curse of a broken Law; from which Christ redeemed us, Gentiles as well as Jews, by bearing the curse Himself.—Ver. 7. The emphatic admonition, Know ye, adopted in our versions, would require an aorist imperative γνωτε, as in Heb. viii. 11. This verse contains a deduction from the former, as is suggested by the inferential ἡ. Since faith was the ground of Abraham's justification, it follows that those who share his faith are his true sons.—οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, sc. νῦν ὁσίους. The form of the Greek sentence suggests the insertion of these words to complete the ellipsis. With this addition the verse carries on the previous argument to its natural sequel. The faith of Abraham was there declared to be a fundamental condition of the divine acceptance. Those therefore who inherit his faith are his sons indeed and heirs of his blessing. The discourse of Christ recorded in the Gospel follows the same line of argument: If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham (John viii. 39). Both alike urge that resemblance in life and character is the true test of sonship. Gentiles therefore who prove themselves sons of Abraham by exhibiting like faith are his sons indeed, and inherit the blessing promised to his seed. The antithesis in ver. 10, δοῦνα ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου εἶναι, sc. νῦν, presents a like ellipsis: the exclusive claim of Jews to be sons of Abraham in virtue of their observance of the Law is there disposed of on corresponding grounds.

Ver. 8. Ἰσχυρισμός: justifieth. The present tense is used because justification by faith, though not revealed to the Gentiles till Christ came, was an eternal truth of God's dealings with man, to be revealed in due time. There were in Genesis anticipations of this truth, and Abraham himself, the father of the faith ful, was a kind of firstfruits of the Gentiles (Rom. iv. 10-12). The quotation here given contains the substance of promises recorded in Gen. xii. 3, and xviii. 18 with slight verbal alteration. These were an earlier Gospel, but not (as our versions intimate) the Gospel.

Ver. 9. οἱ ἐκ πίστεως. See note on ver. 7.

Ver. 10. The Apostle here proceeds to deal with the rival claim to a special blessing on the score of obedience to Law. Jews maintained that their knowledge of the Law entitled them to the blessings attached to the sons of Abraham. He urges on the contrary that this entailed on them the curse of a broken Law: for no flesh could keep the whole Law (cf. ii. 16). The failure of men to satisfy the requirements of the Law is not limited to the Mosaic Law, but is incidental to the idea of righteous Law in the abstract. Hence the expression νῦν rather than τοῦ νόμου. The Roman Epistle accordingly pronounces sentence of guilt on the Gentile as well as the Jewish world for breach of the Laws of natural or revealed religion. Here, however, the object is to meet claims founded on the Mosaic Law, so the curses of that...
Law are adduced in support of the argument. The imprecation here given is not a verbal quotation, but reproduces in substance the series of curses pronounced from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-26), summing them up in a single sentence.

Vv. 11, 12. The failure of the Law to justify is further established by a comparison of Habakkuk ii. 4 with Lev. xviii. 5: the latter embodies the spirit of the Law: for it demands obedience as a necessary condition antecedent to the gift of life from God (cf. Rom. x. 5). The prophet on the contrary makes life dependent upon faith. By thus substituting faith for obedience he virtually supersedes the existing Law, and establishes a new criterion, which takes account of the state of heart instead of the outward life (cf. Rom. i. 17). The same passage is adduced in Heb. x. 38 in proof of the vital importance of faith. Paul here limits his view to the faith which prompts the convert to embrace Christ. Regarding it therefore from a purely Christian standpoint, he embodies in his conception the new revelation of the Father's character made in Christ. The faith which he has in mind is justifying faith, the faith in God's pitying love which assures a repentant sinner of forgiveness and merciful acceptance in spite of a guilty past.

Ver. 13. The Law pronounced a blessing and a curse; but since it made no allowance for human infirmity, the blessing proved barren in result; while the curse, which invoked the just wrath of an offended God for the punishment of the guilty, proved, on the contrary, fruitful in condemnation.

From this hopeless state of just condemnation Christ delivered us by revealing the infinite mercy of an Almighty Father, and so reviving hope and thankful love in the heart of the condemned sinner by faith in His love. — ἐγγέρθημεν. The figure of a ransom, which this word conveys, is doubly appropriate in this connection. Men needed a ransom, for the Law had left them prisoners under sentence of death, and Christ had Himself to pay the price. He had to become a man like His brethren save in sin, and to endure the penalty denounced on malefactors and hang on the accursed cross, as if He had been guilty like them. — γενόμην κατάφα. Hebrew thought tended to identify the man on whom a curse was laid with the curse, as it identified the sin-offering with the sin, calling it ἁπαρία (Lev. iv. 21-25). Hence the scapegoat was regarded as utterly unclean by reason of the sins laid upon it. — ἐπικατάρατος . . . This passage is quoted from Deut. xxi. 23 with one significant alteration. In the original the criminal executed under sentence of death is pronounced κεκαταράτως ὁτι Θεοῦ, so that the Law is affirmed to be the voice of God, carrying with it the fulness of divine sanction. But here the words ὁτι Θεοῦ are omitted, inasmuch as the new revelation of God's mercy in Christ has superseded for Christians the previous condemnation of the Law.

The original passage refers to criminals executed under the Jewish Law, and commands the speedy burial of their dead bodies before sunset in opposition to the vindictive practices prevailing in Palestine among the surrounding nations.
of nailing up unburied bodies in public places (cf. 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 2 Sam. xxii. 10). It made, of course, no reference to crucifixion, which was a Roman mode of execution, not a Jewish.

Ver. 14. Ἐν...ἔπεσεν τάκτης τῷ Πνεύματι ἃ δέχθησθαι οὖν καὶ ἐπαγγέλλατε καὶ τῷ στέρματι αὐτοῦ. Two gracious purposes of the Redeemer are here coupled together: (1) the extension of the blessing to Gentiles as well as Jews; (2) the outpouring of the Spirit upon those that embraced the faith of Christ.

Vv. 15-18. God's word was plighted to Abraham that He would bestow the inheritance on his seed (not on all his descendants, but on one particular seed), and could not therefore be set aside by subsequent stipulations in the law. — Ver. 15. καὶ άνθρωπον λέγει. This preface indicates that the argument which it introduces is founded on the principles of human law and custom. — διαθήκη. The meaning testament affixed to this word in classical Greek belongs to the Greek practice of testamentary disposition, other covenants being designated by συνθήκη, etc. But no such law or custom existed among the ancient Hebrews, so the LXX employed the word to express the Hebrew conception of a covenant between God and His people. As this was the outcome of God's sovereign grace and bounty, and not a matter of mutual arrangement, it could hardly be described by any of the Greek terms for covenant; it was, on the other hand, analogous to a disposition of property by testament, and was accordingly designated by the term διαθήκη. Hence it was extended also to covenants between man and man in the LXX. The same sense of covenant is attached to the word apparently throughout the N.T. Here, at all events, the distinct reference to the covenant with Abraham leaves no doubt of its meaning. — ἄνθρωπον. This phrase (= καὶ τίνες ἄνθρωπον ὁσῶν ὤν) intimates that even men are bound by a contract duly ratified: a fortiori, God is bound by His plighted word. Two distinct methods of superseding a contract are suggested by διαθήκη and στέρματος: it might be expressly annulled, or it might be overlaid by new stipulations.

Ver. 16. The clause καὶ τῷ στέρματι αὐτοῦ is quoted from God's promises to Abraham in Gen. xiii. 15 and xviii. 8 with only the necessary change of the second person σου into αὐτοῦ. The original promise was limited to the possession of the promised land, but was coupled with a perpetual covenant between God and the seed of Abraham: I will be their God, Thou shalt keep my covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. Hence Hebrew prophecy imported into it the idea of a spiritual inheritance, and the Epistle adopts this interpretation without hesitation. — ἀνέφερεν, etc. As the clause in question was quoted from an utterance of God, it was not necessary to specify the subject of ἀνέφερεν; — καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν: And to his seeds, i.e., families. This contrast between the many families and the one chosen family is more than mere verbal criticism: it contains the germ of that doctrine of continuous divine election within the stock of Abraham which is developed in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For Abraham had many children after the flesh; and the exclusion of Ishmael, Dedan, Midian, Esau in patriarchal times in favour of Isaac and of Jacob established the principle which culminated in the rejection of the Jewish nation in favour of Christ. This conception of a continuous holy family linking Christ with Abraham runs through the next section of the Epistle; just as παλαιός and ἄνεφερεν here mean τῷ στέρματι and τῷ σπέρματι, so ἀνέφερεν in ver. 20 means ἀνέφερεν καὶ τὰ πάντα in ver. 22 τὰ τῶν σπέρματα. In like manner Christ is contemplated, not by Himself alone as constituting in the unity of His person the chosen seed, but as a new centre out of whom the family of God branched forth again. He became in a far higher sense than Isaac or Jacob a new head of the chosen family: for all Abraham's children after the flesh that received Him not were shut out from the blessing, while all who believed in Him became by faith sons of Abraham and members of the true family of God. The whole Church of Christ are in short regarded as one with Christ—one in life
and spirit, for they are members of His body and partake of His spirit (cf. vv. 28, 29).

Vv. 17, 18. The inviolate sanctity of God's earlier covenant in presence of the subsequent promulgation of the Law is here affirmed in virtue of the principle established in ver. 15. Had the inheritance been made contingent on obedience to Law, the previous promise would have been thereby invalidated. The Received Text inserts eis Χριστόν after Θεόν. The words appear from the MS. evidence to be a later addition to the text, suggested probably by the previous argument, which associated the promise to Abraham with the coming of Christ, in whom alone that promise finds its fulfilment. The very form of the sentence forbids the acceptance of the addition here: for διαθήκην in the absence of an article does not denote the particular covenant concluded with Abraham, but signifies any covenant in the abstract, if duly ratified by God, whatever its nature.—δι' ἑαυτοῦ, κεχάρασται. The full bearing of the language on the argument can hardly be expressed in English without a paraphrase. χαράζεσθαι denotes not merely a gift, but a free gift bestowed by the grace of God without reserve, and ἐπαγγελία marks the promise as a spontaneous offer, and not an undertaking (ἐνδιακυρίευσις) based on terms of mutual agreement.

Vv. 19-22. The Law was a temporary enactment ordained to deal with the offences which it denounced until the coming of the promised seed. The God from whom it proceeded was the God of Abraham, but He promulgated it through angels and an appointed mediator to all the children of Abraham after the flesh, not to the one chosen seed. Did it then contravene his promises? Nay verily. If indeed it had been capable of quickening life, it would have provided new means of justification: but what it really did was to convict all alike of sin, that the promise might be given to those who believe on faith in Christ. —Τί οὖν ο νόμος; —τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετεθή; ἡ δὲ ἐπίτροπον τό σπέρμα οὐ ἐπηγγέλθη,
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the promulgation of the Law: God's intercourse with Moses through the angel of His presence was evidently a common topic in Jewish schools of theology. In Acts vii. 53 the fact is recorded by way of enhancing the authority of the Law; in Heb. ii. 2 it is contrasted with God's revelation in His Son: here it is contrasted with God's more familiar intercourse with Abraham. He drew nigh to God, and was called the friend of God: but at Sinai the people stood far off, and the Law was made known through the double intervention of angels and of a human mediator.— Pens. The term εν χερι μεσιτων. The term μεσιτης was applied with the utmost atitude to any intermediate between two parties, whether it was the one great Mediator between God and man or any of the subordinate servants of God through whom He makes known His will to men or exercises His authority. The phrase εν χερι defines its meaning here, for it implies that Moses was put in charge of the promulgation of the Law (cf. Numb. iv. 28, 37 in LXX), and was God's appointed agent for the purpose. This interposition of a mediator between God and the people was a marked feature of distinction between the Sinaitic and the patriarchal dispensation.

Ver. 20. The rendering of the first clause in our versions, Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, reduces it to an unmeaning truism. The author is not treating of mediators in the abstract, but writes of Moses the mediator of the Law that he was not mediator of one chosen family; and so contrasts God's revelation through him with the previous covenant. That covenant had been made with Abraham in person, and embraced a single chosen family (cf. ver. 16) restricted from generation to generation by continuous selection of God's elect until it centred in Christ Himself. Not so the covenant of Sinai: it was addressed, not to one family (ενδος, sc. οπερματος), but to many families of Abraham's children after the flesh. This change of recipients involved a vital change in the revelation also: whereas the promise had quickened faith by an appeal to gratitude and love, the Law used threats of wrath and punishment to deter corrupt and carnal natures from indulging the vices of the flesh.

The stress laid on the unity of the chosen seed in ver. 16 and the ellipsis of οπερματα with τα παντα in ver. 22 justify us in understanding οπερματος here with ενδος.— δε Θεος εις εστιν. The recurrence of the same phrase εις δ Θεος with a corresponding force in Rom. iii. 30 suggests its true force and connection with the context in this place. The Apostle is there urging the real harmony of God's dealings with Jews and Gentiles, however different the method employed for justifying the two severally; and argues that it is nevertheless one and the same God who will justify both. So here after differentiating the revelation made through Moses from that to Abraham, he is careful to add that the God of Sinai is one with the God of Abraham, however distinct might be the two revelations. The true force of the clause may be expressed as follows, but the God (sc. the God of Sinai) is one with the God of promise. The twofold revelation of the name of God to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and as the eternal God I am that I am, suggests the same thought of the divine unity in spite of the various aspects in which God reveals Himself to successive generations of men.

Ver. 21. In view of the continuity of divine providence the suggestion that the Law contravened or nullified the previous covenant of God with Abraham and the patriarchs is dismissed as monstrous. It was incompatible with the faithfulness of God to His pledged word, and is therefore repudiated with the customary formula τουτο δεν ευθυς. The apparent sanction given by the Law to a new method of justification (vis., by works) could lead to no actual result, unless it had at the same time possessed the power which it lacked of quickening spiritual life.— του Θεου. These words are omitted in some MSS., but the preponderance of authority is in favour of their retention. The sense is the same whether they be expressed or understood. The addition may perhaps be due to a marginal comment which found its way into the text.

Ver. 22. The real function of the Law was not to justify but to convict of sin, that men might the more readily turn in humble faith to Christ for relief from the
burden of an accusing conscience.— γραφή. The Old Testament was always designated by the plural γραφαί in apostolic times, for the several books were preserved in separate rolls and did not form a single whole. Here, therefore, γραφή points to some particular passage of the Law to which the author has already drawn attention as embodying its spirit. The passage of Deut. xxvii. 26 quoted in ver. 10 answers this description, for it imprecates a curse on all who fell short of perfect obedience.— συνάκλισις . . . τὰ πάντα. The figure here presented of prisoners under sentence, condemned to pay the penalty of sin, makes it clear that the object of συνάκλισις is persons, not things: and accordingly these prisoners are described in ver. 23 as συγκλειόμενοι (masc.). A neuter plural substantive must therefore be understood with τὰ πάντα which is applicable to persons. Hence I infer that by τὰ πάντα is meant τὰ πάντα σπέρματα, i.e., all the families of Abraham after the flesh, in other words the whole Jewish nation.— ἡ . . . The design of the Law was to pave the way for the eventual fulfilment of the promise to all that believe by faith in Christ.

Vv. 23, 24. The position of the true children of God before the coming of Christ is illustrated by the control exercised over children in their father’s house by members of his household. These verses explain the position of the faithful under the Law. They are here associated with Christians by the use of the first person plural; for they too were in generation believers in God, they belonged to the same blessed family and inherited the original promise. Yet since all Israel from the time of Moses to the Advent were subjected to the control of the Law, they too were subject to bondage. But this was really due to the watchful love of their Heavenly Father, who thus provided needful shelter and guidance, just as an earthly father places his young children during years of weakness and inexperience under the charge of house-hold servants.— τὴν πίστιν. The article, though ignored in our versions, is essential to the sense. By the coming of the faith is meant the historic fact of the Christian religion, the spread of the Gospel on earth. The term has the same objective sense as in i. 23, iii. 25. Acts vi. 7, and Rom. iii. 30, where also a clear distinction is drawn between faith in the abstract, and τὸν πίστιν, the faith of Christ. Obviously faith did not come with Christ, it was the most conspicuous virtue of the Jewish Church, and Abraham was but the first of many splendid examples of it.— συγκλειόμενοι. MS. authority is strongly in favour of the present participle, which is also more appropriate than the perfect συγκλειόμενοι for describing the continuous process of legal condemnation which prevailed from generation to generation.— ἄγγιστο. No English equivalent for this term can convey its real force, for it has no exact counterpart in an English home. The position of a nurse towards young children approaches more nearly than that of schoolmaster or tutor to the office of the ἄγγιστο, for he was a confidential dependent, usually a slave, neither qualified to instruct, nor invested with authority to control his young master, but appointed to attend on him, to safeguard him, and to report to his father any disorderly or immoral habits on which it might be necessary for the father to place a check. The Law in like manner regulated outward habits, enforced order and decency, and maintained a certain standard of morality among Israelites until in due time they became ripe for spiritual freedom. It was not the function of the Law to address itself directly to the conscience like the Prophets, or to claim spiritual authority over the whole man, but to address a check on the open tyranny of evil, to enforce on the community a higher standard of morals, and so to foster indirectly the growth of spiritual life.

Vv. 25-29. But now we are no longer children. Ye are all sons
OF GOD: AT YOUR BAPTISM YE PUT ON
CHRIST, AND WERE INVESTED WITH
SPIRITUAL MANHOOD: ALL PREVIOUS
DISTINCTIONS OF CREED OR RACE, OF
POSITION OR NATURE, WERE DONE AWAY:
YE ARE ALL ONE IN CHRIST.— The sudden
change from the first to the second
person plural betokens an extension in
the point of view from Israel to the
Gentile world. The Epistle has been
dealing since iii. 17 with the position
of Israelites under the Law before the
Advent of the Christ. But that event
brought Gentiles also within the scope
of God's revealed promises and of His
blessings in Christ. So the Apostle
turns to his converts, largely enlisted out
of Gentiles, with the assurance, "Ye are
all sons of God, whatever your ante-
cedents". Their adoption is assumed, as
their possession of the gifts of the Spirit
is assumed in iii. 2. The spirit of adoption,
of which they were conscious within their
hearts, assured them that they were sons
of God (cf. Rom. viii. 15, 16).

Ver 27. ἐνυφαίνασθε. The conception
of spiritual manhood is here associated
with baptism by a figure borrowed from
Greek and Roman usage. At a certain
age the Roman youth exchanged the
toga praetexta for the toga virilis and
passed into the rank of citizens. So
the Christian had been invested at his
baptism with the robe of spiritual man-
hood. Whereas he had before been under
the control of rules and regulations, like
a child in his father's house, he possessed
now the independence of a grown up son.
This figure of clothing is applied in
various ways in Scripture: the effects
of death and resurrection are described
in 2 Cor. v. 4 by the figure of unclothing
and reclothing: the figures of putting on
Christ and putting on armour are used
in Rom. xiii. 12, 14, Eph. vi. 11 to
express the new life support and strength
required for our Christian warfare. The
exact force of the figure depends in every
case upon the context. Here the author
evidently has in mind the change of
dress which marked the transition from
boyhood to manhood. Greeks and Romans
made much of this occasion and
celebrated the investment of a youth
with man's dress by family gatherings
and religious rites. The youth, hitherto
subject to domestic rule, was then ad-
mitt ed to the rights and responsibilities
of a citizen, and took his place beside
his father in the councils of the family.
Baptism is in fact likened to a spiritual
coming of age: the convert, who had
hitherto been bound to obey definite
commandments and fulfil definite duties,
was now set free to learn God's will
from the inward voice of the Spirit,
and discharge the obligations incumbent
on a citizen of the heavenly
commonwealth under the guidance of
an enlightened conscience. He had
entered on his spiritual manhood, and
was accordingly emancipated from his
earlier bondage to an outward Law.

There is an obvious correspondence
between this figure of putting on Christ
at baptism, and the ceremony which
prevailed throughout the Church in sub-
sequent centuries of investing catechu-
mens with white robes on the occasion
of their baptism. Both give expression
to a kindred thought: some of the
Fathers associate them together, and
perhaps the language of the Apostle
contributed to the spread of the cere-
monial. The symbolism however differed
materially: the white robes corresponded
rather to the wedding garment in the
parable: they were an emblem of purity
and signified the cleansing effect of
baptism, whereas the context of the
Epistle points to enfranchisement and
emancipation from control.

Ver. 28. Having now established the
temporary and subordinate function of
the Law, the Apostle finally repudiates
every claim, whether on that or any
other ground, on behalf of any distinct
class to superior sanctity in Christ. All
Christians, whatever their antecedents,
are one in Christ.—οὐκ ἐνι. Distinctions
of creed or race are incompatible with
true membership of Christ: the legal
barriers and social clefs which severed
freeman from slave, even natural divisions
as deep-seated as those of sex, disappear
in presence of the all-absorbing unity of
the body of Christ. ἐνι is a strengthened
form of ἐν used for ἐνιστίν, as πάρα, πέρι,
25—29. IV. i—3.
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29. I. Légoi 8è, 'Eφ' óson χρόνον δι κληρονόμους ἑπτώς ἔστιν, οὔτε διαφέρει δοῦλον, κύριος πάντων ἄν. 2. ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους, ἀρξι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3. οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς, οὗτοι ἑπτῶς ὡς τὰ

IV. i. Ανθυ χριστιάνων ἀποκάλυπτο, ὥστε ἄνθρωποι κληρονόμοι. I. 1. Δέον δὲ διαφέρει δοῦλον, κύριος πάντων ἄν. 2. ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους, ἀρξι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3. οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὥστε ἑπτῶς ὡς τὰ

1οστι καὶ FGKLP; om. καὶ ΝABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ 17, etc.

μέτα are for πάχεστιν, περίστιν, μετεστιν.—ἡμεῖς. Special stress is laid on this pronoun by its insertion with πάντες: the Galatians were themselves a signal instance of the power of the Gospel to make men one in Christ: for their Churches were gathered out of the most diverse elements: Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, male and female, had all contributed to their composition.

Ver. 29. ἡμεῖς. The emphatic insertion of ἡμεῖς before χριστιάνων in preference to χριστιάνου ὁτι places apparently on the wonderful transformation of men who had been aliens from the people of God into members of Christ.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-7. There were in the Gentile world also before Christ children of God in bondage to human rule, that knew not the unseen Father in Heaven who was ordering their lives. They were like orphan children, whom a departed father has with loving care consigned during childhood to the charge of guardians and stewards. In due time, however, God sent forth His Son to redeem them also from bondage, and has made us sons and heirs, sending forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts.—In dealing with the relation of the Mosaic Law to the antecedent covenant and with its subsequent fulfilment in Christ, the Apostle necessarily limited his view of the seed of Abraham, who were covenanted heirs of salvation between Moses and the Advent, to Israel. He likened these accordingly to children growing up in their father's house under domestic control. But as most of those to whom he wrote had been converts from heathenism, he now extends his view of the world before Christ so as to embrace Gentiles also within its scope. Amidst the heathen were other children of God, a faithful seed, potential heirs of salvation, who passed through a like stage of spiritual childhood under different conditions. They were like orphan children committed by the watchful care of an unseen and unknown father to the custody of others. For they were subject to human systems of religion, government and law, neither knowing their Heavenly Father nor comprehending His love for them. The conception of a dead father providing by his will for the due education of his orphan children serves admirably to illustrate the mutual relations between God and the Gentile world, and to set forth the combination of steadfast love on one side with utter ignorance on the other. The illustration is obviously borrowed from testamentary systems prevailing among Greeks and Romans (not among Hebrews) which enabled a father to appoint guardians for his orphan children during their minority. These testamentary powers differed considerably in different parts of the Roman world according to the municipal laws of various cities. Whereas Roman citizens became wards of the state at fourteen, so that the powers of testamentary guardians were strictly limited, the discretion of the father was allowed a wider range in Greek cities. At Athens, for instance, the guardians of Demosthenes retained control over his property till he became a full citizen after eighteen; and in Asiatic Greece the custody of property was sometimes prolonged to twenty-five, though the personal authority ceased at fourteen. The dependent position of an orphan is described in popular language without legal precision: ῥησίως is not a legal term, but an appropriate description for a child of tender years, naturally subject to the control of guardians (ἐπιτρόπους) and subordinate agents whom they might employ for household management or care of property (οἰκονόμους). It can hardly be right to identify the latter with the Roman curatores, for the special function of these officers was custody of property and not personal.

Ver. 3. ῥησίως: children, i.e., spiritually children. The clause points to the stage of undeveloped life through which converts from heathenism had passed, the spiritual childhood which had been the lot of earlier generations be-
The time was ripe for the Advent. —

The association of this word with ἐνικεῖσθαι fixes on it the conception of a rudimentary training to which the world was subjected during its spiritual infancy by way of preparation for the Gospel of Christ and the dispensation of the Spirit. Before men could enter into the spirit of His teaching, they had to learn the elementary principles of religion and morality. Compulsory obedience to definite rules of justice and order was a necessary preparation for the freedom of the Spirit. This preliminary education was given to the Hebrews in the Ten Commandments and the Law, it was imparted to a wider world in Greek civilization and philosophy, in Roman law and government, and in other forms of national and social life. These rudiments are disparaged in ver. 9 as weak and beggarly in comparison with the teaching of the Spirit, for Christian men ought to have outgrown their spiritual childhood. So, again, in Col. ii. 8, 20, they are condemned wherever their traditional hold on human society produces an antagonism to the higher teaching of Christ. But before the Advent they formed a valuable discipline for the education of the world.

Ver. 4. When God saw that the world was ripe for the Advent, He sent forth His Son. Until generations of mankind had learnt through years of social training to control some of the animal instincts of their lower nature, to rebel against its brutal passions, and cherish a desire to live in obedience to their higher nature, until they had developed some sense of sin and some craving after a holiness beyond their reach, they were not ready to welcome a Redeemer. — ἠγοράζων ... υἱόν. The incarnation of the Son of God took upon Him our nature and our duties. He was (1) born of woman, (2) made subject to Law. His subjection to Law is so expressly associated with the subjection of the world in general to Law that the term cannot be limited (as our versions limit it) to the Law of Moses. Christ was in fact subjected also to Roman Law, and died by its sentence.

Ver. 5. ἤ λλα τότε μὲν, οὐκ εἰδότες θεόν, ἔδωσεν ... θεοῦ. These two final clauses couple together two gracious purposes of God in the scheme of redemption, (1) the obliteration of a guilty past, (2) divine adoption with the blessings which sonship entails. The description under Law includes Gentiles as well as Jews: for though they had not the Law, they were not without Law to God (cf. Rom. ii. 14 ...); they have indeed been expressly specified in iii. 14 as included in the redemption from the curse of the Law. — ἀπολάβωμεν. This verb denotes receiving back, as ἀποδέχομαι does giving back (cf. Luke xix. 8): accordingly it describes the adoption in Christ as a restoration of the original birthright, withheld throughout many generations for the sake of necessary discipline.

Ver. 6. Sonship involves relations of mutual confidence and love between the Father who bestows His choicest gifts, and the Son who responds with His whole heart.

Ver. 7. θαύμα. This language is unusual, and many variations are found in MSS. and versions, amidst them the Received Text ὅτι Χριστοῦ, but there can be little question on MSS. evidence that the above is the genuine text. As for the true force of the words, the Epistle has now traced the scheme of redemption and design of bestowing a heavenly inheritance in Christ as far back as the patriarchs, and has shown that from the time of Abraham downwards God was disciplining Israel with a view to their becoming sons of God, and again that He was really ordering the lives of Gentiles likewise, though they knew Him not, with the same intent. With good reason therefore it is here said "through God—through His original
Vv. 8-10. But though in time past when you knew not God you were slaves to false gods, how can you, now that you have learnt to know Him, or rather have been recognised by Him, turn back to the lessons of childhood and crave a bondage to times and seasons?—The guilt of past idolatry is palliated on the score of ignorance, in the same spirit as in Acts xvii. 30, in order to press home the responsibility of those who have learnt to know God (γνώσεις Θεοῦ) in Christ. There was some excuse for their former bondage to imaginary gods who had no real existence: but how can they now turn back in heart to the weak and beggarly lessons of their spiritual childhood after they have received the spirit of sonship? Instead of ruling their own lives by reason and conscience under the guidance of the Spirit like men in Christ, they are bent on subjecting themselves like children to elementary rules of formal service.

Ver. 9. σαλπίζω δὲ. This correction is added, lest any should pride themselves on their knowledge of God, to warn them that it is not due to their own act, but to God who recognised them as His sons and revealed Himself to them. αὐθεντὴ καὶ πτυχή. Hitherto the Apostle has spoken with respect of the education given to the world before Christ (iv.1-3), bearing in mind the progress of the Greek and Roman world in social habits, in institutions and laws: they had in fact learnt much in the sphere of morals and natural religion that would bear comparison with the progress of Israel under the light of the revealed Law of God. But when he compares the mechanical routine of formal observances which formed the staple of religion for the heathen and for many so-called religious Jews with the spiritual teaching of the Gospel, he does not hesitate to denounce them as weak and beggarly.

Ver. 10. The observance of Sabbaths and new moons, of feasts and fasts, of sabbatical and jubilee years, was clearly enjoined by the ceremonial Law; and Paul admitted the obligations of that Law for himself and for all the Circumcision. He continued to frequent the Sabbath-worship of the synagogue, attended the feasts, bound himself under voluntary vows. What he condemns is the adoption of these practices by baptised Gentiles: for this imputed to them an inherent sacredness incompatible with the true freedom of the Spirit.

Vv. 11-20. Disappointment of the Apostle at the changed feeling of his Converts; reminiscences of the past; pathetic appeal to old affection; protest against present entanglement.—Ver. 12. Our versions abruptly sever the connection of this verse with the previous context, and do great violence to the Greek text in both clauses. They transpose the words ασκεῖτος (from their true place at the end of the verse to the beginning, and render γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, Be ye as I am. But this makes it = γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ ἐμα μοί (cf. Acts xxvi. 29), though it is impossible to understand ἐμα μοί in the Greek text after γίνεσθε. The context points distinctly to γινώσκω as the proper supplement after ὡς ἐγώ. The last verse has carried back the author's thoughts to his original ministry, and he proceeds to revive the remembrance of that period. "Act as I did (he exclaims); deal with me as I dealt with you." Instead of a mere vague admonition to imitate his character he is holding up his actual conduct for an example to them, and proceeds to specify the particular occasion to which he refers.—ἵνα ἐγὼ ἔμη. For I too beseech you as you, brethren, besought me. It is an undue, erroneous attempt to detach ἐγὼ from the following verb ἐμα μοί and supply ἐμα, as is done in our versions. The Greek requires a verb to be supplied after ἐμα μοί corresponding to ἐγώ ἐμα μοί ἐμα, and I understand accordingly ἐμα μοί ἐμα. The Galatians could not fail to recollect the occasion to which these words refer; for it was the true birthday of their
IV.

The memorable crisis when at the close of Paul's address the Jews departed from the synagogue, but the Gentiles besought him to repeat to them the words of life on the following Sabbath; after which many Jews and proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas persuading them to abide by the doctrine of the grace of God. (See Acts xiii. 42, 43. In the Greek text it is clear that the persuasion proceeded from them, and not from Paul and Barnabas.) The Galatians had then been suitors to Paul to maintain the freedom of the Gospel, he was now a suitor to them in his turn for its maintenance.— You had done me no wrong. The force of this clause appears from what follows: Paul is dwelling on the mutual relations between him and the Galatians at the time of that memorable petition. They on their side had done him no wrong, they had not driven him away by persecution or ill-treatment, yet up to that time (τά ρήματα) he had only been induced by illness to preach to them. The Galatians had, in short, given him no excuse for passing them by, as he in tended to do, until he was attacked by an illness which left him no option.

Ver. 13. διασκέδαστε. This can only mean owing to infirmity of the flesh, i.e., to illness. δία with accusative has the same causal force in the N.T. as in Attic Greek. The pathetic appeal to the Galatians, by night, is found in Homer, but δία subsequently lost its temporal force, and only regained it in the Latinised Greek of later centuries from confusion with the Latin per. The position of διὰ διασκέδαστε before the verb lays stress upon the fact that the ministry was due to illness alone, and not to spontaneous resolve.

It appears from this and the following verses that the illness occurred under the eyes of the Galatians, who watched its progress, were familiar with its repulsive symptoms, and displayed tender sympathy with the sufferer. They were aware also of the alteration it had made in his plans. The inference from these facts is clear, that he did not intend at the time of his arrival in Galatia to preach there at all, but was prostrated immediately after by sudden illness, and so forced to relinquish his previous project and abandon for the present any further journey. The only conceivable way, in short, in which an attack of illness in Galatia can have occasioned his preaching there was by involuntary detention. Here, accordingly, the motive for mentioning it is to show how little claim he had on the gratitude of the Galatians at that time, and how little he had deserved the tender sympathy which they exhibited. The historical connection of this illness with the ministry of Paul and Barnabas is investigated in the Introduction (pp. 135-7).

It has been suggested that this attack was perhaps identical with the σάλος τῆς σοφίας mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 7, and this may be true, but the real nature of the σάλος is unknown. Some features of this attack on the contrary may be inferred from the description given of its effects: it incapacitated the patient for travel, produced disfigurement and offensive symptoms, but allowed free intercourse with those around him. His success in winning the hearts of those who visited him in his sick chamber suggests a chronic ailment prolonged for a considerable time, as does also the complete change in his plans. The only definite hint given of a specific malady is the language of ver. 15: from which I gather that the eyesight was imperilled by a virulent attack of ophthalmia. That disease was notoriously prevalent in the lowlands of Pamphylia through which he had been travelling, and if so contracted, would produce the symptoms described. The pathetic appeal to Galatian sympathy on the score of imperfect sight in vi. 11 confirms this view. If his sight had been impaired by an illness to which they had themselves ministered with tender solicitude, they would be quick to feel for his privation.— τά ρήματα. Lightfoot contends with justice that this phrase cannot on account of the prefixed article refer to an indefinite period in time past. The author clearly had in his mind two distinct periods, an earlier and a later, during the earlier of which he states that his preaching had been occasioned by illness. This suggests that he referred perhaps to the two visits which he had paid to the Galatian Churches: and the suggestion is reasonable if his theory be accepted of sites in Northern Galatia, for no details are known of either visit. But it is quite incompatible with the history of his ministry in Southern Galatia recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. That lasted over two winters at the very least, comprised two visits at considerable intervals to each of
the Churches, and displayed throughout as resolute an initiative, as determined energy, as vigorous activity, as can be found in the whole course of his apostolic career. That ministry gave certainly no sign of illness, but the contrary. We have seen, however, that it was preceded by a prolonged illness, during which he was probably confined to his sick chamber and could only minister to those who visited him there.

His first ministry in Galatia passed in short through two distinct stages, first the private ministrations of a sick man, and then a public career of unexampled vigour and success. The last verse placed the readers on the division line between the two, for it reminded them of the memorable petition addressed to him and Barnabas at the close of his first public address in the synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch. It is, therefore, of the preceding period that he writes here, "You know that it was owing to illness that I had preached to you up to that time (to irpoToKov)." It is needless to dwell on the complete harmony of this interpretation with the context.

Ver. 14. tov ireipo-pov vpuv. The best MSS. all read vpuv, not pov or pou tov. The accusative tov ireipo-pov is not governed by 4(ov8<v^o-aTc or (cirrvo-aTc, whose real object is the u.c which follows cSc'£a.o-8c: it is really a dependent accusative in apposition to the sentence: As for the temptation to you in my flesh (i.e., the temptation to reject me with contempt and disgust on account of my diseased state), you did not...

Ver. 15. ou. . . . The MSS. are decisive in favour of ou, which makes excellent sense. "You congratulated yourselves," it is urged, "on my coming among you, you welcomed me as an angel, as Christ Himself: what has become of that feeling now? where is your satisfaction at your lot?" — 4&kappa. Some MSS. insert av before this verb: the addition would be necessary in Attic Greek to express the conditional force of the clause, but is not needed in Hellenistic Greek — ou 4(ov8<v^0-aTc. The full force of 4(ov8<v^0-aTc may be given in English by the rendering your own eyes: for it lays stress on the contrast between their eyes and those of Paul. The addition is significant, and strongly confirms the view that his eyes were the organ specially affected by his malady.

Ver. 16. 4(ov8<v^0-aTc is often used in the sense of therefore to introduce an imperative or an affirmative conclusion in the Epistles of Paul, but not an interrogation. I can see no reason here for making the clause interrogative: the rendering I am therefore become an enemy to you is quite in harmony with the context, which assumes the existence of some actual estrangement. This estrangement is attributed to plain speaking which had given offence to the disciples. As he had seen no trace of coldness at the time of his recent visit, he must be referring to some language which he had used on that occasion. Circumstances forced him to take up strong ground at that time on the subject of circumcision and to denounce the opposition and intrigues which he had encountered from the Pharisaic party.

Vv. 17, 18. The substantive 4(ov8<v^0-aTc (probably derived from 4(ov8<v,burn) denotes some kind of passionate desire. Whether it was of good or evil tendency depended on the nature of its object and the spirit in which it was pursued: for the same term was used to designate zeal for God or for some noble object, personal passion, or an exclusive spirit of selfish jealousy. The verb 4(ov8<v^0-aTc partakes of the same neutral quality. Its figurative meaning is here borrowed from the efforts of a lover to win favour. The Pharisaic party affected (i.e., courted) the Galatians in a selfish spirit, being minded to shut them out of their rightful inheritance in
18. καλὸν δὲ τὸ ζηλοῦσαι ἐν καλῷ πάντως, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ
παρείναι με πρὸς ὅμως, 19. τεκνία μου, οδὸς πάλιν ἀφιέρων, μεχρίς
οὐ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὅμιν. 20. ἡθελον δὲ παρείναι πρὸς ὅμως
ὁρτί, καὶ ἀλλαξεῖ τὴν φωνήν μου, διὸ ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὅμιν.

1. τεκνία Ἡ:ACDPEKLP; τεκνα Ἡ:BD1FG.

Christ, that they might reduce them to
dependence on their own Law. Paul
also courted them, not for his own glory,
but that he might join them to Christ, and
he was glad that they should be courted
at all times, even by others in his absence,
if it was done in a right spirit. They
affect you (he writes, i.e., court you) not
honourably, but are minded to shut you
out that you may affect them. But it is
good for you to be affected at all times
and not only when I am present with
you.—τίχθωσε. As there are no other
instances of τίνα being followed by an
indicative present in Pauline language,
it is probable that this and ψωυωνεθά in
1 Cor. iv. 6 are really forms of the sub-
junctive, though (τίχθωσε) is the contracted
form in general use.

Ver. 19. τικυιοῦν. This is an
accusative in apposition to ὅμιν, not
a vocative introducing a fresh appeal.
It is clear from the addition of the con-
necting particle ἢ after ἢσάαν that that
word begins a new sentence. τεκνία is
usually a term of maternal endearment;
and though addressed by John in his first
Epistle to his children in Christ, is not
used elsewhere by Paul, who prefers to
address them as children (τεκνα), rather
than as children (τεκνα). But in this passage
he is adopting the figure of a child-bearing
mother; he is in travail for the spiritual
birth of Christ within them (as he says),
and straining all his powers to renew
once more the spiritual life which had
died in them until he could succeed in
shaping their inner man afresh into the
image of Christ.

Ver. 20. ἡθελον. This imperfect ex-
presses a modified wish, qualified by im-
plied conditions, like ψηχόμεν in Rom.
ix. 3 and ἰδουδέλον in Acts xxv. 22.
He would fain be with them now (ὁρτί)
instead of waiting for some future oppor-
tunity, were it not that he was unavoid-
ably detained by other claims.—ἀλλαξεῖ.
This is interpreted by some as a threat
of increased severity, by others as a
craving for the use of gentler words;
but neither interpretation agrees with
the regular Greek usage of the word.

The natural meaning of the Greek ex-
pression is to exchange the voice for
some other means of persuasion, in this
case for the pen, and this sense is clearly
indicated by the context. Paul longs to
come and speak to them instead of writing,
and is confident of his power to clear away
doubts and errors by personal intercourse.

—ἀποροῦμαι. This middle voice denotes
the inward distress of a mind tossed to and
fro by conflicting doubts and fears.

Vv. 21-30. Patriarchal history is
employed to illustrate the perse-
cution of Christians, who are the
promised seed of Abraham, by Jews
who are his seed after the flesh.
Hagar and her son, Sarah and her
son, furnish prophetic types of
the mutual relations between the
two. As his elder son, the slave-
born Ishmael, was cast out for
mocking the freeborn child, so the
older Israel under bondage to the
Law will bring on themselves the
doom of national rejection by per-
secuting the true Israel of God
whom Christ hath endowed with
the freedom of the Spirit.—The
force of this illustration depends on the
distinction drawn in iii. 16-22 between
the seed of promise and the seed of
Abraham after the flesh. The argument
of Rom. ix. 6 ... is likewise based on
the successive exclusion of the latter
from inheritance of the blessing. John
the Baptist and Jesus Himself expressly
warned the Jews not to rely on their
claim to be sons of Abraham.

Isaac the child of promise, only son of
a free mother after years of barrenness,
and heir to an indisputable birthright,
apty prefigured the Church of Christ,
born in the fulness of time, made free
by the gift of the Spirit, and established
for ever in the house of their heavenly
Father by an eternal covenant of adoption.
Ishmael again, who had for some years
filled the position of a son without the
birthright which could entitle him to
inherit the blessing, but was eventually
driven out for his mockery of the promised
child, supplied an exact prototype of
Israel after the flesh, long recognised as the people of God, but bound under the Law, and eventually destined to be shut out from the household of God for their guilt in persecuting Christ and His Church.

— τῷ νόμῳ οὐκ ἀκοινώθη. This is a reproof addressed to men who are bent on upholding the authority of the Law, but are indifferent to the lessons which it teaches. ἀκοινώθη has this force of listening, not only when used absolutely, but when coupled as it is here with an accusative (cf. Luke x. 39, Eph. i. 13).

Ver. 22. γέγραται δὲ. The statement which follows is not a quotation, but a summary of recorded facts.

Hagar and Sarah are entitled the handmaid and the freewoman because they are accepted types of each class in Scripture. In the LXX παιδίσκη denotes any young woman (e.g., Ruth) as it does in Attic Greek, but in the N.T. παιδίσκη, a handmaid, corresponds to παῖς, a male servant.

Ver. 23. The two who were coupled together in the last verse as sons of one father are here contrasted in respect of their different mothers. — γεγένηται. The perfect is used in order to present the birth as a Scripture record now in existence (cf. Heb. xi. 17, 28 . . .): otherwise the story would have been inappropriate. — διὰ τῆς παιδίσκης. There is an alternative reading διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας supported by equal MS. authority: but it is difficult to attach any meaning to the article, whereas διὰ παιδίσκην forms an appropriate antithesis to κατά σάρκα. Luke xii. 21 describes the attendant circumstances under which the birth took place, διὰ not having an instrumental force.

Ver. 24. διὰ παῖς ἡ παῖς ἀλληγοροῦμενα. No doubt is thrown on the historical truth of the patriarchal history by classing the story of Ishmael with allegories: though an additional value is thereby claimed for it as embodying spiritual truth, and typifying the permanent relation between the two seeds.— αὕτη γὰρ ἄβανν. The two women are identified with the two covenants, the Sinaitic and the Christian, which they typify: and the characteristic features of the two are declared to be slavery and freedom.— γεννώσα. This term is applied to the conception of the mother in Luke i. 13, 57 also, though more often applied to the father.

Ver. 25. τῷ γὰρ. The variety of readings in the MSS., τῷ ἀγαφῷ ἀγαφῶ, τῷ ἀγαφῷ, τῷ ἀγαφῷ, τῷ ἀγαφῷ, indicates some primitive error of transcription. It is hardly possible to extract any reasonable sense from the three first: for τῷ ἀγαφῷ cannot mean Hagar herself: it denotes the name Hagar, and Stanley's attempt to connect this name with Sinai proved futile. How then can the statement be understood that the name Hagar is Sinai, or that it answers to Jerusalem? How again can the superfluous description of Sinai as a mountain in Arabia be explained? Moreover, the reading τῷ ἀγαφῷ without any connecting particle is intolerable in Greek language, and διὰ γὰρ was probably added to correct the solecism. Hence I conclude that τῷ ἀγαφῷ was probably an error in transcription for the original γὰρ, suggested by its occurrence immediately before.

The statement in the text on the contrary, "For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia," is full of meaning when it is remembered that Hagar had no connection with Sinai itself, but that she found a home for herself and her children in Arabia. — τῷ ἀγαφῷ. The previous clause to γὰρ . . . Ἀραβία is a parenthesis, ἡ γὰρ is therefore the subject of σωτηρίας. The Apostle finds in the actual state of Jerusalem and her children the same characteristic feature of slavery as in the covenant of Sinai.

Ver. 26. ἢ ἡ παῖς λεπτότης. The Psalms and
Prophets attest the enthusiastic devotion of Israelites to the city of Jerusalem. Since the temple of God and the palace of the house of David were within its walls, it was at once the holy city round which clustered the religious feelings of Israel, and the city of the great king, of whom the royal house of David were representatives. The events of the captivity and restoration associated it still more intimately with the national fortunes and aspirations of Israel. Hence both Isaiah and Ezekiel invested it with ideal glory in their prophetic anticipations of the Messianic kingdom. Their visions of its future destiny looked forward to its becoming the centre of a world-wide worship: there the great King of all the earth would manifest His presence, and thither would flow all nations, offering their homage and bearing due tribute of gifts and sacrifices. But the Hebrew ideal scarcely rose above imaginations of an earthly city and a temple on the mountains of Israel. It was the function of Christian inspiration to spiritualise this conception, to eliminate its local association with the typical temple on earth, and to substitute a heavenly for an earthly city. The Apocalypse bears witness to the process of transition. Though it adheres closely to the vision of Ezekiel, and continues to employ material imagery for expressing the dazzling brightness and intense purity of the temple-city, yet the New Jerusalem is now seen coming down from heaven to a new earth; in place of earthly light it is illuminated by the light which emanates from the throne of God and of the Lamb; and material images are interpreted as symbols of moral beauty and spiritual holiness. The Epistle to the Hebrews views the heavenly Jerusalem from another side. Though it depicts its buildings, streets and rivers, the Epistle describes the throng of angels, the assembly of the first-born, the spirits of departed saints that are gathered there round the throne of God, and contrasts the awful majesty of the living God with the material terrors of Sinai. This Epistle presents the contrast between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, and between the covenants of Sinai and of Christ in a different aspect. For the Apostle embodies in his conception a purely Greek ideal of a city, the mother and home of freemen. A self-governed body of free citizens, subject to no foreign control, but maintaining justice and order in perfect peace by their own sovereign will, furnishes him with an appropriate type of the heavenly commonwealth, whereof Christians are even now citizens, dwelling in peace together in the unity of Christian brotherhood, and independent of all restraints of law because they themselves do the will of God from the heart. The Hebrew form 'Ieroupoliμυ is naturally preferred to the Greek in all these passages, because Jerusalem is personified as an ideal city. The stress here laid on the freedom of Christ's disciples recalls the conversation of Christ with the Jews in John viii. 32. . . but the bondage is there more distinctly associated with actual sin. Ver. 27. The prophecy of Isaiah liv. 1, here quoted from the LXX, describes the restoration of Zion, the enlargement of her borders and increase of her people, under the figure of a wife long neglected and barren, but now restored to the favour of her husband and fruitful in children. This picture was perhaps suggested to the prophet by the history of Sarah's prolonged barrenness before she became the fruitful mother of Israel, and is peculiarly appropriate for describing the long delayed but fertile growth of the Christian Church, of which she was the typical mother. Ver. 29. Bλαικεν. This imperfect denotes a tendency and disposition rather than actual persecution on the part of Ishmael. The nearest approach to it recorded is in fact his mockery of Isaac on the occasion of his weaning (Gen. xxii. 9). The LXX gives a different version of his conduct on that occasion,
which is accepted in the margin of the Revised Version, and seems more in harmony with the circumstances, viz., that he was playing with the child, bearing himself in short as an elder brother in the family, and that the jealousy of Sarah was aroused lest he should claim an elder brother's share of the inheritance. But the Apostle adopts the traditional view of his conduct which was accepted by the Jews, in consequence perhaps of the subsequent feud between the two races; and discovers in Ishmael the same jealous temper that was exhibited by Jewish persecutors towards the infant Church.

Ver. 30. Again, the expulsion of Ishmael gives warning that those who observe the letter of the Law only, and lack the true spirit of sonship, though they render formal obedience to the will of the Father, have no abiding inheritance in His house.

Chapters IV. 31—V. 12. Freedom is our birthright in Christ and an essential condition of our call. Accordingly the Apostle protests against the claim that all Christians should be circumcised, as a departure from the spirit of Christ, a dangerous innovation which the Churches will certainly condemn, and a superstitution of the flesh on a par with the grossest heathen superstitions.—Ver. 31. The preceding allegory has illustrated the essential difference between the heritage of Jews and Christians. Whereas Jews inherit bondage to Law, freedom is the Christian birthright, derived from their heavenly mother. The Apostle now proceeds to enforce the truth that Christ bestowed this freedom upon us, and that it is an essential principle of our call.

Chapter V.—Ver. 1. In the original text, which I have adopted in accordance with the best MS. authority, the first clause of this verse is clearly detached from the second and attached to the preceding without any connecting particle. But this primary connection with the preceding verse was apparently obscured at an early period of Church history, owing probably to the frequent use of the important section v. 1 ff. as a Church lesson by itself apart from the preceding allegory. It is difficult otherwise to account for the great variety of connecting particles employed in MS. versions and quotations to transform the fragment into a complete sentence, e.g., the addition of or yap, and the omission of after evidently corrections made with one object. The division of chapters has unfortunately perpetuated this error. But the removal of the full stop after restores the full force of the original passage: Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but Christ set us free with the freedom of the freewoman. The threefold iteration, free, freedom, freewoman, marks with expressive emphasis the importance of this Christian birthright.—. The best MSS. place the object before the subject, as in a complete sentence, e.g., converts had all alike, whether Jews or Greeks, been under bondage to some law, human or divine: all had been set free by Christ, but might now, by the voluntary adoption of circumcision, forfeit this freedom and rivet the yoke of Law about their own necks.—Ver. 2. The Apostle finds it necessary to express pointedly his own personal judgment on the effect of circumcision in consequence of false reports which had been circulated that he had
given some sanction to the new doctrine.

(See ver. 11.)

Ver. 3. μαρτύρομαι. This verb, which in classical Greek denotes the calling of witnesses, is applied in Pauline language to the Apostle's own testimony.—περιτεμνομένης, περιτεμνομένης. The use of the present tense intimates that the warning is not aimed at isolated acts, but at the introduction of a systematic practice in involving a virtual transfer of allegiance from Christ to the Law.

Ver. 4. Κατάπυγνοι. This verb is applied with comprehensive force to any destruction of growth and life, physical or spiritual, beneficial or deleterious. Joined with ἵππος it denotes the loss of some essential element of life by the severance of previous intimate relations, e.g., annulment by death of a wife's obligations to her husband (Rom. vii. 2), and emancipation from the control of the Law by spiritual death (Rom. vii. 6). Here, in like manner, it denotes the paralysis of spiritual life by severance of union with Christ; this paralysis produces a deadening effect on the whole spiritual nature, and results in the continuous craving for legal justification which is expressed by δικαιοσύνη. — έπεισοτα. As the quasi-passive verb ὑπείσοτα corresponds to the active verb ἐβασιλεύεις in iv. 30; so that the combination of καταπυγνήσθης with ἐπείσοτα contains a special allusion to the doom of Ishmael, who suffered the loss of his inheritance at the same time that he was cast out from his father's house. Disloyal children of God, who prefer bondage to filial freedom, have by their own act forfeited the birthright of sons, and been cast out from His favour and blessing.

Ver. 5. πνεύματι. In the absence of an article this dative must have an adverbial force, and should be rendered in spirit. The Holy Spirit is uniformly designated τῷ Πνεύματι.— ἐπεκδεχόμεθα. This verb expresses eager expectation rather than the attitude of patient waiting attributed to it in our versions. True faith in Christ inspires a confident hope of acceptance (δικαιοσύνης) before God.

Ver. 6. Circumcision conveyed no spiritual blessing in return for its binding pledge of obedience to the Law. In 1 Cor. vii. 17-22 it is placed in the same category as marriage and slavery, outward conditions of life which are neither good nor evil in themselves, but are the appointed portion of some, who should therefore loyally accept the burden or the blessing. Paul not only paid due respect to the Law himself, but even circumcised Timothy, when he desired to take him with him as his minister in Christ amidst Jews, that he might avoid needless offence. But he warned his disciples at the same time that in resorting to it for salvation they were really denying the faith, and forfeiting their birthright of Christian freedom.—διὰ (πάντων. The rendering of our versions by or through love confuses faith with love, as though faith was the result of love or worked through its instrumentality. But the clause really describes a combination of two distinct graces: there may be intense faith without love (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 2); but faith ought to work in love, i.e., in a spirit of love. Love is the atmosphere amid which faith should put forth its energy. This force of διὰ has been already noted in the case of διὰ τοῦ μόρου (ii. 19).— ἐπεργούμενη. The middle voice is here employed to describe the inner working of the spirit of man, the active is used for recording God's work for man in ii. 8.

Ver. 7. ἐνεκοθήν. The figure of a race, introduced by ἐπεργεῖτε, is here carried on. Hitherto they had run a smooth course of obedience to truth; who had thrown obstacles in their way?

Ver. 8. It was God who called Abraham, Moses, Samuel and the prophets of
and was now calling the Galatians through the Gospel of which Paul was minister, but this new persuasion was no true gospel, and did not come forth from Him.

Ver. 9. Leaven became a type of moral and spiritual corruption in virtue of the fermentation it engenders. A very small lump might readily form a centre of widespread corruption; so stringent precautions were adopted in Jewish households for the removal of every particle before the days of unleavened bread. Hence the origin of the proverb quoted here and in 1 Cor. v. 6. It is clear that the taint of heresy had not yet spread widely through the Galatian Churches: it was more its insidious nature than its actual extent that alarmed the Apostle.

Ver. 10. The emphatic iwi with which this verse opens reminds the converts of the Apostle's personal claims in the Lord on their allegiance. He reckons with confidence on their support in pronouncing the judgment of their church on any who may disregard this warning. Every offender shall bear his own responsibility, whoever he may be.

Ver. 11. It seems strange in view of Paul's later career that he should have needed to repudiate, however briefly and scornfully, the charge of still preaching circumcision as he had before his conversion. After his open breach with the synagogue, indeed, at Corinth and at Ephesus it would have been hardly possible to advance such a plea. But he had recently, before writing this Epistle, taken two steps open to this misconstruction on which agitators could fasten. He had deposited with the Galatians for their guidance the resolution adopted by the Church at Jerusalem which recommended scrupulous regard for the Law in certain matters, and he had himself circumcised a Galatian convert whose father had been a Greek. Paul contents himself with pointing for answer to the persecutions which he was still enduring at the hands of Jews, probably those which befell him in Macedonia.— aupa. The interrogative aupa is far more appropriate to the context than the inferential aupa. The Apostle, being accused of currying favour with the Jews, points indignantly to the persecutions he was suffering from them and exclaims, "Hath the stumbling-block of the Cross been done away?"

Ver. 12. apla. This adverb occurs also in 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Rev. iii. 15. In all three places it expresses dissatisfaction with the actual position, "Would that it were otherwise". But it acquires this force from its combination with past tenses, like the aorist apla in Attic Greek. When coupled however with a future as it is here, it does not express a wish, but like the future of apla declares what ought to be the logical outcome of the present. The clause predicts in bitter irony to what final consummation this superstitious worship of circumcision must lead. Men who exalt an ordinance of the flesh above the spirit of Christ will be bound in the end to proceed to mutilation of the flesh like heathen votaries.— aripokfronai. This word was habitually used to describe the practice of mutilation which was so prevalent in the Phrygian worship of Cybele. The Galatians were necessarily familiar with it, and it can hardly bear any other sense.— arapevai. This word forcibly expresses the revolutionary character of the agitation which was upsetting the peace and order of the Galatian Churches. It is used in Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38 to denounce seditious and riotous conduct.

Vv. 13-15. Freedom is an essential element of Christian life, to be used not for self-indulgence, but for willing service to the Law of
Ver. 13. ἐν' ἐλευθερίᾳ. Our versions render this unto (for R.V.) freedom, as though it were the design of the Gospel to lead to freedom. But the Greek text affirms rather that God's call was based upon freedom, and so makes it an essential element in spiritual life and the inalienable right of every true Christian.—μόνον μὴ. A warning is added that freedom, essential as it is to spiritual life, is open to abuse by carnal men, and that it is subject to the demands of the higher Law of mutual love. "Only do not treat it as an opening for carnal self-indulgence, but for loving service to each other." μόνον is used in the same elliptical way in ii. 10 and 2 Thess. ii. 7; and the ellipsis of the verb after μὴ is common in rhetorical passages.—ἀφορμα. This term was applied in military language to a base of operations, and generally to any starting-point for action. In Rom. vii. 8, 11, 2 Cor. xi. 12 it denotes an opening for sin, as it does here.—ὅποιεν. This injunction contains an imitative adoption of the word neighbour by Christ in his teaching. 

Ver. 14. πεπληρωμα. MS. authority is decisive in favour of this perfect against the present πληροῦμαι. The perfect is likewise adopted in the parallel passage Rom. xiii. 8, ὥσπερ τῶν νόμων πεπληρωμα. For the very existence of love in the heart attests the completion of a previous inward act of the will.—ἐν ἐνι λόγῳ. The single precept which follows embodies in itself the whole duty to man.
After the coexistence of two conflicting forces, spirit and flesh, in the heart of man has been definitely affirmed, it is here added that these are set in mutual antago-
nism to each other for the express purpose of due control over the human will. Both alike derive their being from the same Creator, though one belongs to the natural, the other to the spiritual, creation: both alike continue by His will to fulfil their several parts in the scheme of Christian life. It is beside the purpose of the Epistle to analyse the functions of the flesh in the economy of nature, or to affirm the absolute dependence of the human will on the spontaneous action of its desires for vital force and energy: enough that by the will of God they too form an essential element in Christian life: the Epistle deals not with their beneficial action, but with their liability to perversio-

sion. For their indiscriminate craving for indulgence renders them constantly liable to become ministers of sin. The mind of the flesh, if left without a check, issues in enmity to God and death (cf. Rom. viii.6, 7). Wholesome restraint is therefore a condition essential to their healthy action. In every community this is to a certain extent provided by the discipline of education, by social order and law. But in true Christians a far more effective control is maintained by the spirit, since it is capable of combating every wrong desire within the heart before it issues in sinful action, and so by constantly checking any wrong indulgence it gradually neutralises the power of selfish appetites, and establishes an habitual supremacy over the whole mind and will, until in the ideal Christian it brings them into perfect harmony with the mind of Christ.

Ver. 18. Law finds no just occasion against men who are led by the spirit, for they themselves check every wrong desire within them, and so fulfil the whole Law. The identity of Law with justice and right is, of course, assumed.

Ver. 19. Though this verse enumerates only evil works of the flesh, it is not thereby suggested that its action is wholly evil; for the flesh has been shown to have its appointed function from God, and to be essential to the human will. The opening ἐπίσκεψις puts the following catalogue of crimes and vices in its true light as samples, produced by way of specimen of the evil effects wrought by excessive indulgence of natural appetites without due control, and not an exhaustive list of the works of the flesh, as the rendering which, in our versions, rather suggests. The list begins and ends with sensual vices due to the lower animal nature; it couples idolatry with its habitual ally sorcery: in specifying the various quarrels between man and man it adds two διακοσματικοὶ and ἄλλοις to the corresponding list in 2 Cor. xii.20, perhaps owing to the prevalence of religious dissensions in the Galatian churches.—αιτῶν. This term, which in classical Greek expresses insolent contempt for public opinion, denotes in the N.T. shameless outrages on public decency—a fit climax to fornication and uncleanness.

Ver. 20. ζηλος. See note on iv.17.—ἐπίθετα. The apparent derivation of this word from ἐπίθετος (a hiring) points to mercenary motives. The Apostle elsewhere associates it with jealousy, envy and vainglory, and contrasts it with sincerity, union and love. It denotes, probably, selfish intrigues.—ἀλοιφάσις. This term is used in the N.T. to designate any religious sect or party, e.g., the Pharisees, Sadducees, Nazarenes (as the Jews designated Christians).

Ver. 21. προσιδόντων. No particular admonition is here specified: warnings against these sins had, of course, formed the staple of many former discourses.

The Epistle has already claimed for
Christians the inheritance of sons. That this inheritance included a kingdom needed no proof; for the conception of a Messianic kingdom ran through Hebrew prophecy and covered the whole range of Gospel teaching.

Ver. 22. Since the object of this verse is to exhibit the harmony between the fruit of the spirit and the restraints of law, those qualities only are specified which affect man's duty to his neighbour. Love with its unfailing attendants, inward joy and peace, supplies the motive power; long-suffering in the face of wrongs and ill-treatment, kindness in rendering service to others, and goodness in the free bestowal of bounty on those who need, cannot fail to gain goodwill; good faith, meekness, self-control enlist confidence and respect. — irforis. It is clear from the subordinate place here assigned to irlo'Tisthat it does not here denote the cardinal grace of faith in God which is the very root of all religion, but rather good faith in dealings with men, and due regard to their just claims.

Ver. 23. TrpauTTjs: Meekness is the outcome of true humility, the bearing towards others which results from a lowly estimate of ourselves. — ἀγάπη: Love with its unfailing attendants, inward joy and peace, supplies the motive power; long-suffering in the face of wrongs and ill-treatment, kindness in rendering service to others, and goodness in the free bestowal of bounty on those who need, cannot fail to gain goodwill; good faith, meekness, self-control enlist confidence and respect. — διπλωματεῖς. This verb denotes some	times the original framing of a mechanism (e.g., of the human body and of the universe in Heb. x. 5, xi. 3), but more often its readjustment (e.g., the setting of a broken limb, or the mending of nets in Matt. iv. 21). Here it indicates the correction of an offender with a view to
his restoration; and the need of meekness
and forbearance for the due execution
of this delicate task is enforced.

The transition from the plural katarti-
_καταρτι_ to the singular_ οὐκο_ is instructive.
The treatment of offenders belonged to
the Church collectively, but each member
needed to examine himself individually,
in order that he might fulfil his part with
due humility and sympathy.

Ver. 2. πατραλτρε. From its original
sense of taking up, this verb acquires the
most various meanings, e.g., carrying in
Matt. xx. 12, ministration in Matt. iii. 11,
robbery in John xii. 6. Here it signifies
lending a hand to help by lifting heavy
loads. This does not involve transference
of the burden, for it is said in 2 Cor. viii.
13, I mean not that other men be eased
and ye burdened: and in ver. 5 it is added
that each will have his own pack to bear;
but Christian love must ever be carefulto
relieve each in turn when overtaxed by
crushing loads.

Vv. 3-5. Any conceit of our own
strength or goodness is a vain delusion,
for we are nothing. Let no man compare
his own with others' work: but let each
scrutinise his own work. Then, if he
find there ground for rejoicing, it will be
in the ability that has been given by God's
grace to such a one as he is: for each will
have his own burden to bear of conscious
guilt and shame.

Ver. 4. τὸν ἔτερον. This phrase
denotes originally the other of two persons,
but in this connexion _another than self_,
the world being classified under two heads
_self and not self_, so that any other man
with whom we are brought into contact
belongs to the other group.

Ver. 5. φορτίων. This word was
applied to the pack usually carried by a
porter or a soldier on the march. In
Matt. xi. 30 Christ employs this figure
to describe the burden which he lays on
each of his disciples (τὸ φορτίον μου),
and here it denotes the regular daily bur-
den laid on Christians. It is necessary
to distinguish this from the heavy loads
(βάρη) to which ver. 2 refers as needing
the help of Christian brethren for the
relief of overtaxed carriers.

Ver. 6. Let him that is taught share
with him that teacheth. The word
κοινωνέω contains the key to the true
meaning of this verse. Our versions
understand it here, and in Rom. xii. 13,
Phil. iv. 15, in the sense of communicating
to others; but I can find no warrant
for this in Greek usage. In Rom. xv. 27
it signifies distinctly to receive a share,
and elsewhere to become a partner
(κοινωνεῖν γενέσθαι) and share in common
with others (1 Tim. v. 22, 1 Pet.
iv. 13, 2 John 11, Heb. ii. 14). Here in
like manner it enjoins upon the leaders
of the Churches the duty of admitting
all the members to participation in any
spiritual blessings they enjoy. It con-
tinues, in fact, the protest against the
arrogant pretensions and selfish exclusive-
ness of Judaising leaders.—_ἀγαθοί._ It
is impossible to restrict this word to mere
worldly goods, except where the language
of the context suggests or warrants such
a restriction, as is the case in Luke xii.
18, xvi. 25. The language here points
to the blessings of Christian faith and
document.— _κατηχούμενοι_. Oral teach-
ing is specified because it was the only
form of instruction then existing in the
Churches.

Vv. 7-10. God's Judgment is un-
erring. Those who sow either to
the flesh or to the spirit shall
alike reap the harvest for which
they have sown. But faint not in
welldoing, for we shall in due time
reap life eternal.—Ver. 7. μυ-
πρόβλεται. From its original sense of
sneer this verb was applied in rhetorical
language to the betrayal of covert ill-will
and contempt by cynical gestures in spite
of fair words. There can be no double-
VI.

1. Every action produces an effect on the character of the actor corresponding as exactly to its motive as the fruit to the seed. If it springs from selfish desire, it stimulates the growth of evil lusts, and issues in a harvest of inward corruption. If, on the contrary, it be done in obedience to the spirit, it quickens spiritual growth, and issues eventually in a harvest of eternal life.

The heart of man resembles a field in which he sows, by the mere exercise of his will, a future harvest of good or evil.

2. The warnings μὴ ἐμπαυσάτε and μὴ ἐξουσιάζετε carry on figures borrowed from harvest work: the former depicts husbandmen tempted to slacken theirexertion by weariness of prolonged labour, the latter reapers overcome by heat and toil.

3. The last verse affirmed that there is a due season for the spiritual harvest as well as the earthly; the same analogy suggests the existence of a spiritual seedtime also, which we are bound to utilise.

absolute reliance on the Cross and the new life of the Spirit, and concluding with a personal appeal and final blessing.—Ver. 11. The Greek text admits but one meaning. The use of the instrumental dative precludes the rendering See how large a letter I write, which would require πηλικά γράμματα: so that the verse obviously calls attention to the large letters employed by the writer from this point onwards. The statement in 2 Thess. iii. 17, that he regularly dictated the body of his Epistles (cf. also Rom. xvi. 22), merely attaching his signature by way of attestation, explains this appeal. The size of the letters attested the difficulty which he found in writing with his imperfect sight, and the effort he was now making on their behalf proved his anxiety for the welfare of his Galatian disciples. They were evidently well aware of his infirmity, and needed no explanation of this pathetic allusion to his blindness. It may, therefore, be reasonably read in connexion with iv. 15. Probably the prolonged attack of ophthalmia which had threatened the destruction of his sight had seriously impaired it, and they who had watched his sufferings with such tender sympathy would now be quick to feel for the privation which the attack had entailed upon him. ἐγράφα: I write. The epistolary aorist is constantly used to denote personal acts of the writer at the time (2 Cor. ix. 3, Eph. vi. 22, Col. iv. 8, Philem. 19, 21).

Vv. 12, 13. Paul impugns the sincerity of the agitators: their affected zeal for the Law was a pretext with a view to disarming Jewish enmity: they urged the circumcision of Gentiles also to gratify their own vanity. They had probably, like the Jewish Christians at Antioch (cf. ii. 13), been guilty of inconsistency
in their practice: but Paul apparently relies also on his argument in ii. 16 that Jewish converts had by the mere act of embracing Christ confessed their own inability to keep the Law, and could not therefore be sincere in preaching to others obedience to its rules. This dative cannot surely mean for (i.e., by reason of) the cross. If this had been the meaning, it would have been expressed by διά τὸν σταυρόν. The correct translation seems to be, persecuted with the cross, i.e., the cross of outward suffering which was in those days the lot of so many converted Jews, and notably of Paul himself. The Cross of Christ is here identified with persecution as it is in Phil iii. 18 with self-denial.

Ver. 13. περιτεμνόμενοι. The present participle is more appropriate than the perfect irpiTciTVO|, which is read by some MSS.: for the author has in mind the adoption of a system, as in v. 3.

Ver. 14. Paul contrasts his own spirit with that which his rivals are manifesting. They are animated by selfish desires to glory over the flesh of others, he will glory only in the triumph of the cross over his own flesh, whereby the power of the world over him, and his carnal love of the world, are both done away.

Ver. 15. Circumcision is again declared, as in v. 6, to be a mere accident of outward circumstance and of no spiritual import: faith working in love was there pronounced essential for Christian life, and here a new creation, the birth of the spirit in the heart of man.

Ver. 16. κανών. Men need a rule to guide their lives as the surveyor or the carpenter for the right adjustment of his work. This rule was supplied to the Jew by the Law in a code of morals, but the Spirit quickens in Christians a new life whereby the conscience is enlightened to discern good and evil for the regulation of their lives.—καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ: yea upon the Israel of God. καὶ is not properly copulative here, but intensive. Those who walk by the rule of the Spirit are declared to be indeed the true Israel of God, not the Jews who have the name of Israel, but are really only children of Abraham after the flesh.

Ver. 17. τοῦ λόγου... In deprecating any renewal of the present agitation Paul treats with contempt the prospect of serious danger from it. It had disturbed his peace and the peace of the Church, and must be got rid of, but he describes it as a wearisome annoyance rather than a real peril.—στέγαστα. These were indelible marks branded on the flesh. They might be self-inflicted: instances are recorded of soldiers branding themselves with the name of their general in token of their absolute devotion to his cause. But they were as a rule inflicted for a badge of lifelong service; the figure in the text is borrowed from the latter, which were either penal or sacred. The penal were stamped on malefactors, runaway slaves, sometimes on captives; but it is clear from the context that the author has in mind the στέγαστα ἰδι mentioned by Herodotus in ii., 113, with which the Galatians also were familiar in Phrygian temples. A class of slaves (παραδόται) attached for life to the service of a temple were branded with the name of the deity. Paul likens himself to these in respect of his lifelong dedication to the name of Jesus, and of the marks imprinted on his body, by which he was sealed for a servant of Jesus in perpetuity. These were doubtless the scars left by Jewish scourging, by the stones of Lystra and the Roman rods at Philippi, all tokens of faithful service to his Master in which he gloried.

Ver. 18. μετὰ τ. πνεύματος. This form of the final blessing occurs also in 2 Tim. iv. 22 and Philemon 25, but not elsewhere: it was probably suggested
ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ

17. Τοῦ λοιποῦ, κόπως μοι μηδεῖς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ 1 ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. 18. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Γαλάτας. 2

1 Ἰησοῦ ΑΒΓ 17; Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ CD'EKL; Κ. Ι. Χριστοῦ Ν.
2 πρὸς γαλάτας ΕΔ'ΑΒΓ 6, 17, 135; add ετελεσθῇ FG; add ετληρωθῇ DE; add εγραφῇ απὸ Ρώμης ΚΡ 47.

here by the stress laid on the life of the oldest MSS. stamps it as an addition of later date. The Epistle was evidently genuine nor correct. Its absence in the

Introduction, pp. 144-7).
APPENDIX A.

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

The Apostolic Council forms a central landmark in the Christian life of Paul between his conversion and his Roman imprisonment, dividing the interval into two unequal portions. The length of the earlier is computed in Gal. ii. 1 at fourteen years; but this may not imply a total of more than thirteen; for the broken years at the beginning and end are both included separately in that total. The three first of these were spent in Damascus, except a brief sojourn in Arabia, according to Gal. i. 18: the remainder in or around Tarsus and Antioch, with the exception of one brief visit to Jerusalem for the conveyance of alms, and a subsequent mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The visit to Jerusalem was too uneventful to call for notice in the Epistle. Its incidental connection with the history of Herod Agrippa determines its date: Herod reigned from 41 to 44; his persecution of the Church occurred not long before his death, and had already begun when the envoys arrived at Jerusalem. The joint mission occupied at least two years, probably much more; its success established the position of Barnabas and Paul throughout the Church as Apostles to the Gentiles, and led to the controversy in regard to circumcision which was settled by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem; evidently no long time intervened between its termination and the Council. From that time forward the continuous narrative of events in the Acts furnishes material for dating approximately the successive stages of Paul's apostolic career. He and Barnabas returned at once from Jerusalem to Antioch, and many Christians gathered there from Jerusalem, including Peter and others whose names are mentioned. The length of their sojourn in Antioch and the neighbouring Churches cannot be determined with precision, as it is not known at what season the Council took place; if at the beginning of winter, they must have remained there the whole winter; if near the end, perhaps only a few weeks. In either case it is certain that neither Barnabas nor Paul started...
before spring, for the navigation of the Levant and the passes of Mount Taurus between Cilicia and Galatia were alike closed in winter to ordinary travellers. The amount of time spent in the second visit to the Galatian Churches, in Macedonia, at Athens, and on the way to Corinth, is uncertain, but exceeded half a year at the lowest computation, and the Corinthian ministry cannot have fallen far short of two years, as it embraced several Sabbaths in the synagogue, eighteen months in the house of Justus, and a further indefinite sojourn (yet many days) in the city. It may be presumed, as he hastened from Cenchreae to Jerusalem to complete his vow and keep the feast there, that he arrived before Pentecost, about the same season that he departed from Antioch on his travels; so that the interval was about three years in all. Another period of three years carries on the history to the end of the Ephesian ministry; it includes first a journey from Jerusalem to Ephesus, in the course of which he spent some time in Antioch and went over all the Galatian country in order, then three months' ministry in the synagogue, and two years in the school of Tyrannus, and ends about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). Another year brought the Apostle to Jerusalem, after visiting the Macedonian and Corinthian Churches. His imprisonment—first at Jerusalem, then at Cæsarea during the last two years of the government of Felix and the first part of the rule of Festus, and lastly on the way to Rome—accounts for nearly three years more, making a period of ten years in all between his departure from Antioch on his second mission-journey and his arrival in Rome.

A valuable clue for determining the date of that event is supplied by the history of Felix. His recall took place a short time before the departure of Paul from Cæsarea. He was followed by a hostile deputation from Cæsarea complaining of his misgovernment; but apparently there had not been time to organise and despatch it before navigation closed for the winter, otherwise the Roman Jews would have heard of Paul's appeal to Cæsar (cf. Acts xxviii. 21); so that Felix was still awaiting his trial at Rome. Now it is pretty certain that Felix retained the government of Judæa for the first five years after the accession of Nero, in spite of the disgrace of his brother Pallas at the imperial court—as long, in short, as Burrhus and Seneca dictated the policy of the empire, and was not recalled before 59. In spite of his cruelty and extortion he retained the confidence of Burrhus to the last, perhaps by the vigour of his government, perhaps from personal motives; and it was probably the support of Burrhus even more than the wealth of Pallas which
secured his acquittal at Rome; for Burrhus procured from the emperor, as the result of the enquiry, the disfranchisement of the Jewish citizens of Caesarea who had impugned the conduct of Felix, and the systematic adoption of a rigorous policy for the repression of Jewish sedition. As the death of Burrhus took place in February, 62, the trial of Felix cannot have been later than 61. I conclude, therefore, that his recall took place either in 59 or 60, and that Paul reached Rome early in 60 or 61. If Prof. Ramsay is right in his contention (Expositor, vol. iii., 1896, p. 336), that the voyage of Paul to Palestine took place in 57, this is a decisive confirmation of the earlier date. Reckoning back ten years we arrive at the spring of 50 or 51 for the date of Paul's departure with Silas from Antioch. If the earlier date be assumed, I take it that the Apostolic Council was held some weeks earlier in 50; if the latter be preferred, I am disposed to date the Apostolic Council late in 50, and to conclude that the winter of 50-51 was spent in Antioch or its neighbourhood. Either reckoning leads to the choice of 37 for the year of the conversion, according to the computation made in Gal. ii. 1.

It is true that most critics favour the adoption of an earlier date than 37 for the conversion, but chiefly (as I think) because so little is known of the years immediately following the first Pentecost. It seems to me, on the contrary, probable that several years of silent growth intervened before the disciples were strong enough in their faith to establish themselves in Jerusalem and face the persecution of the rulers; and I find in the Acts many indications of a considerable interval. But it is enough here to compare the history of the first great persecution of the Church, which gave occasion for the conversion of Saul, with the particular circumstances of the year 37 recorded in Josephus which impress on me the conviction that the conversion occurred in that year. The narrative of Acts vi.-ix. exhibits a remarkable series of events:—

1. Stephen was indicted for blasphemy, and after a regular trial before the Jewish authorities was condemned by acclamation, carried without the walls, and stoned to death in strict accordance with the procedure of the Mosaic Law.

2. This was followed by domiciliary visits to the houses of Christians, who were arrested, imprisoned, and condemned to death by the Jewish authorities, Saul himself giving his vote against them (Acts xxvi. 10). A sudden reign of terror prevailed for a short time in Jerusalem; and then ceased as suddenly, leaving the Apostles once more free to come and go preaching the faith.
3. The Sanhedrim were able to give Saul authority to bring Christians from the province of Syria outside Judæa bound to Jerusalem for trial.

Historians have with some reason questioned the possibility of such proceedings as these in a Roman province: for the imperial government maintained with the utmost jealousy its exclusive prerogative of life and death over its subjects throughout the empire; the extreme violence of religious factions made the enforcement of this principle more essential in Judæa than elsewhere, and the repeated but futile efforts of the Sanhedrim to procure the death of Paul, first by assassination, then by judicial sentence of the Roman governor, exemplify at once their impotence for the infliction of capital punishment, and the vital importance of Roman protection to the Apostolic Church. It is true that one other noted Christian, James the brother of the Lord, was stoned to death, like Stephen: but that was an isolated act of mob violence during an interregnum, instigated by a fanatical high-priest, and promptly punished as an outrage on Roman authority.

The most striking parallel to the trial of Stephen is presented by that of his Divine Master. Both alike were found guilty of blasphemy, partly on the evidence of witnesses, partly on their own confession of faith. But when the Sanhedrim appealed to Pilate for confirmation of the sentence, he met the appeal with bitter scorn, challenging them in derision of their impotence to carry out themselves the sentence of death which they had presumed to pronounce upon the prisoner. This was indeed no solitary instance of the haughty and arrogant spirit which Pilate displayed throughout his administration. For many years he continued to earn the hatred of the Jews by his imperious temper and excessive severity. It is utterly incredible that intolerable outrages on Roman authority, like the public stoning of Stephen and judicial murders of other Christians at Jerusalem, can have occurred under the government of Pilate. Now that government lasted ten years, and only came to an end by his deposition in the year 37. His removal made way for new rulers and new measures in Judæa, for the Emperor Tiberius, having then become involved in war with Aretas owing to the quarrel between that king and Herod Antipas, had commissioned Vitellius proconsul of Syria to lead an expedition into Arabia and attack him in his capital Petra. As this force had to march across Judæa and make it the base of operations, Vitellius was invested with supreme authority in that country. The support of the Jewish nation became indispensable for his
success, and Vitellius, a supple and unscrupulous courtier, afterwards notorious as the basest sycophant at the imperial court, left no stone unturned to win their favour. He at once dismissed Pilate in disgrace, remitted obnoxious taxes, rescinded unpopular regulations, and repaired in person to Jerusalem to curry favour by feasts and sacrifices while his army was on the march. We know from Josephus that his most ostentatious and successful display of sympathy with the Jews was the restoration of the sacred vestments to the custody of the priesthood, which his predecessors had hitherto retained in their own hands with jealous care as a hostage for Jewish loyalty, and that he bestowed the office of high priest on a son of Annas the powerful head of the priestly oligarchy. That oligarchy had by that time conceived the same jealous hatred against the disciples of Christ as against their master; and an unscrupulous governor like Vitellius could find no cheaper means of gratifying them than the surrender of an unpopular sect to their will. The martyrdom of Christians by Jewish zealots for the Law became in short as natural under the circumstances as it was contrary to the imperial principle of religious toleration, and had been inconceivable under Pilate. The presence again of Vitellius in Jerusalem suggests a reasonable explanation of the mission to Damascus, which could hardly have been undertaken without express sanction from the proconsul.

Finally, the circumstances of the year 37 completely explain the rapid termination of the reign of terror in the Church. For about Pentecost Vitellius received tiding of the emperor's death, and being personally disposed to side with Aretas against Herod Antipas, he at once abandoned the expedition, and gladly returned to Antioch. From the day of Tiberius' decease no motive remained for courting Jewish favour: the new reign brought with it in fact an entire reversal of Roman policy in these regions; the Church enjoyed once more comparative peace under the shelter of Roman indifference; and before long the threats of Caius Cæsar to erect his own statue in the temple of God turned the thoughts of the Jews from attacks on the Christian religion to the defence of their own. There is in short one period, and one only, in the Roman government of Judæa during which the martyrdom of Stephen and many other Christians in Jerusalem was either probable or feasible, and that is the first half of the year 37.

1 The date of Pilate's deposition and of the subsequent events is fixed with some precision by the time of his arrival in Rome: though he hastened thither according to his instructions, he did not arrive before the death of Tiberius on 16th March, 37 (Jos. Ant., xviii., iv., 2).
APPENDIX B.

COMPARISON OF THE ROMAN WITH THE GALATIAN EPISTLE.

The position of Paul toward the Roman Church differed widely from that which he held in regard to the Galatian, and his attitude in the two Epistles differs accordingly. He had the strongest possible claim on the loyalty of the Galatians, for he had spent months in founding and establishing each of the Churches, had recently visited them afresh, and wrote for the express purpose of checking a threatened revolt against his Gospel and his authority. He was, on the contrary, still a stranger to Rome, had no personal experience of their actual condition or special temptations, and no more claim on their allegiance than on any other converted Gentiles. He was, indeed, deeply interested in the welfare of the Church, and had perhaps commissioned Aquila and Priscilla with others of his own disciples to proceed thither and prepare the way for his own intended visit; but the original foundation of the Roman Church was probably due to others. Under these circumstances the coincidence between certain chapters of the two Epistles is remarkable. If it were limited to the expression of certain eternal truths like the antagonism of flesh and spirit, and that love is the fulfilment of the Law, the correspondence might reasonably be expected. But it extends to the quotation and application of the same texts, and to the conclusions founded on them. Both adduce the same Scriptural arguments to uphold justification by faith alone against legal righteousness. Both associate the adoption and inheritance of the sons of God in Christ with His ancient promises to Abraham and his seed. Both alike restrict the function of Law to the condemnation and punishment of sin, and contrast its bondage with the freedom of the Gospel in corresponding language. Lightfoot argues from this coincidence that the two Epistles approximated in date, in spite of the wide divergence in their general tenor. But the coincidence is distinctly
limited in its scope: it is very striking wherever the author is dealing with the doctrinal questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity and is scarcely perceptible elsewhere. The limitation is instructive, for it suggests that the author had made these subjects and the passages of the Old Testament which bear upon them an habitual topic of controversy with Jewish teachers in the synagogue. This view is borne out by comparison of the language used by other authors. Even the Epistle of James, widely different as are his lessons on the subject of faith and works, bases them on the same text as these Epistles, “Abraham believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness”. Why was this? Because the blessing of Abraham, his faith and his righteousness were prevailing topics in the religious teaching of his day. Philo likewise refers constantly to the same passages of Scripture and bases his arguments upon them. Now, what had been the antecedents of Paul before and after his conversion? Educated in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, he had been a zealot for the Law, and a sincere believer in the teaching of the Pharisees. After growing up to manhood in this faith, he had for fourteen years before he wrote the Galatian Epistle been engaged in perpetual controversy with his former teachers, encountering in every synagogue the same objections, and combating them with similar arguments. Inevitably his thoughts and language on such subjects as the blessing of Abraham, faith and works, the Law and the Gospel, had become in a measure stereotyped; and in addressing former disciples of the synagogue, whether in Galatia or in Rome, he fell almost unconsciously into identical language and trains of thought.

The close analogy, however, of the two Epistles in certain parts serves to bring out in stronger relief their wide divergence in spirit and substance. The Galatian Epistle was evoked by an insidious attack on the Christian freedom of Greek Churches, and its tone is thoroughly controversial. It insists on the futility of seeking justification by obedience to the Law, it urges that Jewish Christians have all confessed themselves guilty sinners, and owe to Christ their redemption from the curses of the Law; it establishes the provisional character of the Sinaiitic dispensation, and reduces it to a mere preparatory discipline designed for an age of spiritual childhood and wholly unfit for Christians, seeing they have attained to spiritual manhood; it dwells on the bondage of Israel after the flesh, and identifies unbelieving Jews with Ishmael in their present temper and future destiny. In the Roman Epistle we breathe a different atmosphere. It is a comprehensive exposition of Christian
faith and duty addressed to the central Church of the Empire from the standpoint of an Apostle who claims the right to promulgate a new law in the name of Christ for the whole Roman world; it insists on the universal sinfulness of Jew and Gentile alike; like the Galatian it accepts Abraham as father of the faithful, but is careful to add that he is so not of the circumcision only but also of the uncircumcision; it is not content to pass over God's earlier dealings with mankind before Abraham and to identify Christ with the seed of Abraham, but goes back to the Fall, and describes him as the second Adam redeeming the whole race from the dominion of sin and death; it does not borrow its idea of law, like the Galatian Epistle, from the Mosaic, but develops the conception of an universal law of conscience even in the heathen world which maintains perpetual conflict with the law of sin and death in our members.

The reader can hardly fail to recognise in the changed attitude of the Apostle his altered position, and the transformation that he had been instrumental in effecting in Greece and Asia between the dates of the two Epistles. The earlier is animated throughout with the spirit of conflict, and vividly recalls the period when Paul was earnestly battling for the spiritual life of his Gospel against the surviving spirit of Judaism within the Church. But when he wrote from Corinth to the Roman Church, on the eve of his departure, having no more place in those parts, the issue of the conflict had been virtually settled by the wonderful expansion of the Greek Churches, Judaism had lost its hold, and the independence of the Christian Church no longer admitted of a doubt. Hence the Apostle does not hesitate to write of the national rejection of Israel as an accomplished fact, deeply as he deplored it, and earnestly as he craved for their restoration to a due share in their inheritance and a place in the body of Christ. The Roman Epistle belongs, in short, to a distinctly later stage in the history of the Church than the Galatian. Its decisive inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one category, its identification of Law with the conscience of mankind, its comprehensive scheme of Christian legislation, based on the eternal principles of righteousness, truth and love, its maturity of Christian thought, proved that the Apostle had passed beyond the earlier stage of controversy with Judaism into a region of spiritual conflict with evils of faith and practice, and grasping the conception of a universal religion had braced himself to meet its demand for a new Law and a new life of the Spirit in Christ.
INTRODUCTION

1. Ephesus. The city with which this sublime Epistle is traditionally associated had a notable name in the ancient Greek world. A remarkable place belongs to it also in the history of the origins of the Christian Church. It emerges far back in pre-Christian times, and the glimpses which we get of it from point to point in the course of its fortunes show us things of great and varied interest. Its rise into an importance which became world-wide, its achievements during the palmy period of its prosperity and power, the changes through which it passed from the days of its pre-eminence in Asia Minor on to its destruction by the Goths and its miserable survival in the insignificant modern village of Ayasaluk make an impressive story. Its inhabitants were drawn from various sources, Hellenic and Oriental. It was one of the chief centres of the Ionian settlers. But we are told of strangers who occupied the place or its neighbourhood long before the Ionian immigration. These are referred to by Pausanias (vii., 26), who speaks of them as Carians; but some modern scholars suppose them to have been Hittites (cf. article "Ephesus" in Encyc. Biblica). The city was colonised mostly from Athens, and something of the Athenian genius may be recognised in its people. But it is clear that it had a large infusion of Asiatic elements.

In ancient times Ephesus was a place of commanding commercial importance. It owed this not less to its geographical position than to the energy and enterprise of its people. No Greek city in Asia Minor was more advantageously planted. It stood at the meeting point of roads which carried trade with them and converged on the great line of communication between the East and the metropolis of the world. It was the chief city of one of the four great river valleys that penetrated Asia Minor, being to the Cayster what Miletus was to the Meander, Pergamus to the Caicus, and Smyrna to the Hermus. The most important of the Asiatic trade routes and great lines of intercourse between Rome and the East was the one that passed up
by the Meander and the Lycus to Laodicea and Apamea. This being so, the commercial supremacy was held by Miletus for a length of time, the road which was commanded by it having the advantage of being shorter and less difficult than that to which Ephesus was the key. But under the operation of influences which we can only partially trace things changed in the later period of the Greek sovereignty, and under the Romans Ephesus had the place which had once belonged to Miletus. It gained largely by the decline of other great commercial cities. The overthrow of Smyrna by the Lydians about B.C. 525 and that of Miletus by the Persians in B.C. 494 contributed much to its ascendancy. Thus it came about that during the Roman Empire it ranked with Antioch and Alexandria as one of the three great emporia of the trade of the Eastern Mediterranean, and formed the commercial capital for the wide and varied territory west of the Cilician gates. It rose to the dignity of metropolis of the Roman Province of Asia. It was a free city. It had an "assembly" and "council" of its own, and a governor, or pro-consul, ἀρχιτάρατος (cf. Acts xix. 38). In the general and natural decay of popular government, however, under the Imperial system, power fell into the hands of officials, and in Ephesus the γραμματεύς, the "town-clerk" (Acts xix. 35) or "recorder," was the great authority.

Ephesus was originally a sea-port. It stood on the left bank of the Caýster, it is true, a few miles up from the sea, but for a length of time the channel of the river was carefully attended to and kept open. It was never an easy task, however, to maintain a clear way between the harbour and the sea. The quantity of silt deposited by the Caýster was great. Blundering engineering, undertaken in the second half of the second century B.C. under Attalus II. Philadelphus, made matters worse. By Paul's time the passage had got into such a condition that, though the city still retained its pre-eminence, mariners avoided Ephesus if they could. A serious attempt to improve the channel was made by the Governor of Asia, as Tacitus informs us (Ann., xvi., 23), about A.D. 65. But effort slackened again, and things were left to take their course. The result in course of time was that the once famous harbour became a troublesome marsh. Ephesus ceased to be a sea-port, its trade declined, and the life went out of the city.

The importance of Ephesus, however, in ancient times was not due to its commercial position alone. It had a considerable name as a school of art. The great painters Parrhasius of the fifth century B.C. and Apelles of the fourth belonged to the city. Above all,
it was a place of paramount religious interest. It was the centre of
the worship of the goddess who was known among the Greeks as
Artemis and among the Romans as Diana. The temple erected in
her honour was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world, a
splendid structure of shining marble, stated by Pliny (Nat. Hist.,
ix., 40, 213) to have been 425 feet long and 220 wide (but by
Mr. J. T. Wood to have measured 343 feet by 164), with 127 columns
some 60 feet high. It is reported to have taken about 220 years to
finish. In it was treasured an image of the goddess which was
believed to have fallen from heaven in remote times. Behind the
shrine was the "treasury," which was the bank of Asia. The temple
was destroyed by the Goths in a.d. 262.

Magnificent as the temple was, it was not the only architectural
wonder possessed by Ephesus. There was the great theatre, on the
west side of Mount Coressus, a vast structure, the largest Greek theatre
in Asia Minor and in the ancient Greek world, reputed to accommodate
50,000 spectators. North of it was the stadium, where races were
run and wild beast fights were conducted. It was the temple,
however, that made the chief glory of the city. It was the temple
that added more than anything else to its importance. The chief
boast of Ephesus was the title of ἱεραρχός, or "temple-warden"
(literally "temple-sweeper"), rendered "worshipper" in Acts xix.
35 by the AV, and "temple-keeper" by the RV. It is true that the
title was more usually given to Asiatic cities as wardens of temples
of the Imperial worship, and Ephesus was ἱεραρχός first of one
temple, then of two, and later still even of three. But an inscription
of the second century and coins of the third bear witness to the fact
stated in Acts xix. 35 that Ephesus had the title of Warden of the
Temple of Diana (cf. Prof. Ramsay's article on "Ephesus" in
Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible). This vast temple was not the
only sacred structure that found a place on the slopes of the hill
which made the original religious centre. Here was built the great
Christian Church which was dedicated by Justinian to St. John the
Evangelist. Here, too, at a later date, was erected the mosque
which is reported to have been one of the best specimens of Arabian-
Persian art.

2. The Church in Ephesus. It is with the great names of Paul
and John that the story of the primitive Christian community in
Ephesus is specially associated, both in the New Testament itself
and in tradition. John's connection with the Ephesian Church be-
longs to the latter part of the first century. We have every reason
to believe that, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion
of the members of the mother Church, that Apostle made Ephesus his home. The historian Eusebius speaks of his residence there, and reports certain interesting occurrences which took place during his stay. Other names known to us in the sacred history have also certain associations with the Ephesian Church. One of these is that of Timothy, who appears to have been commissioned by Paul towards the end of his career to do some special work in Ephesus. In 1 Timothy (i. 3) the Apostle is represented as reminding this his "own son in the faith" that he had besought him to abide "still in Ephesus," while he himself went into Macedonia, that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine". It may also be inferred from what is said of John Mark in different passages of the New Testament (Col. iv. 10; 1 Peter v. 13; 2 Timothy iv. 11) that he too had not a little to do with the Churches of Asia; and that being so, it can well be understood that he was known to the Church of Ephesus and visited the city in his journeyings. It has been supposed by some that the Evangelist Luke also had some connection with Ephesus. But there is no historical foundation for this. Mr. J. T. Wood indeed takes the name borne by the modern village which represents the ancient Ephesus to be a corruption of αγιος λουκας, "St. Luke". But Ayasaluk or Ayassaluk appears to be a corruption of Ayo-theolog, Ayo-tholog, αγιος θεολογος, the name being taken from the Church of St. John built there by Justinian.

It is with Paul himself, therefore, that the beginnings of the Church of Ephesus are associated. Men from Asia were among the multitudes in Jerusalem who heard the Apostles speak with tongues on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 9), and it is possible that the first tidings of the new faith may have been carried by some of these to the capital of the Province. But of that there is no record. The testimony of the Book of Acts is that Paul, at the beginning of his second great missionary journey, after he had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost" to preach the word in Asia (xvi. 6); but that at the close of that journey, when he was on his way from Greece to Syria, he did visit Ephesus and "reasoned with the Jews in the synagogue". That he made some impression on this occasion appears from the fact that he was asked to stay. This he could not do, because he had to press on to Jerusalem to keep the feast there. But he left Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus and promised himself to return (Acts xviii. 19-21). To this brief visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles, followed up by the efforts of Aquila and Priscilla, the planting of a Christian Church in the capital of the Province of Asia appears to be due. When
Paul was away in Syria and Asia (Acts xviii. 22, 23) something further was effected in another way. Apollos came to Ephesus, knowing only of the baptism of John. He had the way of God expounded to him more fully by the two devoted friends whom Paul had left behind him in Ephesus. The result was that, understanding better as he now did the fulfilment of the promised Messianic salvation, he "mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ" (Acts xviii. 24-28). After Apollos had passed on to Corinth Paul returned, as he had undertaken to do, to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1). On this occasion his stay was a protracted one, extending over more than two years and three months (Acts xix. 8, 10), or as he expressed it in round numbers in his address to the elders at Miletus "by the space of three years" (Acts xx. 31).

First he devoted himself to the instruction of certain disciples who had been baptised only unto John's baptism and knew nothing of the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 1-7). Then for three months he spoke of the things of the Kingdom of God to the Jews in the synagogue. In this he had only partial success, and soon he had to encounter bitter opposition. He gave up his appeal, therefore, to the Jews, and took the school of "Tyrannus," in which he "disputed daily" for the space of two years. He did this with such result that he turned many from the practice of the magical arts which were in great favour in Ephesus, and "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10, 20). In other words, the report of the Gospel which Paul preached penetrated through the Province, being carried no doubt to the great cities by travellers who visited Ephesus, and by missionaries or messengers like Epaphras. And for the purpose of disseminating the knowledge of the new faith through the Asiatic Province, Ephesus was not less singularly fitted by its geographical position and commercial communications than was Antioch for Syria or Rome for the further West. The tumultuous opposition, however, which was roused by Demetrius against Paul as a destroyer of the silversmith's craft and a subverter of the worship of Diana, brought his work in Ephesus to a close and compelled him to hasten his departure into Greece (Acts xix. 21—xx. 1). During his last voyage to Syria he did not visit Ephesus itself; but, touching at Miletus, he sent for the elders of the Ephesian Church and took his pathetic farewell of them there (Acts xx. 17-38).

So far as the Book of Acts is concerned, that is the last glimpse we get of Paul in his connection with Ephesus. In the Pastoral
Epistles, however, we have some further references to Ephesus and to Paul's care for the Church there. In 1 Timothy (i. 3), as we have seen, we find that Timothy had been placed in the city with a view to the preservation of sound doctrine, and that Paul desired him to remain there when he himself went into Macedonia; and in 2 Timothy mention is made both of the way in which Onesiphorus ministered to Paul in Ephesus (i. 18), and of the fact that Tychicus was sent by Paul to Ephesus (iv. 12). The relations, therefore, between Paul and this Church were of the closest and most confidential kind. As to the composition of the Christian community, it appears to have included from the first both Jews and Greeks (Acts xix. 1-10, xx. 21). The Gentile element, however, seems to have been the larger and to have grown more and more, so that the Epistle deals with the Church as practically a Gentile-Christian body.

In 1 Peter (i. 1) those in Asia, including doubtless the members of the metropolitan Church, are named among the strangers scattered throughout various lands, towards whom the writer has a certain responsibility and to whom he addresses his Epistle. In the Apocalypse which bears the name of John, the Church of Ephesus appears among the seven Churches of Asia to which John's message is directed; and that the Ephesian Church was recognised as the chief of the seven may be inferred perhaps from the fact that it has the first place in the list and in the address (i. 11, ii. 1). It is also with John that tradition connects the Ephesian Church after Paul's decease. Of its later history, it is enough to say that it long retained its importance among the Churches, and that, among other things, it was the seat of one of the great Ecumenical Councils (a.d. 431), and also of the notorious Robber-Synod (a.d. 440).

3. THE EPISTLE—ITS GENERAL CHARACTER, CONTENTS AND PLAN.
Among the Epistles bearing the name of St. Paul there is none greater than this, nor any with a character more entirely its own. There have been students, it is true, who with an almost incredible lack of insight have considered it an insipid production or a tedious and unskilful compilation. Among these must be named even so acute a scholar as De Wette. Such pronouncements, however, belong to the failures and eccentricities of criticism, and count for little. With few exceptions scholars of all different schools who have studied and interpreted this Epistle have been at one in regarding it as one of the sublimest and most profound of all the New Testament writings. In the judgment of many who are well entitled to deliver an opinion, it is the grandest of all the Pauline letters. There is a peculiar and sustained loftiness in its teaching which has deeply
impressed the greatest minds and has earned for it the title of the “Epistle of the Ascension”. It tarries largely among “the heavenlies,” and lifts us into the eternities a parte ante and a parte post. It is characterised by a dignity and a serenity which are entirely in harmony with the elevation of its thoughts. It takes little to do either with the questions of ceremonialism or with the personal vindications which fill so large a space in others of the greater Epistles of St. Paul. The polemical element is conspicuous by its absence. There is scarcely even an echo of the great controversies which ring so loudly in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. If they were still active in any measure or at all in the writer’s view when he addressed himself to these Asiatic Churches, they are not on the surface at least of this majestic Epistle. The nearest approach to any explicit allusion to such things is in what is said in a single verse (chap. ii. 11) regarding the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision.

There is a remarkable cohesion, too, in the composition, part fitting in with part naturally and without effort. In its structure the Epistle is an unmistakable unity. The whole argument moves round a few great ideas. The plan is simple. The Epistle opens and closes in the usual Pauline way, and it divides naturally into two great sections, one doctrinal and the other practical or hortatory. There is first the usual inscription or greeting (i. 1, 2), followed by a thanksgiving which takes the form of a solemn ascription of praise to God for the spiritual blessings enjoyed by the writer and his readers. The mention of these blessings develops into a doctrinal statement which deals with the lofty themes of election, predestination, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; the mystery of the Divine will; the grace of the Holy Spirit as seal and earnest; the power of God in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ; the sovereignty of Christ over the world and His Headship over the Church; the Divine quickening of the spiritually dead; the abrogation of the Law that formed the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile; the love of Christ and His indwelling in the believer. Each of these great themes leads easily to the next. In the course of their exposition the Apostle enlarges especially on the ultimate purpose of God to sum up all things in Christ (i. 9-11); the relation in which Christ stands to the universe and to the Church (i. 20-23); the absolutely gracious character of the salvation, the new life, and the gifts bestowed upon believers by God (ii. 1-10); the revelation and fulfilment of the purpose of God, hidden for ages, to make the Gentile partaker with the Jew (ii. 11-22); and the marvel of the grace that has established equality and unity where once there were privilege and separation.
This first of the two primary divisions of the Epistle concludes with a doxology, which again celebrates that gracious power of God which works all for us and within us.

As the doctrinal section occupies the first three chapters, the hortatory section extends over the last three. These chapters are taken up with practical matters—the necessity of a walk in harmony with the Divine call; the commendation of humility, meekness, forbearance, concord, peace and all good brotherly relations; the duty of growing in likeness to Christ and in obedience to Him; the forsaking of all heathen vices; the practice of truthfulness and honesty, abstinence from all corrupt communications, from all bitterness and wrath and evil-speaking and malice; sedulous watchfulness against any falling back into easy compliance with the two characteristic pagan forms of moral evil, sensuality and greed, or into any slackness in the sense of their deep sinfulness; the reverent regard of the Christian relations between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and slaves, and the careful observance of the duties arising out of the Christian idea of these relations; the need for the full spiritual equipment provided by God for the withstanding of all evil. These various ethical requirements and recommendations are presented as all having their roots in the great facts and doctrines of grace which are expounded in the former division of the Epistle, and as all growing up out of that soil. In their enforcement special prominence is given to the maintenance of concord and peace in the Church (iv. 4); the great object which all Christian gifts are meant to serve (iv. 12-16); the forswearing of all sins of uncleanness as things wholly alien to the Christian life (v. 3-14); the sacredness of the primary domestic and relative duties, those above all pertaining to the relations of husband and wife (v. 22—vi. 1-9); the seriousness of the Christian’s warfare and the sufficiency of the Christian’s armour (vi. 10-18). The Epistle is brought to its close by some personal references bearing on the writer’s requirements and commission (vi. 19, 20); a brief notice of the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21, 22); and a final salutation or benediction, which is given in terms of grace and peace (vi. 23, 24).

In the course of thought thus followed out in the Epistle there are certain great ideas that have peculiar prominence given them. Of these the largest is that of the Divine grace—the term χάρις occurring under one aspect or another some thirteen times. Another is that of “the heavenlies,” which has an entirely peculiar place and application in this Epistle. Much, too, is made of the conceptions of the Divine fulness (πληρωμα); the mystery (μυστήριον); the economy
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(oikonomia); the spiritual understanding (γνώσης, ἐπίγνωσις, σοφία, σύνεσις, φόρμης) proper to the Christian and in which he is to increase. There are also the ideas of union and unity, union with Christ, union and fellowship one with another, the unity of the Church, the oneness of Jew and Gentile, the unity in the diversity of gifts, the unity of the faith. These great conceptions run through the Epistle, and express themselves in such compound forms as συνεξυποίησεν, συνήγαγε, συνεκάθισεν, συμπολίται, συγκληρονόμοι, συναρμολογομένη, συνοικοδομώντα, σύνομος.

The Epistle is remarkable also for the use which it makes of a series of terms of far-reaching significance, which belong to the very essence of its thought and nowhere get the place and the iteration which they have here, except in some measure in the Epistle to the Romans. Among these are the counsel (βουλή) of God, His will (θλημα), His purpose (πρόθεσις), His good-pleasure (εὐδοκία), His fore-ordaining or pre-determining (προορίζειν), His afore preparing (προετοιμάζειν), etc.

The vocabulary of the Epistle also is singular and full of interest. The letter contains a number of words and phrases which are peculiar to itself and the sister Epistle to the Colossians, so far as the New Testament writings are concerned—such as ἀθρωποτάρτας, ἀφή, ἀποκαταλάβεται, ἀπαλλοτριοῦσαι, αὐτες, and its noun αὐτής, ὀφθαλμό-βουλεία, βίος, συζευκτείνει, συμβιβάζειν, ἐκ ψυχής. It has others which are confined to itself and certain others of the Pauline Epistles: ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀληθεύειν, ἀνεξχιστάστο, ἐπιχορηγία, εὔνοια, εὐωδία, θάλπεια, κάμπτειν, περικεφαλαία, πλεονέκτης, ποίημα, προβεβλείν, προετοιμάζειν, προσαγωγὴ, προτίθεσαι, υιοθεσία, ὑπερβάλλειν, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ.

On the other hand, there are a good many words which occur in this Epistle alone of all claiming to be by Paul, although they are found occasionally elsewhere in the New Testament, such as ἀγνωσία, ἀγωνεῖν, ἀκρογνωσία, ἀμφότερος, ἀνέμος, ἀνίμα, ἄτας, ἄτειλή, ἔσπλαγχ-νος, μακάρ, ὀργίζεσθαι, ὀσύς, ὀσφός, πανοπλία, πάροικος, περιποιήσιμος, πλάτος, ποιμήν, in the sense of pastor, πολιτεία, σαπρός, σπλαγχνίζεται, σωφρίστα, ὄπως, υποδείκνυεται, ὑφός, φραγμός, φρόνησις, χαριτών, χειροποίητος. Some of these obviously are of small moment. Others have some significance. On these lists see Abbot's Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, and more especially Holtzmann's Einleitung und Kritik der Epheser- und Kolossenser-Briefe. In addition to these we have a considerable list of pure ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, including ὄνομα, ἀνθρώπητη, ἀληθέως, ἀλλήλως, ἀνείκης, ἀπαλλάγει, ἀνεύος, βλέπω, ἀπεκάθισε, ἀμφότερος, ἀνέμος, ἀπειράκτωσις, ἀποκαλέσθαι, ἀποτελεῖθαι, ἀποσπάσκει, ἀνεύοντα, εὐδοκία, εὐδοκία, ἐνεργεία, ἑπιφανεία, ἑπιμέλεια, ἰδιοικημένος, as applied to
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Christ, θυρεός, καταρτισμός, κατώτερος, κλήροι, κλωνίζεσθαι, κοσμοκράτωρ, κρυφή, κυβεία, μακροχρόνιος, μέγεθος, μεθοδεία, μεσότοιχος, μισολογία, πάλη, παροργιαμός, πολυποίκιλος, προσκρήσης, βυτίς, συμμέτοχος, συμπολίτης, συναρμολογεῖν, συνουσιάμενοι, σύσωμος. In the case of two of these, αιχμαλωτείων and εὖνοια, the TR gives each in one other passage (2 Tim. iii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 3), but on insufficient documentary evidence. The introduction of some of these terms no doubt is due to circumstance. But an analysis of the vocabulary as a whole brings out the fact that in language as well as in thought this Epistle has a character of its own.

4. THE AFFINITIES OF THE EPISTLE. There are some resemblances which deserve notice between the terms of this Epistle and those of the address recorded in Acts (xx. 17-38) as delivered by Paul to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, e.g., ἐμὲν τὸ πάθος ταπεινοφροσύνης, iv. 2, cf. Acts xx. 19; ἐκλερώθησαν, κληρονομία, i. 11, 14, cf. Acts xx. 32; the Divine βούλη, i. 11, cf. Acts xx. 27; the Divine δύναμις καὶ κράτος, i. 19, cf. Acts xx. 32; the being builded, συνουσιαμένοι, ii. 21, cf. Acts xx. 32. But apart from these we find a number of resemblances between this Epistle and other NT writings which are of interest, and which may point to certain relationships between them. There are a few points of contact, e.g., between this Epistle and the three Pastoral Epistles (e.g., in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, ii. 1), which have been considered to go some way to establish identity of authorship, or at least of ultimate source. But these do not amount to much. There are other correspondences which are thought to indicate a certain affinity between this Epistle and the Fourth Gospel. Among these are reckoned the prominence given in both to the great conceptions of ἀγάπη and γνῶσις; the designation of Christ as ὁ γεννημένος (Eph. i. 4) as compared with the terms of John iii. 35, x. 17, xv. 9, xvii. 23, 24, 26; the ἐξελάται πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου of Eph. i. 4, and the ἡγάπησας με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου of John xvii. 24; the common use of the figures of light and darkness (Eph. v. 11, 13; John iii. 20, 21), and the particular phrases ὃς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε (Eph. v. 8), περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἤχει (John xii. 35); the designation of the work of regeneration as a quickening of the dead (Eph. ii. 5, 6; John v. 21, 25, 28). In both writings again we have the work of redemption presented under the aspect of a sanctification or setting apart (ἁγιάζειν, Eph. v. 26; John xvii. 17, 19); and in both this is given as taking effect by way of a cleansing or purifying by the word—καθαρίσας... ἐν ῥήματι (Eph. v. 26), καθαρός διὰ τὸν λόγον (John xv. 3). We have also the idea of grace according to measure (ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἤρειας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph. iv. 17), and grace without measure in the one
case of Christ (John iii. 31). The striking resemblance between the 
αὐθη . . . καταθη, ὁ καταβάς . . . ὁ ἀναβάς in Eph. iv. 9, 10, and the 
declaration αὐθῇ αὐθηνεκ ἐς τὸν ἀναβάς εἶ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ καταβάς 
in John iii. 13 is also noticed. But less can be made of this, as the 
terms in Ephesians are drawn from an OT quotation. Nor can 
much be made either of the contention that what is said of Christ as 
the point of union or restoration for a divided world in Eph. i. 10 is 
essentially the same as the representation of Him as the Ἀγγελος in the 
Prologue to the Fourth Gospel; or of the parallel in such passages 
in John as x. 16, xi. 52, xvii. 20, 21 to the terms in which this Epistle 
enlarges on the inclusion of the Gentiles (ii. 13-22, iii. 6). The more 
relevant of these coincidences, however, may perhaps be taken to 
indicate an acquaintance on the part of the writer of the Fourth 
Gospel with this Epistle. They show at least that the authors of 
these two writings had much in common both in terms and in ideas.

There are certain points of contact also between Ephesians and 
the Apocalypse, of which much has been made by Holtzmann. 
Minor resemblances are discovered between such passages as Eph. 
i. 8 and Apoc. xiii. 18; Bph. ii. 13 and Apoc. v. 9; Eph. iii. 9 and 
Apoc. iv. 11, x. 6; Eph. iii. 18 and Apoc. xi. 1, xxi. 15-17; Eph. 
v. 32 and Apoc. i. 20. But these are too uncertain and remote to 
trust to. Of more importance are the coincidences between the 
view of Christ’s relation to the Church in Eph. v. 25, etc., and the 
figure of the Church as the Bride of the Lamb in Apoc. xix. 7; the 
mention of the Apostles and prophets in Eph. ii. 20 and Apoc. xxi. 
14; the μυστήριον revealed (ἀπεκαλύφθη) “to His holy Apostles and 
prophets (Eph. iii. 5) and the μυστήριον Θεοῦ in Apoc. x. 7; the μὴ 
συγκοινώνετε τοῖς ἐργοῖς τοῖς ἀκάρτοις of Bph. v. 11 and the ἢν μὴ 
συγκοινώνετε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς of Apoc. xviii. 4. It cannot be 
said, however, that these amount to much. Few would pronounce 
them sufficient to prove any literary or doctrinal dependence of the 
one writing on the other. Holtzmann, however, infers from them 
that the writer of Ephesians made some use of the Apocalypse.

Another writing with which Ephesians is thought to be in affinity 
is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Considerable resemblance is found 
between the two in their view of the Person of Christ, e.g., in Eph. 
i. 10, 20-22, iv. 8-10, 15 and Heb. i. 8-13, ii. 9, x. 12, 13, etc. The 
seating of Christ on the right hand of God appears in both Epistles 
(Bph. i. 20; Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12). So is it also with the use of 
the term παρθενία with reference to access to God (Eph. iii. 12; 
Heb. iv. 16); with the conception of Christ’s work as a sanctifying 
(ἀνάξειν, Eph. v. 25, 26; Heb. xiii. 12, x. 10); and with the place
given to the blood of Christ (Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12). In the use of terms, too, there are resemblances of some significance. In both we have the phrases αἷμα καὶ σάρξ (for the more usual σάρξ καὶ αἷμα), ἐπέρασαν πάντων τῶν οἴκων, αἰῶν μέλλων, προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν. And certain expressive words are found in both, such as ἀγνωστεῖν, κραυγῆ, ἐπέραν, βουλή. These things have been supposed to point to the priority of Ephesians, while some, on the other hand (e.g., von Soden), have regarded them as indicating that Hebrews is the earlier writing. But it would be in the highest degree precarious to draw any inference from such data with respect to the chronological relation of the one Epistle to the other.

Of more interest is the connection between our Epistle and 1 Peter. The points of affinity between these two writings have been exaggerated, it is true, and conclusions have been drawn from them with a confidence which they do not warrant. They undoubtedly deserve attention, however, both for their number and for their significance. At the same time the lists prepared by Holtzmann and others require to be carefully sifted and considerably reduced. Among the more relevant coincidences are the following: the place given to hope ; the connection of the Christian hope with the resurrection of Christ and with the κληρονομία (Eph. i. 18-20; 1 Pet. i. 3-5); the prominence of the idea of the Divine power (δύναμις θεοῦ, Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5); the mention of the access or introduction (τὴν προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὸν πατήρα, Eph. ii. 18) to God which we have through Christ in the one, and the definition of the object of Christ's sufferings in the other (Ἰημᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ, 1 Pet. iii. 18); the mystery hid πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Eph. iii. 9, and the fore-ordination of Christ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in 1 Pet. i. 20. Perhaps of yet greater significance are the parallels in idea and in expression with regard to the ascension of Christ (Eph. iv. 8-10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the session of Christ at God's right hand in heaven (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. i. 20; ὦ ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, παρευθεὶς εἰς οἴκων, 1 Pet. iii. 22); the subjection of all angelic powers to Christ (Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 22).

There are other coincidences to which great importance has been attached, but which are of more doubtful relevancy. The most striking of these are the analogous statements about the prophets, the hiding of the meaning of their prophecies from themselves, and the extent of the revelation made to them (1 Pet. i. 10-12; Eph. iii. 5, 10). But it is not the same class of prophets that is in view in both. In 1 Peter it is the OT prophets; in Ephesians it appears to be the NT prophets. The resemblance between Eph. ii. 18-22 and 1 Pet. ii. 4-6 must be discounted to a considerable extent, because
both writers are quoting the familiar passage in Ps. cxviii. 22, or have its terms in mind. Nor does the coincidence between the opening doxologies (1 Pet. i. 3; Eph. i. 3—in both εὐλογητός δὲ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν 'ησυχ Χριστοῦ) carry us very far. On the other hand there are some marked resemblances in syntax and construction, especially in the paragraphs immediately following these doxologies.

On these data very contradictory conclusions have been suspended. Some have inferred that the author of Ephesians was a debtor to 1 Peter (Hilgenfeld, Weiss). Others have taken the author of 1 Peter to be a borrower from Ephesians. The theory has also been broached that both Epistles proceed from one hand, possibly that of the writer of Acts and the Third Gospel. Others have explained the case by supposing that Peter may have heard Paul in Rome, or that there may have been converse between the two Apostles in Rome which is reflected in these parallels. So different are the aspects in which these things present themselves to different minds. One thing at least it is very difficult to imagine. That is, that a writer of the genius and power which the Epistle to the Ephesians discloses could have been a borrower even from the author of 1 Peter.

The question of greatest interest, however, is that touching the relation between the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to the Colossians. Here the resemblances and the differences are equally striking and unmistakable. The general likeness in the structure of the two writings arrests attention at once—in the division of the matter between the doctrinal and the practical, in the form of the paragraphs, and in much of the diction. It is calculated, indeed, that in some seventy-eight out of 155 verses we have much the same phraseology. Lists have been compiled by De Wette and others including the following passages: Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22: Eph. i. 6, 7; Col. i. 13, 14: Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20: Eph. i. 15-17; Col. i. 3, 4: Eph. i. 18; Col. i. 27: Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16: Eph. i. 22 f.; Col. i. 18 f.: Eph. ii. 1, 12; Col. i. 21: Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13: Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14: Eph. ii. 16; Col. ii. 20: Eph. iii. 1; Col. i. 24: Eph. iii. 2; Col. i. 25: Eph. iii. 3; Col. i. 26: Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, 25: Eph. iii. 8 f.; Col. i. 27: Eph. iv. 1; Col. i. 10: Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. iv. 3 f.; Col. iii. 14 f.: Eph. iv. 15 f.; Col. ii. 19: Eph. iv. 19; Col. iii. 1, 5: Eph. iv. 22 f.; Col. iii. 8 ff.: Eph. iv. 25 f.; Col. iii. 8 f.: Eph. iv. 29; Col. iii. 8., iv. 6: Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 4; Col. iii. 8: Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6: Eph. v. 15; Col. iv. 5: Eph. v. 19 f.; Col. iii. 16 f.: Eph. v. 21; Col. iii. 18: Eph. v. 25; Col. iii. 19: Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20: Eph. vi. 4; Col. iii. 21: Eph. vi. 5 ff.; Col.
These parallels are by no means all of the same value. Yet with all necessary deductions they are remarkable both in number and in quality. Taken along with the large resemblance in matter, which extends in some parts over considerable sections, they exhibit a relationship close enough to warrant us to speak of the two as sister Epistles.

It does not follow from this, however, that the one is dependent on the other. There are, indeed, important differences between the two kindred writings which make it difficult to regard the one as made up out of the other. The style is different, that of Ephesians being round, full, and rhythmical, where that of Colossians is more pointed, logical and concise. The question of the Church has no such place in the latter as in the former. The Epistle to the Ephesians has much more of an OT colouring than that to the Colossians. In the latter we have only one OT quotation or allusion. In the former we have eight or nine, viz. Gen. ii. 24 (Eph. v. 31); Exod. xx. 12 (Eph. vi. 2); Ps. iv. 4 (Eph. iv. 26); Ps. viii. 6 (Eph. i. 22); Ps. lxviii. 18 (Eph. iv. 8); Ps. cxviii. 22 (Eph. ii. 20); Song of Songs iv. 7 (Eph. v. 27, perhaps); Isa. lvii. 9 (Eph. ii. 17); Isa. ix. 1 (Eph. v. 14). There are phrases which are distinctive of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but which do not reappear in that to the Colossians, e.g., τὰ ἐνάπαυα. And besides all this there are whole paragraphs in Ephesians which have nothing like them in Colossians—those dealing with the union of Jew and Gentile in the one Church of God as the subject of the Divine predestination (Eph. i. 3-14); the unity of the faith and of the Church (iv. 5-16); the contrast between the light and the darkness with their corresponding results (v. 8-14); the mystery of the marriage-union as a reflection of the union between Christ and the Church (v. 22-33); the description of the panoply of God (vi. 10-17). And in like manner there are whole sections in Colossians, such as the polemical passage in chap. ii. and the salutations in chap. v., which have no place in Ephesians.

The question raised by the co-existence of these likenesses and differences has been very variously answered. Some have inferred that Colossians must have been the original writing, and that Ephesians resembles it at so many points because it has been borrowed largely from it. Others have regarded Ephesians as the earlier and more original composition. The scholar who has gone most laboriously into the details of this question, viz., H. J. Holtzmann, came to the conclusion that the priority could not be given wholly to
either Epistle, but that there were sections of *Ephesians* (e.g., i. 4, cf. Col. i. 22; i. 6, 7, cf. Col. i. 13, 14; iii. 3, 5, 9, cf. Col. i. 26, ii. 2) which pointed to the priority of that Epistle, while there were a considerable number that pointed in the opposite direction. He took refuge, therefore, in the complicated theory that *Colossians* as we have it is not the Epistle as it originally was; that there was a briefer Pauline Epistle to the Colossian Church on which the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians based his work; that the Colossian Epistle was afterwards enlarged by this author; and that the hand that did all this was not Paul's own, but perhaps that of the writer who added the closing doxology to the Epistle to the Romans.

This is a far-fetched explanation, and one beset by many difficulties. The terms supposed to have been taken from the Epistle to the Colossians come in quite simply and naturally in the sister Epistle, but by no means in the same context or connection. The most distinctive sections of the Colossian Epistle, those dealing with the strange, speculative views of Christ's person and relations, have no place in the Ephesian Epistle, and it is surely a surprising circumstance that a borrower such as the compiler of *Ephesians* is supposed to be should have so carefully avoided these things and should have appropriated only the least characteristic parts of the writing which he chose for the basis of his own communication. It is still more surprising that a writer capable of producing the Ephesian Epistle should have thought of using another composition in this dependent manner. In point of fact there is nothing in the Epistle to the Ephesians, whether of likeness or of unlikeness, that may not be accounted for in a far simpler and more natural way. A writer addressing himself in two different communications, prepared much about the same time, to Churches in the same part of the world, not widely separated from each other, with much in common, but with something of difference also in their circumstances, their dangers and their needs, naturally falls into a style and a tenor of address which will be to a considerable extent the same in both writings and yet have differences rising naturally out of the different positions.

5. Authorship of the Epistle. The historical evidence in favour of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle is very strong. We have the best reason for saying that by the end of the second century it was generally regarded as the work of Paul. There is evidence also that it was in circulation by the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. The place which it had then, and the use which was made of it, also indicate that it was recognised as more than an ordinary writing—that it was accepted indeed for what
it professed to be. In short, in oldest antiquity there is nothing to show that the claim which it bore upon its face was questioned, or that it was assigned to any other writer than Paul.

It is possible that within the NT writings themselves we have an important indication of the authorship. In Col. iv. 16 mention is made of an Epistle “from Laodicea”. If Colossians is accepted as what it professes to be, and that Epistle “from Laodicea” can be identified, as many hold it can, with our Epistle to the Ephesians, we have a very direct witness to the Pauline authorship. But apart from that there are things of great interest in relation to the question of authorship in very early Christian literature. Even in Clement of Rome there are forms of expression which look like echoes of ideas and terms characteristic of this Epistle. Thus the phrase ἡ ἐνεχθέσσον ἡμῶν οἱ ἐφθαλμοί τῆς καρδίας in chap. 36 recalls Eph. i. 18. The statement in Eph. i. 4 of our election of God in Christ (καθὼς ἐκλέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ, etc.) may perhaps be reflected in what is said of Christ Himself and us in chap. 64—οἱ ἐκλεξάμενοι τὸν Κύριον ἤρων Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δὲ αὐτῷ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον. The paragraph on unity, too, in Eph. iv. 4-6 may be reflected in chap. 46—ὁ οὐχὶ ἐνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἐνα Χριστῷ; καὶ ἐν πνεύμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκκυθέν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλησίς ἐν Χριστῷ. The most that can be said, however, of these analogies is that they are suggestive. Still less can be made of the witness of the Didache or of certain passages in the Epistle of Barnabas (vi. 15, xix. 7). In the first of these two writings we have these two statements which have a general, but only a general, resemblance to Eph. vi. 5, 9, viz., ὅμως δὲ οἱ δούλοι ὑποταγήσετε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν δὲ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐν αἰείναυτή καὶ φόβῳ (Did., iv., 11), and οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις δοῦλῳ σου η παιδίκη τοις ἑπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν θεῶν ἐξπίστου, ἐν πικρίᾳ σου. But this is all.

It is different with the testimony of Ignatius. It is claimed indeed by some excellent scholars that in one interesting passage Ignatius speaks definitely and unmistakably of Paul as the writer of an Epistle to the Ephesians. That is the statement in Ep. ad Eph., c. 12, Παῦλου συμμόσται (ἐστε) τοῦ ἡγιασμένου . . . δὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μημονευεί ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ ἤρου. The difficulty attaching to the interpretation of the second clause is seen perhaps in certain ancient variations of reading—in the substitution of μημονευεί in the Armenian Version, and in the amplification δὲ πάντως ἐν ταῖς δέησεσιν αὐτοῦ μημονευεί ὑμῶν which it receives in the longer form of Ignatius. In order to make it carry the inference drawn from it the rendering “in all the Epistle” or “in every part of the Epistle to you” must be given it. But, not to speak of the inept
meaning that would thus be the result, it is very doubtful whether that rendering can be accepted as grammatically justifiable. None of the few instances which are adduced in support of the contention that πᾶς without the article can mean “the whole” can be said to be free of doubt. Some, e.g., πᾶσα ἵππος ὄρους (Matt. ii. 3), πᾶς Ἰσραήλ (Rom. xi. 26), are not pertinent, inasmuch as the nouns are proper names. Others are almost equally doubtful for other reasons, e.g., ἑταί παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς (Acts xvii. 26), where the phrase προσώπου τῆς γῆς has much the force of a proper name, there being only one such thing. The same in effect is the case with πᾶν σῶμα in a passage of Aristotle which has been very confidently appealed to, vis., δει τὸν πολιτικὸν εἰλήναι πῶς τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς. Εὐτερ καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν θεραπεύοντα, καὶ πᾶν σῶμα (Eth. Nic., i., 13, 7). For σῶμα is used there not in the sense of any particular body, but in that of body as distinguished from soul. If the sentence must be translated in accordance with the stated force of πᾶς in conjunction with an anarthrous noun, vis., as = “in every letter,” it cannot safely be concluded that Ignatius had in his mind a particular Epistle of St. Paul’s known to be addressed to the Ephesians. It would be strange, indeed, as Professor Abbott remarks (ut sup., p. xi), that if Ignatius wished to remind the Ephesians of Paul’s regard for them he should “only refer to the mention of them in other Epistles, and not at all to that which had been specially addressed to them.” But allowing this contested passage to stand aside, we find Ignatius elsewhere using words or phrases which appear to indicate an acquaintance with characteristic expressions in our Epistle, such as πλῆρωμα, προορίζεσθαι, ἐκλέγειν, ἰδὴν τοῦ Πατρὸς, λίθοι ναοῦ πατρός, ἄρμαμα τοῦ Πατρὸς, λίθοι ναοῦ πατρός, ἀρμαματάρα τοῦ Πατρὸς (chap. ix.; cf. Eph. ii. 20-22), μυτῆι βίοι τοῦ Θεοῦ (chap. i.; cf. Eph. v. 1).

The witness of Polycarp, Hermas and Hippolytus is also of some significance. In Polycarp we have two passages which have all the appearance of quotations from our Epistle or reminiscences of its terms, vis.: χάριτι ἰστε σεσουμένου, οὐκ ἐξ ἐργῶν (Ep. ad Philipp., chap. i.; cf. Eph. ii. 5, 8, 9); and (in the Latin form, the Greek not being extant) “ut his scripturis dictum est, irascimini et nolite peccare et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram” (chap. xii.; cf. Eph. iv. 26). In Hermas, not to mention other sentences which are less definite, we have these—μὴ δὲ λύπην ἐπάγειν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σεμνῷ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ (Mand.; cf. Eph. iii. 30); and ἐστοι σώμα καὶ σῶμα (Sim., ix., 13; cf. Eph. iv. 4, 5). From Hippolytus we gather that Eph. iii. 4-18 was quoted as γραφή by the Valentinians (Philos., vi., 34).

The judgments of scholars have differed and no doubt will continue to differ as to the relevancy and the value of these testimonies.
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But with Irenaeus at least and the Muratorian Canon we reach sure and indisputable ground. Irenaeus refers to Paul by name as the author of our Epistle and quotes it as his. He cites Eph. v. 13 as words of Paul (Adv. Haer., i., 8, 5); and he expresses himself thus—καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παύλος φησὶν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ ὑπὲρ μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ (Adv. Haer., v., 2, 3; cf. Eph. v. 30). The Muratorian Canon mentions the Ephesians as one of the Churches to which Paul wrote Epistles. The testimony of Clement of Alexandria is like that of Irenaeus. Thus, after citing 2 Cor. xi. 2 as an injunction of the Apostle’s (ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστέλλων πρὸς Κορίνθιους φησίν), he introduces Eph. iv. 13-15 in these terms—σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίους γράφων . . . λέγων· μεχρὶ κατανθέωμεν ὁ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνόησιν τῆς πιστεύς, κ.τ.λ. (Paed., i., 18). In the same way he quotes 1 Cor. xi. 3 and Gal. v. 16 ff. as words of Paul (φησίν ὁ ἀπόστολος), and proceeds thus—καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει· ὑποτασσόμενοι ἅλληλοι ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, etc., as in Eph. v. 21-25 (Strom., iv., 65).

The testimony of Marcion is to the same effect, although he gave the Epistle the title “ad Laodicenos” (Tert., Adv. Marc., v., 17); while Tertullian, his opponent, mentions Ephesus among the Churches that had original, apostolic Epistles, and corrects Marcion only on the matter of the destination—Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos (Adv. Marc., v., 17). And from the latter part of the second century the stream of testimony to the fact that the Epistle was recognised as Paul’s flows steadily on.

Notwithstanding the strength of the external testimony, however, there have been not a few in modern times, from Schleiermacher and Usteri on to the present day, who have doubted or denied the Pauline authorship. Among these De Wette, Baur and Holtzmann occupy a conspicuous place. It is to be observed, however, that some who have most strenuously questioned the genuineness of the Epistle still admit it to be of very early date—as early as A.D. 75 or 80. De Wette, e.g., allows it to be a product of the Apostolic age, the work indeed of some highly gifted scholar of the Apostle’s, and Ewald’s position is something similar. Others take up an indeterminate position. The conclusion of Jülicher, e.g., is that the Pauline authorship can neither be certainly accepted nor absolutely denied.

The arguments leading up to the doubt or denial of the genuineness of the Epistle are based upon internal considerations—style, language, peculiar usages, the nature of the ideas, etc. Thus De Wette regards the composition as unlike Paul’s way of writing—in its
want of connection and its many parentheses, in much of its phraseology, and in the poverty of its contents. To him it is a composition copious in words but poor in ideas, lacking originality, so dependent indeed on the Epistle to the Colossians as to look like a "verbose amplification" of it, the work not of Paul himself but of an imitator. But the similarities between Ephesians and Colossians, as we have seen, admit of a simple explanation, and it is a surprising judgment, one that few certainly will accept, which De Wette pronounces on our Epistle when he speaks of it as having no distinctive character, as a dependent production, and non-Pauline in style. We should rather say with Meyer that it is so like Paul in tone, tenor and much else as to make it hard indeed to imagine that it can be the work of a mere imitator; all the more so if it is, as De Wette thinks it, without any special object.

Baur, Schwegler, and other adherents of the Tübingen School dilate chiefly on its doctrinal character as inconsistent with the Pauline authorship. They find it full of Gnostic and Montanist thought and terminology. They lay stress on the use of such terms as πλησμα, on the peculiarities of the Christology, etc., and judge it to be the product of the second century, when Gnostic speculations had taken shape and had become familiar. But this view of the Epistle is no longer asserted with the former confidence or in the pronounced form in which it was elaborated by Baur himself. It is acknowledged more generally now that the phenomena in the Epistle on which the old Tübingen School fastened may be accounted for by the operation of ideas which were in affinity with those known as Gnostic, but which came short of the developed Gnosticism of the middle of the second century; and further that the passages most insisted on by Baur, when fairly interpreted, are quite consistent with the form of doctrine found in the primary Pauline Epistles.

The objections most generally urged against the Pauline authorship take the following forms. In the first place the vocabulary of the Epistle, it is said, presents great difficulty. The ἐπαξ λεγόμενα are thought to be so numerous and of such a kind as to raise a very serious question. But when the list is examined the case is considerably modified. The whole number of words which are found in this Epistle and nowhere else in the NT is forty-two. The number of words found in this Epistle and occasionally elsewhere in the canonical books, but in none of the other writings generally recognised as Pauline by the critics in question, is thirty-nine, according to the reckoning of Holtzmann. But the Epistle to the Colossians and the three Pastoral Epistles are left out of account in this computa-
tion, and at the most the number of these διάφορα λεγόμενα is not proportionately greater than in some of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. In Galatians, e.g., there are thirty-three words used only there and nowhere else in the NT; in Philippians there are forty-one; in 2 Corinthians there are ninety-five; while in Romans there are no less than one hundred and in 1 Corinthians one hundred and eighty. Further, some of these terms, e.g., those belonging to the description of the panoply of God in chap. vi., are obviously the products of the figure or the occasion. Some, again, are but single occurrences, and in the case of several there are related forms found in others of the Epistles. For example, καταρτίζω, κατάρτισις, θοίως, προσκαρτερέων appear elsewhere, though καταρτισμός, θοίωσις, προσκαρτερήσεως happen to be used only in Ephesians.

In the second place it is objected that there are certain Pauline words which get a new sense in this Epistle. Instances of this are alleged to be found in such terms as μυστήριον, οἰκονομία, περιποίησις. But with respect to the first of these the only passage in which it can be said to have anything like a novel application is v. 32. In the other four occurrences it is used in reality very much as it is used elsewhere by Paul. The term οἰκονομία, again, as it is handled in this Epistle, has the same general sense of stewardship as it has in 1 Cor. ix. 17, though with a different application. And if περιποίησις, which has the abstract sense in 1 Thess. v. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 14, has to be understood as concrete here in chap. i. 14, that is a variation which appears in the use of other terms in the Pauline writings and elsewhere.

In the third place it is objected that in this Epistle certain ideas are expressed by terms which differ from those employed by Paul elsewhere for the same purpose. To this class are sometimes reckoned such words and phrases as ἀγάπη τῶν Κύριων, ἀγάπη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, διδονάι τινα τι, ἀγαθὸς πρὸς τι, δήσμος, ἵστε γνώσκοντες, εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων τῶν αἰώνων, πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου, σωτηρίου, αἳ διάνοιαν, τὰ θελήματα, πνεύμα τοῦ νόος. Little need be said of peculiarities of this kind. Some of them have their explanation in the nature of the subject or in simple variety in style and expression. Others have affinities elsewhere in the Pauline writings. How varied, e.g., is Paul's way of speaking of understanding, spirit, etc. Is a writer like St. Paul to be shut up to the same stereotyped forms of expression in one writing after another? Is he to be debarred from using the word ἀγάπαρ with reference to Christ or to the Church in this Epistle, merely because in other Epistles he uses it with regard to God? And is it impossible for him to
address his hearers as τάκτα διάπητα when the imitation of God is in view, because elsewhere he may use that designation with regard to their relations to himself?

Some of the instances most commonly cited, however, deserve more attention. There is, e.g., the use of φωτίζων in iii. 9, in application to the Apostle's commission to enlighten or instruct. This, it is urged, is an application of the word not found elsewhere in the Pauline writings. But that might be the case and yet its use here might have its justification. The reading is not certain. The question is whether πάρτας should be inserted or not. If it is omitted, then the aspect of the question is changed. If it is inserted, there are analogies to this use of φωτίζων in the LXX (Jud. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii. 27, 28), and Paul may have followed these. There is again the designation of God as ὁ Θεός τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (i. 17). This indeed is a rare designation, and for that very reason one most unlikely to have been used by a forger or a mere imitator. But it is a designation perfectly consistent with the highest view of Christ's Person, and one which has its justification in Christ's own words, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel (John xx. 17). The phrase τὰ ἐπιφάνεια, which is used five times in this Epistle and, as it seems, with the local sense, is confined, it is true, to this one writing among all those attributed to Paul. But the adjective, ἐπιφανεῖς, in the sense of heavenly, is used also in 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Phil. ii. 10. It is difficult to see why Paul should not be thought at liberty to use or even to coin such a phrase, or why he might not select the term τὰ πνεύματα instead of τὰ πνεύματα in the large and special sense which it has in this Epistle. Why, too, should it be thought that a word like κορικράτωρ, or a phrase like ὁ ἀγαθὸς τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀρχον, so appropriate to the ideas in hand, must be alien to Paul? So is it also with the word διάβολος which meets us in this Epistle, while in others, it is said, Paul speaks only of ἡμιασ. But διάβολος is also used in 1 and 2 Tim. The two words indeed are practically the same in sense. They are employed interchangeably by other NT writers, e.g., the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Acts. Why should a writer of the power and the versatility of Paul be tied down to the use of one of these words in all his writings, later as well as earlier? There remains the phrase of which perhaps most has been made, τοῖς ἄγιοις ἀποστόλοις καὶ προφήταις. This, it is said, smacks of the later period when men's thoughts of the Apostles and the prophets of the NT Church had changed. Its use here has been felt to be such a difficulty by some that they have tried to dispose of it as a gloss or as a case of dislocation in the text. But
there is nothing so very strange in this application of the term δικαιοσύνη if we give the word the broad sense which is its proper sense, and which it has indeed in the very same context in the phrase ἐν τῷ δικαιοτέρῳ πάσην ἡμῖν (iii. 8).

In the fourth place serious objection is taken to the Pauline authorship on the ground of what is held to be the un-Pauline type of thought which appears again and again in the Epistle. It is said, e.g., that the question of the inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one Church is presented in a different light from that in which it is seen in other Pauline Epistles. Only here, it is said, is it put before us as the great object or, at least, a primary object of Christ's work and of the Divine predestination (ii. 13-18, 19-22, iii. 5, etc., iv. 7-16); and what is more, it is introduced simply as a matter of revelation and not as a thing over which there had been sharp controversy. It is certainly a remarkable place that is given in this Epistle to the thought of the unity of the Church and the perfect equality of Jew and Gentile within it. But there is no contradiction between this way of looking at the inclusion of the Gentiles and that which prevails in the other Epistles. The statement is in harmony with the general disposition of the Epistle, which is to carry all things back to the eternal will and purpose of God. The controversy, moreover, was ended, and Paul had no occasion to revived the memory of it in the message needed by those whom he addresses here.

The view, again, which is given of the Law in this Epistle is thought to be singular. The Law is not exhibited, it is said, as having any real moral value or religious use, but as having simply a typical significance and as the cause of enmity and separation between Jew and Gentile. And Circumcision itself, it is added, is presented as a merely formal thing, and contemptuous words are spoken of it (ἡ λεγομένη περιτομή, ii. 11) which would come strangely from Paul, himself a circumcised Jew and one who elsewhere attaches religious value to circumcision and says good things of it. But where he had for his special subject the oneness of Jew and Gentile as effected by Christ and as seen in the Church, it was matter of course that he should speak particularly of the dividing effect of the Law as it was witnessed in the pre-Christian times. And he does not speak elsewhere of the Law only in one way. He has very different things to say of it according to circumstances; and he presents it in aspects which seem even contradictory, speaking of it, as he does, now as holy (Rom. vii. 9) and again as incompetent (Rom. viii. 3); now as a παραγωγὸς εἰς Χριστὸν (Gal. iii. 25) and again as carrying a curse (κατάρα) and condemnation with it (Gal.
iii. 10). And the same is true of the ways in which circumcision is regarded in the Pauline Epistles: cf. Rom. ii. 26-29, iii. 1; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15; Phil. iii. 5; Col. ii. 11, 13, etc.

A very different position, too, is thought to be given to the Death of Christ in this Epistle from what it has in the acknowledged Pauline writings. In Epistles like those to the Romans, the Galatians and the Corinthians its expiatory and propitiatory value is the theme on which Paul dwells with most emphasis. But here this is passed over in silence, and comparatively little is made of the Death of Christ even in other aspects. It is rather His exaltation with all that it involves that is dwelt on. But the difference, so far as it exists, is due to the occasion and to the state of those addressed. It is true that it is as the means by which the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile is effected that the Cross is specially mentioned (ii. 16), and it is with reference to the imitation of God that Christ's giving of Himself is described as an offering and a sacrifice to God. But there is nothing in this to make it impossible to suppose that the same author, writing with an eye on other conditions, might speak of the Cross and the Death of Christ in connection with the reconciliation of the world or of the individual. Moreover, we have here the blood of Christ, redemption through His blood, and the forgiveness of sins as related to His blood—all which are distinctly Pauline, if they are also Johannine, terms and ideas (i. 7, ii. 13).

Further, this Epistle is alleged to depart widely from the recognised Pauline Epistles in its Christology, its doctrine of Christ's Headship, and its view of the Parousia. With regard to the first of these particulars this Epistle is more in affinity with that to the Colossians than with any other, in so far as it exhibits Christ in His largest relations to creation, and presents Him as designed in the eternal purpose of God to be the bond of union or reunion for a world existing at present in a condition of dislocation and division. But there are at least the rudiments and foretokens of this doctrine of Christ's cosmical relations elsewhere. There is, e.g., the statement of the "one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things," in 1 Cor. viii. 6; and there is the larger analogy in the great paragraph on the Evangel of Creation in Rom. viii. 19-20. It may be, again, that in other Pauline passages the body is said to be as Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12) or be in Christ (Rom. xii. 4, 5), and the head is reckoned simply among the members (1 Cor. xii. 21); whereas here, as in Colossians, believers are the members, Christ is the Head, and the Church is the body. But the different applications of these figures have their sufficient explana-
tion in the different subjects. In the present case the subject is the relation between Christ and the Church; in the others it is the relation between the members of the Church themselves. And as regards the Parousia, the assertion is that, instead of looking, as Paul does elsewhere, to that great event as the near and certain conclusion of the world's end and the consummation of the Kingdom of God, the writer of this Epistle views the future as made up of a series of ages following one upon the other. But this overlooks the consideration that the αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι may be those that are to make up the Eternity which opens after the Second Coming. The fact remains, however, that the Parousia does not occupy the place which it has in such Epistles as those to the Thessalonians, and that there is nothing to show that it fills the writer's vision here as it does there. But this Epistle is separated by years from those earliest writings attributed to Paul. Much had taken place in the interval; the Return of Christ had not been witnessed, but the Kingdom of God had been seen establishing itself far and wide by the preaching of the Gospel. Even in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians it is recognised that the Parousia cannot enter until certain things have happened; and in the further experience of God's ways as regards the times and the seasons, the Second Coming, though the expectation of it was not lost, came to be regarded as a less immediately impending event.

Finally, it is affirmed that this Epistle differs essentially from the acknowledged Pauline writings in its view of the Church, and that in more than one respect. It is singular, it is said, in speaking of the Church as one, and it gives a view of the Church which could not have emerged till a considerably later date than that to which Ephesians must be assigned if it is by Paul. To this it is enough to reply first that there is nothing in the Epistle to point to a highly developed condition of the Church. The organisation of the Church is not one of the subjects dealt with. The gifts bestowed upon the Church are brought into view, and are shown to be of various kinds. But they are not such as infer a comparatively late period. There is no mention of rule by bishops and deacons, nor does the external unity of the Church form a feature of this Epistle. The view which is given of the Church as one is indeed the highest found in the Pauline writings. But it is not wholly new. It has its foundations at least in earlier Pauline writings, as, e.g., in 1 Cor. xii. 28 (ἡ θεος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρώτων ἀποστόλων, etc.) ; xv. 9 (διότι διώκει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ) ; Gal. i. 13 (διώκειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ) ; Phil. iii. 6 (διώκειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) ; cf. in the Book of Acts (the composition of a Pauline
writer), the εκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ [Κυρίου] ἂν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, xx. 28. In the sister Epistle, too, the term εκκλησία is used both of the local Church and of the universal (i. 18, 24, iv. 15, 16). But, apart from that, the unity is a spiritual unity, a oneness which consists in the union of individuals, the ἀγίοι, in faith—not the unity of a corporation or an organisation. There is nothing in this important section of the teaching of the Epistle to make it necessary to suppose that it was written at a time when the multitude of separate local Churches were driven by the needs of defence to form themselves into one large, strong organisation.

In none of these particulars in which this Epistle is asserted to stand apart is there any essential difference between it and the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. There are differences, but they are differences which admit in each case of a natural explanation, and which in no case amount to anything that is incompatible with the recognised Pauline doctrine. On the other hand, as scholars like Jülicher frankly admit, we find in this Epistle many distinctive Pauline ideas, turns of expression, and qualities of style—the use of characteristic terms not found elsewhere in the NT, of particles like διά, ἀρετή, ἄνω, etc.; of ideas like that of the Divine riches, etc., as well as the broad lines of Pauline doctrine. Allowing all reasonable weight to the internal considerations, of which so much is made, they come far short of balancing the strong and consistent argument provided by the historical testimony to the Pauline authorship.

6. The Destination of the Epistle. The traditional view is that the Epistle was addressed to the Ephesian Church—to that Church definitely and by itself. This view has still the support of some important authorities. In modern times, however, it has come to be largely held that the Epistle is an Encyclical letter, meant not for the Ephesian Church specifically, but for a number of Churches, or rather for the Christian people found in the Roman Province of Asia, or more particularly in the Phrygian territory. The question is—Which of these two views of the destination of the Epistle best satisfies the data at our disposal, internal and external?

At first the case for the traditional view seems to be far stronger than the other, especially on the side of the historical testimony. Here much depends on how the reading ἐν Ἐφεσω in the inscription is regarded. The textual question is not by any means the only element in the case. But it is an important element, and the facts which come into view are of great interest. They are also plain and indisputable. First there is the fact that all manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, with the exception of three, have the words ἐν Ἐφεσω in the
opening verse. There is the second fact that all manuscripts, so far as known to us, without any exception have had this express note of destination in the inscription at one time or other. There is the third fact that the description of the intended readers as the saints in Ephesus is found in all the ancient Versions. And in addition to this we have the fact that everywhere the title of the Epistle bears that it is addressed to the Ephesians. These things make their impression. They are taken by so high an authority as Meyer to mean that the entire ancient Church (Marcion being discounted), from the Muratorian Canon (somewhere about A.D. 180), Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, held the Epistle to be addressed to the Ephesians.

The argument from historical testimony in favour of the retention of “in Ephesus” in the inscription is also supported by such considerations as these—that in the Epistles generally acknowledged to be by Paul the readers in view are definitely designated, even when the Apostle is not writing to the Christians of a single Church or city (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1); that if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted, the letter becomes a circular letter “without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality,” as Meyer puts it, and that this does not fit in either with the declared mission of Tychicus (vi. 21), or with what is said in such passages as i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc. It is further urged that in every other case in which Paul makes use of the phrase τοῖς ὁσιοῖς in an inscription, he attaches to it the name of the city or territory to which the readers belong (as in Rom., Cor., Phil.), and that without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ the τοῖς ὁσιοῖς does not admit of a sense that is adequate or even natural. It may be added that some think there is an allusion to the world-famed temple of Diana at Ephesus in chap. ii. It is also strongly argued that it is incredible that no letter should have been addressed by Paul to a Church like this with which he had so many intimate connections, and which was of such importance in the fulfillment of his mission. The case as thus stated seems well-nigh concluded.

But there is another side to it. The arguments last mentioned are obviously of the most precarious kind. There are other Churches with which Paul had very close connections, but which have no letter specifically addressed to them among all the Pauline writings that have come down to us. If there is an allusion to any particular temple in chap. ii, it might be that of Jerusalem rather than that of Ephesus. The phrase τοῖς ὁσιοῖς may be construed satisfactorily, as we shall see (cf. Notes on i. 1), even if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted. The letter may be a circular letter of another kind than that supposed by Meyer to be indicated by the contents. And there may be a
sufficient reason for Paul's departure in this case from his usual habit of designating by their locality the readers he addresses.

But it is of more importance to see how different an aspect the textual question assumes when it is more closely examined. For the weighty fact presents itself that the words ἐν Ἐφεσω are not found in our two oldest and best manuscripts, ΜB. They have also been struck out of cursive 67 by a second hand which may have some affinity with B. This is a fact of essential importance in view of what these two great uncialss have been proved to be in respect of value as well as age. It is reinforced by transcriptional probability, it being far less likely that a local designation so much in Paul's way, if it belonged to the original text, should have been dropped out or deleted by a succession of scribes than that, not forming part of the original inscription, it should have been inserted by later hands. Nor can the witness of the ancient Versions outweigh this textual evidence. For, important as that witness is, it is the witness of documents, the extant manuscripts of which are not equal in antiquity to the Greek uncialss.

But the textual case does not end here. It is supported by Patristic testimony of great significance. From Tertullian we learn that Marcion and his followers spoke of the Epistle as addressed to the Laodicenes. The relevant passages are these two: (1) Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenes (Adv. Marc., v., 11); and (2) Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiti quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam (ib. 17).

In face of this statement it is difficult indeed to suppose that Marcion could have had the words ἐν Ἐφεσω in his text.

Then it appears from what is reported of Origen's commentary that he, too, had not the words in his text. The passage runs thus: Ἰριγένσες δὲ φησι, ἐπὶ μόνῳ Ἐφεσιῶν εὗρομεν κείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι," καὶ ἤποιμεν εἰ μὴ παρέλκει προσκείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι." τι θύναι τημαίνειν· διὰ οὖν εἰ μὴ ὤσπερ ἐν τῇ Ἐξάδῳ ὅμοια φησιν ἐκαυτῷ ὁ χρηματίζων μωσεῖ τὸ ὅν, οὕτως οἱ μετέχουσις τοῦ ὅποιος, γίνονται ὄντες, καλοῦμενοι οἰονεί ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι, "ἐξελέγατο γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὴ ἡξαμι " φησιν ὁ ὁσίος Παύλος, "ἰδα τὰ ὅστα καταργῆτο," etc. (Cramer, Catena). Here Origen states distinctly that the phrase was without ἐν Ἐφεσω, and that this was peculiar to the case of Ephesians; and he proposes a particular way of getting a suitable meaning out of the phrase, giving it a metaphysical sense.
Further, as regards Tertullian, from the passages already quoted, it may be inferred with much probability that he, as well as Marcion, did not have έν Ἐφεσω in his text. For it is of the title that he speaks, and what he charges Marcion with falsifying is not the text itself but the title. If he had had the words έν Ἐφεσω in the text he would surely have appealed to that in refuting Marcion. But instead of that he appeals to the veritas ecclesiae.

Then we have a statement of great importance made by Basil. It is as follows: τοις Ἐφεσιοις ἐπιστέλλων, ὡς γηγοίως ἡμώνεσ τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἰδιαίτερως ἀνέμασεν, εἰτὼν τοὺς ἁγίους τοῖς ὄσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδόκασι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν (Adv. Eunom., ii., 19). Here Basil is obviously referring to the έν Ἐφεσω; not, as some painfully endeavour to make out, to the τοις or to the αὖσι. In doing so he gives us to understand that the local designation was absent, and his statement is the more important because he speaks not only of the ancient copies themselves, but also of the tradition of the men who were before him, and describes the clause as being in both cases simply τοις ἁγίους τοῖς ὄσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

There are other witnesses that are considered to speak to the same effect. But they are less certain and at the best only of subordinate importance. There is a statement by Jerome to the following effect: Quidam curiosius quam necesse est putant ex eo quod Moysi dictum sit "Haec dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me," etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos. . . . Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos qui sint, sed ad eos qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur (On Eph. i. 1; vol. vii., p. 545). In this Jerome seems to refer to Origen and his interpretation of τοῖς ὄσι, and to the peculiar reading. But it is at least possible, as Meyer takes it, that the words eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles may represent τοῖς ἁγίους τοῖς ὄσιν ἐν Ἐφεσω καὶ πιστοῖς; or it may be, as others, e.g., Alford, think, that Jerome is dealing only with two possible interpretations of τοῖς ὄσιν, without saying anything to imply that the words ἐν Ἐφεσω were absent from the inscription.

There is, however, something to notice in the case of certain Latin commentators. In some of these the inscription is dealt with in a way that suggests either that they had not the word Ephesi in the copies they followed, or that it occupied a different place. Thus Ambrosiater passes over the word Ephesi in his comment—non solum fidelibus scribit, sed et sanctis: ut tunc vere fideles sint, si fuerint sancti in Christo Jesu. Victorinus Afer's statement points to a different arrangement of the words—sed haec
cum dicit "Sanctis qui sunt fidelibus Ephesi" quid adjungitur? "In Christo Jesu" (Mai, Script. Vet. nova Collect., iii., p. 87). At a much later period Sedulius Scotus also comments on the passage thus: Sanctis. Non omnibus Ephesiis, sed his qui credunt in Christo. Et fidelibus. Omnes sancti fideles sunt, non omnes fideles sancti, etc. Qui sunt in Christo Jesu. Plures fideles sunt sed non in Christo, etc. (cf. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, pp. 384, 385, and Abbott, ut supra, pp. ii, iii). The strength of the case on the side of Textual Criticism, however, lies with ΝΒ and the testimonies of Marcion, Origen and Basil. It amounts to this, that there is no evidence that the words εν Εφεσω formed part of the Greek text of the first three centuries. It is not till we come to the latter half of the fourth century that we have any certain indication of the local designation being included in the inscription, and that indication is found in Basil’s implied distinction between the ancient copies (τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων) and others.

But the question does not terminate there. The character of the Epistle itself and the relations between Paul and the Ephesian Church form weighty elements in the case. Everything goes to show how intimate these relations were, how peculiar was the place that this Church had in the Apostle’s heart, how much it was his care. Not only was he the founder of the Church of Ephesus, but he spent some three years preaching and teaching in the city. During that long residence his interest in his Ephesian converts was so keen and anxious and his labours in their behalf so great that he describes himself as “ceasing not to warn every one day and night with tears” (Acts xx. 31). Various things that are mentioned or alluded to in his Epistles indicate how constantly he had them in his mind. And the farewell which he took of their elders at Miletus is among the most pathetic passages of the NT. On his side there were words of tender solicitude and loving warning; on theirs thankfulness, affection, an emotion so profound that they “fell on his neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more”. It is difficult to suppose that Paul could have written a letter intended specifically for this Church without giving some indication of what it was to him personally, without some reference to what he had done for it and the grateful response which his labours had found in it, without letting his feeling towards its members express itself in some form.

Yet this Epistle is in all these respects a singularly neutral composition, without the personal note that makes itself felt in such Epistles as those to Corinth and Philippi, with nothing to say about
any individual but the bearer of the letter, with nothing to connect it with the particular locality, with little or nothing to recall Paul's stay in Ephesus or any of the many things that made his work among the Ephesians so memorable and the terms on which he and they stood to each other so close and affectionate. In the present case there is only the very general salutation which is given in the last two verses; and that is something less particular than the salutation with which the Epistle to the Philippians closes; while there are none of those personal touches throughout the Epistle to relieve the impersonal conclusion such as we find in these other letters. And in addition to the argument which founds on this neutral, impersonal quality of the Epistle, there are expressions here and there which perhaps suggest relations of a different kind from those which we know to have existed between Paul and the Ephesians. Not to speak of such passages as i. 15, there is the statement in iii. 4, which seems to some to mean that those addressed had yet to learn what Paul's "knowledge of the mystery in Christ" was; which could not be said of the Ephesians. There are also the two passages in which Paul uses the formula: "if indeed" (iii. 2, iv. 21, 22); of which it may be said that, although εἰκός does not necessarily express actual doubt, it is a particle more in place where the speaker's own experience or work is not in view, than where he addresses those who owe to him what they are and with whom his relations are direct and intimate.

The result, therefore, to which many have been led since Archbishop Ussher first threw out the suggestion is that this Epistle is a circular letter meant for a number of Churches in a particular part of the Asiatic province, of which Ephesus was one. This view is accepted in one way or other by such authorities as Bengel, Neander, Harless, Olshausen, Reuss, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Hort, Weiss, Woldemar Schmidt, Abbott, etc. This general conclusion, however, is put in more than one form. Some regard the sentence as complete in itself and as requiring nothing to be inserted after the τοῖς ὅσιοι. Bengel, e.g., looking to the κατὰ τὴν ὅσιον ἐκκλησίαν of Acts xiii. 1, and the αἱ ὅσιοι ἐκκλησία of Rom. xiii. 1, rendered it "sanctis et fidelibus qui sunt in omnibus iis locis, quo Tychicus cum hac Epistola venit". But the introduction of ἐν Ἀρτέμισι in the former and the force of the ὅσιος in the latter make these imperfect parallels. Others give the words the sense of "the saints who are really such" or "the saints existing and faithful in Christ Jesus". But neither of these readings can be justified. The only interpretation of the clause that is quite consistent with grammar,
in making it a sentence complete within itself, is "the saints who are also faithful". Adopting this, some (e.g., Abbott, following Reiche, Ewald, etc.) take the Epistle to be addressed not to any particular Church or Churches as such, but generally to all the Christian people in the Phrygian parts. This hypothesis, it is held, explains the absence of local particulars; avoids the necessity of supposing that a blank space had been left after the τοὺς ὑδότας; and enables us to understand the phrase "the epistle from Laodicea" in Col. iv. 16. Others, however, think the case is better met by supposing that a space was left in which the name of the particular church might be inserted to which the letter was addressed in the course of its circular journeyings; or, as Hort prefers to put it, that the blank in the original copy sent with Tychicus was filled in with the name of the Church of each place in which it was read.

The last is perhaps the most natural explanation. And on the whole question it may be said that it is much easier to understand how the local designation should have come to be inserted than to imagine how, if originally in the text, it should have come to be omitted, and that, too, at so early a date. The fact that the Ephesian Church was the Church of the chief city of the Asiatic Province and the most important Church in all these parts would account for the insertion of ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, especially if, as is most probable, it was from Ephesus that copies were sent elsewhere. The fact that the Epistle was meant for a wider audience than that found in Ephesus itself would account for the circulation of such a letter as that referred to as "the epistle from Laodicea". On the other hand, the supposition that the Epistle was meant originally only for Ephesus, and that the ἐν Ἐφεσῳ came to be dropped either by accident or by design, is one hard to entertain. It is difficult to imagine how mere accident could account for the omission, and to say that the local designation was struck out of certain very ancient copies because it did not appear to be in harmony with the contents of the letter is to attribute to these very early times the operation of a criticism of which we have very little evidence.

7. TIME AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION. The date has been put variously, e.g., at A.D. 55-58 (McGiffert); 60 or 61 (Meyer); 62 (Zahn); 61-63 (Lightfoot); 75 to 80 (Ewald); about A.D. 80 (Scholten); about A.D. 100 (Holtzmann, Mangold); 130-140 (Baur, Davidson). The question of the date depends largely on the question of the place. The Epistle itself makes it clear that Paul was a prisoner when he wrote it (iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20). It contains things, too, which point to some affinity between it and other Epistles in which the
writer is a prisoner. The reference to Tychicus as the bearer connects it with the Epistles to Philemon and the Colossians (cf. vi. 21, Phil. 13, Col. iv. 7), and suggests that these three letters belong very much to the same period, and that they were written when Paul was occupied very much with the same questions. Two imprisonments, however, come into view—the one in Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35, xxiv. 27), the other in Rome (Acts xxviii.). Each of these has its supporters.

The view that this Epistle belongs to the period of the Cæsarean Captivity is advocated with great ability by Reuss and Meyer among others. Reuss contends that the theory that the various Epistles of the Captivity were all written from Rome rests mostly on "unauthenticated tradition"; that the mood of the Apostle in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon suits his circumstances in Cæsarea better than those in Rome; that there are chronological difficulties of a serious nature in the way of referring these three Epistles together with Philippians and 2 Timothy to Rome; that this makes it necessary to divide the five between Cæsarea and Rome; and that the various allusions to individuals, such as Tychicus, Timothy and Demetrius, in these Epistles are best harmonised, and certain particular statements, such as the πρὸς δὲ αὐτὸν in Phil. 15, best understood, on the theory that those to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written in Cæsarea.

Meyer admits that some of the arguments thus used by Reuss cannot be pressed, especially those founding on such indications as the πρὸς δὲ αὐτὸν, and on the idea that the friends of Paul mentioned in Colossians (iv. 9-14) and Philemon (10, 23) could not have been with him at Rome. But he attaches great importance to these considerations—viz., (1) that it is more probable that Onesimus should have sought safety in Colossæ than that he should have risked the long journey by sea to Rome, and the possibilities of capture in Rome; (2) that if Ephesians and Colossians had been sent from Rome, Tychicus and Onesimus would have arrived at Ephesus first and afterwards at Colossæ; in which case it would be reasonable to suppose that Paul would have mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians, as he does in the Epistle to the Colossians; (3) that the ἵνα εἶδητε καὶ ὑμεῖς in Bph. vi. 21 implies that when Tychicus reached Ephesus he "would already have fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others," and these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9); and (4) that in Phil. 22 Paul asks a lodging to be prepared for his speedy use—a statement implying that his place of imprisonment was not so distant from Colossæ as Rome was.
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These arguments, however, when narrowly examined, are not so convincing as they appear at first sight to be. A runaway slave would in reality be more likely to escape discovery in the thick masses of the population of the world’s metropolis than in Caesarea. Our ignorance of the circumstances of the flight of Onesimus and the supposition that the Epistle is an Encyclical make the argument from the lack of any such mention of Onesimus as we find in Colossians uncertain. The ἐπὶ τοὺς τετρακάσια μισεῖ does not necessarily imply what Meyer infers from it, and the same may be said of the reference to the lodging in Philemon.

On the other hand there are weighty objections to referring this Epistle to the Caesarean imprisonment. Thus, the circumstances of the captivity seem to suit Rome better than Caesarea. For when we compare Acts xxiv. 23 with Acts xxviii. 16, etc., we gather that the Apostle had less liberty in Caesarea than in Rome, and this accords ill with such passages as Eph. vi. 19, 20. The number of friends mentioned in these Epistles of the Captivity as companions of Paul—Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Lucas, Demas, Epaphras, Tychicus, Onesimus—is considerable, so considerable as to make it probable, as Alford, e.g., contends, that he was in Rome; for it was there rather than in Caesarea that so many might have been with him. Then there is the argument drawn from the relations between the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. If these letters belong to much the same period in Paul’s career (and there is much to favour that), then the mention of “Caesar’s household” in Phil. iv. 22 points much more to Rome than to Caesarea as the place of the Apostle’s residence when he wrote these kindred communications; and the same holds good of the statement of his progress in Phil. i. 21, etc. In neither case can Caesarea be fairly said to suit the circumstances, or to be of the importance implied. The expectation also which the Apostle appears to entertain when he wrote Philippians was that of speedy release and a visit to Macedonia (i. 26, ii. 24, Phil. 22); but what he looked to when he was in Caesarea was rather that he might go to Rome.

These arguments will become all the stronger if it is made out that Philippians was written before Ephesians. There is the greater reason then for taking the latter to have been written at Rome. This is a question which need not be discussed at length here. It is enough to say that the arguments against the priority of Philippians in the line of these four letters of the Captivity are neither very certain nor very weighty, while there are various internal considerations which favour the priority. Of these the
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most important perhaps is found in the points of contact on the one hand between *Philippians* and the earlier Pauline Epistles, especially *Romans*, and on the other hand between *Philippians* and the other three Epistles of the Captivity. These have been worked out with care by Lightfoot among others, at once with regard to particular expressions and to parallels in thought. They have led him and others to the conclusion that the Epistle to the Philippians is the middle link between the great letter to the Romans and those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon. The majority of scholars, therefore, take our Epistle to have been written at Rome. If so, its date may be about A.D. 62 or 63.

The question has also been considerably discussed whether our Epistle is prior to that to the Colossians or posterior to it. That it is prior is argued from its more general aim; from the more abstract character of its contents; and from the consideration that, as it is an Epistle which would be much more difficult to draw up than that to the Colossians, the resemblances between the two are best accounted for by supposing that some of the ideas thought out in the former were transferred to the latter. On the other hand, it is held that, as Colossæ was nearer Cæsarea and would be reached by Tychicus before he got to Ephesus, it is more natural to think that the Epistle to that Church would be written before the other, as it would be delivered before it. But this presupposes that the place of composition was Cæsarea. And the same is the case with the contention that the καὶ δὲ τοῦ of Eph. vi. 21 refers to the Colossians (cf. Col. iv. 7), and presupposes that Paul had already communicated with Colossæ. These are all very precarious arguments, and the question must be regarded as undecided.

8. THE DOCTRINE OF THE EPISTLE. The teaching of the Epistle is at once so lofty and so profound as to more than justify all that has been said of the grandeur of the composition by discerning minds in ancient and in modern times. Chrysostom speaks of the Epistle as "overflowing with lofty thoughts and doctrines"—one in which Paul expounds things "which he scarcely anywhere else utters". (ὑψηλῶν σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων· ὡς γὰρ μηθαμοῦ σχέδου ἐφεξῆς, ταῦτα ἐνταῦθα ἡπείροι.) Theophylact, Grotius, Witsius and others speak of it in similar terms. Adolphe Monod, in his *Explanation*, describes it as "embracing in its brevity the whole field of the Christian religion," as expounding "now its doctrines, now its morals with such conciseness and such fulness combined that it would be difficult to name any great doctrine or any essential duty which has not its place marked in it". And Coleridge wrote of it as "one of
the divinest compositions of man," embracing "every doctrine of Christianity—first those doctrines peculiar to Christianity, and then those precepts common to it with natural religion" (Table Talk).

What gives it its peculiar majesty is the way in which it carries everything back to God Himself, His will, His eternal purpose and counsel. It is a distinctively theological Epistle, in the sense in which the Epistle to the Romans is distinctively anthropological or psychological, and that to the Colossians Christological. The great subjects of predestination and the Divine plan, eternal in the mind of God, centring in Christ and fulfilled in Him, have a larger and more definite place in this Epistle than in any other, excepting Rom. viii.-xi. It has at the same time, however, a rich Christology. Christ is set forth as the Son of God (i. 3, iv. 13); the Beloved of the Father (i. 6); pre-existent (i. 4); raised from the dead and exalted to supreme sovereignty over all things—King of the universe and Head of the Church (i. 20-23, ii. 6, iv. 9, 12, v. 23); the Giver of all spiritual gifts (iv. 7, 8); the Treasury of all knowledge and riches (iii. 8-10); having the place given in the OT to Jehovah (iv. 8).

Its Soteriology also is of wide compass. It speaks of Christ as the medium of God's forgiveness of sinners (iv. 32); of redemption as coming to us by Him (i. 7); of the offering and the sacrifice made to God in Christ's giving of Himself (v. 2); of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile as accomplished by Him; of the gracious results of His work as being effected by His blood and His cross (i. 7, ii. 16). The doctrine of the Church also reaches its highest point in this Epistle. Not only is the Church the Bride of Christ (v. 25-27) and His Body and the fulness of His gifts, but it is the Church ideal—one great, catholic, spiritual body including all the chosen, redeemed and sanctified. And among other doctrines which have a place in it is that of the Holy Spirit as active in the prophets (iii. 5), and as the believer's seal and earnest (i. 13, 14, iv. 30); that of regeneration as the operation of God (ii. 25); and that of the existence and power of evil spirits (ii. 2, vi. 12). The deep foundations of the confessional doctrine of original sin are also found by many in ii. 3, and the great Reformation doctrine of the priority of grace has its roots in ii. 5-8.

9. The Literature of the Epistle. The literature is copious.

It is not to mention the well-known books on New Testament Introduction, the various works on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, and the articles in the great Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias, there are many treatises of importance in addition to the formal commentaries. Among these may be mentioned C. F. Baur's Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi; H. J. Holtzmann's Kritik der
Epheser- und Kolosser-briefe; J. Köstlin's Der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der verwandten N. T. Lehrbegriffe; A. Lünemann's De Epistola ad Ephesios Authentia; J. P. Raebiger's De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio; C. von Weizsäcker's Apost. Zeitalter; L. Usteri's Entwicklung des Paul. Lehrbegriff's; O. Pfleiderer's Der Paulinismus (Paulinism, tr. by E. Peters) and his Urchristentum; A. Sabatier's L'Apôtre Paul (The Apostle Paul, tr. by A. M. Hellier); J. T. Wood's Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus; A. C. M'Giffert's History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age; G. G. Findlay's Ephesians (The Expositor's Bible); R. S. Candlish's Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, expounded in a series of Discourses; J. Pulsof'd's Christ and His Seed, central to all things, being a series of Expository Discourses on Ephesians; R. W. Dale's The Epistle to the Ephesians, its Doctrine and Ethics; J. B. Lightfoot's Biblical Essays; F. J. A. Hort's Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians; W. M. Ramsay's Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Church in the Roman Empire, and St. Paul the Traveller.

Among commentaries the following may be noticed: those by Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome and Óecumenius in ancient times; those by Luther, Bugenhagen, Bucer and Calvin in the Reformation period—of which Calvin's is by far the best; P. Bayne's Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (1643); J. Ferguson's A Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians (1659); Thomas Goodwin's Exposition (1681); L. Ridley's Commentary (1546); R. Rollock's In Ep. Pauli ad Ephesios Commentarius (1580); also H. Zanchius, Comment. in Ep. ad Ephesios (1594); R. Boyd of Trochrig, In Epistolam Pauli Apost. ad Ephesios Praelectiones (1652); John Locke, Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians (1707); J. D. Michaelis, Paraphrase u. Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galat., Eph., Phil., Col. (1750, 1769); S. F. N. Morus, Acroases in Epp. Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios (1795); P. J. Spener, Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Colosser (1706); G. T. Zachariae, Paraphrastische Erklärung der Briefe Pauli an die Gal., Eph., Philip., u. Thess. (1771, 1787).

Of works of more recent date those by the following may be mentioned: Dr. Alfred Barry, in Ellicott's New Testament Commentary for English Readers; L. F. O. Baumgarten Crusius, Comm. über die Briefe Pauli an die Eph. u. Kol. (1847); J. A. Beet, Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon; J.
INTRODUCTION


Abbreviations.—The abbreviations adopted in this Commentary are either those usually employed or such as explain themselves.
ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΩΤΕΣ.

I. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δαπέστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 1 διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, επὶ Ἀκροπόλεως Ἡρῴδου, καὶ προς τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς ὁσίους ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦς Ἁγίους Ἰουδαίους, ἤζυγον τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς Πατρίδος. Ἐπιστολὴ τὴν ἔγραψαν Ἁπασκενοτικός Νανδρός, Ἐλεων χριστιανὸς τῶν Βαρνάβαδος. Καὶ παραστάτη τῇ Πολιτείᾳ τῶν Θηβαίων Ἀπολλώνιος. Μετὰ τὰς ἱεροτεχνίας τῶν ἀκούσας, ἐπιστεύεται ἐντός τῆς ἱερατικῆς λόγου τῶν ἐν τῇ Πολιτείᾳ Νανδρόν, ἐπιστεύεται ἐν τῇ Περγαμοῦ τῶν Παραστάτων τῆς ἱεροτεχνίας. 

Chapter I.—Vv. 1, 2. Address and Salutation.—In the form of his Epistles, especially in the opening address and in the conclusion, Paul follows the methods of letter writing which were customary in the ancient world, in particular in Greece and Rome, in his own time. We now possess a considerable collection of ancient letters, especially communications of a business kind and letters of familiar intercourse. Not a few of these belong to the periods immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ. They help us to a better understanding of some things in Paul's Epistles. They also let us see how he infused the new spirit of Christianity into the old accustomed heathen forms of epistolary correspondence.

This Epistle opens in Paul's usual way, with a greeting in which both the writer and the readers are specifically designated. At the same time the address has certain features of its own, which have their explanation in the circumstances.—Πάυλος. In the Epistles which he addresses to Churches, Paul usually associates some one else, or more than one, with himself in the superscription—Σωσθένης in 1 Corinthians; Timothy in 2 Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians; Silvanus and Timothy in 1 and 2 Thessalonians; "all the brethren" in Galatians. The only exception is the Epistle to the Romans. In Philemon, too, a letter of a personal and private character, though meant also for the Church in the house of the recipient (ver. 2), he names Timothy with himself. But in the present Epistle no one is conjoined with him in the greeting. It is difficult to suppose that he was absolutely alone at the time when he wrote this letter. The explanation lies probably in the fact that the Epistle was written as a communication of a general character, intended to go round a considerable circle of Churches.—δαπέστολος. Usually this term has the definite, official sense of a
delegate, a messenger with a commission. Occasionally it has a wider and less specific meaning, as in Acts xiv. 4, 14, 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6; Gal. ii. 9, and probably Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 6. In the Gospels, while it occurs often in Luke, it is found only once in each of the other three. In the LXX it occurs once, as the representative of ἄνδρα (1 Kings xiv. 6). In later Judaism it denotes one who is sent out on foreign service, e.g., to collect the Temple-tribute. See Light., Galatians, pp. 92-101. Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦς. This order is to be preferred, with the RV and ΤΤνWH, to the Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the TR and the AV. The genitive may be the ordinary possessive genitive, "an apostle belonging to Christ Jesus"; or it may be the genitive of derivation or source by Christ Jesus," the term ἀνότοτες retaining something of its original sense of one sent by another. The former is the more probable view, looking to the analogy of such phrases as οὗ εἶμι (Acts xxvii. 23). The name Χριστοῦ, which in the Gospels preserves its technical sense of "the Christ" in all but a few instances (e.g., Matt. i. 18; Mk. i. 1; John xvii. 3), has become a personal name in the Pauline Epistles. The combination "Jesus Christ," or "Christ Jesus," which is rare in the Gospels, occurs frequently in the Book of Acts and most frequently in the Epistles.

There is a variety in the way in which Paul designates himself in his Epistles that is of interest and has its meaning. In some he gives only his name, and makes no reference to his being either an apostle or a servant of Jesus Christ. So in one (Philippians) he describes himself as a "prisoner of Jesus Christ." In one (Philippians) he is "servant only; in two (Romans and Titus) he is both "servant" and "apostle". In seven (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Ephesians) it is only the apostleship that is instanced, but in each case with a further statement of how it came to him.—διὰ δικαιοματὸς Θεοῦ. So also in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Colossians and 2 Timothy. In Galatians we have οὐκ ἀπὸ ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲ δὶς ἀπό άνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ διὰ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, κ.τ.λ.; and in 1 Timothy: κατ' εὐπαθίαν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (RV); cf. κατ' εὐπαθίαν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ, with reference to the commission to preach (Titus i. 3).

The phrase used here in Ephesians defines the apostleship as an office which came to Paul neither by his own will nor by the act of any man, but by direct Divine call and appointment. His Epistles certainly reflect his consciousness of this fact. His work, his discourses, his letters all alike reveal the conviction that he was in actuality what he had been declared to be in the message to Ananias—"a vessel of election" (Acts ix. 15). This is the main idea in the defining sentence and its equivalents. They vindicate Paul's authority, indeed, when that is challenged, but they express primarily the fact that was by grace he was what he was (1 Cor. xv. 10).—τοῖς ἀγίοις. Those addressed are designated first by a term which expresses the great Old Testament idea of their separation. It does not immediately or distinctively denote their personal piety or sanctity in our sense of the word, though that is dealt with as going with the other. It expresses the larger fact that they are set apart to God and taken into a special relation to Him. In three of the Epistles of the Captivity (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians) it takes the place which the Church has in the superscriptions of the earlier Epistles (Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians). The reason for the variation is not easy to see. It has been supposed to be due to the desire to give "a more personal colouring to the Epistle as if addressed to the members of the Church as individuals rather than as a body" (Abbott). The distinction, indeed, is not carried through the two groups of Epistles; for in Philum it is again "the Church," not "the saints"—τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐν Εφεσίῳ. The local definition ἐν Εφεσίῳ (on which see more in the Introduction) is inserted by the TR and the vast majority of manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, and Fathers, and, as far as we know, by all the Versions. It is supported also to some extent by the fact that in the oldest manuscripts the title of the Epistle is πρὸς Ἑφεσίους; by the apparent preference for ἐν Εφεσίῳ of the Early Church that this Epistle was addressed to the Ephesians; by the absence of all evidence indicating that the Epistle was claimed in ancient times for any other Church definitely named; and by certain parallels in Ignatius. On the other hand, it is omitted by the two oldest and most important uncial, B and Ν (in which it has been inserted by later hands); it is expurgated from the cursive 67 by a corrector who seems to have had an older document before him; it did not
belong to the text of the manuscripts followed by Origen early in the third century, nor to that of those mentioned by Basil about a century and a half later. The omission is supported also to some extent by a statement made by Tertullian regarding Marcion; and more decidedly by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If ἐν ᾿Εφεσω is retained, all is plain. If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If ἐν ᾿Εφθου is retained, all is plain. If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If ἐν ᾿Εφθου is retained, all is plain. If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the τοῖς ὁσιῶν to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. The omission is supported to some extent by the general character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.
evangelical χάρις. What Paul desires for his readers is the enjoyment of the free, loving favour of God and the peace which results from it. This is the usual form which the opening salutation takes in the Epistles of the NT. So it is in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 2 and 2 Thessalonians, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter; as also in Revelation 1. 4. It is not, however, the only form. In James, but only in him, we have the old formula χάρις (i. 1). In 1 and 2 Timothy and 2 John (but not in Titus according to the best reading) it is χάρις, εὐαγγελίον; and in Jude we find εὐαγγελίον καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀμέτρητη πληροφορία. —καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. The grace and peace desired for the readers by the writer are blessings which come only from God the Father and from Christ. The "Lord Jesus Christ" is named along with "God our Father" as the giver of the grace and peace — a collocation impossible except on the supposition that the writer held Christ to be of the same rank with God or in a unique relation to Him. There is a distinction indicated here between God and Jesus Christ. But it is not in what they are able to give; for the gifts of grace and peace come from both. Nor is any distinction suggested here in respect of nature. But there is a distinction in respect of relation to believers. To the receivers of grace and peace God is in the relation of Father; to the same subjects Christ is in the relation of Lord. God is Father, having made them His children by adoption. Christ is Lord, being constituted Head of the Church and having won the right to their loving obedience and honour; cf. MacP., in loco.

Vv. 3-8. ASCRIPTION OF PRAISE TO GOD FOR THE BLESSINGS OF HIS LOVE AND GRACE. This extends over six verses, in one magnificent sentence intricately yet skillfully constructed, throbbing in each clause with the adoring sense of the majesty of that Divine Counsel and the riches of that Divine Grace which had made it possible to write in such terms to Gentiles in a distant province of the heathen Roman Empire. It is Paul's way to begin with a doxology or a burst of thanksgiving. The latter, expressed by εὐαγγελισμόν, εὐαγγελισμοί, etc., is the more usual, and is found in one form or another in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy (i. 12), 2 Timothy. The former is seen in 2 Corinthians and (in a different form) in Galatians as well as here. The only Epistle that lacks both is that to Titus.

Ver. 3. εὐλογητός: Blessed. The LXX equivalent for the Hebrew הָעָלֶה, Vulg. Benedictus. In the NT the idea of being blessed is expressed both by εὐλογητός (Luke i. 68; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3), and by εὐλογημένος (Matt. xxv. 34; Luke x. 30; John xii. 38; 1 Pet. i. 3; 1 Cor. i. 12). In the LXX it is used both of God (Gen. vi. 26, xiv. 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 33; Ps. lxxii. 17, 18, 19, etc.), and of man (Gen. xi. 2, xxiv. 31, xxvi. 29; Deut. vii. 14; Jud. xvii. 2; 1 Sam. xv. 13, xxv. 33; Ruth ii. 20). In the LXX εὐλογημένος is occasionally used of God. In the NT it is used only of man (Matt. xxv. 34; Luke i. 28, 42), of the Messiah (Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39);
Mark xi. 9; Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38; John xii. 13), or of the Messianic Kingdom (Mark xi. 10). In doxologies we are usually left to supply the verb, which may be δοθέν (Abbott); δόθων on the analogy of δοθέν. θεός εὐλογητὸς in 2 Chron. ix. 8; or εὐλογητὸς on the analogy of Job i. 21, Psalm cxiii. 2, in which passages, however, the form is εὐλογημένος. Here, as generally where εὐλογητὸς is the word used and not εὐλογημένος, the sentence is best taken as an affirmation, δόθων being supplied; cf. Psalm cxix. 12 in contrast with Ps. cxviii. 1; Job i. 21; 2 Chron. ix. 8. In most cases the εὐλογητὸς stands first in its sentence. There are exceptions, where the verb or participle has a position within the sentence or at its close. These are explained by some (W. Schmidt, etc.) as due to the fact that the emphasis is meant to be on the Subject of the doxology, not on the idea of the praise itself; by others (Haupt, etc.) more simply as regards most occurrences, if not all, as due to the fact that the copula (ἐστι, γεγονότοι) is expressed. The cases most in point are in 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Psalm lxviii. 19, cxiii. 2. In all these instances except the last the form is εὐλογημένος and the γένος or εἷς is expressed. In Psalm lxviii. 19 alone we have Κυρίος διὸ θεὸς εὐλογητός, and that followed immediately by εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ἡμῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς.—διὸ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ὁ Κυρίος μας οἱ προσευχαῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ του Χριστοῦ. The same designation of God appears also in Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, ii. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3. In col. i. 3, the Κυρίος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ of the TR is too slenderly supported to be retained. Many good commentators (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Schmied., etc.) take the θεὸς and the πατὴρ apart here, placing the genitive in relation only to the latter and making the sense “Blessed be God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,” or “Blessed be God who is also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Others (including Theod., Jer., Theophyl., Stier, Blk., V. Hofm., V. Soden, Olt., Klöp., Beck., Alf., Light., W. Schmidt, Abbott) understand God to be praised here as the God of our Lord Jesus Christ as well as His Father. Grammar leaves the question open; for the inclusion of θεὸς and πατὴρ and the omission of εὐλογητός does not affect the second view, nor does the use of καὶ instead of τε καὶ disprove it (cf. iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25). The first rendering is advocated on account of the extreme rarity of the designation “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ” (Ell.); on the ground that θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ being a “stated Christian designation of God,” only the πατὴρ requires any further definition by a genitive (Mey.); or for the reason that the passages in which the phrase θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν occurs show it to have been Paul’s habit to use θεὸς absolutely, the appositional πατὴρ κ.τ.λ. serving to define more particularly the Christian idea of God (Haupt). The second rendering is to be preferred, however, as the more natural, and is supported by the analogous Ephesian prayer in the greeting for grace and peace (Gal. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13). Nor is there anything strange or un-Pauline in God being called “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ.” As true Man Christ had God for His God as we have Him for our God. He himself spoke of God as “My God” in the cry of desolation from the Cross and again in His word to Mary after His Resurrection (John xx. 17). In this same Epistle, too, we have the express designation ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ὁ Χριστός (i. 17). This form of doxology (as well as the prayer in the greeting for grace and peace) occurs again in 2 Cor. i. 3 (as also in 1 Pet. i. 3), but with a different reference—there with regard to Paul’s own experiences, here with regard to the Christian enlargement of others.—διὸ εὐλογητός ἡμῶν: who blessed us. To suppose that the ἡμῶν refers to Paul himself is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the paragraph and with the καθ’ ἡμᾶς in ver. 15. If Paul speaks of God as εὐλογητός it is because of the great and generous things He had actually done for himself and for these Ephesians. These things He proceeds to set forth in respect both of their nature and their measure. He says first that “God blessed us” (not “hath blessed us”). The question is how far he is looking back here. Is it to the time when God first made him and those addressed His own by grace? Is it to the eternal counsel of that grace? There is much to be said in favour of the second of these two references. It appears to be more naturally suggested by the text than the other. We may, perhaps, plead on its behalf the analogy of the aorists in Rom. viii. 29, 30. It gives unity to the whole statement, and makes the interpretation of the following clauses, each introduced by ἐν, easier. Yet on the whole the first is to be preferred, especially in view of the further definition introduced by the καθ’ ἡμῶν of
The idea, therefore, is that in calling us to Christian faith God blessed us, and that the great deed of blessing was the eternal election. All that thus took effect in time had its foundation in an eternal election. All that which thus took place in time had its foundation in an eternal election. The words of good but deeds of grace. So, too, the εὐλογία τῆς καθεύλογίας comes from our lips and is, as the return for, the εὐλογία of God. In word and thought we bless God because in deed and positive effect He blessed us; cf. Is. lxv. 16. — εἰς τόσης εὐλογίας πνευματικής: with every spiritual blessing. This defines the nature of the “blessing” with which God so signally blessed us. The εἰς might be understood in the local sense, as denoting the sphere within which the εὐλογία proceeded. But in view of the following εἰς τοῖς ἐσπουδαίοις, it is simplest to take it as the instrumental εἰς, “by means of”; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 18; James hi. 10, 11; and the synonymous εἰς. In the NT the adjective ἐσπουδαῖος occurs both in the literal sense and in the metaphorical, and in a variety of applications—existing in heaven (διὰ παθή μοι ἐς ἐπ., Matt. xviii. 35, v. 1. σπουδαίος); of heavenly order or descent (the Second Adam, διὰ ἐσπουδαίου, 1 Cor. xi. 18); or the peculiar blessing rather than its source that is in the heavenly places. Further definition of the blessing in respect of its sphere follows. But in view of the εἰς τοῖς ἐσπουδαίοις the blessing with which God blessed us is the highest order of blessing, not of the material or changeable nature, but of heavenly quality and enduring satisfaction, and such blessing He bestowed upon us in its every form and manifestation.—εἰς τοῖς ἐσπουδαίοις: in the heavenly places. Further definition of the blessing in respect of its sphere follows.
In three out of the five occurrences the term has the local sense (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10), and in a fourth (vi. 12) that sense is also possible, though not certain. The expression in all probability has the same application in the present instance. To take it, with Chrys., Thdt., Beng., and more recently Beck, as a further description of the blessing in respect of its nature as spiritual or heavenly has not only usage against it, but also the consideration that the second of the two descriptive clauses would then add little or nothing to what is expressed by the first. Deciding for the local sense, however, we have still to ask how the phrase is to be connected and what is its particular point. Some connect it (e.g., Beza) immediately with δόθη, making the sense “God gave the天上 blessed us,” etc. But this puts the qualifying clause at an awkward distance from its subject. The clause may be connected with the εὐλογίας as describing the deed of blessing in respect of its sphere; which would be most suitable to the case if the εὐλογίας were describing the Divine decree of grace. Some, adopting the same connection, make it refer ideally or prophetically to the blessings laid up for our future enjoyment in the heavenly life (e.g., Th. Aquin.); but the context has in view blessings which are ours in reality now. Others take it to refer to the Church as the Kingdom of God on earth, the present depository of the Divine blessings (Stier); but the Church is not identified in this way with the Kingdom of God in the Pauline writings. It is best, therefore, to connect δύνασθαι εὐπροφανῶς immediately with the previous δύνασθαι εὐπροφανῶς, and to understand it as describing the region in which this “spiritual blessing” is found. Not a few interpreters, indeed, pointing to the analogy of ii. 6, Phil. iii. 20 (where, however, it is our citizenship that is said to be in heaven, not we ourselves), etc., introduce a mystical sense here, and take “the heavens” to be, not “literal locality but . . . the heavenly region in which our citizenship is” (Abbott), the heaven that is created within us here and now by grace. “The heaven of which the Apostle here speaks,” says Lightfoot, “is some remote locality, some future abode; it is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian.” So substantially also Alf., Ell. (the latter connecting it, however, with εὐλογίας), Cand., etc. But what the writer has specially in view here is the eternal counsel of God and the effect given to it on earth, and there is nothing to suggest that at this point he is thinking of believers as being themselves in a certain sense in heaven even now. It is best, therefore, to retain the simple local meaning (as the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions render it, “in heaven,” “in the heavens”), and take it to describe the blessings which are stated to be in their nature spiritual further as being found in heaven. To that they belong, and from thence it is that they come to us to be our present possession on earth with God Himself is and where Christ reigns.

—in Christ. Not merely “through Christ.” The phrase expresses the supreme idea that pervades the Epistle. Here it qualifies the whole statement of the blessing, in its bestowal, its nature, and its seat. The Divine εὐλογίας has its ground and reason in Christ, so that apart from Him it could have no relation to us. It is ours by reason of our being in Him as our Representative and Head; “by virtue of our incorporation in, our union with, Christ” (Light.). “In Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the causa meritoria of this Divine bestowal of blessing” (Mey.).

VER. 4. καθέσθαι: even as. Not “because” but “according as” and “according to.” Cf. καθέσται, which is used in the NT only by Luke and means both “according as” and “because”; and the Attic καθαίρειν, καθά, for which, indeed, καθέσθαι is occasionally used in classical Greek, at least from Aristotle’s time. Here καθέσθαι designates the ground of the “blessing” and so is also the note of its grandeur. The “blessing” proceeded on a Divine election, and took effect in accordance with that. It has its foundation, therefore, in eternity, and is neither an incidental thing nor an afterthought of God. So in Per. i. 3, the εὐλογία has its ground and norm in the πρόγνωσις, the foreknowledge of God the Father, and that “foreknowledge” is not a theoretical but an efficient knowledge.
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c in the Middle (except, perhaps, in Luke ix. 35), is the LXX equivalent for

for oneself out of a number. It is sometimes alleged that we are not entitled to give it so definite a meaning in doctrinal paragraphs like the present, because there are passages in which it appears to express nothing more than the general idea of a choice, without reference either to any special relation to the person choosing or to the leaving of others unchosen. (So, e.g., Abbott.) But the passages adduced in support of this are few in number and by no means bear out the contention. In Luke ix. 35, e.g., where εἰκελεγμένος is said of the Son, the idea of a choice from among others is certainly not an alien idea (cf. Thayer-Grim., Lex., sub voc.); and in Acts iv. 5, xv. 22, 25, the point is a choice for oneself in the form of an appointment to a particular service or office. That the verb denotes the choice of one or more out of others is implied in its compound form, and is made abundantly clear by actual usage, e.g., in the case of the selection of the Twelve (John vi. 70, xv. 16), the appointment of a successor to Judas (Acts i. 24, etc.). In not a few passages it is made more certain still by the addition of explanatory terms, e.g., ἐκ τῶν (Luke vi. 13), ἐκ κόσμου (John xv. 19), ἐκ τῶν (Acts i. 24), ἐκ οἴκου (Acts xv. 7). That it means to choose out for oneself appears from such passages as Luke x. 42, xiv. 7. The verb ἐκλέγομαι is specially used of God's election of some out of mankind generally to be His own in a peculiar sense, the objects of His grace, destined for special privilege, special relations, special service; e.g., xii. 7 (of Israel); Mark xiii. 20; John xv. 19; Rom. ix. xi. 5, 7, 28; 1 Cor. i. 27 ff.; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ff. The foundation of the statement is the great OT idea of Israel as a nation chosen by the Lord to be "a peculiar people unto Himself, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. xiv. 2; cf. Ps. xxxiii. 11, 12, cxxxv. 4; Isa. xli. 8, 9, xlii. 1). What is meant, therefore, is that the blessing which God bestowed on these Ephesians was not a thing of the time merely, but the issue of a foreseen and certain call or conversion, a blessing that came to them in accordance with a definite choice of them out of the mass of others by God for Himself.—ἐκ αὐτοῦ: in Him; that is, in Christ, not "through Him" simply. But in what sense? It is true that Christ is the first "Elect" of God, and that our election is contained in His. But His election is not the matter in hand here, and the point, therefore, is not that in electing Christ God also elected us (Calv., Beng., etc.). Nor, again, is it that we are included in Him (Hofm.), for neither is this the point in view here. The immediate subject is not what we are or are made, but what God does—His election and how it proceeds. And the idea is that that election has its ground in Christ, in the sense that apart from Christ and without respect to His special relation to us, and His foreseen work, there would be no election of us. An extraordinary sense is attached to the ἐκ αὐτοῦ by Beys., who takes the point to be that the "divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him" (Christ. d. N. T., p. 141). This is a philosophical notion wholly alien to Paul, on which see Meyer, in loc. The ἐκ αὐτοῦ might mean that God's election of us was in Christ in so far as Christ was contemplated as having the relation of "head and representative of spiritual, as Adam was the representative of natural, humanity" (Of. Elh.) but it is best taken as expressing again the broad idea that "in Christ lay for God the causa meritoria of our election" (Mey.).—πρὸ κατα-βολής τοῦ κόσμου: before the foundation of the world. This is the only occurrence of this particular expression in the Pauline
It is akin to the form ἄτοκα καταβολής (Matt. xiii. 35, omitting κόσμον with LTTrWHR marg.), ἀτοκα καταβολής κόσμου (Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3; Rev. xiii. 8); as also to these phrases: ἡ στάσις ἁρχῆς (1 Thess. ii. 13), ἀρκετά τῶν ἁλώνων (1 Cor. ii. 7), ἀρκετὰ ἡ χρόνων ἀλλαγής τῆς ἡγεμονίας (2 Tim. ii. 9).

It expresses most definitely the fact that the election in question is not the setting apart of certain persons at a definite period, an act in time, a historical selection, as some (e.g., Beys.) strive to prove, but an eternal choice, a determination of the Divine Will before time. The idea of the Divine election in the NT is not a philosophical idea expressing the ultimate explanation of the system of things or giving the rationale of the story of the human race as such, but a religious idea, a note of grace expressing the fact that salvation is originally and wholly of God. In Pauline teaching the subjects of this Divine election are neither the Church as such (Ritschl), nor mankind as such (Beck), but Christian men and women, designated as ἧμεν, ἴματι. It is, as is here clearly intimated, an eternal determination of the Divine Will, and it has its ground in the freedom of God, not in anything foreseen in its subjects. Of a prevision of faith as the basis or motive of the election there is no indication here. On the contrary, the character or distinguishing inward quality of the subjects of the election is presented in the next clause as the object of the election, the end it had in view. (See especially Haupt, in loc.)—οὖν ἡμᾶς ἄγιον καὶ ἁμώμων: that we should be holy and without blemish. The election, therefore, had a definite purpose before it—the idea all through the paragraph is in or on the Divine Will; the latter its fitness for the consecration (Notes on Epistles of Paul, p. 313). The Vulg. gives immaculati, and Wycl. “without wen”. On the other hand, there is nothing in the verse to suggest the idea of sacrifice or a victim. The parallel passage, also, in Col. i. 22, where we have not only ἄγιον and ἁμώμων, but a third adjective ἄνεγκλητος, is on the whole on the side of “blemishless”. That, too, is the meaning of the word in classical Greek (e.g., Herod., ii., 177), and in inscriptions (C. I., 1974). Little indeed depends on the decision between the two senses; for both terms, “without blemish” and “without blame,” may have ethical applications. There is the further question, however, whether in this statement Paul has in view the standing of believers as justified or as designed to be sanctified. The arguments in support of the objective relation to God being a view here (Mey., Haupt, etc.) are weighty. It is held, e.g., that ἀγάπη would be more appropriate than ἔλεος if the verse be taken the point of their character—whether he thinks of them as justified or as designed to be sanctified. The arguments in support of the objective relation to God being a view here (Mey., Haupt, etc.) are weighty. It is held, e.g., that ἠγάπη would be more appropriate than ἔλεος if the verse be taken as justified or as designed to be sanctified. The arguments in support of the objective relation to God being a view here (Mey., Haupt, etc.) are weighty. It is held, e.g., that ἠγάπη would be more appropriate than ἔλεος if the verse be taken the point of their character—whether he thinks of them as justified or as designed to be sanctified.
parallel passage in Col. i. 22 is followed immediately by a reference to continuing "in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the Gospel". Something depends, however, on the position of the following \textit{iv ayair}, on which see below; that is, before God. Read \textit{avtroi}, not (as Harl., etc.) \textit{avtov}; see Winer-Moul., \textit{Gram.}, pp. 188, 189. So, too, in the parallel passage Col. i. 22. The present approbation of God is in view, not His future judgment. Light, thinks that God \textit{iv ayair} is thus regarded as the great \textit{muqmovks}, who inspects the victims and takes cognizance of blemishes. But this is to import a priestly notion which is not expressed in the context. This phrase might be specially appropriate to the idea of the standing or relation of believers as supposed to be conveyed by \textit{dpovov}. But it also suits the idea of character — \textit{dmwv} "in God's sight," "under the eye of God as Witness and Judge, and so in truth and reality". The terms \textit{iv ayair}, \textit{katmvovs}, \textit{katmvovs} are also used in this sense in the NT, and do not appear to be restricted to sacred Greek. They are peculiar to the LXX, the \textit{Apocrypha}, and the NT. All three are used by Paul, \textit{katmvovs} and \textit{katmvovs} sparingly (the former only here and in Col. i. 22, the latter in Rom. iv. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19); most frequently \textit{katmvovs} (Rom. iii. 20, xii. 17, xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.), which is also much employed in Luke and Revelation, never in Matthew or Mark. — \textit{iv ayair} : in love. What does this qualify? The divine election, say some (Ecc., etc.). But the remoteness of the \textit{iv ayair} from the \textit{aprov} makes this, if not an impracticable, at least a less likely connection. It is possible, indeed, also to retain the connection of the \textit{iv ayair} with ver. 4 and yet give it the sense of the Divine love, if we take it to qualify not the \textit{xe}rov alone, but the whole clause which it concludes. In that case the idea would be that the
ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

by Light., Notes; ut sup., 313), and above all that it is Paul's usual, if not constant, habit to place ἐν ἁγίᾳ after the clause it qualifies (Eph. iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 21 of the AV also, though in association with other terms, 1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Tim. i. 13). On the whole this connection is to be preferred, and the ἐν ἁγίᾳ will then define the holiness and blamelessness, which are the end and object of God's election of us, as having their truth and perfection in the supreme Christian grace of love. Ver. 5. προορίσας ἡμᾶς: having foreordained us. Better, in that He foreordained us. Wycl. gives "hath before ordained us"; Tynd. and Cranmer, "ordained us"; and so the RV, "foreordained". But the Genevan, the Reformed, and the AV, in following the praedestinavit of the Vulg., give "did predestinate us," "hath predestinated us," "having predestinated us". While in Romans and Ephesians the AV adopts "predestinated," in 1 Cor. ii. 7 it has "foreordained". It is best to adopt foreordination, throughout, as预报σιν means to determine before. The verb seems not to occur either in the LXX or in any Greek writer before Paul. It is found in Heliodorus, Ignatius, etc. In the NT it is always used of God as determining from eternity, sometimes with the further definition of God as determining from eternity, etc. In the compound verb expresses the fact that the decree is prior to the realisation of its object. In one case it is applied to the special relation of Israel to God (Rom. ix. 4) the election would be defined as proceeding on the foreordination (Ell.); but it may also be taken as modal, not prior to the election but coincident with it, and expressing the mode of its action or the form which it took—"in that He foreordained us" (Mey., etc.). On this use of the aor. part. see Winer-Moul., Gram., p. 430. This is the more probable view, because no real distinction can be made between the ἐκλογή and the προορίσμος beyond what may be suggested by the ἐκ in the one and the πρὸ in the other; the idea in the ἐκλογή being understood to be that of the mass from which the selection is made, and that of the προορίσμος the priority of the decree (Ell.). It is also to be noticed (cf. Mey.) that both in Romans (viii. 29) and in 1 Peter (i. 2) it is the πρῶτον, not the προορίσμος, that is represented as antecedent to the election also, though in association with other terms. This Divine προορίσμος, like the Divine ἐκλογή, has in the Pauline writings, in which it receives its loftiest, most complete, and most unqualified statement, not a speculative but an intensely practical interest, especially with regard to two things of most immediate personal concern—the believer's incentive to live in newness and holiness of life (cf. ii. 10), and his encouragement to rest in the Divine salvation as for him an assured salvation.—ἐλι σωτηρίαν: unto adoption. Or, as the RV gives it, following the adoptio filiorum of the Vulg., "unto adoption as sons". The term, and conveys an idea distinct from that of sonship and explanatory of it. The sonship of believers, the fact that they are children of God, with the privileges and responsibilities belonging to such, finds frequent expression in the NT writings. But it is only in the Pauline Epistles that the specific idea of σωτηρία occurs, and there in five instances (Rom. viii. 15, 23, ix. 4; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5). In one case it is applied to the special relation of Israel to God (Rom. ix. 4); thrice (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5) it is used of the present position of believers in Christ; once (Rom. viii. 23) it refers to their future consummation, the resurrection of life that will be the full manifestation of their sonship. It is a term of relation, expressing our sonship in respect of standing. It appears to be taken from the Roman custom, with which Paul could not fail to be acquainted. Among the Jews there were cases of informal adoption, as in the instance of Mordecai and Esther (Esth. ii. 7). But adoption in the sense of the legal transference of a child to a family to which it did not belong by birth had no place in the Jewish law. In Roman law, on the other hand, provision was made for the transaction known as adoptio, the taking of a child who was not one's child by birth to be his son, and arrogatio, the transference of a son who was independent, as by the death of his proper father, to another by solemn public act of the people. Thus among the Romans a citizen might receive a child who was not his own by birth into his family and give him his name, but he could do so only by a formal act, attested by witnesses, and the son thus adopted had
in all its entirety the position of a child by birth, with all the rights and all the obligations pertaining to that. By “adoption,” therefore, Paul does not mean the bestowal of the full privileges of the family on those who are sons by nature, but their acceptance into the family of those who do not by nature belong to it, and the placing of those who are not sons originally and by right in the relation proper to those who are sons by birth. Hence εὐδοκία is never affirmed of Christ; for he alone is Son of God by birth, with all the rights and all the privileges of the family on those who are sons by nature. Wyclifie “by the pleasure of His will.” The noun εὐδοκία (Vulg.-Glem., beneplacitum) is a biblical term. It is not current in profane Greek, but represents the [125] of the OT (especially in the Psalms), and occurs a good many times in Sir. In the NT it is found thrice in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 26; Luke ii. 14, x. 21), and six times in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. x. 1; Eph. i. 5, 15, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11), but nowhere else. It has the sense (a) of will (Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21), passing into that of desire (Rom. x. 1); and (b) of good will (Luke ii. 14; Eph. i. 9; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13), passing into that of delight or satisfaction (2 Thess. i. 11). It is used of God in connection with the idea of “election,” so that it is to be understood as implying a new relation of grace, founded on a covenant relation of God and on the work of Christ (Gal. iv. 5 ff.).

—δὰ ηπειρα Χριστοῦ : through Jesus Christ, our Lord, 4th cent. (Gads., Sjurs., Mill., Griesbach, etc., put it), the writer giving it as from his own standpoint. How is this to be understood? It may mean simply that God Himself is the Father to whom we are brought into filial relation by adoption. In that case the point which stands in this case as a mark of the adoption, inasmuch as it is God Himself and none less than He who becomes our Father by it and to whom the foreordination into the position of sons looks. Or it may be the deeper idea that God Himself is the end of the foreordination, as Christ is its medium or channel. Our εἰς is not to be confused with εἰς, nor would the idea thus be reduced to that of simple possession. Here the εἰς may rather have its most definite force, expressing the goal of all. The final object of God’s foreordination of us unto adoption is not the bringing us to Christ, but bringing us to Himself, into perfect fellowship with Him, into adoring, loving relation to Himself as the true End and Object of our being.—κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ: according to the good pleasure of His will. Wyclifie gives “by the purpose of His will”; Rhem., “according to the purpose of His will”; Tynd., “according to the pleaure of His will”; Cran., Gen., AV, “ according to the good pleasure of His will.”
grace. Twice again in the same context we have the phrase “to the praise of his glory” (vv. 12, 14). Here it is the glory specifically of God’s grace, and the praise of that is now stated to be the ultimate end of God’s foreordination of us unto adoption, as our adoption itself has been declared to be the object of the foreordination. God’s final purpose in His eternal determinations, and the supreme end to which all that He wills regarding us looks, is the manifestation and adoring recognition of His grace in its gloriousness.

So Chrys. puts it briefly τὸ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δόθη διὰ τοῦτο. The phrase means more than “the praise of his glorious grace”. It expresses the setting forth on God’s part, and the joyful confession on man’s part, of what the Divine grace in these eternal counsels is in the quality of its splendour, its magnificence.

That this is the idea is shown by the subsequent mention of the “riches” of the same grace (ver. 7).—ἐν τῷ ἐναπτυμένῳ ἡμᾶς: with which he freely bestowed on us. The AV follows Beza’s in qua nos acceptos sihi effecit in rendering it “wherein he made us accepted”. The RV, which gives “where with he endued us” in the margin, deals better with it in the text, “which he graced us.” The AV follows Beza’s in qua nos acceptos sihi effecit in rendering it “wherein he made us accepted”. The RV, which gives “where with he endued us” in the margin, deals better with it in the text, “which he graced us.” The AV follows Beza’s in qua nos acceptos sihi effecit in rendering it “wherein he made us accepted”. The RV, which gives “where with he endued us” in the margin, deals better with it in the text, “which he graced us.” The AV follows Beza’s in qua nos acceptos sihi effecit in rendering it “wherein he made us accepted”. The RV, which gives “where with he endued us” in the margin, deals better with it in the text, “which he graced us.”
συν: in whom we have the redemption.

Here and in the parallel passage in Col. i. 14 the readings vary between ἔκτος and ἐκτος. In the present sentence, though ἐκτος has the support of some good authorities (Köll, Copt., Eth., etc.), the weight of documentary evidence is largely on the side of ἔκτος (BN TAD EFGKL, Vulg., Syr., Goth., etc.). What is in view, therefore, is something possessed now, and the writer describes that as τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν — " the redemption," i.e., the redemption familiar to every Christian, long expected and now accomplished. This ἀπολύτρωσις is viewed sometimes as a thing of the future (Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. iv. 30; and probably also Eph. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30); sometimes as a present possession here; Rom. iii. 24; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15). That the ἀπολύτρωσις here is a redemption not from the power or pollution of sin, but from its guilt, its condemnation, its penalty, is made plain by the defining clause which follows, identifying it with the forgiveness of sins. This is not the only aspect in which it is presented in the Pauline Epistles. The verb λυτροφθαίρει is applied there to a redemption from "all iniquity," Tit. ii. 14, as in 1 Pet. i. 18 it is used of a redemption from a vain manner of life. But it is the primary aspect of the word and its cognates, and the idea of the foundation of the other. The noun ἀπολύτρωσις is of rare occurrence, found only in a few passages in profane Greek (Plut., Pomp., xxiv., 2; Joseph., Antiq., xii., ii., 3; Diod., Frag., lib. xxxvii., 3; 5 [Dindorf]; Philo, Qod omn. prob. lib. 10, 25). It is found only ten times in all. The verb ἀπολύτρωσθαι is not found in the NT at all; the simple λυτροῦν, λυτροφθαίρει thrice (1 Pet. i. 18; Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14) and the noun ἀπολύτρωσις thrice (Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12). The proper idea is that of a release, deliverance, or redemption effected by payment of a price or ransom (ἀγορα).

It is argued indeed that this idea cannot be said to be the essential or primary idea of ἀπολύτρωσις, because it is used in connections in which the notion of a payment is not in view (so Abbott); and that, therefore, we are not entitled to say that it means more than deliverance. It is true that, as is the case with most words, the definite, specific sense passes at times into the more general sense of "deliverance" (Heb. xi. 35; cf. Exod. vi. 6). But in profane Greek and in the LXX the primary sense of the verb, the noun, and their cognates is that of a redemption effected by payment of a price, or a release granted on receiving a price (Plut., Pomp., 24; Plato, Leges, 11, p. 919(a); Polyb., xxii., 21, 8; Exod. xxi. 8; Zeph., iii., 1); and it was so understood when the NT quotations refer to ἀπολύτρωσις. This idea was used in profane Greek often, and it denotes the deliverance accomplished at the cost of Christ's death from the Divine wrath and the penalty of sin. So it is understood, e.g., by Origen, in loc., Mey., Alf., Ell., etc.; and as the ἀφεσίν εἰρηνή shows that the "redemption" here in view is that of the saints through the blood of Christ's "blood," therefore, is that by which the redemption is effected—the price (κόσμον, 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iv. 4) of the penalty of sin, so the διὰ τοῦ ἀματοῦ αἵτω shows that it is a redemption by payment of a price. This is consistent with Paul's doctrine of the Divine wrath, redemption, propitiation, expiation, and the curse of the law (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iv. 4). It has its foundation also in Christ's own declaration of the purpose of His coming, viz., to give His life a λύτρον ἐντὶ πολλῶν (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45).—διὰ τοῦ ἀματοῦ αἵτω: through His blood. Christ's "blood," therefore, is that by which the redemption is effected, viz., a λύτρον ἐντὶ πολλῶν (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45). The same idea appears in the teaching both of Peter and of John (1 Pet. i. 18; Rev. v. 9). The term occurs repeatedly in the NT, and in various forms—τὸ ἀματοῦ αἵτω, 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 27; τὸν ἱερόν (Rev. vii. 14, xii. 11), τοῦ σταυροῦ (Col. i. 20). What is its import? It means more than the death of Christ. It means that death in a particular aspect—as a sacrifice, a death having a definite efficacy. It is a sacrificial term, based on the use of the blood of victims, offered under the OT Law, for purposes of purification and expiation (Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 7, 12, 18-22, 25, x. 4, xi. 28, xiii. 11). It looks back also to Christ's own words in the institution of the Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mk. xiv. 23), and denotes the ratification of a new relation between God and men by a new covenant sacrifice. It is used with reference to the purchase of the Church (Acts xx. 28; Rev. v. 9), the grace of access to God (Heb. x. 19), the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews (Eph. ii. 13), the reconciliation of all things to God (Col. i. 20); but also and most definitely to the changed condition of sinful men, and that most frequently on the objective side, as a new relation. As in the Levitical system there was a purificatory use of blood in the case of certain matters.
of uncleanness (Lev. xiv. 5, 50), so in the NT the "blood" of Christ is used when regarded as the power of Christ's death in purifying or in overcoming (1 Pet. i. 19; 1 John i. 7; Rev. xii. 11). But its special use is with reference to justification (Rev. v. 9), the position of non-condemnation (Heb. xii. 24), the cleansing of the conscience (Heb. ix. 14), the making of "peace" by making God and the world (Col. i. 20), the manifestation of the righteousness of God in the passing over of sins (Rom. iii. 25), the remission of sins (Heb. ix. 22). Its primary idea, as is shown by usage and by OT analogy, is not that of renewing power or moral effect, but that of expiation, the removal of guilt, the restoration of broken relations with God. The important passage indeed in Lev. xvii. 11, which speaks of the "blood" as reserved by Jehovah for the altar, for the purpose of "covering" sin or making "atonement" for it, and declares that the atonement is made by the blood by reason of "the life of the flesh" that is in it, has been held by not a few (including Bähr and other distinguished scholars) to express only the idea of self-surrender. On this ground the pecular efficacy of the OT sacrifices, and, therefore, of the sacrifice of Christ, has been denied. But this great phrase, "the blood of Christ," covers two ideas which ought to be distinguished, namely, that of the blood as shed and that of the blood as offered, or death and life as two different conceptions. Thus the phrase in question is interpreted as setting forth Christ's life in two distinct aspects, namely, as laid down in the act of dying and as liberated by the same act and made available for us, so that we are saved by having it communicated to us. So West., Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 293 ff., Epistles of St. John, pp. 34 ff. But neither in the present paragraph nor in any other Pauline passage is there anything to bear this out. Paul, indeed, speaks largely of the Christ who has the power of salvation that is effected for us by His life (Rom. v. 8-11; Phil. iii. 10, etc.). But what the Living Christ does for us in the forgiveness of sin, or in the subjugation of sin, is done as the power of what He did in dying, as declared for us.—τὸ δόσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων: the forgiveness of our trespasses. The term δόσις, while used occasionally in the general sense of release (Luke iv. 18; cf. Isa. li. 1), expresses statedly the idea of the letting go of sin (δόσιν τὴν παραπτώματα, Matt. xxvii. 32; δόσιν τὰ δικαιώματα, τὸ παρατάτου, Matt. vi. 12, 14, etc.), its dismissal or pardon, in the sense of the remission of its penalty (Matt. xxv. 28; Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 36, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, etc.), and as distinguished from πάρεσις, the praetermission or passing by of sin in simple forbearance (Rom. iii. 25). The term παράτητα describes sin as lapse, misdeed, trespass (nearly equivalent to παράβασις, transgression, and ἁμάρτημα, evil deed, these differing not so much in their use as rather in the metaphors underlying them), as distinguished from ἁμομία, lawlessness or iniquity, ἁμαρτία, unrighteousness or wrong, and ἁμαρτία, which is applied not only to acts of sin, but to sin as a power, a habit, a condition (cf. Trench, Syn., § lxvi.; Fritzsche, Rom., i. 289; Light., Notes, ut sup., on Rom., v., 20).—κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τοῦ χριστίου ἁμαρτίαν, to the riches of His grace. The readings vary between τὸν πλοῦτον (TR, following N^3D^1KL, etc.) and τὸ πλοῦτος (LTTWHRV, following B^3AD^1, etc.). The masculine is the usual form, but the neuter is found in the best MSS, in several passages in the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. viii. 2; Eph. i. 7; ii. 7, iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. i. 27, ii. 2). Elsewhere in the NT the masculine prevails. Winer explains the exchange between these two forms as due to the popular language, as δ and τὸ πλοῦτος are used indifferently in modern Greek (Winer, Moult., Gram., p. 76). The great word χάρις, "grace," which has been used twice already in these opening verses, touches the pulse of all Paul's teaching on the redemption of sinful man. It has a large place in all his Epistles, and not least in this one. For here it meets us at every turning-point in the grim statement of the Divine counsel, the securities of the forgiveness of sin, the way of salvation. While it has the occasional and subordinate senses of loveliness (Col. iv. 6), favour or good will, whether of God or of man (Luke ii. 40, 52; Acts ii. 47, iv. 33, vii. 10, etc.), in the Pauline writings it has the particular sense of free gift, undeserved bounty, and is used specially.
of the goodness of God which bestows favour on those who have no claim or merit in themselves (Rom. iii. 24, v. 17, 20; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Gal. i. 15, etc., etc.), or of that free favour of God as a power which renews men and sustains them in the Christian life, aiding their efforts, helping them from falling, securing their progress in holiness (2 Cor. iv. 15; vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 12, etc.). The freeness of this Divine favour in the form of grace, the unmerited nature of the Divine goodness, is what Paul most frequently magnifies with praise and wonder. Here it is the mighty measure of the largesse, the grace in its quality of riches, that is introduced. This magnificent conception of the wealth of the grace that is bestowed on us by God and that which is in Christ for us, is a peculiarly Pauline idea. It meets us, indeed, elsewhere (cf. the plenteous redemption of the Psalmist, Ps. cxiii. 13, 16, and loving kindnesses, Ps. lxiii. 7; the fulness of Christ, John i. 16; Col. i. 19, etc.), but nowhere so frequently or with such insistence as with Paul. Cf. the riches of God’s goodness (Rom. ii. 4); His glory (Rom. viii. 9), the riches of Christ the Lord (Rom. x. 12), the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii. 8). That our redemption cost so great a price, the blood of Christ, is the supreme evidence of the richness of the Divine grace. And the measure of what God does for us is nothing less than the magnitude of “wherewith he abounded.”

Ver. 8. ἡ ἐκπλητεύσεως ημῶν: which he made to abound towards us. Both in profane and Biblical Greek ἐκπλητέων is usually intrans. It is so used in the vast majority of cases in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 5, viii. 2, ix. 12; Phil. i. 26, etc.). In later Greek, however, it has also, though not frequently, the trans. sense, and there are some instances of this also in the NT (Luke xv. 17, according to the better reading; 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12). Here, therefore, two interpretations are possible, as (as in Syr., Vulg., Arm., AV, RV marg., etc.), or “which he made to abound” (as in Goth., Eth., RV, etc.). The latter sense, that of furnishing richly so that there is not only enough but much more, is on the whole in better harmony with the context. It is also supported by grammar, inasmuch as it is uncertain whether the NT presents any instance of attraction where the genitive of the relative represents the dative. Such attraction is possible in classical Greek (cf. G. Krüger, Untersuch., p. 274; Jelf, Gram., 822; Winer-Moulton, Gram., p. 204); but the instances referred to in the NT (Rom. iv. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 6) may admit of another explanation. It is also possible, indeed, to take the ἦς, not as a case of attraction, but as under the immediate regimen of ἐκπλητεύουσαν. For there are at least some instances of ἐκπλητέων τινας in the sense of abounding in something; cf. ἤς ... παντὰς χαράματας ἐκπλητέωσαν in Ignat., Pol., 2, and ἐκπλητέωσαν ἄρτον in Luke xv. 17 (the reading of the TR with DQR, etc.; ἐκπλητεύσαται, however, being accepted by TR W H R V with BAP, etc.). The transitive sense, however, is further favoured by the force of the following γνωρίσας, as Winer points out. The ἐς ἡμῶν, expressing the objects to whom the “abounding” is directed, is like the ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν of Rom. v. 15, the ἐς ἡμῶν of 2 Cor. i. 5, the ἐς χριστοῦ of 2 Cor. i. 8. In the last-named passage, indeed, ἐκπλητεύεται occurs both in the sense of making to abound and in that of abounding, and in both cases, though with different shades of meaning, it is followed by ἐς—ἐν πάσῃ σοφία καὶ προφητείᾳ: in all wisdom and prudence. The clause expresses the particular forms in which God made His
grace to abound towards us, or the gifts in which His abounding grace was to be seen, namely, those of insight and practical intelligence or discernment with regard to the deep things of His saving counsel. There is considerable difference of opinion, however, with respect to the connection of the clause, its application, and the precise import of its terms. By some (Theod., Griesb., etc.) the words are attached to the following γνωσις and taken to define the way in which God made known the "mystery of His will". But the reason already given, for attaching the εν δικαι (ver. 4) to the statement preceding it, holds good also (Rüetsi, De Wette, Alf., etc.) understand the clause to refer to God, and to express the thought that the supremacy of His wisdom was seen in the bestowal of His grace so abundantly on us, that it was "in His manifold wisdom and prudence, manifested and made known..." (Rüetsi). It is difficult to adjust the terms to such a use. For it is doubtful whether φρονησις in the sense which it bears here can be predicated of God. The instances which are cited (Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12; Deut. i. 15) are extremely few. They are also of dubious relevancy, inasmuch as the φρονησις in these passages represents a Hebrew word with a somewhat different idea, rendered by the RV "understanding". Neither is the πολυτοιχος σοφια του θεου (Eph. iii. 10) a valid analogy, the thought expressed there being that of the many and various ways in which the Divine wisdom is manifested and realised. The same must be said of the phrase φρονησις θεου in the narrative of Solomon's decision (1 Kings iii. 28); for it expresses a prudence or intelligence given to Solomon by God or divine in quite a different sense. It rather seems to mean that it is there that biblical warrant for affirming φρονησις of God, the παση puts that reference out of the question here; παση being an extensive, not an intensive, definition, expressing not the highest wisdom and prudence, but all wisdom and prudence. There is little or no use of such attributes (cf. Winer-Moul., p. 137). It is true that there are cases in classical Greek which might entitle us to take παση σοφια as equivalent to παση ἡ σοφια, "the whole of wisdom," "the sum of wisdom" (cf. Kühner, Gram., ii., § 452; Alth. & Wern. 8). But there does not appear to be a special parallel to the use of that in NT Greek. Further, it is the grace of God that is magnified in the paragraph, and that not in respect of other qualities in God Himself, but in respect of what it does for us. Hence most (Harl., Mey., Ell., Abb., Haupt, etc.) understand the clause to refer not to God the Giver, but to us the receivers. This is borne out also by the εν πληρωθητι την επιγνωσι του δεικτευτοι αυτου εν παση σοφια και σοφιας of Col. i. 9; by the place assigned to Christian wisdom in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and also to some extent by such partial parallels as these: εν παση σοφια (Col. iii. 16); εν παση και εις παση γνωσιν (1 Cor. i. 5), etc.

There remains, however, the question as to the precise sense of the two nouns. Σοφια is of frequent occurrence in the NT generally and in the Pauline writings in particular; φρονησις occurs only twice in the whole NT, viz., in Luke i. 17 (where the RV renders it "wisdom") and here. As in the present passage the two nouns are also conjoined in 1 Kings iii. 12, iv. 29; Prov. i. 2, viii. 1; Dan. i. 17, ii. 21, 23. So, too, in Joseph., Antiq., ii., 5, 7, viii., 7, 5. There is a distinction between them which is variously put in Greek and Roman literature. Aristotle, e.g., defines σοφια as ανθρωπι δικαι and φρονησις καποιον ανθρωπων τη φρονησις (De prom. et Poen., 14). Cicero again describes the former as rerum divinarum et humanarum scientia and the latter as rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque scientia (Off., i., 43); while others explain σοφια as επιστημη θειον τε και θεων και ανθρωπων και φρονησις as επιστημη γνωσεων και καλων (Sext. Emp., p. 720; Plut., Mor., 1066 D). In all these definitions σοφια is the larger idea, wisdom in the most general sense, and φρονησις is the secondary idea, expressing a particular result or application of σοφια. So it seems to be also substantially with the Biblical use of the terms. Σοφια is the collective moral intelligence, "insight into the true nature of things" (Light.), and in the Pauline Epistles it is this intelligence in especial as knowledge of the Divine plan of salvation long hidden and now revealed; while φρονησις is the prac-
For forsooth, γνωστει 17: sumnevis 71.

γνωσις, γνωσις 76, d, e, g, Vlg., Goth., Hil., Theophyl., Victorin., Ambrst., Aug., etc.

2 αντον om. DEFG, d, e, g, Goth., Copt., Tert., Victorin., Hil.

The secret now open. In this sense it is applied to the Divine plan of redemption as a whole (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, etc.), or to particular things belonging to that Divine in-plan—the distribution of the riches, the abounding riches, of the grace expended on us stood revealed in the bestowal of these gifts of spiritual comprehension and practical discernment with reference to the deep things of the Divine Counsel and the Divine Revelation.

Ver. 9. γνωσις ημων: having made known unto us. Better, “in that He made known unto us”. As in ver. 5 the aor. part. is modal, not temporal, expressing an act not conceived as prior to that intimated by the definite tense, but coincident with it and stating the way in which it took effect. The γνωσις means to us Christians generally, not to us Apostles particularly, and the knowledge in question is spiritual understanding or insight. It was in giving us to know a certain secret of His counsel that God made His grace to abound toward us in all wisdom and discernment. The revelation of this secret to our minds meant the bestowal on us of all that is implied in wisdom and intelligence.— το μυστηριον του θεληματος αυτου: the mystery (or secret) of His will. The gen. is the ordinary gen. objecti, the mystery touching or concerning His will; not the gen. subjecti, the mystery originating in His will, nor the opposition gen., as if it were simply another form for “His hidden will”. The word μυστηριον, which in classical Greek meant something secret, especially the secrets of religion communicated only to the initiated and by them kept as a mystery, is used in the Apocryphal books of things hidden, e.g., the counsels of God (Wisd. ii. 22; Judith ii. 2), and in the NT occasionally of things not clear to the understanding (1 Cor. xiii. 2, xiv. 2), or of the mystic meaning of things—sayings, names, appearances (Heb. vi. 12; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5). But its distinctive sense in the NT is that of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret now open. In this sense it is applied to the Divine plan of redemption as a whole (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, etc.), or to particular things belonging to that Divine in-plan—the distribution of the riches, the abounding riches, of the grace expended on us stood revealed in the bestowal of these gifts of spiritual comprehension and practical discernment with reference to the deep things of the Divine Counsel and the Divine Revelation.

Ver. 9. γνωσις ημων: having made known unto us. Better, “in that He made known unto us”. As in ver. 5 the aor. part. is modal, not temporal, expressing an act not conceived as prior to that intimated by the definite tense, but coincident with it and stating the way in which it took effect. The γνωσις means to us Christians generally, not to us Apostles particularly, and the knowledge in question is spiritual understanding or insight. It was in giving us to know a certain secret of His counsel that God made His grace to abound toward us in all wisdom and discernment. The revelation of this secret to our minds meant the bestowal on us of all that is implied in wisdom and intelligence.— το μυστηριον του θεληματος αυτου: the mystery (or secret) of His will. The gen. is the ordinary gen. objecti, the mystery touching or concerning His will; not the gen. subjecti, the mystery originating in His will, nor the opposition gen., as if it were simply another form for “His hidden will”. The word μυστηριον, which in classical Greek meant something secret, especially the secrets of religion communicated only to the initiated and by them kept as a mystery, is used in the Apocryphal books of things hidden, e.g., the counsels of God (Wisd. ii. 22; Judith ii. 2), and in the NT occasionally of things not clear to the understanding (1 Cor. xiii. 2, xiv. 2), or of the mystic meaning of things—sayings, names, appearances (Heb. vi. 12; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5). But its distinctive sense in the NT is that of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret now open. In this sense it is applied to the Divine plan of redemption as a whole (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, etc.), or to particular things belonging to that Divine in-plan—the distribution of the riches, the abounding riches, of the grace expended on us stood revealed in the bestowal of these gifts of spiritual comprehension and practical discernment with reference to the deep things of the Divine Counsel and the Divine Revelation.
10. *Eis* οἰκονομιάν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνα-προσμετρηθείσα παντὸς καὶ ἀλλονομίας.

... in Himself. Some make it "in Christ," that is, in Christ Jesus the Lord (Eph. iii. 11). But God and His will are the subjects in view here, and the mention of Christ seems too remote for the thought naturally to re-occur to Him. The purpose is God's own free determination, originating in His own gracious mind. The reading ἐν αὐτῷ is adopted by Mey., Ell., etc., while ἐν αὐτῷ is given by Lachm., Tisch., WH, Hari., etc. The question whether the NT knows any other form than ἐν αὐτῷ as the reflexive of the third person is still debated. It is urged (e.g., by Bleek, Buttt., etc.) that the NT does not use ἐν αὐτῷ but only ἐν αὐτῷ in most cases or at least the vast majority, on such grounds as these, viz., that the MSS. have ἐν, ἐν, ἐν, etc., and not ἐν, ἐν, ἐν, before ἐν αὐτῷ; that in the second person we find only ἐν αὐτῷ, not ἐν αὐτῷ; and that the first and second personal pronouns are often used in the NT instead of the reflexive, though not when the pronoun is immediately dependent on the verb. Lightfoot concludes that "ἐν αὐτῷ, etc., may be used for ἐν αὐτῷ, etc., in almost every connection, except where it is the direct object of the verb" (see his note on Col. i. 20). On the other hand, Ell. is of opinion that the reflexive form is in place "where the attention is principally directed to the subject," and the non-reflexive where it is "diverted by the importance of the details". Winer, while admitting that in most passages ἐν αὐτῷ, etc., would suffice, would write ἐν αὐτῷ, etc., certainly in a few cases such as John ix. 21 (ἀνα-προσμετρηθείσα), and Rom. iii. 25 (ἐν προσθετετέρῳ Θεῷ... ἐν ἐνδείξει τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ), and would prefer it also in such passages as Mark vii. 35; Luke xii. 34, xix. 13; Rom. xiv. 14; Rev. xi. 7, xii. 2; as also here in Eph. i. 9. See Buttt., p. 111; Win.-Moult., p. 188; Bleek, Heb., ii., p. 59.

Ver. 10. *Eis* ὀκονομιάν: unto a dispensation. This expresses the end which God had in view in that which He purposed. Some (Erasm., Calv., etc.) give *eis* the temporal sense of usque ad. But the idea is rather the more definite one of design. God had His reason for the long delay in the revelation of the "mystery". That reason lay in the fact that the world was not ripe for the dispensation of grace which formed the contents of the mystery. In classical Greek the word ὀκονομιά had the two meanings of (a) administration, the management of a house or of property, and (b) the office of administrator or steward. It was used of such things as the arrangement of the parts of a building (Vitruv., i., 2), the disposition of the parts of a speech (Quint., Inst., iii., 3), and more particularly of the financial administration of a city (Arist., Pol., iii. 14; cf. Light., Notes, sub voc.). It has the same twofold sense in the NT—an arrangement or administration of things (in the passages in the present Epistle and in 1 Tim. i. 4), and the office of administrator—in particular the stewardship with which Paul was entrusted by God (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25). The idea at the basis of the statement here, therefore, as also in the somewhat analogous passage in Gal. iv. 1-11, is that of a great household of which God is the Master and which has a certain system of management wisely ordered by Him. Cf. the figure of the Church as the household of God (1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2-6; 1 Pet. iv. 17), and the parables which run in terms of God as ὀσκονομιάς (Matt. xii. 37, xx. 11, xxii. 33; Luke xiii. 24, xiv. 21)...

... πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν: of the fulness of the times. That is, a dispensation belonging to the fulness of the times. The gen. cannot be the gen. objecti (Storr, etc.), nor the expository gen. (Harr.), but must be that of characteristic quality, "a dispensation proper to the fulness of the times" (Mey.), or it may express the relation of time, as in ἡμέρα...
fitness of the times, it is probable, is also expressed by the καιρός as distinguished from χρόνον; here it has the more specific form τὸ πλήρημα τῶν καιρῶν, the fullness of the seasons, or series of appointed, determinate times. The idea of the fitness of the times, it is probable, is also expressed by the καιρός as distinguished from χρόνον, the former being a qualitative term, the latter a quantitative (see Light., Notes, p. 70). Cf. Heb. i. 5, and especially the πεπλήρωται καὶ καιρός of Mark i. 15. In classical Greek πλήρημα appears to have both the passive sense, "that which is filled," and the active, "that which fills." The former is rare, thus "the latter is sufficiently common. See Lidd. and Scott, Lex., and Rost u. Palm., Wortb., sub voce. In the NT likewise it seems to have both senses (though this is questioned); the passive being found in the great doctrinal passages in the Pauline Epistles (Eph. iii. 19, etc.), the active in its more frequent and in a variety of applications (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21, vi. 43, viii. 20; Rom. xi. 12; 1 Cor. x. 26). With reference to time it means "complement"—the particular time that completes a long prior period or a previous series of seasons. The purport of the statement, therefore, appears to be this: God has His household, the kingdom of heaven, with its special disposition of affairs, its οἰκονομία or steward (who is Christ), its own proper method of administration, and its gifts and privileges intended for its members. But these gifts and privileges could not be dispensed in their fulness while those for whom they were meant were under age (Gal. iv. 1-3) and unprepared for them. A period of waiting had to elapse, and when the process of training was finished and the time of maturity was reached, the gifts could be bestowed in their completeness. God, the Master of the House, had this fit time in view as the hidden purpose of His grace. When that time came He disclosed His secret in the incarnation of Christ and introduced the new disposition of the objects of His grace. So the Fathers came to speak of the incarnation as the οἰκονομία (Just., Dial., 45, 120; Iren., i., 10; Orig., C. Cels., ii., 9, etc.). This "complement" of the Divine grace which was to be the trust of Christ, in other words, the dispensation of the Gospel, and that dispensation as fulfilling itself in the whole period from the first advent of Christ to the second. In this last respect the present passage differs from that in Gal. iv. 4. In the latter "the fulness of the time" appears to refer definitely to the mission of Christ into the world and His work there. Here the context (especially the idea expressed by the next clause) extends the reference to the final completion of the work—and the close of the dispensation at the Second Coming. — ἀνακάθισθαι: to sum up. Or, having regard to the Middle Voice, "to sum up for Himself." The sentence, therefore, thus reads: "This is the order of things which God in the purpose of His grace had in view for the fulness of the seasons, was one which had for
its end or object a certain **summing up** of all things. But in **w** at sense is this **summing up** to be understood? The **precise meaning of this rare word ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι** has to be looked at. In the classics it is used of **repeating summarily** the points of a speech, gathering its argument together in a summary form. So Quintilian explains the noun ἀνακεφαλαίωσις as *reverum repetitio et congregatio* (*vi.*, 1), and Aristotle speaks of the ἔργον ἰδρυμίης as being ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν (*Frag.*, 123). In late Greek the verb means also to present in **compendious form** or to reproduce (*Protev. jac.*, 13). The simple verb κεφαλαίον in the classics denotes a head or topic in argument (*Plato*, *Tim.*, 26, etc.). In the NT the verb ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι occurs only twice, namely in *Rom. xiii. 9*; in which latter passage it is used of the **summing up** of the various commandments in the one requirement of love to one's neighbour. The simple verb κεφαλαίον occurs only once, viz., in *Mark xii. 4*, where it has the sense of wounding in the head; but the text is uncertain there, TTrWH reading κεφαλαίον with Bֶטְל, etc. The noun κεφαλαίον is found twice, viz., in Acts xxii. 28, where it has the sense of a sum of money (as in Lev. vi. 5; Num. v. 7; xxvii. 26), and in Heb. viii. 1, where it means the chief point in the things that the writer has been saying. The prevailing idea conveyed by these terms, therefore, appears to be that of a logical, rhetorical, or arithmetical summing up. The subsequent speeches, however, are indicated by ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι, however, makes it plain that what is in view here is not a logical or rhetorical, but a real or objective summing up. Further, as the verb comes not from κεφαλή but from κεφαλαίον, it does not refer to the summing up of things under a head, and the point of view, therefore, is not that of the **Headship** of Christ—which comes to distinct expression at the close of the chapter. On the other hand it does not seem necessary to limit the sense of the word (with Haupt) to the idea of a **rētōriča** or **compendious presentation of things** in a single person. The question remains as to the force of the prep. in the compound verb. The ἄνω is taken by many to add the idea of **again**, and to make the result or end in view the bringing things back to a unity which had once existed but had been lost. So it is understood by the Pesh., the Vulg., Tertull. (e.g., in his *Adv. Marc.*, *v.*, 17, “affirmat omnia ad initium recolligi in Christo”; in the *De Monog.*, *v.*, “adeo in Christo omnia revocantur ad initium,” etc.), Mey., Alfr., Abb., etc. On the other hand, Chrys. makes the compound verb equivalent to **συνάψεις**; and the idea of a return to a former condition is negatived by many, the ἄνω being taken to have simply the sense which it has in ἀνατινάδος, ἀναρίτες, ἀναφαίνω, ἀναπληρώσω, ἀναπληρώσω, ἀναπροσατελεῖν, **κοιμάω**; and the simple verb ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι occurs only twice, namely in *Rom. xiii. 9*; in which passage in Col. i. 20 speaks of a final **reconciliation** of all things.—τὰ πάντα: **all things**. An all-inclusive phrase, equivalent to the totality of creation; not things only, nor yet men or intelligent beings only (although the phrase might bear that sense, cf. Gal. iii. 22), but, as the context shows, all created objects, men and things. Cf. the universal expression in Col. i. 20.—ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ: **in Christ**, or rather “in the Christ,” the introduction of the article indicating that the term has its official sense here. The same is clearly the case in ver. 12, and, as Alford notices, the article does not seem to be attached to the term Χριστός after a prep. unless some special point is in view. The point of union in this gathering together of all things is the Christ of God. In Him they are to be unified.—τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ θεῷ γῆς: **the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth**. Or, according to the better reading and as in RV marg., **the things upon the heavens, and the things upon the earth**.
must give place to τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, which is adopted by LTTW on the basis of Bς, etc. It is an unusual form for the compound phrase, the term ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς being ordinarily coupled with ἐν τῷ σώματι, etc. (Acts iii. 15; also the parallel in Col. i. 20, where the ἐν is poorly attested). The ἐν in ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, however, may have the force of at, which it has in such phrases as ἐν πόλειν (II., iii., 149). ἐν τῷ θάνατῳ (II., vi., 431), ἐν τῷ προσβολικῷ (Acts iii. 21), the heavens being regarded, as Meyer thinks, as "the stations at which the things concerned are to be found". The phrase in its two contrasted parts defines the preceding τὰ πάντα, making the all-inclusive nature of its universality clear by naming its great divisions. It is not to be understood as referring in its first section to any particular class, spirits in heaven, departed saints of Old Testament times, angels (as even Chrys. and Calv. thought), Jews, and in its second section specifically to men or to Gentiles. It explains the universality expressed by τὰ πάντα as the widest possible and most comprehensive universality, including the sum total of created objects, wherever found, whether men or things.—ἐν αὐτῷ: in him. Emphatic resumption of the ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ and transition to the following statement, solemnly re-affirming also, as Ell. suggests, where the true point of unity designed by God, or the sphere of its manifestation, is to be found.

The passage has been supposed (Orig., Crell., etc.) to teach the doctrine of a Universal Restoration. But interpreted as above it has nothing to do with any such doctrine, and it is the sense of a final salvation of all unrighteous and unbelieving men or that of a final recovery of all evil beings, devils and men alike. Nor, again, does it refer particularly to the case of the individual. It speaks, as Meyer notices, of the "aggregate of heavenly and earthly things," and of that as destined to make a true unity at last. Another view of the general import of the statement, which has been elaborated with much ability by Haupt, requires some notice. Pressing to its utmost the sense of a resume or summary, which he regards as the idea essentially contained in the terms in question, he contends that the meaning of the statement is that in Christ, who belongs at once to humanity and to the heavenly world, should be seen the comprehensive and all-inclusive universality, including the sum total of created objects, both earthly and heavenly, so that outside Him nothing should exist. He looks for the proper parallel to this not in Col. i. 20, but in Col. i. 16, 17, where it is said of Christ that "in Him were all things created" and that "in Him all things consist". And he appeals in support of his view to the use of the kindred verb συγκεκαθαρισθέναι in Xen. (Cyr., viii., i., 15, viii., 6, 14), where it expresses the organisation of a multitude of slaves under one representative, in whom they and their acts were so embodied that Cyrus could transact with all when dealing with the one. But the idea of Christ's agency in the first creation and the continuous maintenance of things is not expressed in the passage in Ephesians, and while it is the pre-existent Christ that is in view in Col. i. 16, here it is the risen Christ. It remains, therefore, that the present passage belongs to the same class as Rom. viii. 20-22; Col. i. 20, etc., and expresses the truth that Christ is to be the point of union and reconciliation for all things, so that the whole world will be finally restored by Him to its normal condition of harmony and unity.

Ver. 11. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: in heaven. The καί does not qualify the subjects (for there is no emphatic ἣμας, nor is there any such contrast between ἡμῖν and ᾧμᾶς here as appears in verses 12, 13),
but refers to what is expressed by the verb and presents that as something additional to what has been expressed by the preceding verb. The "we," therefore, designates Christians inclusively, and the καί gives the sentence this force — "not only was it the purpose of God to make known the secret of His grace to us Christians, but this purpose was also fulfilled in us in point of fact and we were made His own—not only chosen for His portion but actually made that". The AV "in whom also we" seems to follow the erroneous rendering of the Vulg., in quo etiam nos. Equally at fault are those (including even Wetstein and Harless) who limit the "we" to Jewish Christians here.—ελπιδοθημεν: were made a heritage. The reading ελπιδοθημεν, found in a few uncials and favoured by Griesb., Lachm., Rück., may be a gloss from Rom. viii. 13, or possibly a corruption of ελπισθημεν. So also the description due to the faulty eyes of some scribe. The verb ελπιδοθημεν is of disputed meaning here. This is its only occurrence in the NT. The compound form προσελπισθηθαι also occurs in the NT, but only once (Acts xvii. 4). In classical Greek κληρονομεν means to cast the lot, to choose by lot, and to allot. Both in the classics and in the NT κληρος denotes a lot, and then a portion allotted. The cognate κληρονομαι means to get by lot, to obtain an allotted portion, and so to inherit; and κληρονομες, in the LXX often representing מִלְחָמָה signifies a property inherited, or a possession. In the OT it is used technically of the portion assigned by lot to each tribe in the promised land, and of the Holy Land itself as Israel's possession given by God (Deut. iv. 38, xv. 4). In the NT it gets the higher sense of the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, the Christian's destined possession in the consummation of the Kingdom of God. The affinities of κληρος show that it may have the definite sense of heritage. It is alleged indeed by some (e.g., Abb.) that the only idea expressed in κληρος is that of assigning a lot or portion, and that the notion of an inheritance does not belong to it. But the portions of land assigned by lot to the tribes of Israel on their entrance into Canaan were secured inalienably, and the lots belonging to each family were so secured to the family from father to son that it was impious to let them go into the hands of strangers (cf. the case of Naboth, 1 Kings xxii. 3). Thus the idea of lot or portion passed over into that of inheritance. Thus, too, in the OT the blessings of the people of God, recognised to be possessed by God's free gift and not by the people's merit, came to be described in terms of a heritage, and God Himself, the Giver of all, was looked to as the supreme portion of His people, the possession that made their inheritance (Ps. xvi. 5-11). But in the OT there was also the counter idea that Israel was the portion or inheritance of the Lord, chosen by Himself to be His peculiar possession. At times these two ideas meet in one statement (Jer. x. 10). The question, therefore, is— which of these two conceptions is embodied in the ελπιδοθημεν here? Or may it be that the word has a sense somewhat different from either? Some take this latter view, understanding the word to mean appointed by lot, or elected by lot, sorte vocati sumus as the Vulg. makes it. So Syr., Goth., Chrys., Er asm., Estius, etc. Some take the passive ελπιδοθημεν for the latter view, and the Rhemish "we are called by lot". The point thus would be again the sovereignty of the Divine choice, the Christians in view being described as appointed to their Christian position as if by lot. But when our appointment or election is spoken of it is nowhere else said to be by lot, but by the purpose or counsel of God. Retaining, therefore, the general conception of an inheritance, some take the passive ελπιδοθημεν for the middle, and render it simply "we have obtained an inheritance" (AV., Conyb.). The passive, however, must be accepted as a real passive, and the choice comes to be between these two interpretations: (a) we were made partners of the inheritance, in hereditatem ascidiis, enfeoffed in it (Eadie), and (b) we were made a heritage (RV), God's λαος, taken by Him as His own peculiar portion. The former is the view of Harl., Mey., Haupt, etc., and so far also of Tyndale and Cranmer, who translate "we are made heirs". It deals with the pass. κληρονομηθαι on the analogy of such passives as παρεστημεν, φθειρισται, διακωμομαι: it has the advantage of being in accordance with the idea regularly conveyed by the cognate terms κληρονομες, κληρονομαι; and it points to a third gift of God of the same order with the previous two—forgiveness, wisdom, inheritance. The other interpretation, however—"made a heritage," "taken for God's inheritance"—is to be preferred (with Grot., Olsh., De Wette, Stier., Alf., etc.) as being on the whole more consistent with usage; more in
harmony with the import of the other passives in the paragraph: sustained, perhaps, by the use of προσελήφθων in Acts xvii. 4, where the idea is rather that of being allotted to Paul as disciples than that of joining their lot (AV and RV = "consorted with") with Paul; and, in particular, as suggested by the εἰς τὸ ἐν τῷ that follows rather than εἰς τὸ εἰσελθεῖν being what would naturally follow the statement of an inheritance which we received.—προπρομάθησεν κατὰ πρόθεσιν: having been foreordained according to the purpose. The fact that we were made the heritage of God is thus declared to have been no incidental thing, not an event belonging only to time or one having its explanation in ourselves, but a change in our life founded on and resulting from the eternal foreordaining purpose of God Himself. The purpose of God is expressed here by the term πρόθεσις, the radical idea in which is that of the setting of a thing before one. It occurs six times in the Pauline Epistles, and is not confined to one class of these, but appears alike in the Primary Epistles, the Epistles of the Captivity, and the Pastoral Epistles (Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, iii. 10). Outside these Epistles it occurs only twice in the NT, both times in Acts (xi. 23, xxvii. 13) and of human purpose.—τοῦ τα πάντα ἐνεργοῦσώς: of Him who worketh all things. The πάντα has the absolute sense, and is not to be restricted to the "all things" that belong to the Divine grace and redemption. The foreordination of men to a special relation to God is connected with the foreordination of things universally. The God of the chosen is the God of the universe; the purpose which is the ground of our being made God's heritage is the purpose that embraces the whole plan of the world; and our position as the κληρον and possession of God has behind it both the sovereignty and the efficiency of the Will that energizes or is operative in all things.—κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ δεσμοτος αὐτοῦ: after the counsel of his will. The distinction between βουλή and θέλημα is still much debated, scholars continuing to take precisely opposite views of it. On the one hand, there are those who hold that θέλειν and its cognates express the will as proceeding from inclination, and that βουλεῖται and its cognates express the will as proceeding from deliberation (Grimm, Wilke, Light., etc.). On the other hand, there are those who contend that θέλειν is the form that conveys the idea of deliberation and βουλεύειν that which carries with it the idea of inclination. In many passages it is difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate any real distinction, the terms being often used indiscriminately. But in connections like the present it is natural to look for a distinct distinction, and in such cases the idea of intelligence and deliberation seems to attach to the βουλή. This appears to be supported by the usage which prevails in point of fact in the majority of NT passages, and in particular by such occurrences as Matt. i. 19. Here, therefore, the will of God which acts in His foreordaining purpose or decree, in being declared to have its βουλή or "counsel," is set forth as acting not arbitrarily, but intelligently and by deliberation, not without reason, but for reasons, hidden it may be from us, yet proper to the Highest Mind and Most Perfect Moral Nature. "They err," says Hooker, with reference to this passage, "who think that of God's will there is no reason except His will" (Eccl. Pol., i., 2). It is also implied in this statement that the Divine foreordination, whether of things universally or of men's lots in particular, is neither a thing of necessity on the one hand nor of caprice on the other, but a thing of free and of thought; and further, that the reasons for that foreordination do not lie in the objects themselves, but are intrinsic to the Divine Mind and the free determination of the Divine Will.
Ver. 12. *el to elen ha{m}a elen svavon tis de{gen} a{no}v: to the end that we should be unto the praise of His glory.

The art. is inserted by the TR before de{gen} is omitted by a few ancient authorities, especially D F. This clause states the ultimate end which God had in view in foreordaining us to be made His kl{fites}.

It was not for our own privilege (as the Jews with their limited and exclusive ideas had misinterpreted the object of God in His election of them), but that through us His glory might be set forth.

Cf. the prophetic declaration, "the people which I formed for myself, that they might set forth my praise" (Isa. xliii. 21); and such passages as Ps. cxliv. 12; Sirach xxxix. 10; Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7. The sentence is best connected with the principal verb, not with the proorv{theta}v, which defines the kl{fites} itself. It is also to be further defined by the tovs irpoT|Xiri|koV as the predicate, so that the sense expresses a hope cherished before the event. Some understand this differently, taking the pro to express the fact that Jewish Christians preceded Gentile Christians in hoping in Christ (Beza, Grot., Beng., etc.). Others (De Wette, etc.) would make the event in view as the object of hope the second Advent of Christ, the Parousia of the Epistles. But the point appears to be that there were those, namely, pious Jews of OT times, who cherished a hope in the Christ of promise and prophecy before the appearance of Christ in history. The words are entirely appropriate as a description of those who looked for Christ before He came. The prep. iv is most naturally understood as it is after the simple o{te}wv, e.g., in 1 Cor. xv. 19, and the o{te}wv itself must have the natural sense of hoping, not believing or trusting. Yet, again, the object of the hope is here not XristoV, but XristoV, "the Christ," "the Messiah". The sense consequently is, "we, as those who have reposed our hope in the Christ before He appeared". These things help us to answer the question — Who are the persons referred to? They are, say some, Christians generally, as those who hope in the Christ who is to return, and of whom it may be said, speaking of them from the standpoint of the final fulfillment at Christ's second Advent, that they are those who have reposed their hope in the Christ who is to come. This is urged specially on the ground that, as all through the preceding paragraph Paul has spoken of things pertaining to Christians generally and has used the terms "we," "us" of Christians without distinction, it is unreasonable to suppose that at this point he changes all and puts a restricted meaning on the ha{m}a. On this view the following o{te}wv must also be taken not as referring to a distinct class of Christians, but simply as applying to the Ephesian readers in particular what is said of all Christians as such. It must be allowed that much may be said in favour of this view. But on the other hand it is just at this point that Paul introduces a ha{m}a as well as a ha{m}a — a fact that naturally suggests a distinction between two classes; as in chap. ii.
11-22 he draws out the distinction definitely and with a purpose between two classes who became believers in the Christ in different ways and at different times. Hence it appears simplest (with Mey., etc.) to regard Paul as speaking in this clause specially of those who like himself had once been Jews, who had the Messianic prophecies and looked for the Messiah, and by God's grace had been led to see that in Christ they had found the Messiah. In the following ὑμεῖς, therefore, he refers to those who had once been Gentiles and had come to be believers in Christ. This is supported by the explanatory nature of the clause introduced by ὥσπερ, by the proper sense of the ἐρωτησάσθαι and by the introduction of τῷ Χριστῷ in place of τῷ Χριστῷ.

Ver. 13. ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς: in whom ye also. The reading ἐν ὑμῖν appears in certain manuscripts of importance (AKLg e, f, g, etc.); but the weight of documentary authority is greatly on the side of ὑμεῖς. Taking, therefore, the καὶ ὑμεῖς, as contrasted with the previous ὑμεῖς, to refer to the readers of the Epistle as Gentiles in distinction from the writer and those whom he couples with himself as having formerly been Jews, we have in this verse and the following a paragraph which gives first a description of the evangelical standing and experience of Gentile Christians such as these Ephesians were, and then a statement of the fact that, in their case as in that of the others, God's ultimate end in His gracious dealing with them was the praise of His glory. The opening clause, however, presents some difficulty. The sentence is left with something unexpressed, or its form is disturbed. How is it to be construed? It is natural to think first of explaining it by supplying some verb for the ὑμεῖς, and as the substantive verb is often left to be understood, some introduce ἐστι here = "in whom ye also are," "in whom ye also have a part" (Mey., Alf.). But the great Pauline formula ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι can scarcely be dealt with thus, the εἶναι in it has too profound a sense to allow of its being dropped and left to be understood as is possible with the ordinary substantive verb. Others, therefore, look to the immediately preceding προσκυνήσασθαι for the word that is to be supplied (Erasm. Calv., Beza, Est., etc.; and so AV "in whom ye also trusted"). But to make the apposite statement of the fact of their having requires us (unless the Second Advent is supposed to be the object of the hope) to supply only ἐλπικατε not προσκυνηκατε, and to give the verb the modified sense of trusting or believing. Much more may be said in favour of supplying the definite verb καθήμενοι which rules the larger sentence (Erasm. in his Paraphrase, Cornel. a Lap., Harl., Olsb., etc.) = "in whom ye also were made God's κληρον, or possession". The comparative distance of the ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς from καθήμενοι is no serious objection, especially in view of the fact that it is the definite verb, and not a qualifying participle, that is in view. There remains, however, yet another method of explanation, viz., to regard the sentence as an interrupted construction, in which the expression of the main thought, that of the εὐαγγελία, is delayed by other preliminary ideas, the second ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ being a resumption and continuation of the first (Theod. Mops., Jer., Beng., De Wette, Rück., Bleek, Bisp., Ell., Humphrey, Abb., Von Sod., Haupt). This solution of the difficulty appears on the whole to be the best, and it has been preferred by the majority of interpreters. It seems to be favoured by the Syr., Copt. and Eth. Versions, and is adopted by the RV—"in whom ye also, having heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation—in whom, having also believed, ye were sealed". The interruption of the regular construction in the fact of their having been "sealed" appears to be caused by the introduction of the idea of the primary Christian requirement of faith after the mention of the hearing. It is objected that the distance between the one ἐν τῷ and the other is much less than is usual in such cases, and that in a
resumption we should expect not εν ψ ψ καλ, but εν ψ ψ ημεροι. But anacoloutha are quite in Paul's way, and they are not all of one type or one extension (cf. Win.-Moul., p. 704), and the καλ (minus the ψηφι) is appropriate as giving an ascensive force to the πιστευοντες. This view of the construction has the advantage also of enabling us to retain substantially the same sense for the εν ψ in these three occurrences (vv. 11, 13, and it makes the defining participles δικαιοσυνες (with its clause) and πιστευοντες important preparations for the statement of privilege in the επιφανειας, each contributing something proper in its own place to the order of ideas. Hence both the first εν ψ and the second εν ψ, connected with the επιφανειας = "in whom, on hearing and believing, ye were sealed"; it being in Christ, in virtue of our union with Him, that we receive the gift of the Spirit—δικαιοσυνες: having heard (or, on hearing). This comes in its proper order, the first in the series of things, preparing the way for the sealing of the Spirit. In the narratives of cases of reception into the Christian Church in the Book of Acts we discover this order of grace: hearing, repentance, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (ii. 37, 38), or hearing, faith, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (viii. 6, 12). Yet this is not an invariable order. Sometimes only hearing, baptism, and the gift of the Holy Ghost (xix. 5, 6) are mentioned; and in such instances as those of Paul (ix. 17) and the men of Caesarea (x. 44-47), the gift of the Holy Ghost appears to have preceded the administration of baptism. On the importance of hearing, that is, access to the preached word, cf. Rom. x. 13-17, where the πιστευοντες is declared to come by the επιφανειας: τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας: the word of the truth. The λόγος here is evidently the word of preaching, "of the truth," not with any particular reference, as Meyer justly observes, to the OT word as one that dealt with types and shadows rather than realities (Chrys.), or to the word of heathenism as the word of error (Corn. a Lap., etc.), but in the sense in which our Lord connected the word of the truth and the word (John xvi. 17: cf. Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15; James ii. 17). The gen. is not that of apposition (Harl.), but the gen. objecti, "the word concerning the truth;" or, as Ell. suggests, the gen. of ethical substance or ethical content, "the word of which the truth is the very essence, or content."—τὸ εὐαγγελιον τῆς σωτηρίας υμῶν: the gospel of your salvation. Further definition of the word of the truth. The preached word which has the truth for its essential content is that which brought you the good tidings of salvation. Here, again, the gen. is not that of appos. or identity (Harl., etc.), but most probably that of content or subject matter (Mey., Ell., etc.). Elsewhere we have the εὐαγγελιον defined as that of the Kingdom (Matt. ix. 35), of God (Rom. i. 1), of the Kingdom of God (Mark i. 14), of Christ, Jesus Christ, His Son, etc. (Rom. i. 9, 16; Mark i. 1), of peace (Eph. vi. 15), of the grace of God (Acts xx. 24), of the glory of the blessed God (1 Tim. i. 11), of the glory of Christ (2 Cor. iv. 4). Nowhere in the NT is the word grace used so frequently and in such a variety of applications as in the Pauline Epistles. It is never used in Luke's Gospel, in John's Gospel or Epistles, in Hebrews, or in James; in Matthew's Gospel it occurs four times, in Mark eight times, in Acts twice, in Peter once, and in the Apocalypse once. The noun grace, which has so large a place in the rest of the Pauline writings, is of rare occurrence in these Epistles of the Captivity. It is found thrice in the Epistle to the Philippians, but only once in this profound Epistle to the Ephesians (in vi. 17 we have the other form τον άνθρωπον), and not even once in the sister Epistle to the Colossians.—ἐν ψ: —in whom, I say. With the former εν ψ the writer turned from the case of those like himself who, having been Jews, had been made God's λαός in Christ, to that of Gentiles like these Ephesians who also had been made partakers of God's grace in Christ, though in a different way, not as having had the hope of the Jews in a promised Messiah, but simply as having heard the word of Christian preaching. The particular gift of grace which it was in his mind to state as bestowed on these Gentile Christians was the sealing of the Spirit. With this second εν ψ, "—in whom, I say," he takes up the statement which had been interrupted by the mention of the way in which they had come to receive the grace, and brings it (with a further reference to the antecedents to the sealing) to its intended conclusion. This εν ψ, therefore, is not to be dealt with differently from the former and made to relate to the εὐαγγελιον, as if = "in which Gospel having also believed, ye were sealed" (Mey.). It simply continues the idea of the previous εν ψ, expressing the fact that the grace which came to the Gentile who heard the word of preaching,
like the grace which came to the Jew who had the Messianic hope, was bestowed "in Christ," and had its ground in Him.—

This hope or assurance which is given to ourselves seems rather in view here (cf. Rom. vii. 16). There is no reason to suppose that there is any allusion here to any peculiar use of the seal whether in Jewish custom or in heathen religious service. Nor is the rite of Baptism specially referred to. In ecclesiastical Greek the phrase παντεύοντες ἐν Χριστῷ is of very rare occurrence, especially in the sense of believing or confiding in a person (Ps. lxxviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6). In Mark i. 1 it has to do with the verb παρατίθεναι, not the idea of authenticating or certifying them to be of God's heritage, or that of marking them as such. The two ideas are near akin. The latter will be more applicable, if (with Theophyl., Chrys., Cornel., Lap. etc.) we take the attestation to be the objective attestation to others, the evidence to our fellows that we are the chosen of God; the former, if (with Mey., Ell., etc.) we take it to be the attestation to our own consciousness.

Ver. 14. δότων ἰδραμαντὶ τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν: which is an earnest of our...
inheritance. So with the RV, rather than "who is the earnest," etc., of the AV. The reading is preferred by Lachm., Alf., WH, etc., as supported by ABGL, Athan., Cyr., etc. The TR is the reading of DK, Thdt., Damasc., Theophyl., etc.; the masc. form διαδέχοντας being due to attraction to the following ἄρρατον, as, e.g., in τῷ σώματι σου διαδέχοντας ἁπλά, and in the other passages. The word διαδέχοντας, the form preferred by Tisch. and regarded by WH as only Western, cf. Westcott and Hort's New Testament in Greek, II., App., p. 148 is the LXX reproduction of the Heb. בְּרִית which occurs in Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20 and is rendered "pledge." It is found in classical Greek of earlier date than the LXX (e.g., Isaeus, De Cir. her., 23; Aristotle, Pol., i., 11; Menander, Frag. Com. [Meineke], iv., pp. 268, 283; etc., cf. Light., Notes, ut sup., p. 343), and is supposed, therefore, to have come from the Phoenicians into Greek use. At an early date it was introduced also into Latin, but by what channel we know not. In Latin it occurs in the three forms -arrabo, rabo (e.g., in Plautus, Truec., iii., 20), and arra (e.g., Aul. Gell., xvii., 2). It survives in the forms arra, arrhes in the languages most directly derived from the Latin; as also in our ears, the obsolete English earUspenny, etc. Etymologically, it appears to have expressed the idea of exchange, and so its primary sense may have been that of a "pledge" simply. But it came to mean more than ἄνευρων, or pledge, in the sense of something exchanged between two parties to a contract or agreement. Its proper sense is that of earnest—part of the price to be received or part of the thing that is to be possessed, given in assurance that the full payment or the complete possession will follow. It is the tenor of the passage plainly indicates, the full, perfected redemption, as in iv. 30, Rom. viii. 23, and probably 1 Cor. i. 30.—τῆς περιστοσίας: of the possession. The "purchased possession" of the AV is less apt, as the verb περιστοικείον expresses the general idea of preserving, acquiring, gaining for oneself, without specific reference to a price. But what is the import of the phrase here? The form of the noun περιστοικείον and its use point to the active sense, preserving, acquiring. In 2 Chron. xiv. 13 it is said of the Ethiopians that they fell ἀρρατοῖς, so that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.). The word occurs in the NT five times in all (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In three of these instances it certainly has the active sense (1 Thess. v. 9, περιστοικείον; 2 Thess. ii. 14, περιστοικείον ἀδελφοίς; Heb. x. 39, περιστοικείον ψυχῆς), and it would be most natural to take it in that sense here. But it is difficult to adjust that to the context. In 2 Chron. xiv. 13 it is said of the Ethiopians that they fell ἀρρατοῖς, so that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.). The word occurs in the NT five times in all (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In three of these instances it certainly has the active sense (1 Thess. v. 9, περιστοικείον; 2 Thess. ii. 14, περιστοικείον ἀδελφοίς; Heb. x. 39, περιστοικείον ψυχῆς), and it would be most natural to take it in that sense here. But it is difficult to adjust that to the context. In 2 Chron. xiv. 13 it is said of the Ethiopians that they fell ἀρρατοῖς, so that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.). The word occurs in the NT five times in all (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In three of these instances it certainly has the active sense (1 Thess. v. 9, περιστοικείον; 2 Thess. ii. 14, περιστοικείον ἀδελφοίς; Heb. x. 39, περιστοικείον ψυχῆς), and it would be most natural to take it in that sense here. But it is difficult to adjust that to the context. It is said of the Ethiopians that they fell ἀρρατοῖς, so that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.).
becomes plainer if we understand the idea to be rather that of God's possession in us, the περιποίησις being taken as the equivalent of the OT ἱλασμός, by which Israel is designated as the possession acquired by the Lord for Himself (Exod. xix. 5; cf. Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18; Ps. cxxxv. 4). It is true that the LXX rendering of ἱλασμός is usually περιποίησις. But that is not the only form that is adopted. In Ps. cxxxv. 4 the phrase is ἐλείς περιποίησαμένοις αὐτός; and in Mal. iii. 17, where Aquila has περιποίησος, the LXX has περιποίησιν. Further, in Isa. xliii. 21 the same idea is expressed by the corresponding verb—λαῶν μου περιποίησατοι (cf. Acts xx. 28, τὴν ἐκπλήρωσαν τοῦ Θεοῦ περιποίησατο). So, too, Peter, with this passage in view, describes the spiritual Israel of the NT as λαῶς ἐλείς περιποίησον (1 Pet. ii. 9); while in Titus, ii. 14, again, we have λαῶν περιποίησον. This interpretation is that of the Syriac, Erasm., Calvin, etc., and it is preferred by most recent commentators, including Harless, Meyer, Ell., Alf., etc. It is adopted also by the RV, which renders it "God's own possession". Wycliffe, however, gives "purchasynge"; the Genevan, "that we might be fully restored to liberty"; the Rhemish, "the redemption of our acquity, the AV, Tyndall and Cranmer give "the purchased possession".—ἐλεῖς σώζων τῷ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ: unto the praise of his glory. The second end of the sealing, or rather the second aspect of the ultimate purpose of God in the sealing. The final end on our side of that great act of grace is the consummation of the redemption of those who have been made God's own people. On God's side the final end of the same grace is the "praise of His glory"—the adoring confession of the glories of the Divine Nature and Mind so revealed to men. The αὐτοῦ refers to the main subject here, not Christ in whom we obtain the grace, but God by whom it is willed—the Eternal Origin of all.

Ver. 15. Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ: For this cause I too. Διὰ τοῦτο might cover the contents of the entire preceding paragraph, pointing back to ver. 3 and indicating that in his thanksgiving to God, in behalf of these Ephesians, the Apostle had in his mind the whole counsel and eternal choice of God of which he first made mention, and the whole operation of grace in the lives of the Ephesians in the several particulars afterwards instanced. In view, however, of the transition from the more general "us" to the more definite "ye also" in ver. 13 it is probably more accordant with the tenor of thought that take the ἐλεῖς τοῦτο to refer to the signal manifestation of God's grace in the sealing of these believers, who had been taken from the dark pagan world, with the Spirit which was both assurance and foretaste of an inheritance undreamt of in their heathenism. The κἀγώ is best explained by the same καὶ οὕτως. It means simply "I on my side, taking the same view, including, even Meyer, suppose, that the writer was thinking of a co-operation be-
tween those addressed and himself in thanksgiving and prayer.—Δικοςασα την καθ' υμας πιστιν εις την Κυρια ηγιασα: having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus. It has been wrongly inferred from the Δικοςασα that the writer had no personal acquaintance with those addressed and knew of their conversion only by the report of others. Philemon was well known to Paul, who spake of him indeed as his ἀγαπητος, his σωτηρος, and his son in the faith (ver. 19). Yet Paul uses with reference to him almost the same terms as those used here—μενειν σων τοιούτων . . . Δικοσα σου την ἀγαπην κα την πιστιν κ.τ.λ. (ver. 4, 5). Besides, what the writer speaks of here is not their conversion but their faith and love, and it is only in harmony with all that we know of Paul that he should have used every opportunity of keeping himself in communication with them and watching their progress. Through Tychicus, or some other visitor or messenger, tidings of their Christian walk may have come to him now (cf. Introduction). In any case he finds his first and foremost reason for thanksgiving in the report of the way in which the fundamental Christian requirement was made good among them—that of faith, their faith in the Lord Jesus Himself. The phrase here is not the usual την ὑμητεραν πιστιν, or την πιστιν υμων, but την καθ' υμας πιστιν. The sense, however, is substantially the same. Some good grammarians indeed seek to establish a distinction between the two phrases, and claim a special partitive or distributive sense for the one with καθ'. Ellicott, e.g., points to the fact that the form ἡ καθ' υμας πιστις is adopted only once by Paul, while πιστις υμων occurs some seventeen times in his Epistles, and concludes on the whole that the former may denote "the faith of the community viewed objectively," "the faith which is among you," whereas the latter expresses "the subjective faith of individuals". Alford, also, gives the former the sense of the faith which prevails among you" (on the analogy of την καθ' ανθρωπος βλε την θυσιν in Thuc., vi., 16), and takes it to imply that some in the Ephesian Church may not have had the faith. So the RV gives in its text "the faith . . . which is among you"; marg., "in you". But the analogies referred to (e.g., την πιστιν την ενθρωποι, Acts xviii. 17, as contrasted with τοιον του καθ' υμας in Acts xviii. 15; cf. Ell.) scarcely bear this out, and there is much to show that the latter form had become, or was on the way to become, simply a peri-phrasis for the former. Such phrases as ου κατιν των καθ' υμας πιστων; the above τοιον του καθ' υμας; and των κατα λουδαλους θων (Acts xvi. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3) may be thus explained; and in later Greek καθα with an acc. is frequently used where the older classical Greek would have had the gen. case, e.g., ἡ κατα την ἀρχην επονομαζεται = the resignation of government, Diod., S., i., 65. So, while in the NT καθα may usually retain its distributive force, in cases where it is followed by the acc. of a personal pronoun it may mean nothing more than the poss. adj. or the gen. of the personal pronoun. As Buttmann points out, strictly speaking it is not so much that "the case was periphrased but that the prepositional phrase displaced the simple case": as it was easy for the Greek language to make prepositional phrases dependent immediately upon substantives, and natural, therefore, for it in its later developments to carry this further and employ "prepositional expressions even where the earlier language still preferred the simple case" (Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 156; cf. Bernhard's Syntax, p. 241; Win.-Moul., pp. 199, 409; Blaiss, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 133).—κα την ἀγαπην την εις παντας των άγιων: and your love toward all the saints. The reading is uncertain. The Received Text inserts την ἀγαπην, which has the support of such authorities as Π Digk, Syr., Boh., Lat., Copt., Goth., Thdt., etc., and is adopted by Tisch. and Tregelles (the latter bracketing it in margin). It is regarded by WH as a Western and Syrian insertion from Col. i. 4. The την ἀγαπην is omitted by Π BAP, 17, Orig., Cyr., Jer., etc., and is deleted by Lach., WH and RV. The documentary evidence is on the side of the omission. But the difficulty is to find in that case a suitable sense. Hone thinks that Phil. 5 furnishes a parallel, as it might be rendered (with RV marg.) "hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus and toward all the saints." But the love is expressed there. Dale would render it "having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ which is among you and shown toward all the saints," as if the point of the latter clause was the reality or manifestation of the faith. But in the Greek there is nothing corresponding to the "shown." The πιστις, in short, if it belongs to both clauses, must be introduced in two different aspects, as belief in the first clause and as faithfulness in the second. But in the absence of any
intimation of a double presentation of an awkward exceedingly. The Revisers nevertheless render it—"the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which ye shew toward all the saints". The insertion in any case is of early date, and the omission may have been due to the eye of some ancient scribe being deceived by the two occurrences of τών. The grace in question, whether their love or their faithfulness, was of catholic quality, taking all the saints for its objects.

Ver. 16. οἱ πατήρ τίς ἡδός, ἡδής ὁμώς πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ αὐθοκαλύ-

1 ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 137; Win.-Moul., p. 470; Bernh., Syn., p. 246. The local reference proper to τῶν (as the preposition answering the question Where?), however, is not wholly sunk in the temporal sense. See Ell. on 1 Thess. i.2. Winer takes it to express the idea of something attaching itself to something else. It may be of one of frequent occurrence in the NT, sometimes joined with δέον (e.g., Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6, etc.), and sometimes with ἐφευρέσθη as well (1 Tim. ii.1). The most general term is προευρέσθη = praedicatio, and that term is not used but of prayer to God. δέον, which can be used also of addresses to men, has the more definite sense of petito, rogatio; while ἐφευρέσθη, which means a falling in with, conference, and goes beyond the idea of intercession (as our AV renders it), expresses prayer as the converse of the soul with God, with the notion of urgency and filial confidence. See Huther and Ell. on 1 Tim. ii.1; Win.-Moul., sub δέον; Light, on Phil. iv. 6; Trench, Syn., sub voces.

Ver. 17. ἦν δὲ θέσι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the parallel passage in Col. i.9 the τῶν is preceded immediately by ἐπηρεάσθη, and has the reduced or sub-telic force which it has after verbs of asking, expressing the content of the prayer, but that in the light of purport. Here the τῶν relates to the general idea of the sentence, instead of being immediately dependent on any verb for asking. It has more of the idea of purpose, therefore, in it. It is to be admitted, however, that in NT Greek the proper telic sense of τῶν is seen in the process of weakening and passing over into the force of τῶν as the sign of the inf. in modern Greek. Yet, even that simple notion of event, it has behind it the Hebrew idea of events as the results of Divine purpose;
...the Father of glory. 

In the ministry of redemption our Lord, while the Son of the Eternal Father, is the Christ of God, God being revealed in Him, sending Him (Gal. iv. 4), exalting Him (Phil. ii. 9), receiving back the kingdom from Him (Acts vii. 2; also "the King of glory," Heb. ix. 5, etc.). The appropriateness of the title here lies in the preceding definition of the final end of God's counsel and grace—εἷς ἐν λαόν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀΰτου.—

εἷς ἐτῶν: may give unto you. Lachm., Fritzsche (Rom., iii., 230) and Haupt (who refers to the confirmation furnished recently by two inscriptions of the second century given in Dittenb., Syll., 462, 466g) give the Ionic conj. δέ ; WH give δέ vel δέ in the margin, but δέ in the text. The latter form is to be preferred, although opinion is still divided to some extent on the conj. and opt. forms. Blass, e.g., takes the δέ in the present passage to be really a conj. and to be best represented by the δέ of Cod. B. He is inclined to regard the forms δέ, δέ as both conj. and opt. (Gram. of N.T. Greek, pp. 49, 211). As in the NT the in the vast majority of cases is followed by the conj. form, or the fut. indic. after past tenses, it would be most natural to accept the conj. form here. But this Ionic form of the conj. appears to be strange to the NT and to be "without analogies in later Greek" (Butt., Gram. of N.T. Greek, p. 46). On the other hand, the form δέ seems to be recognised as a later Greek equivalent to δέ, and Winer accepts it as an opt. pres. in NT Greek, pointing to such passages as Rom. xv. 5 ; 2 Tim i. 16, 18 (ii. 8); John xv. 16, as well as Eph. i. 17, iii. 16, and the comp. ἀνεπαίθεν of 2 Tim. iv. 14 (\in.-Moult, Gram., p. 94.—πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀνακατάληψεις: the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. The question here is whether the πνεῦμα is to be understood in the subjective sense of our spirit, or in the objective sense of the Holy Spirit. The former view is adopted by Chrys., Thdrt., Rückert, De Wette, Bleek, and more recently by Alcott and the Revisers. The RV rendering being "a spirit of wisdom and revelation". This is urged on the analogy of such occurrences as Rom. viii. 15, xi. 8; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 7. But there is much against this. As Meyer points out, it is doubtful whether in the NT there is any case in which the ψυχή is spoken of as given, it is not the objective πνεῦμα. But apart from this, the matter in view is what the Ephesians were themselves to be, not what they were to do for others, and although it is easy enough to suit the subjective view of the πνεῦμα to the εἰρήνηsa, the difficulty is to adjust to this the subjective view of the πνεῦμα ἀνακατάληψεως. The fatal objection, indeed, to the interpretation...
in question lies in the sense of the ἀνωτάτωρ, which has the stated meaning not of understanding mysteries but of disclosing them; and the tenor of the paragraph makes it impossible to suppose that in the one case, that of the σοφία, Paul had in view a gift that was to make themselves wise, and in the other, the ἁπλότης, that was to render them capable of disclosing mysteries to others. How difficult it is to give ἁπλότης its proper sense on the subjective view appears from the renderings proposed, e.g., De Wette's, Ruckert's, or Abbott's. The first makes it = "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth)"; the second takes it as = "a wise heart and open for His revelation"; the third gives "a spirit of wisdom," but leaves the rest unattempted. But ἀνωτάτωρ is not a susceptibility for knowledge, nor a mind open to revelation, nor anything like that. It is necessary, therefore, to take πνεύμα as = the Holy Spirit, with Mey., Ell., Haupt. and most. The fact that the phrase is πνεύμα and not τὸ πνεύμα is no objection to that. The attempts made by Middleton, Harless, and others to make out an established distinction between the two forms, the one referring regularly to the personal Spirit of God and the other to the indwelling influence of the Spirit or the spirit of the believers as ruled by the Holy Spirit, cannot be regarded as successful; the terms πνεύμα, πνεύμα, ἐγνώ, πνεύμα θεοῦ being free to drop the article as proper names or terms of understood meaning. But what is the particular idea then in each of the two words σοφία and ἀνωτάτωρ? It cannot be that the latter refers specifically to the supernatural gifts (of prophecy, etc.). For that is presented as a gift bestowed only on some, whereas the prayer here contemplates gifts for all those addressed, and there is nothing to indicate that a gift for the time being only is in view. Nor can it well be that the second noun expresses the means by which the gift intimated by the first noun was to take effect,—the gift of revelation bringing about the gift of wisdom (Harl.); for we should expect the order in that case to be reversed. The distinction between the terms is rather that of the gift of spiritual understanding generally and the gift of special revelations in particular, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10; and so far the second is the higher idea. What Paul prays for on behalf of these Ephesian converts is that God might continue to bestow upon them the gift of His Holy Spirit already imparted to them, and that to the effect both of making them wise to understand the things of His grace and of disclosing to them more of the mysteries of His kingdom.—ἐπηνύσθαι εὐτυχ. in the knowledge of him. The αὐτῶν refers to God, as the context shows, not to Christ. The term εὐνυποίκωσις occurs with special frequency in the Epistles of the Captivity and in 2 Peter with reference to the knowledge of God or of Christ, as in the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews it is used of the knowledge of the truth. It means a knowledge that is true, accurate, thorough, and so might be rendered "full knowledge," notwithstanding the fact that the simple γνῶσις may be used at times in much the same sense (as possibly in 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8). The use of γνῶσις and εὐνυποίκωσις in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 points to the intensive sense of the compound form. The ἐν is not to be dealt with as = εἰς (Grot.) or ἐκ (Beza), but must have either the instrumental sense or the local. It was by the knowledge of God Himself, or, as it may be better put, within the sphere of that knowledge that the gift of enlightenment and the reception of further disclosures of the Divine Counsel were to make themselves good. The only gifts desired for these converts were gifts of a spiritual order, meaning a better acquaintance with God Himself. The clause ἐν εὐνυποίκωσι προ τοῖς εὐπ. is connected by some (Chrys., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) with the sentence which follows, and by
others only with the ἀποφθέγματα. But the course of thought and the balance of the terms point to it as qualifying the two gifts specified in the preceding sentence.

Ver. 18. ἐφωτισμένοι τοὺς ἀποφθέγματα τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν: the eyes of your understanding (heart) being enlightened. For the διανοίας ... τῆς ἀποφθέγματος, which is very poorly attested, καπάξις is to be read (with LTTRWHRV) on the authority of the best MSS., representing the different families (NBADFKL, etc.). The ὑμῶν is to be retained, though it is omitted by B 17, etc., and is bracketed by WH. The syntax of the sentence is difficult, but is best taken (with AV, Beza, Beng., Bleek, Mey., etc.) as an acc. absol. The existence, indeed, of the acc. absol. in the NT is still doubted by some good grammarians (Winer, Blass, etc.), and alleged cases are disposed of as anacoloutha. But such a construction, though of much rarer occurrence than the gen. absol., was not unknown to classical Greek (cf. Jelf, Gr. Gram., ii., p. 406), even where there was no repetition of the subject (cf. Mey., in loc.), and there appear to be at least a few instances of it in the NT, e.g., certainly in Acts xxvi. 3 (admitted by Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 347), and probably in Rom. viii. 3, etc. The syntax is otherwise explained here (e.g., by Harl., Stier, etc.) as a case of apposition, the ἀποφθέγματα continuing the στοιχεία, as if = “that He may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation—enlightened eyes,” an explanation in the highest degree awkward and next to impossible in view of the τοῦς. The presence of the article before ἀποφθέγματος and its absence before ἐφωτισμένοι point to a case of tertiary predicate (Buttm.), so that the second ἀποφθέγματος is “giving unto you the Spirit—to wit, eyes enlightened.” Others (Ell., etc.) account for it as an instance of lax construction and abnormal case (by no means rare in the NT), the ἐφωτισμένοι standing for ἐφώτισενς and the τοὺς ἀποφθέγματος being the defining acc. = “that he may give unto you—being enlightened as to the eyes of your heart” (Ell., etc.). Only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek is φωτισμός used of the inward enlightenment which means a spiritual, saving knowledge of the things of God; cf. φωτισθήσετε as applied to those who had become Christians (Heb. vi. 4, x. 32), and the subsequent use of the same term to describe the “baptised” in early Christian literature. The unusual figure of speech, “the eyes of your heart,” is peculiarly appropriate here.

The gift in question is the special gift of knowledge or insight, hence the figure of the eyes. The knowledge is a spiritual knowledge; hence “the eyes of the heart,” καπάξις being the “inner man,” the seat and centre of the mental and spiritual life, with special reference at times to the faculty of intelligence (Matt. xiii. 15; John xii. 40; Acts xxvii. 27; Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12, etc.). — εἰς τὸ ἐλθέναι ὑμᾶς: that ye may know. The object of the enlightenment, viz., knowledge, a fuller knowledge of certain things now specified.—τίς ἐστιν ἡ λειτουργία τῆς ἁλατρείας ἀνήλθον; what is the hope of his calling. The τίς is to be taken in its proper sense, not “how great” nor “of what kind,” but “what”—what the hope really and essentially is. The κληρονομία ἀνήλθον is the call of which God is the author, and that is an effectual call. In the Gospels the κληρονομία are contrasted with the ἁλατρεία, the “chosen” beings the select few of the “called” (Matt. xxii. 14). In the Epistles the “called of God” are always those to whom the call has come with effect, who have listened to it and been made believers. The καλλιφθήμενος is best taken as the gen. of efficient cause (cf. Mey., Ell., etc.)—the hope, what the riches of the glory of his inheritance. The best critics (LTTRWHRV) omit the καπάξις of the RV, the diplomatic evidence (NBADF 17, etc.) being decidedly against it, although it has the support of ΚΑΠΚΕΛ as certain Editions and Fathers. It does not follow from this omission, however, that we have not three distinct things mentioned in the three clauses, or that the second and third, which refer to the inheritance and the power, are only co-ordinate with the first, specifying the hope of his calling to the ἀνήλθον (so Haupt). The καλλιφθήμενος is not the inheritance which God has in us (a sense which the word seems never to have in the NT), but the inheritance which God gives to us and which is the object of our hope. The ἀνήλθον is the gen. of origin. The magnitude and significance of this inheritance, the perfected blessedness of the Consummation, is expressed by a series of terms setting it forth in respect of the glory belonging to it and the riches pertaining to that glory,
and these as qualities for the better knowledge of which a new illumination of the Spirit is desired. The δόξης and the κληρονομία are genitives of possession or of characteristic quality.—ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοις: in the saints. How is this to be connected? Many (Harl., Ruck., Olsh., Alf., etc.) attach it immediately to κληρονομία = "the inheritance given by God among the saints," or, as Alf. paraphrases it, "His inheritance in, whose example and fulness and embodying is in, the saints." This would have been a more reasonable interpretation if the κληρονομία had been followed by τοις; in the absence of the article it would suit better if the κληρονομία could be taken as meaning God's inheritance in us. It is best on the whole to regard the ἐν τοῖς ἄγιοις as related to the idea of the clause as a whole and as expressing the sphere within which (ἐν = among) these riches of the glory of the inheritance are known and realised. The κληρονομία is the future inheritance, which is ours at present only in foretaste. The "saints" are the whole community of those set apart to God in Jesus Christ (cf. Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18), and that community contemplated specially in its future completeness. This is the seat of the inheritance, or the circle within which alone it is to be found in its riches and glory.

Ver. 19. καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως ἄντω: and what the exceeding greatness of his power. The αὐτῷ refers again to God, and the power of God is introduced in respect of that surpassing greatness which belongs to it alone and which is the guarantee of the fulfilment of the Christian hope. The context and the subsequent mention of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ show that it is the future, and not the present power of God which is described in this passage. The phrase, therefore, means "the efficiency of the active power of God in his might". This again is best understood as defining the whole preceding statement, not as belonging simply to the πιστεύων; for, while the idea that our faith is the result of God's power, is clearly expressed elsewhere, e.g., Col.
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"that the measure of that surpassing power of God which is the guarantee of our hope, is the operation of the exertion of the might that dwells in God as seen in the historical case instanced in the following sentence, viz., the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.

Ver. 20. ὁ ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἡγεμόνι αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν: which He wrought in the Christ when He raised Him from the dead. The ὄντως refers to the preceding ἐνέργησεν. The documentary authorities vary between the ἐνέργησεν of the TR (after ἐνέργησεν of the AV and the RV, etc.), and ἐνέργησεν which is the reading of BA, etc., and is preferred by LTTr (marg.) WH (with the other in margin). The aorist is more in keeping with the definite historical event referred to; the succeeding aorists on the other hand favour the present, making it the more difficult reading to account for. Here again the article with the Χριστῷ may give it the official sense "the Christ". This is the more probable in view of the use of the ὄντως as well as the relation of the statement to the hope and the inheritance. The surpassing power of God was not only manifested in the case of our Lord, but was wrought in Him, and in Him not as an individual member of the race, but as "the Christ," the Anointed of God, in whom we are represented and have our Head. The result of that working of God's energy in Him was His resurrection from the dead — an event which, as Paul uniformly teaches, had a power not for Himself only but for us. The ἡγεμόνι may have the force (coincidence in time) given it by the AV and the RV, etc., "when he raised Him"; or it may be better taken as the defining, explanatory aor. (as in ἐνέργησεν, ver. 9), "in that He raised Him" — καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ: and seated Him on His right hand. The καθίσεως of the TR, supported by such MSS. as DFKL, the Copt, and Goth. Versions, etc., must give place to ἐκάθισεν, the reading of BMA 17, etc., adopted by LTTrWHRV. A few authorities (NA 17, etc.) insert αὐτὸν before ἐν δεξιᾷ. The exaltation to the place of honour and authority following the resurrection is a further witness to what the ἐνέργημα of God can effect.— ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: in the heavens. That the phrase has the local sense here (cf. on ver. 3 above) is made abundantly clear by the terms ἐνέργησεν, καθίσασθαι, ἐν δεξιᾷ—all terms with a local reference. The phrase ὄντως indeed is found instead of ἐνέργησαι in a few ancient authorities (B, HIL., Vict.).

Ver. 21. ὁ ἐνέργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἡγεμόνι αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν: on the preceding sentence. The intensive force i.e. "far above" is given to the ὄντως by Chrys., Theoph., Stier, the AV, the RV, etc. But it can scarcely be sustained in face of the actual use of the word in Heb. ix. 5 (cf. Ezek. xiii. 15); the tendency of late Greek to substitute compound for simple forms without substantial change of sense; the non-intensive use of the cognate form ἐνέργημα (Mark xi. 36; Luke viii. 16). But in the testimony of the Syriac and other ancient Versions, which render it simply...
of variety of ranks among the angels appears, and that in the later Rabbinical Jews (e.g., Test. XII. Patr., etc.) the idea of "every," every particular kind of ἀρχή that can be named. The terms are given in the abstract form, not as if only principles and forces were in view, and not personal powers, but because "classes or categories of personal beings are expressed," just as, e.g., ἔσωσια is said of human authorities, which consist of persons" (Mey.). The use of the abstract ἀρχαί, etc., instead of the concrete ἄγγελοι, etc., enhances the conception of the absolute, all-embracing dominion of Christ. But what manner of powers or authorities do these terms designate? The fact that the immediate subject here is the heavens and Christ's position in them at once excludes such interpretations as identify these ἀρχαί, etc. with earthly powers (Morus); with every kind of dignity wheresoever found (Erasm., Olah., etc.); with the Jewish hierarchy (Schöpf., etc.); or with the various orders of Gentile powers (van Til). The leading idea of the section and the apparent purport of similar statements (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22) point to the angelic world as meant. The fact that nothing is said here of Christ's triumph over Satanic powers suggests further that only angels of good,—heavenly intelligences, are in view. Can any definite distinction then be made out between the terms? And can it be said that the enumeration means that the world of good angels has its distinct orders and grades of angelic dignity? The idea that follows is therefore, not a descending scale, beginning with the highest and proceeding to the lower and the lowest. For this two reasons are offered, viz., first that it would be natural for the writer, who has led the reader up to the right hand of God as the position possessed by Christ, to give his enumeration of the powers subject to Christ in the succession of dogmatic terms either teaching or implying any doctrine of graduated ranks, differentiated functions, or organised order in the world of angels, but as rhetorical terms brought together in order to express the unique supremacy and absolute sovereignty proper to Christ, and mean that whatever names they might be designated, Christ's dominion was above them all. This is suggested also by the further generalisation that follows.—καὶ παντὸς ὁνόματος ὄρωματων: and every name that is named. The word here is not to be taken as a title of dignity, but (as the ὄρωματων shows) has the simple sense of name. There is an advance in the statement of Christ's supreme rank, but it is simply from the idea of a supremacy over all heavenly intelligences to that of pre-eminence over all objects by whatever name called.—φόρον ἐν τῷ οἴνῳ τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι: not only in this world (or age),
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but also in that which is to come. The statement of Christ's absolute and un-

matched supremacy is brought to its

height by this last generalisation, which

embraces within its sweep the totality of

created objects not only as they now are,

but as they may hereafter be in any

possible future. The word aluv here as

elsewhere, has the idea of duration at its

foundation. It means " age," " aeon,

" and as used of the world presents it, in

distinction from κόσμος, in its temporal

aspect, " this present state of things ".

The Jews spoke of the period before

Messiah's Advent as ηυμηνία, " this age," and of the period introduced

by that event as ηπείρημον, " the

coming age ". So the NT writers designate

the period preceding the final Return

or Parousia of Christ δέ αἰών οὐνόσ (also

δύναμις αἰών, I Tim. vi. 17; δ αἰωνιοῦκα

αἰών, Gal. i. 4; or simply δ αἰών, Matt.

xxv. 29, 35), in distinction to the Parousia δέ αἰώνος (also δ

αἰώνιος), Lk. xx. 35; δ αἰών δραχώ-

μενος, Mk. x. 30; Lk. xviii. 30; cf. αι

αἰώνες οἱ ἐπιρρήχευσαν, Eph. ii. 7).

This paragraph gives simply a positive

statement of the exaltation of Christ,

His sovereign and unshared supremacy

cover all. It makes no reference to Jewish

or Gnostic speculations inconsistent with

this. It is different with the great sec-

tion in the sister Epistle to the Colossians.

There we see that such speculations were

rife in at least one of the Churches of the

Lycus valley. The statements in that

Epistle have an unmistakable reference to

cosmopoeic notions akin to the Gnostic

ideas of emanations— notions of angelic

intermediaries between God and the

world; against which the Apostle has

to assert the exclusive relation of Christ
to the whole system of things, seen and

unseen, earthly and celestial, as the

Creator of all, the Upholder of all, the

One Being in whom resided all the forces

pertaining to the maintenance and ad-

ministration of things. The literature of

Judaism makes it also clear that by Paul's
time the Jews had constructed a some-

what elaborate system of angelology,

with theories of graduated positions and

distinctive functions. The Book of Enoch

(lxi. 10) speaks of " angels of power and

angels of principality."

The Book of the Secrets of Enoch (xx. 1, 3) describes

the heavenly host as consisting of ten

troops— lordships, principalities, powers,

cherubim, seraphim, thrones, etc. In the

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi

3) six orders are named, of which the high-

est are the θρόνος, ξωορία, occupying the

seventh heaven, while the θρώνες are

the fifth in order and are assigned to the

third heaven. The same general doctrine

appears also in Ephraem Syrus (i., p.

270), who gives three great divisions of

the celestial world, viz. (1) θεοί, θρόνοι,

κυριότητες; (2) ἄρχανγγελος, ἄρχαι, ἄ-

ωτρίαι; (3) ἄγγελος, δυνάμεις, χρυσόβυθος,

σαραφίς.

In the De Princip. of Origen

(5., etc.) five orders are named,
rising from the τάξις ἄγγελων to ἄρχαι,

ξωορίαν, θρόνον, and finally κυριότητας.

But the conception of a great, graduated

angelic hierarchy was elaborated most

fully by the author of the remarkable

book, De Coelesti Hierarchia, the so-
called Dionysius the Areopagite. There

we find a scheme of orders in three sets of

three, descending from the highest to the

lowest: Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones;

Domains, Virtues, Powers (or Author-

ities); Principalities, Archangels, Angels.

Hence the sublime description in Dante

(Paradiso, canto xxxviii.) and Milton's

" Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms,

Virtues, Powers " (Paradise Lost, v., 601).

Ver. 22. καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξαν ὑπὸ τοῦ

ποδᾶς αὐτῶν: and He put all things under

His feet. The ὑπέταξαν is coordinate with

the previous ἐπερρήσασα. These two things

God did: He wrought His mighty power

in raising and exalting Christ and He sub-

jected all things to Him. The idea ex-

pressed by the ὑπέταξαν here is not the

limited idea of a subjection of opposing

objects, which we have in x Cor. xv. 27,

but the wider idea of placing all created

things under the sovereignty of Christ.

The words recall those of Ps. vii. 7, but

do not give these in the form of a quota-

tion. That Psalm speaks of Man as he

was meant by God to be, with dominion

over all the creatures. Here that ideal is

presented as made real in Christ our ex-

alted, sovereign Christ. The act re-
ferred to, therefore, by the aor. έκκλησίαν
may be the definite gift of absolute domi
nion consequent on the exaltation.
The raising of Christ to God's right hand
was followed by the placing of all things
under His feet and making Him, de facto,
sovereign over all.—καὶ ἀπὸν Μοναν κα-
φαλὴν ἐκέφαλον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ: and
gave Him as head over all things to the
Church. The RV agrees with the AV
and the Bishops' Bible in rendering it
"and gave Him to be head". Tynd. and
Cran. have "hath made Him head above all
things the head"; the Rhemish, "hath
made Him head over all the Church".
The two ideas of Christ's Headship over
all things and His Headship over the
Church appear to be in the statement.
The question is how they are related,
and what is the precise idea attaching to
each of the significant terms. The ἐκ-
κλησία is not to be taken in the technical
sense of appointed, installed (as expressed
by [κοσμίζω], τίθησιν), but, as is indicated by
the simple dat. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in its ordi-
nary sense of gave. Christ in His capacity
or position here ascribed to Him is pre-
sented as a gift of God to the Church.
Having exalted Him to the highest and
invested Him with supreme dominion,
God gives Him to the Church. The
πᾶντα in ὑπὲρ πᾶντα must have the sense
it has in ἐπὶ τῶν πᾶσιν, not "all autho-
rities," but "all things". The ἐκκλησία,
therefore, must express an absolute head-
ship over all the created world, visible and
invisible, not a particular, higher head-
ship over other subordinate headships,
Apostles, Bishops, etc., in the Church.
Further, as the subsequent statement
about the σύμων shows, it must have the
full sense of head, organic head, and
neither that of sum nor that of highest
dignity only. The term ἐκκλησία, again,
obviously has here its widest Christian
sense. Used by the Greeks to designate
an assembly of the people called for de-
liberation (cf. Acts xix. 39), and by the
LXX as the equivalent of the Hebrew
γένος, the congregation of Israel, espe-
cially when called in religious convention
(Deut. xxxi. 30, etc.), it expresses in the
NT the idea of the fellowship or assembly
of believers meeting for worship or for ad-
ministration. And it expresses this in
various degrees of extension, ranging from
the small company gathering for worship
in one's house (the ἐκκλησία κατ' ἐπαθων,
Rom. vi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, etc.), or the
single congregation of village or city (Acts
v. 11, viii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 17, etc.), to the
larger Christian communities of provinces
and countries (ἡ Ἀγία, συναγωγή, λαοῦ-
δαλών, 1 Cor. x. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal.
1. 1, 2, 22), and finally to the Church
universal, the Church collectively, the
whole fellowship of believers throughout
the world (Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28;
Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24, etc.). Here and
in the other occurrences in this Epistle
the word has this largest extension of
meaning, with the further mystical idea
of a unity vitally related to Christ, in-
corporated in Him, and having His life
in it. If the terms then are to be so
understood, how is their connection in
the sentence to be construed? The ἐκ-
cκλησία is immediately dependent on
τῆς καταξίας, and cannot well be taken as a dat.
 commodi = "for the good of the Church"
(De Wette), as if it were attached immedi-
ately to the ὑπὲρ πᾶντα. The καταξία ὑπὲρ πᾶντα may then be taken either as in oppo-
sition to ἀπὸν—"gave Him, head over all things, to the Church," i.e., gave Him, the head over all things, to the Church (Chrys., Stier, etc.); or as having a predicative force—"gave Him as head over all things" (Ell., etc.). The latter is to be preferred both as the easier con-
struction and as more congruous with the
anarthrous καταξία. Thus the pur-
port of the clause is that God, in giving
Christ to the Church, gave Him in the
capacity of Head over all things. There
is no distinction or comparison, therefore,
two between headships, as if one were
over the world or over the state, and the
other over the Church. Christ's Head-
ship over the Church, so far as this clause
is concerned, is rather implied than ex-
pressed. The idea of the Headship over
the Church is more distinctly conveyed
by the sentence which follows, with the
further description of the Church as the
σύμων Χριστοῦ. Here the great idea is
still that of the Headship of Christ over all things. Having that supremacy He is given by God to the Church, and as given in the capacity of universal Head He is given to the Church as her Head also.

Ver. 23. ηπάντα ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ: which is His body. The ηπάντα (not ηπάντας) introduces a profound statement, the interpretation of which is much contested. It is supplementary to the preceding, and further defines the relation between Christ and the Church in respect of His Headship. The ηπάντα, therefore, has something of its qualitative force, pointing to what belongs to the nature of the Church (Meyer), and in that way giving the ground of God's gift of Christ to the κοινωνία. Or (with Ell., etc.) it may be taken in the subdued, explanatory sense— "which indeed". The word κοινωνία, which passes readily from its literal meaning into the figurative sense of a society, a number of men constituting a social or ethical union (cf. Eph. iv. 4), is frequently applied in the NT Epistles to the Church, with or without τοῦ Χριστοῦ, as the mystical body of Christ, the fellowship of believers regarded as an organic, spiritual unity in a living relation to Christ, subject to Him, animated by Him, and having His power operating in it. The relation between Christ and the Church, therefore, is not an external relation, or one simply of Superior and inferior, Sovereign and subject, but one of life and incorporation. The Church is not merely an institution ruled by Him as President, a Kingdom in which He is the Supreme Authority, or a vast company of men in moral sympathy with Him, but a Society which is in vital connection with Him, having the source of its life in Him, sustained and directed by His power, the instrument of which we have an instance in ch. v. 18 (Mey., Ell., Alf., and most) "with all things".

The preceding sentence carries the idea of the Church far beyond the limited conception of a concrete institution or outward, visible organisation, and lifts us to the higher conception of a great spiritual fellowship, which is one under all varieties of external form and constitution in virtue of the presence of Christ's Spirit in it, and catholic as embracing all believers and existing wherever any such are found. It is the conception of the Epistle (cf. iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32). It appears again in similar terms in the sister Epistle (Col. i. 18, 24), and elsewhere in the varied phraseology of the κοινωνία τοῦ πάντα ἐν τάσσων, κοινωνίαν: the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. The preceding sentence carries the idea of the Church far beyond the limited conception of a concrete institution or outward, visible organisation, and lifts us to the higher conception of a great spiritual fellowship, which is one under all varieties of external form and constitution in virtue of the presence of Christ's Spirit in it, and catholic as embracing all believers and existing wherever any such are found. It is the conception of the Epistle (cf. iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32). It appears again in similar terms in the sister Epistle (Col. i. 18, 24), and elsewhere in the varied phraseology of the

"royal priesthood" (t. Pet. ii. 9) and the "Church of the Firstborn" (Heb. xii. 23). It is this supreme idea of the Church as a spiritual order the essence of which is a living relation to Christ, that receives further expression in the profound sentence with which the paragraph closes. The great difficulty here is with the term κοινωνία itself. The other terms are easier. For the νεών of the TR, which has the most meagre attestation, τὰ νεών (supported by the great uncials, etc.) must be substituted (with Beng., Griesb., LTTr WHRV). The "all" therefore must be taken here in the sense which it has in i. 10—"the all," the whole system of things made by Christ and having in Him the ground of its being, its continuance, its order (Heb. i. 3; Col. i. 16, 17; 1 Cor. viii. 6). The ταυτάρατον will have a corresponding extension of meaning, "with all things," not merely with all blessings, gifts or spiritual requisites, but universe itself and all the things that make its fulness (cf. "the earth . . . and the fulness thereof," Ps. xxiv. 1) are alike made and maintained by Christ. The prep. is taken as some in its primary force of in. But it is difficult then to find a natural sense for the clause; the interpretations proposed, e.g., "in all points" (Harless), "in all modes of manifestation" (Bleek), etc., going beyond the actual terms. It is best to understand it as the instrumental ταυτάρατον, of which we have an instance in ch. v. 18 (Mey., Ell., Alf., and most) "with all things". Some strangely take ταυτάρατον as masc. here, supposing the point to be that Christ supplies in all His believing members all the things with which they need to be provided (Haupt, Moule). The κοινωνία may be a pure passive, and so it is taken by some (Vulg., Chrys., etc.). In that case Christ would be described as Himself "filled as to all things". It occurs, however, also as a middle with an active sense (Xen., Hell., v. 4, 56; vi., 2, 14, etc.). So it is rendered here by some of the Versions (Syr., Copt., Goth., Arm.), and the sense of "filling" best suits the context. The middle, however, probably retains something of its proper reciprocal or reflexive force, conveying the idea of filling the totality of things for Himself.

What is to be said now of the term κοινωνία itself? There are some interpretations which may at once be set aside, e.g., "the means of Epiphany" (Budge), the Church being described as the medium or instrument by which Christ accomplishes His destined work of bringing all things back to God; οὐσίας νυμε-
omnis, with reference to the multitude of these subjects, is subject to Christ (Storr, Rosenm., etc.); *perfection*, in the objective sense of the term, the Church being Christ's perfect work (Olt.—) a meaning which goes beyond the term itself; *the totality of the axioms*, in the Gnostic sense, Christ and the Church being viewed here in union and the two without, "that which makes full" and "that which is made full," being supposed to pass over the one into the other (Baur). The choice is between the active sense of "that which fills or completes" and the passive sense of "that which is filled." The former is favoured by Chrys., Æcem. Aquin., Schwegler, Abb., etc., and it must be admitted to be linguistically possible. Verbs in the Passive, it is true, have the passive sense, and this one formed from *φιλάμεν* (which means both to fill and to fulfill) would most naturally be taken as "that which is filled," or "that which is fulfilled or completed." It is argued indeed by Light in a weighty dissertation on "The meaning of ἐφήμομαι" (Saint Paul’s Epistles to the Colossians and to Philonem. pp. 275-273) that nouns of this formation are usually passive, expressing either the product of the action denoted by the active verb, or that action itself regarded as a completed thing; and further that in the case of *φιλάμεν*, if we follow out the idea of fulfilling rather than that of filling, we shall not require to give it now an active sense and again a passive, but shall be able to take it in all its occurrences as a real passive, denoting result in one aspect or another. But, while it is possible enough to understand it in this way in all the passages in the Epistles, it is difficult to carry the passive sense through the various occurrences (e.g. Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 27, viii. 20). Nor does it seem easy to adjust the properly passive sense to all the passages either in the LXX (cf. Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3), or in profane Greek (e.g., Soph., Track., 1203; Eurip., Troad., 824; Philo, de Abr., ii., p. 39), without putting somewhat strained interpretations on some of the cases. The idea, however, that results from allowing *φιλάμεν* to have the active sense here is not germane to the general scope of the paragraph. That idea is that the Church is that which makes Christ Himself complete. A head, however perfect in itself, if it is not crowned with a body, is soon here incomplete. So Christ, who is the Head of the Church, requires the Church to make His completeness, just as the Church which is His body requires Him as the Head to make it a complete and living thing. But the main thought of the whole paragraph is that Christ is and does in relation to the universe and the Church, not what the Church is to Him or does for Him, and the *φιλακμόν* cannot have the sense of "Him who is being filled" with which is being given a forced meaning on the *ἐπέφανεν* by *φιλάμεν*. Hence *φιλάμεν* is to be taken in the passive sense here, as is done by most commentators, and the idea is that the Church is not only Christ's body but that which is filled by Him. In Col. i. 19, ii. 9 the whole *φιλάμεν* or every plenitude of the Church, the totality of the Divine powers and qualities, is said to be in Christ, so that He alone is to be recognised as Framem and Governor of the world, and there is neither need nor place for any intermediate beings as agents in those works of creating, upholding and administering. Here the conception is that this plenitude of the Divine powers and qualities which is in Christ is imparted by Him to His Church, so that the latter is pervaded by His presence, animated by His life, filled with His gifts and energies and endowed. Here is the whole Head of the universe, which is supplied by Him with all that is needed for its being and order. He is also the sole Head of the Church, which receives from Him what He Himself possesses and is endowed by Him with all that it requires for the realisation of its vocation.

Chapter II. Vv. 1-10. A new paragraph begins at this point. This is denied indeed by some, who would connect the *καὶ* ὧν of ii. 1 immediately with the *ἐπέφανεν τούς αἰῶνας* of i. 19 (Knatchbull), the *ἐπέφανεν* of i. 20 (Ben-george), etc., as the Head is continually said to require *ἐπέφανεν* rather than *ἐπέφανεν*. All three, too, take seriously from the point and power of the closing verses of chapter i., which are given in a strain of lofty and majestic affirmation similar to the winding up of a great argument. We have, therefore, members, in which a particular application is made of what has been affirmed in the preceding paragraph. These first ten verses speak of
a further manifestation of that power of
God which was seen in the resurrection
and exaltation of Christ, namely, in the
raising of the Ephesians themselves from
the death of sin into a new life unto God,
and that not of works but of grace.
Ver. 1. καὶ ὑμᾶς ὑμεῖς νεκροὶ ὑμεῖς νεκροὶ: and
you, being dead. The construction is
broken, the writer turning off into two
relative sentences (w. 2, 3) before he
introduces his leading verb. His original
statement is taken up again, as some think,
at the οἷς ὑπερετήσατε of ver. 5 (Griesb.,
Ruck., etc.). But the resumption begins
rather with the οἷς ἔχεις of ver. 4 (Mey.,
Ell., etc.). So the νεκροὶ ὑμεῖς here is
under the regimen of the οἷς ἔχεις (ver. 5), and the καὶ has the force of
"and you too," "you, also, as well as
Christ." The νεκροὶ expresses the condition
they were in when God's power
wrought in them. The νεκροὶ means
neither dying nor mortal, nor yet, again,
condemned to death, but dead. Meyer,
indeed, contends for the sense of " made
liable to eternal death," as he also takes the
following συνήθεσιν, συνήθεσιν,
συνήθεσιν, συνήθεσιν, συνήθεσιν, etc.,
but the whole series of terms is best understood
to express things done then and states
belonging to the actual present. The
νεκροὶ, therefore, means ethically or
spiritually dead, and what had been said of
the power of God in Christ's case is
now applied to the case of the readers
themselves. The power that raised Christ
from the dead and exalted Him is also the
power that raised themselves from the death
and exaltation of Christ, namely, in the
raising of the Ephesians themselves from
the death of sin into a new life unto God,
and that not of works but of grace.
Ver. 2. ἐν ἐλαττῶν ἐπερετήσατε: in time past (RV, "aforetime ")
ye walked. The ἐν takes the gender of
the nearer noun, but refers to both the
παρετήσμοι and the ἐπαρτίας. Tres
passes and sins were the domain in which
they had their habitual course of life in
their former heathen days.— κατὰ τὸν
ἀλῶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου: according to
the course (or age) of this world. As the
ἐν of the former clause gave the stated
sphere within which their pre-Christian
life moved, so the κατὰ of this clause and
the next gives the standard to which it
conformed and the spirit by which it was
ruled. The phrase κατὰ τὸν ἀλῶν τοῦτον
might have sufficed; the fuller form which
introduces both αἰῶν and κόσμος is more
expressive. The κόσμος is the world as
the objective system of things, and that as
evil. The αἰῶν is the world as a world-
period—the world as transitory. In such a
connection as the present αἰῶν comes near
what we understand by "the spirit of the
age," but is perhaps most appropriately
considered course, as that word conveys the
two ideas of tenor, development, and
limited continuance. This course of a
world which is evil is itself evil, and to
live in accordance with it is to live in
trespasses and sins.— κατὰ τὸν ἐπαρτίας
πῆς ἴνωνὶς τοῦ ἀδρῶς: according to the
prince of the power of the air. A yet
darker colour is now given to the descrip-
tion of the former heathen walk of those
addressed. Their life was determined
by the master of all evil, the
supreme ruler of all the powers of wicked-
ness. The terms obviously designate
Satan, but their precise sense is some-
what difficult to decide. Three different
shades of meaning are suggested for ἰγ-
powers, as possibly in Col. i. 13 (Chrys.,
Hofm., Oltr.); (c) authority in the
collective sense, the totality of evil
powers, all that is known as evil authority.
The third sense is supported in some
measure by Rom. xiii. 1, 2, and is preferred
by most. The idea thus becomes "the
prince who rules over all that is called
authority." The ἀδρῶς then is best taken
as the gen. of place, denoting the seat of
this overlordship of evil. The word ἀδρ
cannot be taken as equivalent to οὐρανός
(Aquin.) or οὐρανῖς (Olsh.) or "έκτος (Kl.)
or οὐρανία (Hofm.); neither can it express
the quality of these evil powers—their
incorporeal or aeriform nature (Hahn).
It has it here, and it describes these
demonic powers as between earth and
heaven, in that "supra-terrestrial but sub-
celestial region (ὁ ὑπουργάνιος τῶν,
Chrys.) which seems to be, if not the
abode, yet the haunt of evil spirits" (Ell.).
The latter is perhaps to be preferred,as in
more definite accordance with the contrast
with the Holy Spirit of God which seems to
be in view. By οὐρανία is meant not
merely unbelief, but disobedience. Its
stated sense in the NT is that of "obsti-
nate opposition to the Divine will"
(Thay.-Grimm, sub voce). The term
was in its topical sense and followed by
the gen. of a thing, expresses what is
in intimate relation to the thing, what
belongs to it and has it as its innate
quality. "Sons of disobedience" are
those to whom disobedience is their very
nature and essential character, who belong
wholly to it. It is a well-known Hebrew
idiom, occurring often in the NT, espe-
cially in the case of Hebraisms of trans-
Rom. xi. 30, 32; Heb. iv. 6, 11; 1 = 2 Cor. 1. 12 (and constr.); 1 Tim. iv. 15; 1 Pet. i. 17; 3 Pet. ii. 18; see Heb. x. 33; Ezek. xli. 6; Gal. v. 16; 1 John ii. 16.

v. 3. & c. 17, 73, Orig.; text ADEFGKLP, Clem., Did., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

But the same or similar forms are found now and again in profane Greek, especially in inscriptions and in dignified speech (cf. Plato's use of τρθκτης, Phaedr., p. 275 d), the τρθκτης of the Tragedians, etc.; see Deissmann, Bible Studies, pp. 161-166. The τρθκτης does not refer to the present in contrast with the future of the Parousia (Olsh.), nor with any other future; nor again is it = "Even now," which would have been καλ τρθκτης. It looks back upon the previous τρθκτης, and contrasts the present working of the τρθκτης with the past. Once that spirit worked in all those addressed; now it works not in them indeed, but in those given over to disobedience to God's will. So the lordship belonging to the Prince of evil extends not only over all those malign powers whose seat is in the air, but also and more particularly over that Spirit who operates as an energy of wickedness in the hearts of men opposed to God.

Ver. 3. & c. 17, 73, Orig.; text ADEFGKLP, Clem., Did., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

For τρθκτης, see B 17, 73, Orig.; text ADEFGKLP, Clem., Did., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al. (RV). 'Like the Heb. ' עת it denotes one's walk, his active, open life, his way of conducting himself. It keeps within the confines of the appetites and impulses proper to fallen human nature or springing from it. The noun ἐπιθυμία has its usual sense of craving, the craving in particular of what is forbidden; σάρξ in like manner has its large, theological sense, human nature as such, in its physical, mental and moral entirety, considered as apart from God and under the dominion of sin. — τοιούτα τὰ δειλίμαta τῆς σαρκος καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν: doing the desires of the flesh and of the thoughts. The τοιούτα is sufficiently represented by the "doing" of Wycl., Cov., Rhein., RV.
The AV and other Versions give “fulfilling”. The word ὑλή is of very rare occurrence, except in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. It denotes properly the thing willed, but is used also of the Divine purpose (e.g., Eph. i. 9), or command (e.g., Eph. v. 17), etc., and only here, as also in John i. 13, it denotes inclination or desire. The pl. διανοούμεναι is best rendered “thoughts,” with Wycl., Cov., Rhem. and RV margin; RV text, following the AV and other Versions, gives “mind”. In the LXX the singular represents the OT לְכָל, and denotes the mind in the large sense, inclusive of understanding, feeling and desiring. It is only the context that gives it the sense of wicked thoughts. Two sources of evil desire and impulse, therefore, are indicated here, viz., our fallen nature in general and the laboratory of perverted thoughts, impressions, imaginations, volitions, in particular.—καὶ ἡμῖν τέκνα φῶς τῆς φρονήσεως: and were children by nature of wrath. “Children,” rather than “the children,” as it is given by AV and all the other old English Versions (except Wycl., who has “the sons”). From what he and his fellow-Christians did in their pre-Christian life, Paul turns now to what they were then. The statement is so constructed as to throw the chief emphasis on the ἡμῖν and the ὑλή. For the better attested form is ἡμεῖς. Some good MSS. and Versions (ADGLP, Syr.-Harcl., Vulg.) read φῶς τέκνα, and that order is accepted by Lachmann, while a place is given it in the margin by Tregelles. The order τέκνα φῶς, however, which is that of ΜΚ, Chrys., etc., and both the TR and the RV, is to be preferred. The ἡμῖν makes it clear that it is no longer doing (πραπτάτα) simply that is in view, but being, condition. The τέκνα is the same kind of idiomatic phrase as the former νοεῖ, only, if possible, stronger and more significant. It describes those in view as not only worthy of the ὑλή, but actually subject to it, definitely under it. But what is this ὑλή itself? It is not to be identified with punitive righteousness (τῆς ὁμολογίας), punishment (κατάληψα), future judgment, or the effect of God’s present judgment of men, but denotes the quality or affectus of wrath. But is it man’s wrath or God’s? The word is certainly used of the passion of wrath in us (Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; Jas. i. 19, etc.), and so the whole phrase is understood by some to mean nothing more than that those referred to were given to violent anger or ungovernable impulse (e.g., Maurice, Unity, p. 538). But this would add little or nothing to what was said of the lusts of the flesh and thoughts, and would strip the whole statement of its point, its solemnity, and its universality. It is the Divine wrath that is in view here; as it is, indeed, in thirteen out of twenty occurrences in the Pauline writings, and that, too, whether with or without the definite article or the defining θεοῦ (cf. Moule, in loc.). This holy displeasure of God with sin is not inconsistent with His love, but is the reaction of that love against the denial of its sovereign rights of responsive love. The term φῶς, though it may occasionally be applied to what is habitual or to character as developed, means properly what is innate, implanted, in one by nature, and this with different shades of meaning (cf., e.g., Rom. ii. 14; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8, etc.). The clause means, therefore, that in their pre-Christian life those meant by
the sin was already affirmed. This universal sin has been already affirmed. This universal sin is now described as sin by nature. Beyond this Paul does not go in the present passage. But the one is the explanation of the other. Universal sin implies a law of sinning, a sin that is of the nature; and this, again, is the explanation of the fact that all are under the Divine wrath. For the Divine wrath operates only where sin is. Here is the essential meaning of the doctrine of original sin. That it finds any justification here is denied, indeed, by some; even by Meyer, who admits, however, that elsewhere (e.g., in Rom. vi.) Paul teaches that there is a principle of sin in man by nature, and that man sins actually because of that innate principle. But he argues that it is in virtue not of the principle itself, but of the acts of sin by which that principle expresses itself, that we are in a state of subjection to the Divine wrath. This, however, is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing.

Ver. 4. καὶ δὲ θανάτου, πλανῶντος ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ: but God (or, God, however), being rich in mercy. A return is now made to the statement which was interrupted at ver. 2. The resumption might have been made by συν. The adversative δὲ, however, is the more appropriate, as the other side of our case is now to be set forth—the Divine grace which meets the sinful, condemned condition, and which stands over the dark background of our death by sin and our subjection by nature to the Divine wrath. God who is wroth with sin, is a God of grace. His dispensation toward those who are dead by trespasses and sins is one of mercy, and this no stinted mercy, but a mercy that is rich, exhaustless (for πλανῶντος, πλανώτατος, etc., cf. 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18; Jas. ii. 5).—διὰ τὴν παλαιὰν θανάτον ἡμᾶς: by reason of His great love whereby He loved us. The present participle adds to the force of the idea; cf. the use of the same phrase by our Lord Himself with reference to His Father's love, John xvii. 26. If mercy is God's attitude to sinful men, love is His motive in all that He does with them; and as the mercy is “through” it, as Luther puts it) that He acts with us as He does. The mercy has the widest sense here—all of us, whether Jew or Gentile.

Ver. 5. καὶ δόθητε θάνατος ἀπειρίας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν: even when we were dead by our trespasses. The condition of death in which we are by nature is now reaffirmed, and in a still more emphatic way than in ver. 1. The καὶ is not the copula, simply attaching one statement to another (Mey.), nor a mere repetition of the καὶ of the opening verse, nor = “also,” “also us” collectively (which would require καὶ θανάτου), but the ascensive καὶ = even (Syr.-Phil., AV, RV, Ell., etc.). It qualifies the δόθητε (while the νεκροίος is thrown emphatically forward), and heightens the sense of the greatness of the Divine power—as a power operating on us when we were yet held fast in the state of inexorable death. The τοῖς defines the trespasses as those already mentioned in connection with that state of death, and so has much the sense of “our”—a power which that principle expresses itself, that we are in a state of subjection to the Divine wrath. This, however, is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing. The tois defines the trespasses and sins that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing. The τοῖς defines the trespasses as those already mentioned in connection with that state of death, and so has much the sense of “our”—a power which that principle expresses itself, that we are in a state of subjection to the Divine wrath. This, however, is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing.
description of the worldly walk and the conversation in the lusts of the flesh, which is given in vers. 2, 3, and which seems to explain what is said in ver. 1 of the state of being "dead by trespasses and sins"; and having regard also to the application to the moral life which is made in the second half of the Epistle, most interpreters understand the quickening here affirmed to be that of regeneration—the communication of spiritual life.—χαρὰν ἄνω συνωμομένων: by grace have ye been saved. So the RV, while the AV is content with "are ye saved". The idea is that they were saved and continued to be so. The χαρὰ is put emphatically first—"by grace it is that ye have been saved". The parenthetical mention of grace is in place. Nothing else than grace could give life to the dead, but grace could indeed do even that.

Ver. 6. καὶ συνήγαγεν: and raised us with Him. That is, to life now, in a present spiritual renewal. The συνήγαγεν expresses the definite idea of resurrection, and primarily that of the physical resurrection. The introduction of this term and the following makes it not improbable that both ideas, that of the present resurrection and that of the future bodily resurrection, were in Paul's mind, and that he did not sharply distinguish between them, but thought of them as one great gift of life.—καί συνανάθανεν ἐν τοῖς ἐναρκταίοις: and seated us with Him in the heavens. Made us sharers with Him in dignity and dominion, so that even now, and in foretaste of our future exaltation, our life and thought are raised to the heavenlies where He reigns. But as Bengel notices, Paul pauses here and does not add the ἐν δεκα ἀβών, which is said of Christ in i. 20—ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: in Christ Jesus. Not the συνανάθανεν only, but the whole statement is qualified by this. This quickening, this resurrection, this seating of us with Him take effect in so far as we are in Him as our Representative, having our life and our completeness in our Head.

Ver. 7. ινα ἐνδειξηται ἐν τοῖς ἀλών τοῦ ἐνερχομένου τοῦ ὑπερβάλλοντος πλοῦτος τῆς χαρίτος αὐτοῦ ἐν χριστοτήτι: that He might shew forth in the ages that are coming all the exceeding riches of His grace. For the τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος of the TR the neuter form τὸ ὑπερβαλλόν is preferred by most editors (LTT & WHRV). The satisfaction of His love was God's motive in quickening and raising them. The manifestation of His glory in its surpassing wealth is His final purpose in the same. The verb ἐνδείκνυσθαι occurs eleven times in the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, and nowhere else in the NT. The active is very rare even in the classics, and is never found in the NT. Hence the ἐνδείκνυσθαι is to be taken as a simple active (not as=l.rops forth for Himself), all the more by reason of the αὐτοῦ. What is meant by the τοῖς ἀλών τοῦ ἐνερχομένου? Some give it the widest possible sense, e.g., per omne vestrum tempus relinquum quem in hac vita tum in futura quoque (Morus), "the successively arriving ages and generations from that time to the second coming of Christ" (Ell.). But it is rather another form of the ἀλών ἡ μέλλων (Harl., Olsh., Mey., Haupt, etc.), the part, ἐνερχόμενος being used of the future (e.g., Jer. xivii. 11; Isa. xlii. 4, 22, 23, xili. 23; Luke xxi. 20; Jas. v. 1, etc.), and the future being conceived of as made up of an undefined series of periods. In other cases reduplicated expressions, ἀλών τον ἀλών, etc., are used to express the idea of eternity. God's purpose, therefore, is that in the eternal future, the future which opens with Christ's Parousia, and in all the continuing length of that future, the grace of His ways with those once dead in sins should be declared and understood in all the grandeur of its exceeding riches.
toward us. The ἐν is taken by some (Mey., etc.) as the instrumental ἐν, “by means of kindness”. It is more natural to give it the proper force of “in”, as defining the way in which the grace showed itself in its surpassing riches. It is the way of kindness directed towards us. The χάρις, which means moral goodness in Rom. iii. 12, has here the more usual sense of benignity (cf. Rom. ii. 4, xi. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12; Tit. iii. 4).—

Ver. 9. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μὴ τῇ καυχήσει: for works make not glory. The OT protest against glorying in any but the Lord and the prophet’s jealousy for the honour of God (Jer. ix. 23, 24; Is. xlii. 8, 14, etc.) burn with a yet intenser flame in Paul, most of all when he touches the great theme of man’s salvation. That the glory of that salvation belongs wholly to God and in no degree to man, and that it has been so planned and so effected as to take from us all ground for boasting, is enforced on Paul’s hearers again and again, in different connections, with anxious concern and utmost plainness of expression (cf. Rom. iii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 29, iv. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Phil. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 10. αὐτοῦ ὡς ἔργον τοιμα: for we are His workmanship (or, handwork). The αὐτοῦ is emphatic—"His handwork are we". The word τοιμα occurs only once again in the NT (Rom. i. 20, with reference to the works of
nature). Here, as the following clause shows, it expresses not appointment to something, but an actual making. The clause gives the reason for the statement that our salvation is not of works. We ourselves are a work, the handiwork of God, made anew by Him, and our salvation, therefore, is due to Him, not to ourselves.—κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ ἀρχῆς ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθένει: created in Christ Jesus for good works. Further definition of the ζωὴν αἰωνίον ἐκ τῆς ἁγίως ἁγιασθέ

Vv. 11-22. The second half of this chapter makes a paragraph by itself. Its subject is the case of those Gentile believers whom Paul has immediately in view—their heathen past and their Christian present. They are reminded of what they once were—outside Christ, outside the special privilege of Israel, without hope, and without God; and of what they have come to be by the power of Christ's death—placed on an equality with the chosen people, brought nigh to the Father, made part of the house.
hold of God and the living temple of the Lord.

Ver. 11. Wherefore remember that aforetime ye. The order of the TR, υπὲρ παραδοσίαν, is supported by such authorities as 31.VG (with οἱ before παραδοσίαν), Syr.-Hard., etc. Some authorities place the παραδοσίαν after the ἡμέρα (Syr.-P., Boh.). But παραδοσίαν is characteristic of the best and oldest MSS. (*ABD*), the Vulg., etc., and is adopted by most (LTTrWHRV). As διὰ indicates, what follows is a personal, ethical application of what has been said; and the application is drawn not from the immediately preceding sentence, but from the contents of the prior paragraph as a whole. The great things done for them by God's grace should incline them to think of the past from which they have been delivered. The remembrance of that past will make them more thankful for their present privilege, and more careful to walk in the good works which God has in view for them. The sentence is interrupted by descriptive clauses, but is taken up again in the next verse; where a second καὶ and the words ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐκείνης are introduced, resuming the καὶ and the παραδοσίαν of ver. 11. There is no need, therefore, to supply either ἐν πάντι or ἐν πάντες at this point. Ἡμέρα ἐν κοιμήσει Gentiles in the flesh. The article is given to the ἡμέρα, the class to which the readers belong being in view (Win.-Moul., pp. 132, 217). It is not repeated before the σαρκὶ, as the ἐν σαρκὶ makes one idea with the ἡμέρα (Win.-Moul., p. 166). The term σαρκὶ also is to be taken literally, not as referring to the former unregenerate life, but (as the subsequent sentences show) in the sense of the flesh to which circumcision is applicable. They are reminded that they belonged to the class of the Gentiles, their bodies proclaiming their heathen character. — οἱ Χριστιανοὶ: who are called Uncircumcision. A further definition of what they were as ἡμέρα, suggestive of the low regard in which they were held as members of that class. The name Uncircumcision (a name of contempt, was flung at them. The term ἐκκοπή, which is unknown to profane Greek but is used in the LXX, is taken to be an Alexandrian corruption of κατακοπή—ἵνα τῇ λεγομένῃ περιτομή σαρκὶ χειροποιηθῇ: by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hand. So the RV. Better perhaps "by the so-called Circumcision, performed by hand in the flesh" (Ell.). Wicl. gives "made by hand in flesh"; but the simplicity of the description of the Jew, given in a tone of depreciation. Hence probably the change from οἱ λεγομένας τῷ λεγομένῳ περιτομῆς. This sentence also is introduced with reference to the poverty of the previous condition of these Godless, Christless Gentiles. The point seems to be that the inferiority in which they were held, and which was expressed by the contemptuous name Uncircumcision, meant all the more as it was fastened on them by those to whom, while proudly calling themselves the Circumcision, the distinction was nothing more than an outward manual act performed on their bodies. The rite when its spiritual significance and use are in view, is spoken of with honour by Paul (Rom. iv. 11). As a mere performance, a barrier between Jew and Gentile, a yoke imposed by the former on the latter, a thing made essential to salvation, he spoke of it in terms of scorn and repudiation.

Ver. 12. ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐκείνης χαρὰς Χριστοῦ: that ye were at that time apart from Christ. The sentence interrupted by the description of those addressed as ἡμέρα κ.τ.λ. is now resumed—Remember, I say, that ye were Gentiles, corresponding to the previous παραδοσίαν, refers to their pre-Christian days. In such phrases it is usual to insert ἐν (Donald., Greek Gram., p. 487), and it is inserted by the TR (following ADPG, etc.). But time when is also often enough expressed by the simple dat. (Win.-Moul., pp. 273, 274), and the balance of evidence is largely against the presence of the prep. here. The χαρὰς Χριστοῦ is the predicate to ἡμέρα, and is not a defining clause = "being at that time without Christ" (De Wette,
Bleek). It describes their former condition as one in which they had no connection with Christ; in which respect they were in a position sadly inferior to that of the Jews whose attitude was one of hoping and waiting for Christ, the Messiah. Their apartness from Christ, their lack of all relation to Him—this is the first stroke in the dark picture of their former heathen life, and the four to which the eye is directed in the subsequent clauses all follow from that.—πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ: alienated from the commonwealth of Israel. The alienation is expressed by ἀπολειμμάτων, a strong verb, common enough in classical Greek (at least from Plato's time), corresponding to the OT "撤离" (cf. Ps. lvi. 4), and used again in Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21. It does not necessarily imply a lapse from a former condition of attachment or fellowship, but expresses generally the idea of being a stranger as contrasted with one who is at home with a person or an object. The term πολιτεία has two main senses—a state or commonwealth (e.g., 2 Macc. iv. 11, viii. 17), and citizenship or the rights of a citizen (Acts xxii. 28). The first of these is most in harmony with the theocratic term τοῦ Ἱσραήλ, and so it is understood by most. These Ephesians, therefore, had no part in the theocracy, the OT constitution under which God made Himself known to the Jew and entered into relation with him.—καὶ γένος τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐνεγέλας: and strangers from the covenants of the Promise. The διαθήκη is probably the general of separation or removal. That idea is usually expressed by a prep., but with verbs like ἄφορον, διαφέρω, ἀνεστρεψώμεθα, and with some adjectives, it is also expressed by the simple gen. (Win.-Moul., pp. 243, 244). The word ἔνεγελα means forsaken, and with the participle it is used here in the general sense of foreign to a thing, having no share in it. The διαθήκαι are the covenants with Abraham and the patriarchs (cf. Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. viii. 15). It is obviously the covenants of Messianic significance that are in view. That the Mosaic Law or the Sinaitic Covenant is not in view seems to follow from the mention of the ἐνεγέλα; for that Covenant was not distinctively of the Promise, but is described by Paul as coming in after it and provisionally (Gal. iii. 17-19). The ἐνεγέλα is the Promise, the one distinctively so called, the great Messianic Promise given to the fathers of the Hebrew people (Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 8, etc.). The defining τῆς ἐνεγέλας is attached by some (Rosenmüller, etc.) to the following οὐχὶ ὑποτετθέν. But the covenants and the promise are kindred ideas, and make one thought here.—οὐχὶ ὑποτετθέν: having no hope. With participles the subjective negative is much more frequently used than ἐν. In cases like the present, where the participle does not belong to the class of those expressing command, purpose, condition or the like, the use of ἐν is due to the aspect in which the matter in question presents itself to the writer—e.g., that he has a genus, not the individual, in view; cf. Ell. on 1 Thess. ii. 15, and Win.-Moul., p. 606. The statement here is absolute—οὐχὶ ὑποτετθέν. It is not only that they had not the hope, the Messianic hope which was one of the distinctions of the Israelite, but that they were utterly without hope. Ignorant of the Divine salvation and of Christ in whom it was found, they had nothing to hope for beyond this world.—καὶ οὐκ εἶσαι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: and without God in the world. The last element in the darkness and misery of their former life. The adj. οὐκ, which is never found in the LXX or in the Apocrypha, and only this once in the NT, in classical Greek means impious in the sense of denying or neglecting the gods of the State; but it is also used occasionally in the sense of knowing or worshipping no God (El., V., b., 2, 31), or in that of abandoned by God (Soph., Ed. R., 633). Three renderings are possible here—ignorant of God, denying God, forsaken of God. The third is preferred by many (Mey., Ell., etc.), who think that the darkest colour is given to the picture of their old heathen condition by this men-
calls immanent instrumentality, the action of the verb being regarded as existing in the means. See Ell. on the present passage and on 1 Thess. iv. 18. There is little to be gained, however, by attempting much finesses in such matters.

Ver. 14. αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν: for He is our Peace. As most commentators notice, the emphasis is on the avros— "He and no other". But there is evidently more in it than that. The selection of the abstract εἰρήνη, instead of the simple εἰρήνωνος, suggests that the point of the avros is not only "He alone," but "He in His own person". It is not only that the peace was made by Christ and ranks as His achievement, but that it is so identified with Him that were He away it would also fail,—so dependent on Him that apart from Him we cannot have it. And He is thus for us "the Peace" (ἡ εἰρήνη), Peace in the absolute sense to the exclusion of all other. Peace, the peace of the Messianic age, the peace that is to come by Messiah, is a personal and particular peace (Isa. ix. 5, 6, lii. 7, liii. 5, lvii. 19; Mic. v. 5; Hag. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10). Here, as the next sentence shows, the peace especially in view is that between Jew and Gentile. —οὐδεὶς τὸ ἐμφύτευμα ἐν: who made both one. Not "hath made," but "made," were a frequent note in 1 Thess. iv. 18. The ephyrp is the abstract neuter—the two parties or classes. The sing. neut. ἐν (= one thing, one organism) expresses the idea of the unity, the new unity which the two long separate and antagonistic parties became; cf. the ἐν used even of the relation between Christ and God in John x. 16, and for the unity here in view, cf. Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11.—καὶ τὸ μεσότικον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λόγως: and broke down the middle wall of the partition. The former clause explains the explanation of how Christ became our Peace. That explanation is continued in this clause and in the following. The καὶ, therefore, is epexegetical = to wit, or in that (cf. Win.-Moul., p. 543). The gen. φραγμοῦ is not a mere equivalent to an adj. or a partic. as if = τὸ μεσότικον διαμέτρουν (Grotz., Rosenmü., etc.), nor is it the gen. of quality, = "the middle wall whose character it is to divide"; but either (a) the ἀπὸς. gen. or gen. of identity, τὸ μεσότικον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λόγως: and broke down the middle wall that (or, consists in) the partition," or (b) the posses. gen., = "the wall pertaining to the partition". On the latter view of the gen. the μεσότικον (a word found only once in the NT and of rare occurrence elsewhere) becomes the more definite and specific term, the προτοετοίμενον the more general, the former being, indeed, a part of the latter. That is to say, the φραγμός is the whole system of things that kept Jew and Gentile apart, and the μεσότικον is the thing in the system that most conspicuously divided them, and that constitutes the "enmity," and also, the Law. It is best, however, to take the terms μεσότικον and φραγμός in the simple, literal sense of division and separation, which are not explained to be the Law till the νόμος is actually introduced in the subsequent clause; and, therefore, the former view of the gen. appears to be preferable. It is suggested that what Paul really expresses then is the fact that the legal system, which was meant primarily to protect the Jewish people against the corruption of heathen idolatry, became the bitter root of Jewish exclusiveness in relation to the Gentiles. This is to give the aπουμ here the sense of something that fences in or encloses, which it occasionally has (Soph., Ed. Tvr., 1387). But that is a rare sense, and the idea seems to be simpler. It is doubtful, too, whether Paul had in view here any material partition with which he was familiar. It could scarcely be the veil of the Temple that was rent at the Crucifixion; for that veil did not serve to separate the Gentile from the Jew. It might rather be as Anselm, Bengel, and many more have thought) the wall or screen that divided the court of the Gentiles from the sanctuary proper, and of which Josephus tells us that it bore an inscription forbidding any Gentile from penetrating further (Jew. Wars, v. 5, 2; vi., 2, 4; Antiq., viii., 3, 2; xv., 11, 5). But even this is questionable, and all the more so because the wall was still standing at the time when this was written. For the use of ἄνως cf. John ii. 19.
Acts xvi. 4, xvii. 7; Col. ii. 14
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Ver. 15. τὴν ἐνμίαν: to wit the enmity. Many (Luth., Calv., De Wette, etc.) take this to be a figure for the Mosaic Law. But the ἐνμίαν is in antithesis to the εἰρήνη of ver. 14, and the specification of the Law in the latter is better, therefore, to take the ἐνμίαν here in the abstract sense of hostile, separating feeling. But is it the enmity of Jew and Gentile to God (Chrys., Harl., etc.) or the enmity between Jew and Gentile? The statement of the μετατομον as a middle-wall decides for the latter. The argument in favour of this view is stronger still when the former view is connected with the idea that the ἐνμίαν is the Mosaic Law. For the Mosaic Law could not be said to have been the cause of hostile feeling on the part of Gentiles to God.—τὸν χιτᾶν τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας: having abolished (or, in that He abolished) the law of commandments (expressed) in ordinances. Further statement of the way in which Christ by His death on the cross removed the separation and the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile, viz., by abrogating the dividing Law itself. The Law is now introduced, and the term δόγματος is to be taken in its full sense, not the ceremonial Law only, but the Mosaic Law as a whole, according to the stated use of the phrase. This Law is abolished in the sense of being rendered inoperative (as καταργεῖν means), and it is defined as the Law τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν. What is the point of the definition? The article, which is in place with the δόγματος, is omitted before the δόγματος, as the latter makes one idea with the former and further is under the regimen of a prep. (cf. Win.-Moul., pp. 139, 149, 151, 158). The Law is one of "commandments-in-decrees". What is in view is its character as mandatory, and consisting in a multitude of prescriptions or statutes. It joined, and it expressed its injunctions in so many decrees, but it did not enable. The Law was made up of ἑντολαί and these ἑντολαί expressed themselves and operated in the form of δόγματος, ordinances. The word δόγμα in the NT never means anything else than statute, decree, ordinance.

Ver. 15. τὴν ἐνμίαν: to wit the enmity. Many (Luth., Calv., De Wette, etc.) take this to be a figure for the Mosaic Law. But the ἐνμίαν is in antithesis to the εἰρήνη of ver. 14, and the specification of the Law in the latter is better, therefore, to take the ἐνμίαν here in the abstract sense of hostile, separating feeling. But is it the enmity of Jew and Gentile to God (Chrys., Harl., etc.) or the enmity between Jew and Gentile? The statement of the μετατομον as a middle-wall decides for the latter. The argument in favour of this view is stronger still when the former view is connected with the idea that the ἐνμίαν is the Mosaic Law. For the Mosaic Law could not be said to have been the cause of hostile feeling on the part of Gentiles to God.—τὸν χιτᾶν τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας: having abolished (or, in that He abolished) the law of commandments (expressed) in ordinances. Further statement of the way in which Christ by His death on the cross removed the separation and the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile, viz., by abrogating the dividing Law itself. The Law is now introduced, and the term δόγματος is to be taken in its full sense, not the ceremonial Law only, but the Mosaic Law as a whole, according to the stated use of the phrase. This Law is abolished in the sense of being rendered inoperative (as καταργεῖν means), and it is defined as the Law τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν. What is the point of the definition? The article, which is in place with the δόγματος, is omitted before the δόγματος, as the latter makes one idea with the former and further is under the regimen of a prep. (cf. Win.-Moul., pp. 139, 149, 151, 158). The Law is one of "commandments-in-decrees". What is in view is its character as mandatory, and consisting in a multitude of prescriptions or statutes. It joined, and it expressed its injunctions in so many decrees, but it did not enable. The Law was made up of ἑντολαί and these ἑντολαί expressed themselves and operated in the form of δόγματος, ordinances. The word δόγμα in the NT never means anything else than statute, decree, ordinance.
...
the two appear to be practically indistinguishable. As derivatives of ἀλλαγ-σως they both convey the idea of a change, not primarily in feeling (which is expressed by ἀλλαγεσθαι and its compounds), but in relation, and in mutual relation, on the side of God to man and on the side of man to God (cf. Rom. v. 9-11; 2 Cor. v. 18-20).—ἐν ἐνι σῶμα ἐν τοῖς σταυροῖς: in one body through the Christ's body (Chrys., Beng., Harl., Hofm.), as if the point were either the reconciliation of two parties by one body, or the one offering of Christ that needed no repetition (Heb. vii. 27, etc.), or, again, the one sacrifice as contrasted with the multitude of the Levitical oblations. These are ideas alien to the context, and they are the less appropriate because Christ Himself is the subject of the ἀνακαταλλάξῃ. The reference is to the Jews and Gentiles now making one body; cf. the ἐν σώμα in 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. iv. 4; and especially in Col. iii. 12. His object was to bring the two long-sundered and antagonistic parties as one whole, one great body, into right relation to God by His cross. The διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ belongs rather to the ἀνακαταλλάξῃ than to the following ἀνακατειναί (von Soden).—ἀνακατειναί τὴν ἐξόνταν ἐν αὐτῷ: having slain the enmity thereby. For ἐν αὐτῷ there is a variant reading ἐν δαυίδ, more commonly supported (F 115, etc.); and some propose ἐν αὐτῷ (von Soden). But this ἐν αὐτῷ refers to the σταυροῦ, and the idea is that Christ slew the enmity in Himself, but that He did it “by the cross,” or “on the cross.” The ἐξόντα here, again, is not the Law itself, nor the enmity of Jew and Gentile to God (though most take it so), but rather the ἐξόντα previously mentioned—the enmity between Jew and Gentile. Further, the ἀνακατειναὶ which may be understood in action coincident with that denoted by the main verb, or might define the way in which the latter was made good, seems to have its proper sense of priority—“after He had killed.” He had first to kill this enmity between the two before He could bring them both into right relations to God in the way indicated, in one body, as one great, united whole.

Ver. 17. ἐκλάθεν εὐγενελεστῶς εἰ-ρήνην ὑπὸ τοῦ μακάρου καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἔγγοις: and He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh. The TR reads simply εἰρήνη (with KL), the mass of cursive, the Syr., etc.). The primary uncials and other important authorities (BRAD 17, Vulg., etc.) insert εἰρήνην (so L ΤΤ Tr WH). The repetition has rhetorical force. The aor. partic. has probably its only force of priority in relation to the def. aor. εἰ-γενελεστῶς. The coming in question preceded the preaching. The best rendering, therefore, will be neither “coming” (Eadie), nor “came and preached” (AV and RV), but “having come” (Mey., Ell., etc.). But to what coming does the ἦν refer? Not to the incarnation (Chrys., Anselm, Harl., etc.); for the preceding sentences, which speak of His blood and of the peace effected through His cross, make it clear that the time in view is not before the crucifixion but after it. Nor can the reference well be to the event of His Resurrection, nor even to His own direct teaching during the forty days (Beng.). What is in view is rather His coming in His Spirit (cf. John xiv. 18; Acts xxvi. 23, etc.). That the idea of His spiritual Advent in the Holy Ghost which is prominent in the Fourth Gospel is not a Johannine idea only, but one entirely consistent with Paul’s teaching, appears from the Pauline doctrine of the dwelling of Christ Himself or His Spirit in the believer (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 17, xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20); as also from the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Apostle’s preaching (Rom. xv. 18). The preaching meant by the εὐγενελεστῶς, therefore, is Christ’s immediate preaching through His Apostles and others, especially that declaration of His truth which made these Gentiles Christians. Those “afar off” are mentioned first, as the Gentiles in the persons of these Ephesians and other Asiatics were the writer’s immediate concern.

Ver. 18. διʼ αὐτοῦ ἔρχεται τὴν προ-σαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνι κύριοι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα: for through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father. Some take διʼ as = that, the mention of the common access being taken as the contents of the εὐγενελεστῶς. But the subject of the preaching has already been given, viz., εἰρήνη. Hence διʼ = for, and the verse is a confirmation of the previous statement in the form of an appeal to the experience of those addressed. The fact that we both of us, are now brought to God
through Him is a witness to the truth of what I have just said, viz., that Christ came and preached peace to both. The privilege referred to is a present and continuing privilege (προσώπων, not προσώπων as in Rom. v. 2)—one to which effect is being given now, viz., τοῦ προσώπου, "the introduction," or "our introduction". This noun denotes, properly speaking, the act of bringing to one, and then the approach or access (Herod., ii., 58; Xen., Cyr., vii., 5, 45). It is urged by some (Mey., Ell., etc.) that both here and in Rom. v. 2 it has the primary trans. sense, and denotes the privilege of being brought to God or introduced to Him. Christ would thus be presented in the character of "Bringer," perhaps with some allusion to the office of the ἐνσωπών through whom in Oriental courts one was brought into the royal presence. But the difference in idea between access (πρόσωπος) and "admission" ( Ell.) or "being brought" (προσώπων) is slight, and there seems sufficient justification for the intrans. sense. The ἐν δὲ πνεύματι, which is strangely translated (Anselm, Rosem.) as = διενεργοῦν, "with one mind," obviously refers to the Holy Ghost. That is made clear both by the mention of the coming and preaching in the Spirit, and by the reference both to Christ and to the Father. The ἐν is not = by, but in, with reference to the element in which alone we have the access. As that right is ours only through Christ (δι' αὐτοῦ), so it is made ours in actual experience only in the Spirit, and Jew and Gentile have it alike because it is one and the same Spirit that works in both. So both have continuous access to God from whom once they were far removed, to Him, too, in the benign character of the Father (τὸν πατέρα) whom they can approach without fear. 

Ver. 19. ἔρεον οὖν οὐκ ἐκεῖθεν ἐκεῖνοι καὶ πάροικοι: So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners. At this point Paul brings to their conclusion the statements made in vv. 14-18, and draws from them the natural, comforting inference. The conclusive ἐρεῖ is one of Paul's favourable particles. In his writings and in the NT generally it is sometimes placed second in the sentence, and sometimes (contrary to classical use) first. The combination ἐρεῖ οὖν is peculiar to Paul, and takes the first place in the sentence. In this form it has less of the ratiocinative force and more of the collective; cf. Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 372; Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 273. ἐν πνεύματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, a comprehensive expression, including "all who, whether by natural and territorial demarcation, or by the absence of civic privileges, were not citizens" (Ell.). The term ἐν πνεύματι in ordinary Greek means a neighbour. In the LXX it represents ἐν πνεύματι (nine times) or ἐν ἑαυτῷ (eleven times). Here it stands for the classical μέτοχος, which never occurs in the NT, is found only once in the LXX (Jer. xx. 3) and means one who comes from one country or city and settles in another, but does not rank as a ἐννοτος or οἰκος having the right of citizenship (cf. Acts vii. 6, 29; Rom. i. 11). There is no reference to proselytes in particular (Baumg.). ἐν τῷ καὶ πάροικοι τῶν ἔρων: but fellow-citizens with the saints. Most critical editors (LTHWHRV) insert οὐκ ἐν πνεύματι ἀλλ' ἐν σώματι, after ἀλλά, on the authority of BΔΓCD, etc. The form ἐν πνεύματι is preferred by Tisch., WH, Ell., Alf., etc. The word belongs mostly to late Greek. The ἔρων is not to be restricted to Jews, the patriarchs, or OT believers, but is a comprehensive name for Christians, the whole community of believers in Christ without distinction of Jew and Gentile. The Jewish people were once "the saints" of God, and Gentiles stood outside having no part in their πατέρας. Now all Gentile believers, like these Ephesians, form part of that greater "Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16) which con-
18— 21.

20. ἐπικοινωνίας ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν—Acts xx. τῶν, δότος ἀκορογυμνασμοῖς αὐτῶν χριστοῦ ἤσοῦ, 21. ἐν τῇ πάσᾳ τῇ ἔργῳ τῷ μεταμφίσματι τῆς κατασκευῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 2 rec. ; i Cor. iii. 10, etc.; y = Pet. ii. 6 only; Isa. xxviii. 15.

Col. ii. 7; Jude xx only. x = Rom. xv. 20; i Cor. iii. 10, 11; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. vii. 1.

1 Insert lθου DEF, Orig., Eus., Chr.
2 Om. αὐτοῦ, Copt., Orig., Victorin.
4 Rec. after παρὰ insert η with ΝACP, Arm., Orig., Euth., Bas., Chr., Thdr., etc.; text ΝBDHEFLG, most mss., Clem., Orig., Bas., etc.

Thus says all Christians, and share in all the rights of such.—καὶ οἶκος τοῦ Θεοῦ:

and of the household of God. So in Gal. vi. 10, πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τῆς πίστεως. In Greek writers of the later period ὥλεα is used frequently with the cognate.

of abstract nouns (ὁλείας, φιλοσοφίας, διάνοιξες, etc.) in the general sense of one closely connected with philosophy, etc., but without any specific reference either to the house of God, or to the ὥλεος as forming one family.

With the present case, however, it is different. The phrase ὥλεας Θεοῦ naturally suggests the idea of members of God's household or family (Mey.); cf. 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 7.

Ver. 20. ἐπικοινωνίας ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ: being built upon the foundation. From the idea of the house or household of God contained in the ὥλεος Paul passes by an easy transition to that of the building of the spiritual ὥλεα. The ἐπικοινωνία of the household gives the notion of building up; the second ἐπί with the dative θεμελίου, that of resting on the foundation—which also might have been expressed by the gen. The forms ὅθεμελίῳ and τῷ θεμελίῳ both occur, the former much more frequently than the latter in Greek literature generally. The latter, however, is found frequently in the LXX, and at least once quite unmistakably in the NT (Acts xvi. 26)—τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν: of the Apostles and Prophets. The omission of τῶν before προφητῶν does not necessarily identify the Apostles and Prophets as one and the same persons (Harl.); cf. Win.-Moult., p. 162. It indicates, however, that they both belong to the same class. The gen. is variously understood as (1) the gen. of opposition = the foundation which is or consists in the Apostles; (2) the gen. of originating cause = the foundation laid by them; (3) the possess. gen. = "the Apostles' foundation"—in the sense of that on which they built (Anselm, Beza, etc.), or that on which they also were built (Alf.). The choice seems to be between (1) and (2). The former has been the view of many from Chrys. down to Von Soden and Abbott, and is supported so far by Rev. xxii. 14. But the second has the suffrages of the majority of modern exeges (Rück., Harl., Bleek, Mey, Ell, etc.). It is more in accordance with x Cor. iii. 10 (although it is the worth of teachers that is immediately in view there), and more especially with Rom. xv. 20, where the Gospel as preached by Paul appears to be the "foundation". Here, therefore, it seems best on the whole to understand the Gospel of Christ as preached by the Apostles to be the "foundation" on which their converts were built up into the spiritual house. But who are these προφήται?

The OT prophets, say many (Chrys., Thed., Jer., Calv., Rück, etc.)—a view certainly favoured by the use made of the writings of these prophets in the NT, and by the view given of them as "evangelists before the time" (Moule); cf. Luke xxiv. 25; Acts iii. 18, 21, 24, x. 43; Rom. xvi. 26. But the natural order in that case would have been "Prophets and Apostles," and the previous statements referred clearly to Christian times—to the preaching after Christ's death. Hence the προφήται are to be understood as the Christian prophets, of whom large mention is made in the Book of Acts and the Epistles—the NT prophets who in this same Epistle (iii. 5) are designated as Christ's prophets and are named (iv. 11) among the gifts of the ascended Lord to His Church. The frequency with which they are referred to (Acts xi. 28, xv. 32; x Cor. xiv., etc.) and the place assigned to them next to the Apostles (Eph. iv. 11) show the prominent position they had in the primitive Church. The
statements made regarding them in the early non-canonical literature (The Teaching of the Twelve, Clem. Alex., Strom., the Shepherd of Hermas, etc.) show how they continued to exist and work beyond the Apostolic Age, and help us to distinguish their ministry as that essentially of teachers and exhorters, whether itinerant or resident, from the essentially missionary ministry of the Apostles. Further the association of these prophets with the Apostles suggests that the latter term is not to be restricted here to the Twelve, but is to be taken as including all those to whom the name "Apostle" is given in the NT.—οικοδομή avtou Xristou: Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone. A few documents, including BN, omit Ιησοῦ. The Ιησοῦ Xristou of the TR is supported by such authorities as COFKL. The best reading, however, is Χριστου Ιησοῦ, "Christ Jesus," which is found in BA-cor., 17, Vulg., Copt., Goth., etc., and is adopted by LTTrWHRV. The word ἀρχιερείας (cf. the ἐν τοῖς Ἰς of Isa. xxviii. 16) is peculiar to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and is applied to Christ also in 1 Pet. ii. 6. It denotes the stone placed at the extreme corner, so as to bind the other stones in the building together—the most important stone of the structure, the one on which its stability depended. The ἀρχιερεία refers to Χριστοῦ Ιησοῦ, not to the ἄρχωνοι, nor to the θεομάχος (Beng.), the one point being that to Christ Himself and none other the building owes its existence, its strength and its increase. He Himself, and neither Apostle nor Prophet, is at once the ultimate foundation (1 Cor. iii. 11) and the Head-stone of the Corner. Some have supposed that the ἀρχιερείαι being the stone inserted between two others to give strength and cohesion to the whole, there is a reference in the phrase to the union of Jew and Gentile. But this is to push the figure too far.

Ver. 21. ἐν τῷ πάσα τῷ ἁλλότριῳ συνεργολογούμενοι αυτες εἰς ναὸν ἄγνων ἐν Κυρίῳ: in whom each several building (RV text; "every building," RV marg.), fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord. The relative refers naturally to the nearest subject, what is also the leading subject, Χριστοῦ Ιησοῦ, not to the ἀρχιερείαι, far less to the remoter θεομάχος; the ἀναίρετος has its full sense of is, not by or on. That is to say, it is in Christ Jesus, and only by connection with Him, that the ὁλοσωμός is what it is here declared to be. The word ὁλοσωμός appears to be confined to late Greek, no certain instance of it having been found in classical Greek. It occurs in Diod., Philo, Plut., Joseph., the LXX, Macc., etc. It is used both for οἰκοδόμως and οἰκοδόμεα. In the NT it has sometimes the literal sense of οἰκοδόμης (e.g., Matt. xxiv. 1; Mark xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 1); and sometimes the figurative sense of edification (Rom xiv. 19, xv. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 29), or, as here, that of a body of Christian believers. The question of the text here is important. There is considerable support for ἐν τῷ ἁλλότριῳ (ACP, Arm., etc.), and it is conceivable that itacism might have caused the omission of the Ι. But diplomatic evidence is decidedly in favour of ἐν τῷ πάσα ὁλοσωμός (BN, DGKL, etc.). Adopting this reading (with LTTRWHRV) we have to ask whether the phrase is to be rendered the whole building or every building. The former rendering is certainly the one that first suggests itself, while the latter seems at first difficult to relate to the context. The former is defended as legitimate by some weighty authorities; e.g., Winer, on the ground that the subject is "the Church of Christ as a whole," and Ellicott, who takes it to be a case of grammatical laxity. But the distinction between ἐν with the article and ἐν without it is so well maintained in the NT that only an absolutely intolerable sense can justify us in departing from it. The only exceptions to the general rule appear to be those that hold good also in ordinary Greek—in general and unqualified statements, with proper names, and with nouns which have acquired so stated a meaning that
they can drop the article, etc. (cf. Win-Moult., p. 138, and especially Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, pp. 119, 120; Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, pp. 161, 162). The present instance does not come within the scope of these exceptions. It is not like πάντες οὐκ εἰρήνη (Acts ii. 36), nor is it really analogous even to such cases as the πᾶσα ἡ γῆ of Thucyd., ii., 43, or the πᾶσα ἐπιτολή of Eph., 12. Hence the rendering here must be "every building" or "every several building". The present participle συναρμολογούμενη (the verb occurs in the NT only here and in iv. 16, and corresponds to the classical συναρμόζειν) describes the joining together as a process now going on. The pres. ἀξίζει (a form occurring in the NT only here and in Col. ii. 19, but common in Soph., Thucyd., Pind., etc.) in like manner expresses what is happening now, or, it may be, what is normal. The phrase ναὸς ἱερὸν is sufficiently rendered "a holy temple" or "sanctuary". Some (e.g., Mey.), supposing that Paul has the Jewish temple in view and means to say that the Christian Church is now the true Temple of God, the house made His own sanctuary by His dwelling in it, would render it "the holy temple". The ἐν Κυρίῳ is connected by some (Harl., etc.) immediately with ἱερὸν, = a temple that is holy as being in the Lord; by others with ναὸς ἱερὸν (Ell.); by others with ἀξίζει (Mey.). But it really qualifies the whole statement of the joining and growing. All this is in the Lord, i.e., in Christ, as both the context and the general NT application of Κύριος show. The sense of the whole, therefore, is this—in Christ the Lord every several building that goes to make up the ideal Temple of God, every Christian community, the one not addressed not less than others, is at present being surely framed and fitted together, and is growing and harmoniously developing so that it may form part of the great mystical Body of Christ, the vast spiritual fellowship of believers which is God's true Temple.

Ver. 22. ἐν τῷ καὶ ἡμῖν συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι: in whom ye also are being built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit. The relative refers again, as in ver. 21, to Christ, the Κύριος just named, not to the preceding θέας. The καὶ ( = also, not even) points to the dignity of the present position—"the exalted nature of the association in which the Ephesians shared " (Ell.). The συνοικοδομεῖσθε is not imper. (Calv.), but indic., the burden of the whole section being what was done for the readers and what was made of them. The συν- in the comp. verb might convey the idea of being built together with others; but, in view of the force of the συναρμολογούμενη it is rather to be understood as denoting the compact connection of one part with another.

The present participle συναρμολογούμενη (the verb occurs in the NT only here and in iv. 16, and corresponds to the classical συναρμόζειν) describes the joining together as a process now going on. The pres. ἀξίζει (a form occurring in the NT only here and in Col. ii. 19, but common in Soph., Thucyd., Pind., etc.) in like manner expresses what is happening now, or, it may be, what is normal. The phrase ναὸς ἱερὸν is sufficiently rendered "a holy temple" or "sanctuary". Some (e.g., Mey.), supposing that Paul has the Jewish temple in view and means to say that the Christian Church is now the true Temple of God, the house made His own sanctuary by His dwelling in it, would render it "the holy temple". The ἐν Κυρίῳ is connected by some (Harl., etc.) immediately with ἱερὸν, = a temple that is holy as being in the Lord; by others with ναὸς ἱερὸν (Ell.); by others with ἀξίζει (Mey.). But it really qualifies the whole statement of the joining and growing. All this is in the Lord, i.e., in Christ, as both the context and the general NT application of Κύριος show. The sense of the whole, therefore, is this—in Christ the Lord every several building that goes to make up the ideal Temple of God, every Christian community, the one not addressed not less than others, is at present being surely framed and fitted together, and is growing and harmoniously developing so that it may form part of the great mystical Body of Christ, the vast spiritual fellowship of believers which is God's true Temple.

Ver. 22. ἐν τῷ καὶ ἡμῖν συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι: in whom ye also are being built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit. The relative refers again, as in ver. 21, to Christ, the Κύριος just named, not to the preceding θέας. The καὶ ( = also, not even) points to the dignity of the present position—"the exalted nature of the association in which the Ephesians shared " (Ell.). The συνοικοδομεῖσθε is not imper. (Calv.), but indic., the burden of the whole section being what was done for the readers and what was made of them. The συν- in the comp. verb might convey the idea of being built together with others; but, in view of the force of the συναρμολογούμενη it is rather to be understood as denoting the compact connection of one part with another.
that opened the Church to those who were not of Israel. This with the view that the present position or be discouraged by it.

Ver. 1. πόλεμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: for this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus. The πόλεμος is referred by some (Mey., etc.) to the immediately preceding sentence; the fact that they are destined to make a habitation of God, and are being built together with a view to that end, being Paul's reason for pleading with them and praying for them. It is best referred, however, to the purport of the whole statement just brought to its conclusion; the fact that they are now what God's grace has made them and are meant by Him to form a spiritual habitation for Himself, being His reason for what He urges on them and what He does for them. Ἰησοῦς. A solemn and emphatic designation of the writer by himself, expressive rather of his personal interest in them than the consciousness of his authority (Mey.). For similar occurrences of the emphatic personal designation, with different shades of meaning, see 2 Cor. vii. 1; Gal. v. 2; Col. i. 23; Phil. 19. The article with the δέομεν expresses simply the character in which Paul appears at present or the class to which he belongs (cf. Τιμόθεος ὁ διδάσκαλός, Phil. 1); not his pre-eminence among the Lord's prisoners, as if it = the prisoner par excellence (Mey.) — a claim surely which would neither be like Paul nor in harmony with the thought of the paragraph. The γεν. Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ is probably that of originatioe case — one who has been made a prisoner by Christ; cf. 2 Tim. i. 8; Phil. 9, as also Eph. iv. 1. The 'Ιησοῦ is omitted by Tisch. on the authority of such MSS. as Δ* D* G*; but it is rightly retained by most as found in Byz. Com. ACD Vulg., etc. — best ὁμοιότατος τῷ Θεῷ in behalf of the Gentiles. Paul was called specially to be a minister of Christ to the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21, 28, xiii. 21), and his preaching Christ as for the Gentiles equally with the Jews provoked that enmity of the Jews which led to his imprisonment. It was thus for the Gentiles that he was a prisoner; and there is probably also the further thought in the ὁμοιότατος that Paul's imprisonment was to be for their good, helpful to the Christian life. For the idea with which the paragraph closes is that his afflictions were their glory (ver. 13). But what of the construction and connection here? The simplest adjustment is to insert αὐτῷ after the δέομεν: "I Paul am the prisoner," etc. So the Syr., Chrys., Mey. and others. But this takes the point from the ὁμοιότατος and makes Paul assert and exalt himself as a sufferer in a way unlike him. It is best to take it as a broken construction, the statement with which Paul begins being, as in so many other cases, diverted into a different channel by the introduction of some subsidiary remark. Here he is turned off from what he meant to say by the polite reference in the εἰς clause. Where then have we the resumption? Not at chap. iv. 1 (with the AV, Mich., Winer, etc.), for chap. iii. is not part of a parenthesis, but a paragraph complete within itself; nor at ver. 13, which is of too limited scope and fails to meet the full force of the πόλεμος; but at ver. 14, where the πόλεμος is repeated.

Ver. 2. εἰς Ἰησοῦν τὴν ὁμοιότατον τῇ ἔκκλησιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ μοι ἐλέησα: if so be that ye did hear of the dispensation of the grace of God that was given me to you-ward. The comp. particle εἰς, or εἰ γα (according to LTWH), makes a supposition which is taken for granted, = "if, indeed, as I may assume." Whether the certainty of the assumption is in the particle itself or is derived from the context is still debated among grammarians. Some hold that in this case as in others the εἰς simply strengthens the force of the simple particle, while others think that it is its significance, if not in every instance, at least in a considerable number of occurrences; cf. Mey. and Ell., in loc.; Win.-Moul., p. 561; Bäumlein, Partikel, p. 64. Here it
introduces a polite reminder of what these Ephesians certainly had heard—a gentle appeal, expressed in a hypothetical form, and conveying the hope that his words had not been quite forgotten" (Ell.). On ἀναγινώσκων, which means the dispensation, the arrangement made in the matter of something, not "the apostolic office" (Wiesel.), see under i. 10. The τῆς χάριτος is the gen. object of ἀναγινώσκων, cf. Acts xxi. 13. The στις is omitted by BD-lat., Ambros., etc., and is bracketed by L and WII, but is retained by most. The πρὸς ἡμᾶς, admirably rendered by the AV "to you-ward," denotes the "ethical direction" (Ell.) of the gift of grace — the fact that it was bestowed on Paul not for his own sake, but with a view to their position.

Ver. 3. ἴνα κατὰ ἀνακάλυψιν ἐγνώμην περί τῆς χάριτος: how that by way of revelation he made known (was made known) to me the mystery. The στις is omitted by BD-lat., Ambros., etc., and is bracketed by L and WH, but is retained by most. The ἐγνώμην of the TR (supported by D*KL, etc.) must give place to ἀναγινώσκων, which is the reading of By�ΑξαΔι? 17. Latt., Syr., Copt., etc., and is adopted by LTTWHRV. On μεταφορῶν see under i. 9. Here it is the particular μεταφορῶν or "secret" of the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the chosen people—a disclosure of the Divine purpose which so often calls for comments when reading the Epistle. The sentence explains and develops the preceding statement, giving what they heard (ἀκούσατε) of the peculiar dispensation made by God with Paul; and the prominent thing here, as indicated by the emphatic position of κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, is the way in which the "mystery" was made known to him, viz., the way of revelation.—καθὼς προφέραγα ἐν ἡλίγνῳ: as I wrote afore in few words. The ἡ ἐλίγνωσ is wrongly taken by some as = ἔριπον ἡλίγνωσ, "a short time before". It is equivalent to the ἔτες ἡλίγνοι or the ἐν ἰδραυλίας, ἐν ἰδραυλίας of classical Greek, and means briefly (cf. Acts xxvi. 28 and the συντάγματα in Acts xxiv. 4). But what is the writing referred to? It might be a previous letter now lost (Chrys., Calv., etc.). The aor. might so far favour this, and the ἀναγινώσκων of vers. 4, which Meyer thinks excludes it, is not necessarily inconsistent with it. The δύναμις ἀναγινώσκων νοσθηρα need not be limited to the reading of the present Epistle, but might equally well apply to the act of reading any other letter, and the terms might suggest indeed a fuller statement of the "mystery" in question than is given anywhere in the first part of this Epistle. The reference, however, might also be to something already said in the present letter, in which case the προφέραγα in which the inclusion of the Gentiles is the special topic. Ver. 4. θέλε δὲ ἀναγινώσκοντες νοσθηρα τῆς σύνως μου ἐν τῇ μεταφορᾷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: in accordance with which, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of the Christ. The δὲ refers to the προφέραγα, the πρός with acc. being here, as often, the idea of the standard or measure of the νοσθηρα (Win.-Moul., p. 505; Bernhardy, Synt., p. 205). Wicl. gives "as"; Cov., "like as"; Rhem., "according as"; Tynd., Gen., AV and RV, "whereby". The aor. νοσθηρα follows the present ἀναγινώσκων, the perception being re-
garded as a single, accomplished act, the result of the process of reading. The verbs νοεῖν and συνείδειν when contrasted are supposed (cf. Tittmann, Syn., p. 191, and Ell., in loc.) to differ as marken, "perceive" differs from verstehen, "understand". But such distinctions are precarious as regards NT Greek. The noun συνείδειν, which is applied sometimes to the understanding mind (Mark xiii.33; Wisd. iv. 11), occurs repeatedly in the NT in the sense of mental apprehension (Luke ii.47; 1 Cor. i. 19; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7). It is defined as "insight depending on judgment and inference" (Mey. on Col. i. 9), usually in the theoretical sense, but sometimes in the practical (cf. Mark xii.33). It appears to denote critical understanding, the apprehension of the bearings of things, while φθοράν conveys the idea of practical, ethical understanding (cf. Light, on Col. i. 9; Schmidt, Synonymik, chap. xiii., § 10, chap. cxvii., § 8). Here συνείδειν is followed by ἐν (cf. also 3 Esdras, i. 3), συνείδειν ἐν being a common phrase for having understanding in a matter (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Josh. i. 7; Dan. i. 17). As the συνείδειν μου ἐν τῷ, etc., makes one idea, the article is dispensed with after the prep. The τοῦ Χριστοῦ is taken by some as that of originating cause (Hofm.), = the mystery of which Christ is the author; by others as the gen. objecti, = the mystery relating to the Christ (Abb., Haupt, etc.), by others still as the gen. of opposition (Mey., Alf., etc.), or of identity (Ell.), = the mystery which is the Christ, which He makes, or which is contained in Him. The latter is thought to be favoured by Col. i. 27. But the idea there is that of the Christ in us, which is not quite the same; and it seems best on the whole to take the second view, "the mystery relating to the Christ," i.e., the revelation of the long-hidden purpose of God regarding the Christ as not for Israel only, but also for the Gentiles.

Ver. 5. ὡς ὑπὲρανγέλων γενεᾶς ὁμοῦ ἐνυπηρετήσατο, which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men. The TR inserts ἐν before ὑπὲρανγέλων, as in Syr.-Phil. and Copt. But the insertion is due probably to the double dative, and the ἐν (which is not found in BNAcDEFGK, etc.) is rightly omitted by LTTrWHRV. The γενεᾶς, therefore, is the dat. of time; the term γενεᾶς, like the OT γῆς (of which it is the usual rendering in the LXX), meaning the period covered by a generation of men (Luke i. 20; Acts xiv. 16, xv. 21; Col. i. 26) as well as the generation or race itself. By τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν μνήματι it is to be understood, not the OT prophets (Beng.) as contrasted with the "Apostles and prophets" of the next clause, but men generally and in the absolute sense, in conformity with the γενεᾶς.—ὡς ἐν τούτῳ, ἀνακελλυθήσεται οἱ ἀναπτύλους αἰώνοι καὶ προφῆται ἐν πνεύματι: as now it was revealed to His holy Apostles and prophets in the Spirit. The ὡς has its proper comparative force. The fact of the revelation made in pre-Christian times to the fathers and the prophets is not questioned. The matter in view is the measure or manner of the revelation. The ἐν = "now," in these Christian times, and the aor. ἀνακελλυθήσεται defines the fuller revelation as made definitely at a former period in these times. The verb also has its proper force, as distinguished from the ἐνυπηρετήσατο and as describing the way, viz., by revelation, that the truth was made known. The prophets of the OT dispensation were designated διάγοι (2 Kings iv. 9; Luke i. 20; 2 Pet. i. 21). Those of these Christian times are in like manner designated διάγοι, as men separated and consecrated to the office and distinguished from the mass of the ἀνθρώπων. They are further described as Ἰησοῦ (ὁ Θεός), i.e., God's Apostles and prophets, God being the subject implied in the ἐνυπηρετήσατο and the ἀνακελλυθήσεται. The terms ἀναπτύλους and προφῆται have the same sense here as in ii. 20, viz., the Christian Apostles and prophets. The clause ἐν πνεύματι defines the ἀνακελλυθήσεται, which is as if = προφητεύετο Θεονεύνου (Holz., Koppe), for the προφητεύετο need no such
After ἐπιεύρησθη insert τοις ἁγιοις πόροι. 6. ἔναν τὸ ἔπιθον 5 συγ- ω. Ch. ii. 22. κληρονόμα καὶ σύνομα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας 5 ἐν χριστῷ ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 7. οὗ ἐγένετο ἡ διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσαν 6 μοι κατὰ αὐτοῦ 5. Act. i. 4 ref. b = 1 Cor. iii. 5 al.; Col. i. 7, 23, 25. c John iv. 10; 8. χ., Rom. v. 15.

definition. As in ii. 22 the πνεῦμα here is the Holy Spirit, and the ἐν would most naturally be taken in the same sense as these. Here, however, most understand it as the instrumental ἐν. It seems to combine the two ideas of agency and element or condition, and describes the revelation as having been made in and by the Spirit.

Ver. 6. εἴην τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα: [to wit], that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs. The εἴην are, not should be, the "mystery" or secret revealed being a fact, not a purpose. The obj. inf. expresses the contents or purport of the ἀποκάλυψις (Win.-Moul., p. 400). συγκληρονόμα (or συγκληρονόμα, LTTr WHVR) = fellow-heirs with the Ἰουδαῖοι; the only occurrence of the word in the NT in this application (for other applications cf. Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 7). —καὶ σύνωμος: and fellow-members. σύνωμος (σύνωμος, LTTr WHVR) in the NT occurs only here and is unknown to classical Greek, although Arist. uses συνώμοταισιν (De Mundo, i., iv., 30). It was probably constructed by Paul for his present purpose. It means belonging jointly to the same body. —καὶ συμμέτοχος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας: and fellow-partakers of the promise. συμμέτοχος (συμμέτοχος, LTTr WHVR) is found in the NT only here and in v. 7. It occurs also in Joseph. (Ἰσρ., Wars, i., 24, 6), and in Justin (Αφοι., ii., 13). The verb συμμείναι, however, was used in classical Greek (Eurip., Τύφρ., 648; Plato, Τέης, 181 c, etc.), although it is not found in the NT. τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, not specifically the promise of the Spirit, but, as undefined, the promise of Salvation, the Messianic promise in its length and breadth. The three terms describe the Gentiles, therefore, first generally as heirs together with the believing Jews in all things, and then more particularly as belonging equally with them to the same corporate body and sharing equally with them in the Messianic promise. The TR inserts αὐτοῦ after ἐγένετο. It is wanting, however, in the best documents (B^ACD1, 17, etc.) and is to be omitted. —καὶ τὸν χριστὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ΜΑΒ CP 17, 47, 73. Vulg., Goth., Cop., etc.

Ver. 7. οὗ ἐγένετον διάκονον κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ: of which I became a minister according to the gift of the grace of God. The TR reads ἐγένομαι (with CD^EKL, etc.), the less usual form ἐγένετο, however, is given by BNDF1, 17, etc., and is to be preferred. There is no difference, however, in the sense; ἐγένετον being simply the Doric equivalent to ἐγένομαι, which reappeared in the LXX and in later Greek generally. Διάκονος is a servant, attendant of any kind; also a deacon in particular (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12), or a deaconess (Rom. xvi. 1), and perhaps a waiter, one who serves at table (John...
Here only: μηδέπερον, 3 John 4. f Ch. i. 19 reff. g Ch. ii. 17 reff.

1 Εἰκότης FG 49. Insert τῷ before ποιεῖται P, al., mss., Goth., Cyr., Thdt., Theophyl.; omit τῷ ΝACDEFGKL, most mss., Orig., Dial., Did.

2 Insert αὐτοῦτον Archel.

3 After αὐτῷ insert τοῦ Θεοῦ FG.

4 Before τοὺς ἐν, insert ἐν with DEFGKL, mss., nearly It., Vulg., Goth., Syrr., al., Chr., Thdt., Dam., al., Lat. Fathers; omit ΝABC, 31, 61, Copt.

5 τὸν ἀγάπην τοῦ σπουδαιοῦντος πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ; to me, who am less than the least of all saints, was given this grace. The τοὺς inserted by the TR, on slender documentary evidence; hence, the better reading is τοῖς FG, 17, etc.; so LTTHWRV. As the former sentence affirmed the gift of the grace, this one states the manner of the bestowal. The standard or proportion of the giving was the efficiency, the efficacious working (ἐγέρθαι) of God's own power. The change in Paul when God made him an Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles was so great that he saw in it nothing less than the result of the Divine omnipotence.

Ver. 8. Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἡσυχίας τῆς ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ: to me, who am less than the least of all saints, was given this grace. The τοῖς inserted by the TR, on slender documentary evidence; hence, the better reading is τοῖς FG, 17, etc.; so LTTHWRV. The thought of the dignity of the office he had received at the cost of such grace and power at once evokes the sense of his own utter unworthiness, to which he gives stronger expression here than even in 1 Cor. xv. 9, or 2 Cor. xii. 11. The form Εἰκότης, a comparative of the superlative Εἰκότος, is found only here. It belongs to a class of double comparisons which had a place probably in the popular modes of speech, but of which a considerable number are found in later literature, especially in poetry. The only other example in the NT is the double comparative μείζων in 3 John 4; cf. Buttm., Gram. of NT Greek, p. 28.—ἐν τοῖς Θεοῦ εὐαγγελισάμενοι τον ἀγάπην τοῦ σπουδαιοῦντος πλοῦτον τοῦ Χριστοῦ: τὸ πρὸ τῆς ἐναρκτήριων τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐναρκτήριων τοῦ ἐξηκρίματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the unsearchable riches of Christ. The TR inserts ἐν before τοῦ Θεοῦ with) DEFGKL, etc.; but it is not found in BΝAC, etc., and is best omitted. The former reading would define the sphere assigned to Paul in his ministry; the latter, the subject of that ministry. For τὸν πλοῦτον the better accredited form is τὸ πλοῦτος. The τοῦ Χριστοῦ is prob. the gen. of possess.,= the riches that Christ has, or that are in Him. The πλοῦτος thus contained in Christ is the whole wealth of the salvation He bestows; to which may be added the word not in the sense of inexhaustible, but rather in that of unfathomable, "past finding out," such as cannot be fully comprehended by man; cf. Rom. xi. 33, the only other NT occurrence of ὄνομα-νομοστρώτων; also Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxiv. 24, the only occurrences in the LXX. It is a picturesque and suggestive word, meaning literally such as cannot be traced out by footprints.

Ver. 9. καὶ πεπώλησεν τὸν τῆς κοινωνίας τοῦ μυστηρίου ποιεῖται τοῦ ἐναρκτήριων ἔκτις: to make all see what is the fellowship (dispensation) of the man whom God from all ages has kept hidden. The τοῖς which the TR inserts after φωτισάμην is omitted by some MSS. (including ΝΑ) and certain Fathers (Hil., Jer., Aug., etc.). It is rejected by...
The KOLvwvia of the TR, which has the slenderest possible authority, must give place to the oUovopla of the RV with LTTrWH, which is the reading of BMACDKFL, etc. If the πάντας is omitted the sense becomes, as it is given in the margin of the RV, "to bring to light what is " the dispensation. If it is retained, the idea will be that of the enlightenment of all as to what the dispensation is. The πάντας, however, which occupies an unemphatic position here, after the verb (in contrast with the emphatic position of τοις ὑνεμον before its verb) can scarcely bear the absolute sense of all men, Jew and Gentile alike, but refers to all the ἐκκλησία previously mentioned. The verb φωτίζων is more than διάστημα or κηρύσσα. It means to illuminate. Paul was not only to deliver his Apostolic message, but also to spiritually enlighten those who heard it, so that they should understand it. The particular thing in that message which is here in view is the οἰκονομία (on which see under i. 10), that is, the dispensation or arrangement of the mystery, to wit the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews; the πρότερον of the world to which having the same application as in iii. 6. The formula ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων occurs in the NT only here and in Col. i. 26; the forms από τῶν αἰῶνων and ἀπὸ τῶν αἰῶνων also occur, the former in Luke i. 70 and Acts iii. 21, the latter in John ix. 32. It means literally "from the ages," "from the world-periods," that is, "from the beginning, or since the world began. It is to be distinguished from ἐκ τῶν αἰῶνων (1 Cor. ii. 7). The Divine decree was formed before the ages of the world began; the keeping of that decree hidden was since the ages of the world began, i.e., "from the commencement of the ages when intelligent beings from whom it could be concealed were called into existence " (Ell.). In Rom. xvi. 25 we have the similar description of the παραδόθη αιώνιον αἰώνιοι συνεκτιμήμενον. — εἰ τῇ Θεῷ τῇ πάντας κηρύσσα ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησίων: in God who created all things [through Jesus Christ]. The "mystery" had its place of concealment in God Himself, in the Divine mind. And God is designated specially in respect of His creative power—" God who created all things " (not "inasmuch as He created all things," which would require the omission of the τό), The τα πάντα, which also occupies a somewhat emphatic position here, is not to be restricted either to the physical creation (Chrys.), or to the spiritual (Calv.), but has the absolute sense of all that exists. The TR adds ἐκ τῶν ἡμῶν to the εἰσερχόμενοι (with DPKL, etc.); but these words must be omitted, as the best authorities (BJACDF, 17, etc.) do not give them. But why is this reference to God as the Creator of all things introduced at this point? By way of confirmation, say some, of what has just been said of the "mystery" as having been hidden from the beginning in God; the point being that He who created all things must have had the contents of this "mystery " in His eternal plan (Mey.). To "enhance the idea of His omnipotence," say others; He who created all things having ordained the mystery itself in the exercise of His undoubted prerogative of sovereign and creative power" (Ell.). Or, as others put it more precisely, its object is to take the wonder from the idea of the "mystery" having been so long unrevealed; the creation of all things by God being a fact which involves His perfect right to adjust all things as He will " (Alf.)—the Creator of all being "free to make what arrangements He pleased as to the concealment and revelation of His purpose" (Abb.). None of these interpretations can be said to be either very clear or very adequate. This designation of God as the Creator of all that exists is intended rather to express the greatness of the "mystery " that is now disclosed and of
which Paul is to be a preacher. The main thought in the verse in question is the thought with which it starts, viz., the marvel of that Apostolic commission of which Paul had been put in trust by the grace of God; and the majesty and the wonder of that commission are made the greater by the grandeur of the "mystery" the Divine disposition of which he was appointed to declare to all men. This "mystery," though long hidden, had been in the Divine mind from the first, and it had been there in such a sense that the whole scheme of created things had it in view, and in such wise that the knowledge of it was to be imparted even to the angelic world (cf. Haupt). Or, as it may be better put, the "mystery" now at last revealed by God and proclaimed by Paul to all men in all the sovereign and surpassing wisdom of the Divine dispensation by which it was hidden long and in the fulness of time at last disclosed, was one of God's own eternal secrets, one of His unsearchable thoughts, a thing that had its place from the beginning in His creative plan, a reserve in the Eternal mind that purposed and formed all that exists. And to Paul's hands did the surpassing grace of God commit the proclamation of a truth of such magnitude, the illumination of so unsearchable a disposition of the Divine wisdom!

Ver. 10. 

The creation of all things, says Harless; who connects the ἑλευσία immediately with the τῷ τὰ πάντα κτισμα. But, while it is true that this sometimes exhibited in relation to creation (John i. 1-14, etc.), and while Christ Himself is presented at times not only as the author and ground of creation but also as its end or object (Col. i. 16), the idea resulting here on that view would be that the purpose of God in creating all things was the proclamation of His wisdom to the angelic world by the Church. This, however, would be a statement without any parallel elsewhere in the NT. It is better, therefore, to take the verse as referring to the previous καὶ τοῖς ἐξωσκοιλαῖς, etc. (Ell., Alf.; and substantially De Wette, Hofm., etc.). The main idea in the paragraph from ver. 7 onwards is unmistakably that of the marvellous call and commission of Paul, and the wonder of the grace that made an Apostle and preacher of him is magnified the more by the Divine purpose revealed in that commission, to wit, the making known the manifold wisdom of God in His ways with sinful men and with the outcasts of the Gentile world in particular. It is objected indeed that this is to make Paul claim for his own preaching and as his own special work what belonged to other Apostles and God in creating all things was the proclamations of His wisdom to the angelic world by the Church. This, however, would be a statement without any parallel elsewhere in the NT. It is better, therefore, to take the verse as referring to the previous καὶ τοῖς ἐξωσκοιλαῖς, etc. (Ell., Alf., etc.). The main idea in the paragraph from ver. 7 onwards is unmistakably that of the marvellous call and commission of Paul, and the wonder of the grace that made an Apostle and preacher of him is magnified the more by the Divine purpose revealed in that commission, to wit, the making known the manifold wisdom of God in His ways with sinful men and with the outcasts of the Gentile world in particular. It is objected indeed that this is to make Paul claim for his own preaching and as his own special work what belonged to other Apostles and God in creating all things was the proclamations of His wisdom to the angelic world by the Church. This, however, would be a statement without any parallel elsewhere in the NT. It is better, therefore, to take the verse as referring to the previous καὶ τοῖς ἐξωσκοιλαῖς, etc. (Ell., Alf., etc.).
least worthy of the saints—that to the heavenly powers themselves should be made known, by means of those whom he was empowered to enlighten—the manifold wisdom of God. The ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι can only mean good angels (cf. under i. 21 above); and these names of dignity (the term ἀγγέλος is not used in this Epistle) are appropriate here as suggesting again the greatness of Paul's commission, and perhaps also (as Mey. thinks) the glory put upon the Κύριος. That the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι cannot mean any orders of earthly powers—Jewish, Gentile or Christian rulers or the like, is shown by the τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Nor can they refer to demonic powers, whether by themselves alone or as part of the angelic world, for this would scarcely be consistent with the mention of the Church, and further the Divine power would in that case be more in point than the Divine wisdom. Nor again is there anything in the context to suggest that Paul has in view the angels that ministered the law and the elemental powers honoured by the heathen (V. Soden). The τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς here, as elsewhere in the Epistle, has the sense = in heaven; see under i. 3 above. The τῶν, therefore, has its proper local sense, and is not = in respect of, as if the clause meant "in the case of" or "world-periods"; but the phrase makes one idea, too, with the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι, defining them as heavenly, it requires no τῶν after the ἐξουσίαι. οὖν τῆς ἐκκλησίας: through the Church. The Church, therefore, that is, as is evidently meant here, the whole body of believers in the unity in which Jew and Gentile are now made one, is the means by which the Divine wisdom is to be made known and Paul's commission in that respect made good. The Church, which it was his high Apostolic vocation to build up by bringing multitudes of Gentile believers into its membership—the Church in which the breaking down of ancient barriers and the removal of the old enmity were now seen, was itself the living witness to the Divine σοφία, the "mirror," as Calvin puts it, "in which angels contemplate the wonderful wisdom of God." And that Divine wisdom is described as σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ (a word found only this once in the NT)—not with any reference to Gnostic ideas of σοφία (as Baur imagined), for the use of such a term as this in that connection is of later date (Iren., Haer., i., 4, 1); nor simply in the sense of very wise, for which Aesch., Prom., 1308, is mistakenly cited; but as = multivarius, multiformis (Vulg.), having a great variety of forms. The adj. is used of the rich variety of colours in cloths, flowers, paintings, etc. (Europ., Iph. T., 1140.; Eubulus, ap. Athen., 15, p. 679 D; Orph. Hym., xi., ii.; lxii., 4). In different ways had God dealt with men, with the Jew in one way and with the Gentile in another, in the long course of the ages. But in all these He had had one great end in view. Now in the Church the realisation of that end is seen, and in that great spiritual harmony angels can perceive the manifoldness and majesty of that Divine wisdom which by ways so diverse had been working to this great result. That angels have an interest in man's redemption and desire to look into it is stated in 1 Pet. i. 12. Here it is indicated that they are capable of an enlargement of insight into it.

Ver. 11. κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων: according to the eternal purpose. Literally, "according to the purpose of the ages" or "world-periods," the phrase is presented with substantial accuracy by the "eternal" of the AV and the other old English Versions with exception of Wicl. and the Rheinisch. The term πρόθεσις must be taken here as elsewhere in the proper sense of purpose, not in that of foreknowledge (Chrys.); and the clause is to be connected neither with the σοφία nor with the σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ in particular, but with the γνώμη. The disclosure of the manifold wisdom of God to the angelic world, contemplated in the commission given by God's grace to Paul, was of further-reaching moment than that. It was contemplated in God's eternal purpose and took place in accordance with that. The gen. αἰώνων may be a gen. of time (cf. Jude 6); Alf. compares our phrase "an opinion of years"; or it may rather be one of the many forms of the gen. of possession—"the purpose
pertaining to the ages," formed before the foundation of the world (i. 3), long hidden in the Divine Mind (iii. 9), but existent and in God's view from the beginning till now (cf. 2 Tim. i. 9).—ἐν ουσίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ: which he wrought in Christ Jesus our Lord. The subject of ἐπετύχει is the ἔστις, not the οὖν (Jer., Luth., etc.). The verb is rendered "purposed" by the RV; as it is also taken by many to mean formed, constituted (Calv., Harl., Hofm., De Wette, Alt., Abb., etc.). This use of the verb is somewhat like that in Mark iii. 6, xv. 1 (συνέβλησιν), etc., and gives a good sense. On the other hand, the use of τοῖς in such connections as θλήμα τοῖς (Matt. xxi. 31; John vi. 38; Eph. ii. 3), γνώμη τοῖς (Rev. xvii. 17), etc., seems to be sufficient justification for giving it the sense of fulfilling, carrying out; and the designation Christ Jesus (not Christ simply), pointing as it does to the historical Person, suggests that what is in view now is the realization of the purpose rather than its formation. On the whole, therefore, it is perhaps best to render it "which He wrought, or carried into effect, in Him whom we preach as Christ Jesus our Lord." (Mey., Ell., etc.). The TR (with διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ) gives in Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ; the best critics (LTTWHRV), on the authority of ΒΔ*AC 17, etc., insert τῷ before Χριστῷ. The designation of Χριστῶν Ἰησοῦς Ἰουλίου Ἡρῴδου is singular; cf., however, the τῶν Ἰουλίων Ἰησοῦς τῶν Κέριων of Col. ii. 6.

Ver. 12. ἐν ᾧ ἔχουμεν τὴν παρασχεσίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν: in whom we have boldness and access. The second τὴν, which is inserted by the TR, has the support of some good authorities, CD* KLP, etc.; but is not found in BΔ*AC 17, etc., and is to be omitted (with LTTWHRV). As the παρασχεσία and the προσαγωγὴ meet in one idea the τὴν does not require to be repeated. The article before the noun has much the force of "our boldness and access". The παρασχεσία is not to be limited to freedom of speech, freedom in preaching, or boldness in prayer, but is to be taken in the large sense which it has in Phil. i. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 13; Heb. x. 19; and especially in 1 John ii. 28, iii. 14, iv. 14—"the joyful mood of those reconciled to God." (Mey.). The conjunction of the προσαγωγὴ with the intrinsics. παρασχεσία makes the intrinsics. sense of access more appropriate here than the trans. sense of introduction; cf. under ii. 18—ἐν παρασχεσίᾳ: in confidence. The noun παρασχεσία belongs to late Greek (Joseph., Philo., Sext. Empir., etc.). In the LXX it occurs once (2 Kings xviii. 19); in the NT it is found only in Paul (2 Cor. i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Phil. iii. 4, and here). It indicates the disposition in which the παρασχεσία and προσαγωγὴ are made good.—διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ: through our faith in Him. The αὐτοῦ is best taken as the gen. objecti; cf. Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16. Thus, as the ἐν expresses the fact that Christ is the ground of our παρασχεσία and προσαγωγὴ, and the ἐν παρασχεσίᾳ the state of mind in which we enjoy these blessings, so this clause declares the means by which they become our actual possession. The whole verse, moreover, is not so much a simple addition to the preceding statement as rather an indirect appeal to personal experience, in confirmation of what was said of the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose in Christ Jesus our Lord, the ἐν having, as Ell. explains it, much the same force as ἐν αὐτῷ γέρον.
which follows. It is better, however, to refer the δικαίωμα to the great thought of the whole paragraph, to which the statement in ver. 12 is subordinate, viz., the dignity of the office committed to Paul and its significance for them. Because the great trust of the Apostleship among the Gentiles is what he has declared it to be for himself and for them, he puts this request before them. The ἀριθμός, which sometimes expresses a demand (Luke i. 63; 1 Cor. i. 22), has the simple sense of asking here; and in such connections as the present ἀριθμός has the full sense of asking for one’s self. It is followed sometimes by the acc. and inf. (Luke xxiii. 23; Acts iii. 14), and sometimes, as here, by the simple inf. (Acts vii. 46). The idea in the verb ἐγκαίνια is that of losing courage, becoming faint of heart. The form ἐγκαίνια, which is given in the TR, is adopted by CDPFKL, etc. It is doubtful, however, whether that form occurs anywhere in ordinary Greek. It may have had a place in popular, oral use. The written form was ἐγκαίνια, and that form appears here in most of the best MSS. (B^AD1, etc.). Hence LTRV adopt ἐγκαίνια; TWH, ἐγκαίνια. But what is the construction here? Some supply ὅσον, and make the sense either (1) “I pray God that ye faint not,” or (2) “I pray God that I faint not.” But if the subject of the αἱρετικαί had been God, the ὅσον could scarcely have been omitted, as there is nothing in the context clearly to suggest it. And that it is the readers, not Paul himself, whose possible faint-heartedness is referred to appears from the force of the ὁ πάντως καὶ ητέρους ἴδε ὑμῖν: which are your glory.

The distinction between the definite or objective rel. δικαίωμα and the indefinite, generic, or qualitative rel. Δικαίωμα (cf. Jelf, Gr. Gram., 816) is not always maintained in the NT, and indeed the use of Δικαίωμα for δικαίωμα is as old as Herod. (ii. 92) and Ionic Greek generally (Kühner, Gr. Gram., ii. 906). In the Pauline Epistles, however, the distinction seems to be fairly maintained (Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 173), and Δικαίωμα appears here to have the force of an explanation—“inasmuch as they are,” “for indeed they are.” The rel. is referred by some (Theod., Oshl., Harl.) to the μη ἐγκαίνια, or to the whole sentence beginning with that; in which case Φίλιππως would stand for δικαίωμα. But it is most naturally referred to the Δικαίωμα. It is a case of an action, but one in which the noun of the rel. clause gives its number (cf. Dem. ap. Aphob., p. 853, 31, and in the NT itself, Acts xxiv. 11; Phil. iii. 20) as well as its gender to the rel. (Win.-Moul., p. 206; Buttm., Gram. of NT Greek, p. 281; Donald, Gr. Gram., p. 362; Madvig, Syn., § 98). The clause, therefore, gives the readers a reason or motive for not yielding to faintness of heart. Paul’s tribulations were endured in their behalf, and were of value for them. The greater the office of the sufferer, the more did the afflictions which he was content to endure for them be endowed to their honour; and the better this was understood by them, the less should they give way to weakness and discouragement.

Vv. 14-19. A paragraph containing an earnest prayer for the inward strengthening of the readers, the presence of Christ in them, their enlargement in the knowledge of the love of Christ, and the realisation in them of the Divine perfections.

Ver. 14. τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: for this cause. The sentence begun at iii. 1 and interrupted at ver. 2 is now taken up again. The τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, therefore, refers to the great statement of privilege in the latter part of the previous chapter. The ideas which came to expression in the digression in vv. 2-13, are also no doubt in view in some measure. The thought of the new relations into which the Ephesians had been brought by grace toward God and toward the Jews—the reconciliation of the Cross, peace effected where once there was only enmity, the place given them in the household of God—gave Paul cause for prayer in their behalf.—κατόπτε χεῖρας: I bow my knees.
A simple, natural figure for prayer, earnest prayer (Calv.)—not as if Paul actually knelt as he wrote (Calov.). The standing posture in prayer and the kneeling are both mentioned in the NT (e.g., Mark xi.25; Luke xviii.1; for the former, and Luke xxii.41; Acts vii.60, xx.36, xx.i, 5, for the latter). For kneeling in the OT see 1 Kings viii.54; Dan. vi.10; cf. also 1 Kings xix.18.—προς τὸν πατέρα. The προς takes the place of the simple dat. which usually follows the phrase κατ' ὑπόπτων γένος (Rom. xi.4, xiv.11), the idea here being that of prayer, and of God as the Hearer to whom it was directed. The TR, following ΔΕΚΓ, Lat., Syr. Goth., etc., adds τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is an addition which might very readily find a place in the text, the designation being a familiar one, occurring already indeed in this Epistle (i.3). It does not appear, however, in BN, C, 17, Copt., Eth., etc., and it is omitted by the best critics (LTTrWHRV).

Ver. 15. οὐκ οὖσα πατρία ἐν ὄσαροι καὶ ἐνὶ γῇς ὀνομάζεται: from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named. The οὐκ οὖσα denotes the origin of the name, the source whence it is derived (cf. Hom., II., x., 68; Xen., Mem., iv., 5, 8; Soph., Æd. R., 1036). The verb ὀνομάζεται is also followed by ἐκ (Herod., vi., 129); but ἐκ conveys the idea of more direct origination (cf. Ell., in loc.). The noun πατρία, for which πάτρα is the more usual form in classical Greek, never has the sense of πατρίνης, pateritas (Syr., Goth., Vulg., Luth., and, so far, also Harl.). It means sometimes ancestry (Herod., ii., 143; iii., 75), but the great name of family (Exod. vi., 15; xii. 3; Num. i. 3; Luke ii. 4). race or tribe, i.e., a number of families descended from a common stock (Herod., i., 200; Num. i. 16), nation or people (1 Chron. xvi. 28; Ps. xxii. 28; Acts iii. 25). In the LXX the πατρία are the ἀνθρωπίνα as distinguished from the φύλα, φυλή. The Israelites were constituted of twelve φυλα divided into a number of πατρία, each of these latter again consisting of so many αὐλα. Here the word seems to have the widest sense of class, order, nation, community, as the idea of family in the proper sense of the term is inapplicable to the case of the angels, who are indicated by ἐν ὄσαροι. Further, the anarthrous πάτρα πατρία grammatically can only mean “every family” (see under ii. 21 above), not “the whole family” (Mich., Oloth., etc.). All such ideas, therefore, as that angels and men, or the blessed in heaven and the believing on earth, are in view as now making one great family, are excluded. Nor can ὀνομάζεται be made to mean anything else than “are named” —certainly not exist, or called into existence (Estius, etc.), or “are named the children of God” (Beng., etc.). The sense, therefore, is “the Father, from whom all the related orders of intelligent beings, human and angelic, each by itself, get the significant name of family, community.” The various classes of men on earth, Jewish, Gentile, and others, and the various orders of angels in heaven, are all related to God, the common Father, and only in virtue of that relation has any of them the name of family. The father makes the family; God is the Father of all; and if any community of intelligent beings, human or angelic, bears the great name of family, the reason for that lies in this relation of God to it. The significant name has its origin in the
spiritual relationship. It is not possible, however, to give proper expression to the thought in English. In the Greek there is a play upon the words ἀγαθός, ἀγαθία, which cannot be reproduced. Some have supposed that Paul has certain Rabbinical notions in view here, or that he is glancing at certain Gnostic theories, or at the vain worship of angels. But there is no ground for such far-fetched suppositions. The Rabbinical conceits regarding angels and the Gnostic speculations were both very different from anything suggested here.

Ver. 16. ἦν ὑπὲρ ὅλας κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ: that He would grant you according to the riches of His glory. The ἦν introduces the subject of the prayer, representing it, however, also as the thing which he had in view in praying and which made the purpose of his prayer (see under i. 17 above). For the ὑπὲρ of the TR (with DKL, etc.), the RV (with LTTRWH) gives ἐπί as in BACF, 17, etc. (see under i. 17 above). For τὸν πλοῦτον (TR, with DKL, etc.) read again τὸ πλοῦτον, with ΝΙABCDF, etc. The δόξα is the whole revealed perfections of God, not merely His grace or His power; and the clause belongs more fitly to the ἐπί than to the following καταπληκτικαί. The measure of the gift for which Paul prays on behalf of the Ephesians is nothing short of those perfections of God, which are revealed now in their glorious fulness and inexhaustible wealth (cf. i. 7, 18; ii. 4, 7).—καταπληκτικαί κραταιωθήσατε τὸν πνεύματος αὐτοῦ: to be strengthened by power through His Spirit. The καταπληκτικαί is taken by some as the dat. of manner, or as an adverbial expression = mightily. But the former mention of the ἐνεμέρωσε suggests that the power is regarded here as in the subjects rather than as put forth by God. Others make it the dat. of reference, or take it to denote the particular form in which the strengthening was to take effect, viz., in the form of power as contrasted with knowledge or other kinds of gifts. But there is nothing to suggest limitation to one special capacity. Such limitation indeed would be inconsistent with the comprehensive ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν. It is best understood as the dat. instrum. The strengthening was to take effect by means of power imparted or infused, and this impartation of power was to be made through the Spirit of God.—ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν: into the inward man. The "inward man" is viewed here as the recipient, that into which the strengthening was to be poured, or the object towards which the gift was directed. The ἐς, therefore, has its full force of "into," and is not to be reduced either to "in" (RV), or to "in regard of" (Mey.). The phrase ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν has certain parallels in classical Greek, e.g., ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν (Plato, Rep., ix., p. 589), ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν (Plotin., Enn., v., 1, 10); and it is conceivable that these philosophical expressions had become popularised in course of time, and had penetrated even into the common speech of Jews, or at least into the vocabulary of educated Jews. But the question is—What is the force of the phrase in the NT itself? The two terms ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν, ἐς τὴν ἐνεμέρωσιν denote the two sides or aspects of the nature of man, soul and body, real and phenomenal, enduring and perishable (cf. the contrast in 2 Cor. iv. 16); as the terms ἐς τὴν ἐνεμέρωσιν, ἐς τὴν ἐνεμέρωσιν denote his twofold moral nature. The ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν itself occurs only thrice in the NT, and all three occurrences are in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16). It has different shades of meaning there, but the same general sense, viz., that of the personal subject, the rational, moral self, somewhat similar to the νοῦς in Rom. vii. 23, and the ἅρφες τῆς καρδιᾶς ἐνεμέρωσεν of 1 Pet. iv. 4. Hence this ἐς τὴν ἐνεμέρωσιν the goodness of the law of God can be recognised so that one can delight in that law. But there is another law that wars against it and brings it into subjection (Rom. vii. 19-23). Hence the ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν has to be regenerated, and so becomes "the new man," ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν, that is created after God (ἐς τὸν θείου κτίσιν, Eph. iv. 24), or ἐς τὸν ἐνεμέρωσεν, that is renewed (ἐνεκαλησιασμένος).
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The former view has the difficulty of taking two somewhat different grammatical constructions as parallels, and it fails to bring out as the latter does the advance in the thought. The indwelling of Christ is the higher boon which is in view as the end and effect of the strengthening. — The article being often dropped before abstract nouns, and especially after a preposition (Win.-Moul., pp. 148, 149). As the ἁγίασμα is also without any ἀπόθεμα or other defining gen., it appears to have its most general sense here, not "the love of God " or "the love of Christ " in particular, but love, the Christian principle or grace which is "the bond of perfectness" (Col. iii. 14). In this love they are described (by two perf. partis.) as "having been rooted and grounded." If the terms εὐπρεπείαν, τεκτωνεῖαν were used in their proper etymological connotation, they might suggest much. The former might convey the idea of subjects deriving their life and growth from love; and the latter the idea of subjects built up on the basis of love as living stones in the Divine temple, etc., may be taken as dependent on the ἅγια and as forming a second boon contemplated in the gift prayed for, as if "and that He may grant you also that Christ may dwell in your hearts " (Mey., Abb., etc.). Or it may be taken as dependent on the ἁγίασμα, etc., expressing the contemplated result of the gift of strength (inf. of consequence); cf. Acts v. 3; Heb. vi. 10; Apoc. v. 5, xvi. 9, etc.), = "the effect that Christ may dwell in your hearts ". The omission of the connecting καὶ is no insuperable objection to the former; for cases of a dimityndeton are sufficiently common. But the second view (so Ell., Alf., etc.) is on the whole to be preferred, as it deals better both with the grammatical connection and with the emphatic position of the κατοικήσασθαι. The the construction is a difficult question. Westcott and Hort attach an ἁγίασμα to the κατοικήσασθαι clause and the ἐφημερίσασθαι καὶ τεθραμμένων to the ἐν clause. But the εἰς κατοικίας ἡμῶν seems a proper and adequate conclusion and completion
of the idea of the indwelling. Many (including Meyer, Winer, Buttm., AV, RV, etc.) connect the whole clause with the 

τα, = "in order that, being rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able". This gives an excellent sense, and examples of the transposition of part of a sentence from the natural place after the ινα to one before it are found elsewhere in the NT (e.g., Acts xix. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 10; Col. iv. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 7; cf. Buttm., Gr. of N. T. Greek, p. 380). On the other hand, the relevancy of most, if not all, of these examples is not above suspicion (cf. Ell. and Abb. in loc.), and it does not appear that in the present passage there is any such emphasis on the ινα ἐγνώς as can explain its peculiar position. Hence it is better on the whole to connect it with the preceding (as is done in one way or other by Chrys., Luth., Harl., Bleek, De Wette, Alf., Ell., Abb., etc.), and take it as another instance of the nom. absol. or participial anacolouthon (cf. Win.-Moult., p. 715; Krüger, Sprachl., § 56, 9, 4; Buttm., Gr. of N. T. Greek, p. 85). So we translate it—"ye having been rooted and grounded in love in order that ye may be able," etc. The rooting and grounding are expressed by the perf. part., as they indicate the state which must be realised in connection with the indwelling of Christ before the ability for comprehending the love of Christ can be acquired.

Ver. 18. Ἰνα ἐγνώς τινα ἀκαλαβάναι στὶν πάντα τοῖς ἁγιοῖς: that ye may be fully able to comprehend with all the saints. The "may be strong" of the RV is a less happy rendering than usual, as it obscures the fact that the verb is different from that expressing the strengthened in ver. 16. The strong compound ἀκαλαβάναι, = "to be eminently able, to have full capacity," occurs only this once in the NT and is rare in ordinary Greek. καταλαβάναι, = "take hold of" (2 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12, etc.) or in the sense of mental grasp (Plato, Phaedr., 250 d), in its various NT occurrences in the Middle Voice (Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25) has only the latter meaning. Here, therefore, it is = understand, not = occupare, take possession of (Goth., Kypke). The RV substitutes the more general καταλαβάναι, as it is not possible to express the sense of "comprehend" of the AV. This gift of spiritual comprehension is contemplated further as to be possessed and exercised στὶν πάντα τοῖς ἁγιοῖς, not as a matter of private experience, the peculiar faculty of some, or an exceptional bestowment like the rare privilege of visions, but as a gift proper to the whole community of believers and one in which these Ephesians might share together with all God's people; for the phrase of i. 15, vi. 18; Col. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13; Phil. 5; Rev. viii. 3; and for the sense of ἀγιός see under i. 1 above.

τὸ τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ἡ ύφος: what is the breadth and length and depth and height. So the AV. But height and depth, according to the RV. The order of the TR, βάθος καὶ ἡ ύφος, is that of ΝΧΤ, Syr., etc.; ἡ ύφος καὶ βάθος is that of BCD, Vulg., Boh., etc. The latter is preferred by LTrWH, the former getting a place in the margin with Tr and WH. What is the object in view in the mention of these dimensions? It is left unnamed. Hence the many conceptions on the subject; e.g., that it is the Christian Church (Mich., Koppe, etc.), or Temple (Bengel), the work of redemption, or the mystery previously noticed (Theophy., Harl., Olah., Bleek, etc.), the mystery of the Cross (Est.), the love of God (Chrys., Erasm., Grut., etc.), the wisdom of God (De Wette), the love of God (Moulmein), all that God has revealed or done in us and for us (Alf.). But the context naturally suggests the love of Christ (Calv., Mey., Ell.), that being the supreme theme and the one which is immediately set before us in express terms. The imagination of the Fathers, Augustine, Gregory Nyssa, Jerome and others, ran riot in the endeavour to find some distinctive, spiritual meaning in each of the four things here named, the shape of the Cross, e.g., being supposed to be signified (Estius), the Divinity of Christ being found in the figure of the height, His human nature in the depth, the extent of the Apostolic Commission in the length and breadth, etc. Nor are the feats of interpretation less forced or fanciful which have been performed by some more modern exegetes. But the terms length, breadth, depth, height are introduced with no other purpose than the simple and consistent one of setting forth the surpassing magnitude of Christ's love for us. The power to comprehend that love in its utmost conceivable grandeur and its furthest-reaching relations is what Paul prays God to grant his Ephesians.

Ver. 19. γνῶσις τῶν ὑπερβαλλομένων τῆς γνώσεως ἡγέτη τοῖς Χριστοῖς: and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. Literally, "the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ". The gen. γνώσεως is due to the ὑπερβαλλομένων having the force of a comparative (cf. Aesch., Prom., 944; Hom., II. xxii.,
847; Bernhardy, Synt., iii., 48 a). That the Χριστός is the gen. subj., Christ's love to us, is made clear by the description of it as surpassing knowledge, which could not be said of our love to Him. The repetition of the same idea in contrasting senses in the γνώσει and the γνώσεως has its point not in any antithesis between theoretical or discursive knowledge (Ell.) and practical knowledge, or between false knowledge and true (Holz), or between human knowledge and divine (Chrys.), but in the simple fact that there is a real knowledge of Christ's love possible to us, a knowledge that is capable of increase as we are the more strengthened by power in the inner man, while a complete or exhaustive knowledge must ever remain beyond our capacity. This petition for the gift of a true and enlarging knowledge (a knowledge which is obviously not a matter of mere intellect but of conscious, personal experience) is connected with the former petition for spiritual comprehension by τε, and this is presented in the character, not of a climax, but of an adjunct, an additional statement in supplement of the former. The simple τε (as distinguished from τε . . . καὶ) occurs rarely in the Gospels, with greater comparative frequency in Hebrews, but oftener by far in Acts. It is used to connect single ideas in Greek poetry (seldom in Greek prose), and is occasionally so used in the NT (cf. Acts ii. 37, 40, xxvii. 4; and see Bernh., Synt., xx., 17). In this case it seems to indicate a "closer connection and affinity" than καὶ (cf. Blass, Gr. of N. T. Greek, p. 263).—οἵ τε πληρωμαί τοῦ Θεοῦ: that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God (or, into the whole fulness of God). The great Vatican Codex (followed by 17, 73, 116) has an interesting variety of reading here, viz., πληρωμα for πληρωμάτε, the εἰς being added. The latter gets a place in the margin of WH. On the difficult term πληρωμα see under i. 10 and especially i. 23 above. The interpretation of this clause is much disputed. The εἰς cannot mean with or in, as it is taken by some, but must = "into" or "unto," expressing the measure up to which the being filled is to take effect, the limit of the filling, or the goal it has before it. The AV and the other Old English Versions erroneously give "with"; except Wicl., who makes it "in," Cov., who renders "into," and Rhem., "unto." The Θεοῦ may be the gen. of originating cause, = the fulness bestowed by God, or, better, the poss. gen., = the fulness possessed by God. The main difficulty is the sense of the πληρωμα itself. Some explanations may be set aside as paraphrases rather than interpretations; e.g., that πληρωμα = the Church (Koppe, etc.); the gracious presence of God, the Divine Εδάφος, filling the people (Harl.); the perfection of God, in the sense of the highest moral ideal that can be presented to him "in whose heart Christ dwells" (Oltr.), etc. Nor can any good sense be legitimately got by taking it as = πληρωμα—is—"that ye may be filled with the gifts with which God is wont to furnish men" (Grot.)—an interpretation that cannot be adjusted to the εἰς. The choice lies between two views, viz., (1) that πληρωμα has its primary, pass. sense—the fulness that is in God, or with which God Himself is filled; or (2) that it is the sense derived from this, viz., fulness, copia, πλείως, πληθος. The latter is preferred by Meyer, who appeals to such passages as Song of Songs, v., 12; Rom. xv. 29; Eph. iv. 13, etc., in support of it, and understands it to convey the special idea of charismatic fulness as bestowed by God. So he renders it, "in order that ye may be filled with Divine gifts of grace to such extent that the whole fulness of them (πληρωμα has the emphasis) shall have passed over upon you". So also substantially De Wette, Abbott, and others, who refer to 2 Pet. i. 4. But there are weighty reasons on the other view with Alf., Ell., Haupt, etc. It gives πληρωμα the largest and profoundest sense, not restricting it to gifts of grace bestowed, but taking it to express the sum of the Divine perfections so substantially Chrys,
Rück., etc.), the whole δέ of excellence that is in God; cf. Chrysostom's δέντρα πληρωθεὶς πάσης δρατίς ἢ πλήρης ἐστὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. It brings the whole paragraph to a conclusion worthy of itself, lifting us to a conception which surpasses all that has preceded it, and carrying us from the great idea of the fulness in Christ to the still greater idea of the fulness in God. Nor is it any valid objection to it that what is thus put before us is what can never be attained in this life. It is an ideal, essentially the same as that contained in the injunction to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect (Matt. v. 48). This interpretation also is most in harmony with the great idea of the indwelling of Christ in our hearts, expressing indeed what is implied in that. In Christ the χάρις of God dwells; so far as Christ dwells in us the χάρις of God is in us. In that indwelling lies the possibility of our growing in moral excellence on to the very limit of all that is in God Himself. That they might be strengthened in the inner man so as to have Christ's living and abiding presence in them, and be lifted thereby to the comprehension of His love and the personal knowledge of that which yet surpasses all knowledge, and at last be filled with all spiritual excellence even up to the measure of the complete perfection that is in God Himself—this is the sweep of what Paul in his prayer desires for these Ephesians so late sunk in heathen hopelessness and godlessness.

Vv. 20-21. A fervent ascription of praise to God evoked by the thought of the great things which His grace has already wrought in these Gentiles, and the greater things of the future which the same gracedestines for them and would have them attain to.

Ver. 20. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῃ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιήσαι ὑπερεχθουσίου ἕν αἰτομέθα γινομεν: Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think. More exactly it = "able to do beyond all things, superabundantly beyond what we ask or think" (Ell.). The τῷ refers naturally to God, the main subject of the whole paragraph. The δέ has something of its proper adversative force, the contrast between the subjects of the Divine grace and the Divine Giver of the grace being to some extent in view. The doxology brings the whole preceding paragraph and the first main division of the Epistle to a fitting close. Its best parallel is in Rom. xvi. 25-27. The θεός cannot be taken as an adverb (Beng.), but governs the πάντα. The πάντα again is not to be connected with the ἔν as if = "all that we ask"; the gen. ἔν is due to the comparative in the ὑπερεχθουσίου, as in the previous case of the ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως. Further, the θεός πάντα does not belong to the δυναμένη, but makes one idea with the ποιήσαι. Thus we have two distinct descriptions of God here, the second of which explains and develops the thought of the first. He is described first generally in respect of the absoluteness of His power, as "able to do beyond all things," "able to do more than all," i.e., One to whose efficiency there is no limit; and then with more particular reference to the case of Paul and his fellow-believers, as able to do above measure beyond anything with which our asking or even our thinking is conversant; superabundantly beyond the utmost requests we can make in prayer, nay beyond all that can suggest itself to our minds in their highest ventures. The verb νοεῖν, here used of thinking of as distinguished from asking for, has two main lines of meaning, viz., to understand and to consider. The latter is in view here. The strong, cumulative ὑπερεχθουσίου occurs again in 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13. Such compounds with θεός (ὑπερβάλλω, ὑπερεχθοῦμαι, ὑπερφέρω, ὑπερπνέω, ἐνεργεῖον) are characteristic of Paul. They are not entirely limited to him (e.g., ὑπερεχθοῦσιν, Mark vii. 37; ὑπερέχουσαινοῦν, Luke vi. 38). But they are much more used by him
than by any other NT writer, occurring nearly thrice as often in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews as in all the other NT books (cf. Ell., in loc.). Such bold compounds are "in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which strives after adequate expression" (Mey.).—κατά τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἑμῖν: according to the power that worketh in us. The "power" in question is doubtless the inward operation of the Holy Spirit. The ἐν ἑμῖν has the force of an appeal to consciousness. The power that we know to be operative in ourselves is a witness to God's ability to do super-abundantly beyond what we ask or think. The efficient power of which we have experience in ourselves represents the measure and mode of the limitless capacity that is in God, and by the one we can conceive of the other and trust it. The ἐνεργομένη must be taken here not as pass., but as middle (cf. Gal. v. 6). In Col. i.29 we have the similar phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργομένην ἐν ἑμῖν ἐν δυνάμει. There it is used with reference to the Apostle's labour and striving at the time; here with reference to the possibilities of God's future dealings with his converts.

Ver. 21. ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀληθείας, στὸν Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν: unto Him be the glory in the Church in Christ Jesus (better, "and in Christ Jesus"). In the αὐτῷ the great Subject of the ascription is named the second time with rhetorical emphasis, and as it stands first in the sentence αὐτὸν (not αὐτός) is to be supplied. The article with ἐνδέκα defines it as the glory that is due to Him, or that befits Him. And that "glory" is to be given Him ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, the Church being the domain in which the praise that belongs to Him is to be rendered Him. The reading of the TR, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, is followed by some authorities as ḎKLP, Syr., Eth., Arm., Goth. It is rendered by some "in the Church which is in Christ Jesus". But there is no evident reason for defining the Church here specifically as in Christ; for it is the Christian Church that is obviously meant, and there is no need to distinguish it from the Church of Israel. Such a construction, too, distinguishing one Church from another, would have been clearer if τῷ had appeared before ἐν Χριστῷ, although the absence of the article is not fatal to it (cf. 1 Thess. i.1, etc.). Hence those who follow the TR take the τῷ as two distinct clauses, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, understanding them to mean that the praise which is given in the Church is praise given in Christ in virtue of her union with Him as her Head, or taking them to point first to the Church as "the outward domain in which God is to be praised" and then to Christ as the "spiritual sphere in which this ascription of praise is to take place" (Mey.), it being only in Christ that believer or Church can really praise God. There is, however, a small, but important addition made to the text by some of the oldest and best authorities, by the insertion of καὶ before the ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦν. The evidence is so strong (ḆNAC, 17, Vulg., Boh., etc.) that the καὶ can scarcely be refused, and it is accepted by LTTRWHV. So the sentence becomes "unto the Church and in Christ Jesus," and the idea is that praise is to be given to God and His glorious perfections shown forth both in the Church which is the body, and in Christ who is the Head—in the Church as chosen by Him, and in the Christ as given, raised, and exalted by Him. So Haupt, with a somewhat similar idea, understands the sense to be that the glorifying of God takes place in outward-wise in the circle of the Church and at the same time in such inward-wise that it is in Christ.

Furthermore, the use of the expression "unto all the generations of the age of the ages. Amen." Another of these reduplicated, cumulative expressions by
which the mind of man working with the ideas of time labours to convey the idea of the eternal. The formula may be, as was suggested by Grotius, a combination of two distinct phrases of similar meaning, one in which continuance, endless continuance, is expressed in terms of \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰών} \), \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον} \) (cf. e.g., Luke i. 50; 1 Cor. xii. 3, with LTRWHRV); and another in which the same idea is expressed in terms of \( \text{αἰών} \), \( \text{αἰῶνας} \) (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 26; 1 Cor. xi. 26, etc.). The peculiarity here is the conjunction of the two formulae and the use of the sing. \( \text{αἰὼν} \) in the latter; cf. (If \( \text{τοῦ αἰὼν} \), 3 Esdr. iv. 38; (If \( \text{οἱ τῶν αἰωνῶν} \), Dan. vii. 18; (If \( \text{τὸ αἰών} \) (οἱ αἰὼν), Heb. i. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 18). The precise idea underlying the phrase is not quite clear. It may be that the everlasting future is thought of as one long "age" embracing in it an unnumbered succession of "generations" and making the sum and crown of all possible "ages". Or the "age of the ages" may have the force of a superlative, "the age \( \text{par excellence} \)," the "age beside which there is none other to be named," and that regarded as containing in itself all conceivable "generations". More precisely, the idea of the Parousia may be behind all, the age (δ \( \text{αἰών} \)) being the Messianic age which opens with the Parousia, brings all other "ages" with the "generations" belonging to them to an end, and is itself to endure for ever. Thus the "age of the ages" may be regarded as expressing the idea that the glory to be given to God in the Church and in Christ its Head is to endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰών} \) —consequently to last not merely \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰών} \), but also \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰώνιον} \). The \( \text{εἰς τὸ αἰών} \), which occurs so frequently in our Lord's discourses at the beginning of an affirmation, is used here, as so often in the OT, at the close of the sentence in the sense of \( \text{so be it} \) (LXX, \( \gammaέρον\); cf. Num. v. 22, etc.). It was the people's assent in OT times to declarations made at solemn assemblies (Deut. xxvii. 15; Neh. vi. 3, viii. 6, etc.). It was also their response to the prayers offered in the synagogue, and from 1 Cor. xiv. 16 we gather that this use of the word was continued in the Christian Church.

**Chapter IV. Vv. 1-16.** With the fourth chapter begins the second main division of the Epistle. As in others of Paul's Epistles the doctrinal statement is followed by the practical enforcement of duty. Doctrinal considerations are at the same time introduced again from point to point in support of the duties enjoined. The hortatory section commences with the earnest recommendation of a life in conformity with the Christian vocation, with special reference to the need of humility, loving consideration and unity.

**Ver. 1.** \( \text{παρακαλῶ ὦν ὄμης ἐγὼ} \) δ \( \text{θεομος ἐν κυρίῳ} \). I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech (or, exhort) you.

In more exact accordance with the order of the words—"I beseech you, therefore, I the prisoner in the Lord". The \( \text{οὖν} \) connects the practical charge with the preceding statement of doctrine and privilege, and establishes the one upon the other. The connection is taken by some to be with the statement just made in iii. 21 regarding the Church (Mey.). A reference of a larger scope, however, seems more in harmony with the contents of the paragraph. It is best, therefore, to understand the \( \text{οὖν} \) as basing the exhortations which follow on the whole preceding statement of the great things done for the readers by God's grace—from chap. iii. 6 onwards. The verb \( \text{παρακαλῶ} \) is rendered "beseech" by Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., AV, RV, while the Genevan gives "pray". But in Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish., it is "exhort", and this is the more probable shade of meaning here in view of the context (Alf., Ell.). In classical Greek the dominant idea of the verb, except when it is used with reference to the gods, is that of \( \text{admonishing or exhorting} \). In later Greek and in the NT the idea of "exhorting" has its place along
with the other. For the force of the article in δέκιος and the anaethrous ἐκ Κυρίου, see under iii. 3 above. The ἐν Ἰησοῦ is not to the ἐν εἰρήνῃ (Semler), but to the δέκιος. It expresses the sphere within which his captivity subsisted or the ground of that captivity. He was a prisoner because of his connection with Christ, the Lord, and for no other reason. As in chapter iii., so here the dignity of his office seems to lie behind the mention of his imprisonment. He designates himself "the prisoner in the Lord" not with a view to stir the sympathy of the readers and enforce his exhortation by an appeal to feeling, but as one who could rejoice in his sufferings and speak of his tribulations as their "glory" (iii. 13; Gal. vi. 17).—δέκιος παρατηρηθηκε τῆς κλησίματος ἣς ἐκλήθη: to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called. As the phrase καλῶν κλησίματος occurs (cf. 2 Tim. i. 9, and, with ἐν, 1 Cor. vii. 20), the ἤς may be by attraction for ὑς. As that, however, is a doubter while his translation of the law was thought to be attraction, and as the formula κλησίματος καλῶν is found in Arrian, Epict., p. 122, it is to be explained rather as = ὑς (cf. i. 6; 2 Cor. i. 4; and Win.-Moult., p. 202). With the δέκιος τῆς κλησίματος cf. πολιτεύεσθαι δέκιον τοῦ εὐγενείου, Phil. i. 27; περικλητὴς τῆς κλησίματος (καλοστασίος), 1 Thess. ii. 12; περικλητὴς δέκιον τοῦ Κυρίου, Col. i. 10.

Ver. 2. μετὰ πάσης τακτευοφορούσης καὶ προφήτητος: with all lowliness and meekness. Statement of moral dispositions which should attend their walk; μεταπαραγόνωσθαι τῆς idea of accompanying, relation, association, while such suggests closer conjunction, fellowship, especially a fellowship which helps. Krüger (Sprachl., § 68, 13, 1) puts the distinction thus—"σὺν τινι denotes rather coherence, μετὰ τινος rather coexistence" (cf. Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 489). As in the case of ἀμάρτησα (i. 8), ἀμαρτία τακτευοφορούσης can mean only "all lowliness," "all possible lowliness," or "every kind of lowliness," not summa humilitas. The word τακτευοφορούσης is of very rare occurrence in non-biblical Greek, and when it does occur it has the sense of pusillanimity (Epictet., Disc., 3, 24, 56; Joseph., Jewish Wars, iv., 9, 2). It is not used in the OT; but in the NT it denotes one of the passive graces, unrecognised or repudiated in Graeco-Roman ethics, which Christianity has glorified—the lowliness of mind which springs from a true estimation of the dignity of his office—a deeper sense of our own moral smallness and demerit (cf. Acts xx. 19; Phil. ii. 3; Col. iii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 5; Col. ii. 18, 23, of a false humility). προφήτης, or better προφάτης (TTrWH Προφήτης, or better Προφάτης (2 Cor. vi. 6); cf. Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 26 (who regards the form πρφατος as apparently "unknown to the language of the NT"); and Blasi, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 7 (who thinks there is not sufficient evidence to decide between προφάτης Προφήτης, etc means more than modestia, masnustudo, ἀταξία, gentleness, or equanimitas, insomuch as it has regard to our attitude towards God as well as towards men, and includes more than outward behaviour or natural disposition. It is a grace of the Spirit, the disposition of loving submissiveness in the first place to God and His dealings with us, and, as the consequence of that, of quiet restraint, mildness and patient abnegation of self in face of the provocations of others. It is a moral quality, therefore, with a far wider scope, a larger significance, a deeper and more vital relation than was thought of by the philosophers and moralists of the old world, who regarded it only as the opposite of ἀρρήτης, savageness (Plato, Symp., 197 d), ἀλληλομορφία, harshness (Arist., Hist. Anim., ix., 1), or ἀποτομία, roughness (Plut., De lib. ed., 18); cf. Trench, Syn., pp. 193, etc.; Schmidt, Synon., p. 98, 2—μετὰ μακρυθυμίας: with long-suffering. This is best taken as an independent clause, which is developed in the following sentence. Some (Theod., Beng., etc.) attach both the μετὰ πάσης τακτευοφορούσης καὶ προφήτητος, and the μετὰ μακρυθυμίας, to the ἀναγάφημα clause. But this gives one long sentence, which obscures the transition from idea to idea and makes the several clauses less distinctive. Others (Calv., Harl., Rück., Ols., etc.) attach both the παρατηρηθηκε τῆς κλησίματος and the ἀναγάφημα; but to make it part of that clause takes from the point of the μακρυθυμία and disturbs the balance of the clauses, in which we have first the general idea of worthiness of walk, then certain particulars involved in that, and then the further explanation (in the ἀναγάφημα clause) of these various particulars or of the one last noticed. The term μακρυθυμία means both endurance or constancy in presence of illness and trouble (Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Heb. vi. 12; James v. 10), and, as here (cf. also Rom. ii. 4, ix. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 6, etc.), the abnegation of revenge in presence of wrong—the opposite of ὀργή (Prov. xvi. 32), ἀναγάφημα (James i. 19), etc., and akin to ἀναγάφημα (2 Cor. vi. 4, 6; Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; James v.
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ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

tiourophioumen kal 'pragmatos,1 metà 'makrobdymias, 1dänexhmerous i: Cor. iv. 21 ref.;
aallhlon en ángh, 3. = stoudádonvestes 'tirien tõn 'dýntita tõn Pa. xlv.
pneumatov en tõn 'sýndemwmos tõn eléýntos.2 4. = òn tõma kal 'òn òn Rom. ii. 4

James v. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Prov. xv. 15; 1 Term. and constr., Matt. xvii. 17;
6 Acta xvii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Col. iii. 13 Paul; Isa. xxxii. 15.
7 Gal. ii. 10; 1 Thees. ii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 10, 15, iii. 14; Isa. xxi. 3.
8 = 1 Cor. xvii. 37; 2 Cor. xii. 9; 1 Thes. v. 23 al.; James i. 27 al.
9 Ver. 13 only.
10, 11. The word belongs to later Greek (Plut., Macc., etc.), and the LXX;
in neither has it the exact sense it gets in the NT.—dänexheros ai aallhlon en ángh forbearing one another in love, displays an eleemosynary of the makrobdymia. By a natural and familiar irregularity which gives effect to the logic of the statement rather than to the construction the partic. reverts from the acc. to the nom. (cf. Col. i. 10; Krüger, Sprachl., § 56, 9, 4). To attach en ángh (Orig., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) to the following stoudádonvestes is to make the dänexhmeros abrupt and bare, and to disturb the harmonious form of the participial sentences. The duty of mutual forbearance is to be practised in love. It was to be a loving forbearance—a forbearance having its motive, its inspiration, its life, in love.

Ver. 3. stoudádonvestes 'tirien tõn 'dýntita tõn pneumatov: giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit. Further description of the mutual forbearance in respect of the inward effort required, but introductory to the larger, fundamental idea of unity, stoudádonvestes, which conveys the idea of exertion, is better rendered "giving diligence" (RV) or "earnestly striving" (Alf.), than "endeavouring" (AV). 'Tirien = keep, in the sense of maintaining with watchful care; suggesting also that what is to be kept is something already in our possession. Tò pneumatov is the gen. of originating cause, = the unity which the Spirit produces or works, and here the oneness in feeling, interest and purpose which is appropriate to the oneness in doctrine and privilege whereof the readers are immediate participants, even of the rank of Calvin, have interpreted the pneumatov here as the human spirit, the Christian spirit of concord; while others (De Wette, etc.) have taken it to denote the spirit of the Christian community. But the en pneumatov of the following verse, the general NT doctrine of the Spirit of God as operating in the believer and in the Church (cf. ii. 22), and the analogy of such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 13, point clearly to the Holy Spirit.—en to sýndemwmos the bond of peace. This is not to be attached to the next verse (Lach.), a connection which would again disturb the symmetry of the participial sentences and rob some of the statements which follow of their appropriateness. It defines the way in which the unity is to be kept.

Ver. 4. òn tõma kal 'òn tõma: There is one body and one Spirit. This is not to be taken as part of the exhortation, kata or ýlwcwrit beting understood (Calv., Est., Hofm., etc.); for that would not be consistent with the following eis Képws, eis Ódés. It is a positive statement, made all the more impressive by the lack of yap or any connecting particle, and giving the objective ground, or basis in fact, on which the walk in lowliness, meekness, long-suffering and loving forbearance is urged, and of which it should be the result. The òn tõma is the whole fellowship of believers, the mystical body of Christ (cf. ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13; 1 Col.
The Πνεῦμα, as in ii. 18, is the Holy Spirit who is in the Church and in whom we are “baptised into one body” (1 Cor. xii. 13). The idea that this great sentence means only that we are to be united so as to be one body and one soul, though supported by Calvin, is out of harmony with the larger scope of the following verses, and in any case stands or falls with the view that this verse is part of the exhortation.—καθὼς καὶ εἰσεληφθή 

even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling. καθὼς (late Greek for the ἐκαθορίσα, καθαιρεῖ, καθαρίσθεν of the Atticists and the earlier writers; cf. under i. 4, iii. 3 above) illustrates and enforces the unity as something entirely in accordance with their calling, the καθὼς marking this as a second thought suggested by the first. The εἰσεληφθή may be instrumental (so Mey., referring to Gal. i. 6), the point then being that the calling came by means of one hope, viz., that of the Messianic salvation. But it is rather = εἰς, expressing the ethical domain or element in which the calling took place (Ell.). The καθὼς is the gen. of origin or efficient cause, = the hope originated or wrought in you by your calling, as in i. 18 (Ell., Mey.); rather than the gen. of possess., = the hope belonging to your calling. The fact that, when they were called out of heathenism, one and the same hope was born in them, is a fact in perfect keeping with the unity of the Christian body and the unity of the Divine Spirit operating in it, and the one confirms and illumines the other.

Ver. 5. εἷς Κύριος, μια πίστις, εἷς βάπτισμα: one Lord, one faith, one baptism. “One Lord,” that is Christ, He alone and He for all equally whether Gentile or Jew. “One faith,” i.e., one belief having Him as its object; πίστις having here its usual subjective sense of saving trust, not = that which is believed, the Christian doctrine or creed (Grot.)—a meaning which is at the best very rare in the NT and not quite certain even in most of the passages usually cited in support of it (Acts vi. 7; Gal. i. 23; Tit. i. 4, 19, ii. 7, iv. 1, 6, v. 8, vi. 10, 21), but most probable in Jude iii. 20. “One baptism”—the rite, one and the same for all, by which believers in Christ are admitted into the fellowship of His Church, and which is described as “into Christ” (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27), into His name (Acts x. 38, 48, xix. 5), into the “name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. xxviii. 19). No mention is made of the Lord’s Supper. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that elsewhere it is referred to as a token of unity (1 Cor. x. 17). Various explanations of the omission have been given—e.g., the desire to preserve the rhythmical form of the sentence, together with the fact that the Lord’s Supper did not as yet stand by itself, but was combined with ordinary Christian meals (Mey.); the fact that it was more a representation than a condition of unity (De Wette); the consideration that it is not like baptism an initial, fundamental rite, but one that comes to be observed after admission (Harl.). None of these reasons can be called satisfactory, nor have we the materials for an adequate explanation.

Ver. 6. εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων: one God and Father of all. This supreme name, Θεὸς or ὁ Θεὸς, is used both absolutely (1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Jas. i. 27), and with defining terms, e.g., τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, i. x. (Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3), ἡμῶν (Gal. i. 4; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. iii. 11, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 16), πατέρων (here; cf. the Lord’s Divine Fatherhood in the o ο Θεὸς εἶμι τὰ πάντα, 1 Cor. viii. 6). Christian unity being here in view, the name applies to the special Fatherhood of God in grace, not (with Holz., Abb.) to the universal Fatherhood of God and His relation to all men. Attention is rightly called by Mey. and others to the advance in the thought in these verses from Church to Christ, and from Christ to God who is One in the highest and most absolute sense—the one source of life and good in all His people, the one to whom both Christ and the Spirit are related, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ κατὰ πάντα ὁ ἡμῶν: who is over all, and through all, and in [you] all. The ο Θεὸς of the TR (following some cursives and
The passage discusses the Trinity and the grace given to each individual. It explains that God is the Father, sovereign over all, with each individual given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. The text references various biblical verses to support its arguments.

The text is a study of the relationships and the grace given to each individual, highlighting the sovereign nature of God and the individual's role in maintaining unity and peace.
ustify the assertion that the passage is a quotation from some Christian hymn, and not from Scripture. There is nothing in the verse or in the context to suggest anything else than the Psalm. The question is raised whether the introductory λέγει is personal or impersonal; and whether, if personal, ὁ Θεός, or ὁ γραφή, or τὸ πνεῦμα is to be understood. OT quotations are usually introduced by the personal term in such forms as δὲ τρεπόμενος λέγει (Acts ii. 17), ὁ γραφή λέγει (Rom. x. 17), ἡγεῖται λέγει (Rom. x. 16), νοεῖται λέγει (Rom. x. 19), Διαβάζει λέγει (Rom. iv. 6), ἡ διὰ πίστεως δικαίωσιν λέγει (Rom. x. 6). Sometimes, again, passive forms are used, γέγραπται (Rom. x. 15), μαρτυρεῖται (Heb. vii. 17), etc. In other cases the simple ὁμιλεῖ (1 Cor. viii. 11), αἰτεῖ (Heb. iv. 4), or λέγει (Gal. iii. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Eph. v. 8; v. 14) is used; and in one case the λέγει is introduced as continuing γέγραπται (Rom. xv. 10). Some, therefore, hold that, in cases like the present, λέγει is impersonal, " it is said," as ὁμιλεῖ is usually (cf. Light. on Gal. iii. 16). As the NT, however, makes a very limited use of impersonal verbs of any kind, most take these undefined verbs by which quotations are introduced as personal, and so it is with λέγει here. The subject to be supplied must be the one most readily suggested by the context; and here, as in most cases, that will be neither ὁ γραφή nor τὸ πνεῦμα, but ὁ Θεός. The full formula λέγει ὁ Θεός occurs in Acts ii. 17, and is implied in the παλιν τινα δρέα υμαν, " Ἰησοῦν," ἐν Δαυίδ λέγει of Heb. iv. 7. It is also confirmed in some degree by the analogous mention of the Holy Ghost in Heb. x. 15 (cf. Win.-Moults., p. 566; Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 75).— ἄναβας εἰς ὄζωσ: when He ascended on high. In the Psalm the victorious Subject is addressed in the second person; here the "Thou" becomes "He". In the Psalm the ascension expressed by ΛΟΝ (=" Thou hast gone up to the height") is the triumphant ascent of the God of Israel to Zion, the place of His earthly rest, or (better) to heaven His proper habitation, after the victorious entry for His people. Here it is the ascension of Christ to the right hand of God (cf. Acts ii. 33). The aor. part. has its most proper temporal once, denoting something that preceded the main event in view. It means here, therefore, that Christ's ascension had taken place before He distributed the gifts of grace.— φυλάττων τοὺς φυλαττόντων: He made captives captives. In the original ἀλληλολατρεύοντος αὐχειμαλατεύοντος: He led captivity captive. In the original, the abstract αὐχειμαλατεύοντος = " a body of captives") chosen according to a familiar usage (cf. Num. xxxi. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 11; see Win.-Moults., p. 283), instead of the concrete αὐχειμαλατεύοντος (" captives "), adds to the force of the sentence. The verb αὐχειμαλατεύοντος belongs to late Greek; it is pretty freely used in the LXX and the Apocrypha. The phrase is a general one, nothing more than that He made captives (cf. Judges vi. 12), and suggesting nothing as to who these captives were. Neither in the Psalm nor in Paul's use of it here is there anything to warrant the idea that the captives are the enemies of Christ; just as in the Psalm they are the enemies of Israel and Israel's God. But these are left quite undefined, and the whole idea of the clause is subordinate to that next expressed, viz., the giving of the gifts.— καὶ ἐδωκε δῶματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις: and gave gifts unto men. The καὶ of the TR is found in BCW'D5, etc.; but is omitted in AC5D5G, etc. It is put in brackets by WH, and omitted by LT, but retained (on the whole rightly) by RV. Here the quotation diverges widely, both from the original Hebrew, which has ἔδωκεν ἀνθρώποις, and from the LXX which renders it ἐδωκε δῶματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις. The idea in the Psalm is that of Jehovah, the Conqueror, receiving gifts, that is to say, gifts of homage; or, possibly, receiving the captured men themselves regarded as gifts or offerings, the δῶματα being capable of that sense (cf. Ewald, Aus. Lehrb. d. Hebr. Sprache, § 289 h). The idea expressed here is that of the ascended Christ giving gifts to men: δῶματα being substituted for δῶματα, and τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.—Thus in order to suit the purpose of a testimony to the statement made regarding Christ and the gift of grace, the OT passage is materially changed. OT quotations introduced in the NT are given without much regard to the literal faithfulness with which
quotations are expected to be made in modern times; and in other passages made use of by Paul (e.g., Rom. x. 6-10) we discover a remarkable liberty both in reproduction and in application. But in none is the change so great as in the present case. There is first the departure from the historical meaning of the Psalm; in which, however, this passage stands by no means alone. The Psalm in which this magnificent description of the victorious march of Israel's God occurs, celebrates the establishment of Jehovah's kingdom in the past and proclaims the certainty of its triumph over all enemies and in all nations in the future. It does this in connection with some great event in the history of Israel. All possible opinions have been expressed as to the particular occasion of the Psalm. It has been identified with the removal of the Ark to Zion in David's time (2 Sam. vi. 12, etc.; 1 Chron. xv.); with some unnamed victory of David or with David's victories generally; with the placing of the Ark in Solomon's Temple; with the victory of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram over Moab (2 Kings iii.; Hitzig); with the check given to the Assyrians in Hezekiah's time; with the consecration of the Temple of the Restoration (Ewald); with the opening of the Temple of the Restoration (Hupfeld); with the return from the captivity (cf. the passage in the LXX); with the struggle between Egypt and Syria for the possession of the Holy Land towards the close of the third century B.c.; with the victories of Jonathan or Simon in the Maccabean wars (Olah.); with the struggle between Ptolemy Philometor and Alexander Balas (1 Macc. xiv.), etc. But all this uncertainty as to the particular date and occasion does not affect the fact that what is dealt with is some great passage in the history of the Jewish nation. The probabilities are that the Psalm belongs to the latter part of the Babylonian exile; but Paul goes by the actual historical intention of the words and puts on them a quite different sense. There is, secondly, the notable change from Jehovah receiving gifts to Christ giving gifts. Some have explained this by supposing that Paul followed a Hebrew text which read ἐνανθρώπους, or some such form, instead of ἀνθρώπους; but of this there is no evidence. It is possible, indeed, that the Apostle adopted a traditional version or interpretation of the passage which was familiar, and of which some indication is found in the Peshitta Syriac and the Chaldee Paraphrase (both having a rendering = "Thou didst give gifts to the children of men"). Something also may be said in support of the explanation that the ἀνθρώπους of the original, which is used elsewhere in the sense of fetching or taking in order to give (Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 13, xlii. 16, xlvii. 9, etc.), has that meaning here. But after all such explanations the fact remains that both the terms and the idea are changed. There is thirdly the Messianic interpretation. It is here that the justification of the change is found. The Psalm, there is good reason to believe, had been regarded as a Messianic Psalm; and the use made of it by Paul was in all probability in accordance with views of Messianic prophecy which had become current, and with a method of dealing with the OT which was generally understood. But in any case it is an application rather than an interpretation in the strict sense of the word that we have here. And the justification of such an application lies in the fact that the unknown event celebrated in the Psalm was a victory of the Theocratic King, and in that sense a part of that triumph of the Kingdom of God which was to be carried to its consummation by the Messiah.

Ver. 9. Τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπους, ἐκκένωσεν τῷ μὴ σὺν κατὰβι βο tob. Now this, "He ascended," what is it but that He also
descended [first]? The TR inserts ἐπεφέρα, with NK̄C̄K̄L̄P̄, most cursives, Syr., Vulg., Goth., Arm., etc. The omission of ἐπεφέρα is supported by ἐπεφέρα, 17, Boh., Sah., Eth., etc. The documentary evidence is pretty fairly balanced. The preponderance, however, on the whole, is on the side of the omission, especially in view of transcriptional probabilities. The word is deleted by LTTr; while WH and RV give it a place in the margin. The Ἐ has its usual transitional force, but with something added. It continues the thought, but does that in the form of an explanation or application; cf. Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 3; see also Butt., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 303; Winer.-Moul., p. 553. What the precise point of the quotation is, and what the explanation amounts to which is thus introduced, are questions of no small difficulty. The answer will appear when the particular terms have been examined. The clause τὸ ἔδρα του, ἔδρασι not to be taken as if Paul were limiting Himself to a play upon the word. What follows shows that he had in view the historical fact expressed in the ἀναβο, viz., the Ascension. As in Matt. ix. 3; John x. 6, xvi. 17, the ἔδρα has the force of—What does it mean? What is implied in the statement? And the reply given by Paul in ἔδρα, κατέβα, is that the ascent presupposes a previous descent. This of course is not given as an inference of universal application, but as one that holds good in the case in view, and one which gives Paul the warrant to use the quotation as he does. In the Psalm it was Jehovah that ascended, but that was only after He had first descended to earth in behalf of His people from His proper habitation in heaven. And so the Giver of gifts to whom Paul desires to direct his readers was One who had first come down to this earth. It was the belief of those whom Paul addressed (cf. the express statement in John i. 13) that Christ's proper abode was in heaven. That belief is here taken for granted, and the conclusion consequently is drawn that the Giver who descended is Christ.—ἐλαττομάς ἐδένυε: into the lower parts of the earth. The locality or the extent of the descent is now defined. The question is whether the locality in view is this world as a scene of existence lower than heaven, or the under world as a deeper depth than earth itself. Does the sentence refer to Christ's incarnation and the subjection to which He humbled Himself on earth even unto death? Or does it point to His descent to Hades? And if the latter is the case, in what aspect and with what particular significance is His visit to the world of the dead presented? On these questions there has been and there continues to be great diversity of opinion. Both interpretations have large support. That the "lower parts of the earth" mean simply earth itself in distinction from heaven is the view of Calv., Grot., Mich., Winer, Harl., Thom., Reiche, de Wette, Hofm., Beyschlag, Schweitzer, Weiss, Pfeil., Bissing, Abb., Haupt and others. That they mean Hades is the view favoured by the Copt. and Eth. Versions, and by such interpreters as Iren., Tertull., Jer., Erasm., Estius, Beng., Rücks., Olah., Del., Bleek, Mey., Alf., Ell. (on the whole), etc. Those who adopt this latter view, however, are not wholly at one. The great majority indeed, especially among Patristic and Lutheran exegetes, understand Paul to affirm that Christ after His death made a manifestation of Himself in triumph to the world of the departed and fulfilled a certain ministry there. That ministry is understood by some, especially among the Fathers, to have been concerned with the release of the souls of OT saints from the Limbus Patri- rim; by others, especially among certain classes of modern commentators, to have been a new proclamation of grace to the whole world of the departed or to certain sections of the dead; cf. Pearson on the Creed, sub Art. v.; Salmond's Christian Doctrine of Immortality, p. 421, etc. But there are those, especially Calvinistic theologians, who take the writer to mean nothing more, if he refers to Hades at all, than that like other men Christ passed at death into the world of the departed and had experience there of the power of death for a time. Some (e.g., Chrys., Theod., Oec.) are of opinion that the phrase afore He ascended refers to His resurrection, and not to His descent of Christ, but do not press it beyond that. On the other hand, there are those (e.g., Von Soden, Abb.) who take the descent to be to earth and not to Hades, but instead of identifying it with the incarnation regard it as subsequent to the ascen- sion. What then is the most reasonable interpretation? It must be said in the first place that neither grammar nor textual criticism gives a decisive answer. The τὸ γῆς γῆς may be taken equally well as the appos. gen., = "the lower parts which are or mark the earth"; the first gen., = "the lower parts belonging to earth," Hades being conceived to be part of the earth, but its lower part; or the comp. gen., =
the comparative idea is not more pertinent to the one main line of interpretation than to the other. The κατώτερα may mean the parts lower than the earth itself, i.e., Hades; but it may also mean the parts lower than heaven, i.e., the earth. Nor does the variety in reading affect the sense, though much has been made of it. The word μην is inserted after κατώτερα by B, P, D, K, L, P, Syr.-P., Boh., Vulg., Arm., Chrys., etc. It is omitted by D*G, Goth., Eth., Iren., etc. It must be held, therefore, to belong to the text. But it is not inconsistent with either interpretation. The main arguments in favour of Hades being in view are these; that if earth were meant, it is difficult to understand why some simpler form such as εἰς τὴν γῆν or εἰς τὴν γῆν κατά (Acts ii. 19) was not chosen; that the use of so singular a phrase as τὰ κατώτερα, which recalls the LXX rendering for ἥν τὴν ἔρημον, one of the OT expressions for the underworld, suggests at once that something lower than earth itself, a yet deeper depth, was intended (Mey.); that the accompanying phrases ὑπεράνων πάνων τῶν ὀφράνων and ἐνα πλαγία τὰ πάντα, being expressions of largest extension, make it reasonable to give the widest possible sense also to the κατώτερα; and that justice is done to the peculiarity and the amplitude of the various expressions only by taking Paul’s idea to be that as Christ rose in order to fill the whole world, He had first to pass in His victorious power through all the great divisions of the universe—heaven above, earth beneath, and even the subterranean world, in the assertion of His universal sovereignty. But there is much to be said on the other side. The superlative formula τὰ κατώτερα would have been more in point if the idea to be expressed had been that of a descent, and even a deeper descent (Abb.), or that of a descent embracing all the several parts of the universe. In point of fact, too, it is not τὰ κατώτερα, but τὰ κατώτατα, that the LXX employs in reproducing the Hebrew יֵלַה.

If Hades had been intended, it is strange that Paul did not select one or other of the more familiar and quite unambiguous phrases which are used elsewhere, e.g., ἐν τῷ ἔδαφῳ (Matt. xi. 23), εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος (Acts ii. 27), or such a formula as εἰς τὴν κορώνιν τῆς γῆς (Matt. xii. 40). It is also to be considered that, granting it is the Ascension and not merely the Resurrection of Christ that is expressed by the ἀνάβης, it was not from Hades, but from earth that He did ascend. Further, the point immediately in view is not any work that Christ did in the world and its several parts, but the identity of the Person who descended, and ascended, and gave gifts. This is made sufficiently clear by the repeated αὐτῷ (vv. 10, 11), and the idea of a Hades-visit or a Hades-ministry has no obvious relation to that. The great paragraph in Phil. ii. 5-10, which is in some sense a parallel, has also to be taken into account. There again the whole statement turns upon the two great ideas of the incarnation with the humiliation involved in it and the exaltation, and nothing is said about any visit of Christ to the underworld. Here, too, the whole idea of a descent to Hades appears to be foreign to the thought. It is not suggested by the passage in the Psalm; for there is not a word about Sheol in it. Neither is there any indication of it in the context in the Epistle. For there the bestowal of gifts is referred not to Christ’s descent, but to His ascension, and no hint is given of any work done by Him in Hades with a view to that bestowal, or of any relation in which the world of the dead stands to His prerogative of giving. For these reasons we conclude that the phrase τὰ κατώτερα μην τῆς γῆς means the earth as a scene of existence, lower than Christ’s native heavens, to which Christ descended.
The view not only ascended but also descended. Hence what is in the writer's mind here is held not to be the incarnation or humiliation of the pre-existent Christ, but the descent of the exalted Christ to His Church, supposed to be referred to also in such passages as ii. 17, iii. 17, v. 31, 32. But it is nowhere taught that the Pauline Epistles that a descent or a departure from heaven after the exaltation was necessary in order that the ascended Lord might bestow gifts upon His Church. The passages cited do not bear out any such idea. The first (ii. 17) does not refer to a coming of the glorified Christ; the second (iii. 17) speaks only of the spiritual presence of Christ in the heart; and the third (v. 31, 32) deals obviously with a "mystery" of relations, and has nothing to do with any coming of Christ out of heaven following on His ascension or required for the bestowal of His gifts. Nor is there anything to suggest that the ubiquity of Christ's body is in view, as some Lutherans have argued (Hunn., Calov., etc.). The idea that is in the paragraph is not that of a "diffused and ubiquitous corporeity," as Ellicott well expresses it, but that of a "pervading and energising omnipresence". The thought is the larger one that the object of Christ's ascension was that He might enter into regal relation with the whole world and in that position and prerogative bestow His gifts as He willed and as they were needed. He was exalted in order that He might take kingly sway, fill the universe with His activity as its Sovereign and Governor, and His Church with His presence as its Head, and provide His people with all needful grace and gifts. In OT prophecy to "fill heaven and earth" is the note of Deity (Jer. xxiii. 24).—We may be in a position now to determine Paul's object in introducing the passage from Ps. lxviii. and in applying it as he does. The general connection is clear enough. He bids his readers study lowliness, forbearance and unity, because there is one faith, one baptism, etc. They are not to be vexed or divided because one may have more of the gift of grace than another. All receive from Christ, each in his own way and measure as Christ wills; for, as the Psalm shows, all gifts come from Him. Now some take the point of the quotation to be this—He who is the subject of the Psalm is One whose seat is in heaven, a Sovereign Giver of gifts (Ell.). Others are of opinion that the words are cited in order to bring out the fact that Christ's bestowal of gifts stands in necessary connection with His general position of...
filling the whole universe” (Mey.). But the case appears to be less involved than that, and to turn simply on the identification of the Person who is the source of the gifts. Paul has spoken of the grace as given (ἐδόθη, ver. 7), and he has quoted the words of the Psalm which say that “he gave gifts” (ἐδωκεν δώματα, ver. 8). But he has not named the Giver. Now he explains that the Giver is Christ; and that this is indicated by the Psalm itself, because it sings of One who went up on high, and of an ascent which presupposed a previous descent. Thus he identifies the subject of the Psalm with Christ; as elsewhere the Jehovah of the Prophets and the Psalms is identified with the Christ of the Apostles, and what is affirmed of the former in the OT is ascribed to the latter in the NT.

Ver. 11. καὶ ἀπόστολοι οὗτοι μὲν ἀποστόλους: ὁ δὲ ἔδωκεν ἀπόστολους. That is, “He gave some apostles,” or (with RV) “some to be apostles”. At this point Paul reverts to the statement in ver. 7, and having shown that the declaration in Ps. lxviii. applies to Christ, he proceeds to set forth the purpose (ver. 12) with which the gifts of the exalted Giver are bestowed and His grace given to such. But before he explains that purpose he specifies a series of gifts given with that in view. We have a somewhat similar enumeration in 1 Cor. xii. 28. But while the ruling idea there is that of appointments (στοιχεία) and the subject is God, here the particular idea is that of gifts (δώματα) and the subject is Christ. Further, while the list in Ephesians begins with Apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, and continues in terms of persons, the statement in 1 Cor. takes note indeed of Apostles, prophets, and teachers, but thereafter passes from persons to gifts or ministries—miracles, healings, helps, governments, tongues. This has its significance, as we shall see. The ἀπόστολοι is again emphatic, = “he himself” “he and no other”. The δώματα is not to be taken as = δόμος, appointed or set. That it has proper sense of gave is clear from its relation to the preceding δώματα. The “giving” refers to the call of the Church’s Head, the point being the gift of Christ to the Church in the form of certain men chosen by Him and equipped by Him to do service toward the building up of His body and the bringing of all its members to the measure of the stature of His fulness. Further, the exhortation to unity (ver. 3) is still in view, Christ having given these “Apostles” and others in order that all His disciples may come to the unity of the faith (ver. 13). All through the statement, too, the primary thing is the persons, not the offices. Nothing is said of any special order or orders in the Church possessing exceptional prerogatives, or any office or rank to which peculiar or exclusive powers of grace were attached. The men are Christ’s gifts to the Church and to every member of it; and they are given to do a certain work looking to a great end, viz., to furnish His people and every individual believer among them (vv. 7, 16) for their particular service and their particular contribution to the building up of Christ’s body. Nothing is said of the time when these gifts were given. But as they are the gifts of the exalted Christ, it is plain that the ἀποστόλους are not to be restricted to the original Twelve, but are to be taken in the wider sense, including not only Paul, but Barnabas (Acts xv. 4, 14), James (1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19), Silvanus (1 Thess. ii. 6), perhaps also Andronicus and Junia (Rom. xvi. 7). The “Apostle” is described as one called by Christ (Gal. i. 1); one who has seen Christ and been a witness of His resurrection (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Acts i. 8, 21-23); one whose “signs” were “wrought ... by signs, and wonders, and mighty works” (2 Cor. xii. 12); whose office also was not limited to a single church or locality, but was related to the world generally and to all the churches (Matt. xxviii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 28). See also on chap. i. 1.—τοὺς δὲ προφητεῖς: and some as prophets. These are referred to along with the Apostles also in ii. 20, iii. 5, and in 1 Cor. xii. 28. With NT prophets we have also NT prophetesses. Agabus, those of Antioch Judas and Silas, the four daughters of Philip, are mentioned as having the gift of prophecy. As in the case of Agabus

1 Omit τῶν i. 109, 114, 121, 178.
IV.

This gift of prophecy included the prediction of events (Acts xi. 28, xxi. 10), but its chief function was edification. The prophets were preachers or exhorters, to whom revelations of spiritual truth were imparted, and who spoke in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι; Eph. iii. 5; Apoc. i. 10), but not in ecstasy or as one in a trance (ἐν ἐκστασὶν, Acts x. 10, xxii. 17). Further, he was usually, if not always, itinerant. Thus he was prepared to have a place in the Church for a considerable period. Large mention is made of it in the Didache, and in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., v., 17, reference is made to Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia. This may take the order on to Hadrian's time; cf. Selwyn, The Christian Prophets, and Gwatkin's article in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, iv., p. 127. See also on ii. 20 above.—τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστὰς: and some as evangelists. In 1 Cor. xii. 28 the evangelist is not mentioned. Here he is distinguished from the Apostle and the prophet and named as the third in the order of Christ's gifts to the Church. The εὐαγγελιστὴς is mentioned only twice again in the NT, viz., in Acts xxii. 8, where Philip, one of the seven deacons is so designated; and 2 Tim. iv. 5, where Timothy is charged to "do the work of an evangelist". Like the prophets the evangelists were generally itinerant preachers or missionaries, though sometimes they had a stated place of abode or ministry. The term seems, therefore, to belong to the Pauline vocabulary. These evangelists were inferior to the Apostles, assisting them or delegated by them, but without the title of Apostle. They had the gift (ἐν εἰσόδωμα) of the Spirit, as in the case of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); but, if we may judge by Philip's case (Acts viii. 5-18), they could not impart the Holy Ghost. Nor do they seem to have had the special revelations which were the proper business of the τομήν καὶ διδάσκαλοι: and some as pastors and teachers. The τομήν and διδάσκαλοι are distinguished from the former orders as being connected with particular churches, resident and not missionary or itinerant. The absence of the τομήν is for the most part remarkable that the τομήν and the διδάσκαλοι were not two distinct orders, but designations of the same men (cf. the προφήται εἰς τοὺς ἱεραρχοὺς, Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 2), in different functions, the former defining them according to their office of oversight, the latter according to their office of instruction and guidance. The τομήν would naturally also be a διδάσκαλος; but there is not the same reason for supposing that every διδάσκαλος would also be a τομήν. Nothing is said here of προφήται εἰς τοὺς ἱεραρχοὺς, διδάσκαλος. The absence of such official terms points perhaps to the comparatively early date of the Epistle.

Ver. 12. πρὸς τὸν καταρτίσμον τῶν ἄγίων: with a view to the full equipment of the saints. The object with which Christ gave some men as Apostles, and some as prophets, etc., is now stated in a sentence consisting of three clauses. The precise construction and meaning of these clauses are by no means easy to determine. The main difficulty is the relation in which they stand to each other and to the preceding clauses. What that relation is will be best seen when the several terms have been examined. The sentence begins with πρὸς, but the two clauses which follow are introduced each by καταρτίσμον τῶν ἄγίων: and some as evangelists.
the general idea of making ἑργεῖν, fit, complete, is used in the sense of repairing literally (Matt. iv. 21; Mark i. 19), restoring in a spiritual or disciplinary sense (Gal. vi. 1), perfecting or making perfect (Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10, etc.), and also in that of preparing, furnishing, equipping (Polyb., i., 47, 6; v. 28, 71; 1 Pet. iii. 40; Heb. x. 5, xi. 3, also Rom. ix. 22, with τις). The noun, therefore, may well have the meaning of equipment here.— τοῦ ἑργοῦ διακοινίας: for the work of ministration. ἑργοῦ has the simple sense of business—the work done in ministration. διακοινίας also takes its stand in the sense of ministerial service, service of an official kind in the Church. But while this is a very frequent use (Acts i. 17, 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13, xii. 7, etc.), the word has also the more general sense of service (Heb. i. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Its cognates διακονία, διακονεῖν have also the same sense (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; John xii. 26; Acts xix. 22; Phil. 13; Col. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 4, xi. 15, etc.). It is quite legitimate, therefore, to give the noun here the non-official sense, if the context points to that. This also is in harmony with the use of τοῦ ἑργοῦ διακοινίας in iv. 29, and τοῦ ἑργοῦ διακοινίας in 1 Cor. xiv. 12. The two figures of the Church as a building and a body are combined here. But in what relation do these clauses stand to each other and to the οἰκοδομή? This is very differently put. Some take them to be three parallel or coordinate clauses dependent on οἰκοδομή, as if = “Christ gave some as Apostles, some as prophets, etc., with a view to the full building up of the body of Christ”. This gives a somewhat awkward and involved construction, and reduces the force of the third clause, which would naturally be expected to bring us to the ultimate end; as if = “Christ, with a view to the full perfection of the saints, gave Apostles, prophets, etc. for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ”. But this gives a somewhat awkward and involved construction, and reduces the force of the third clause, which would naturally be expected to bring us to the ultimate end; as if = “Christ gave Apostles, etc., for the perfecting of the saints, on the one hand for the fulfillment of the teacher’s office, and on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for edification”. But no such distinction is in view here between teachers and hearers, the subjects being the οἰκοδομή generally. None of these adjustments of the clauses quite meets the case. The proper construction, recognized so far by Erasm., Luther, De Wette, Rückert, Weiss, and more recently accepted by Haupt, is the simplest. It takes the sentence to be dependent as a whole on the οἰκοδομή, and understands the three clauses as successive, the first looking to the second, the second to the third, the third forming the climax and expressing the ultimate object of the giving on the part of the ascended Christ. Thus the sense becomes—“Christ gave some men as Apostles, some as prophets, etc., with a view to the full equipment of the saints for the work of ministration or service they have each to do in order to the building up of the body of Christ”. The building up of the Church—that is the great aim and final object; to that every believer has his contribution to make; and to qualify all for this is the purpose of Christ in giving “Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers”. This way each clause fits in naturally with the next, and the ultimate object is expressed last. This, too, is the only construction which does justice to the ἐκκλησία at the beginning of the statement (ver. 7) and the ὁ ἐκκλησίας at its close. These are the terms which convey the ruling idea, viz., that each member gets the gift of grace, and each has his part to do towards that upbuilding of the Church which is the great object of Christ’s bestowments; and these Apostles, prophets, etc., are the means provided by Christ whereby all the members shall be made capable of performing their several parts in order that at last the whole Church may be built up in its completeness as the body of Christ.
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ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

w Ver. 3 "ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν" only.

x Ch. i. 17 εἰς ἑδρή τῆς ἁλίκας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ θεοῦ.

y James iii. 2; see Col. i. 28, iv. 12.

z Ver. 7 ref. = Luke ii. 52, xix. 3 only; John ix. 21

b Ch. i. 21.

Ver. 13. μέχρις καταντήσωμεν οὖ ἑιδοτεῖς τῆς ἑνότητος τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ θεοῦ: until we all attain unto the unity. The AV wrongly makes it "come in"; Tynd., "grow up unto"; Cran., better, "come to". But best, "arrive at," or (with RV) "attain unto".

The statement of the great object of Christ's gifts and the provision made by Him for its fulfilment is now followed by a statement of the time this provision and the consequent service are to last, or the point at which the great end in view is to be realised. It is when the members of the Church have all come to their proper unity and maturity in their Head. The tendency of late Greek to use the subj. without ἐν, especially after temporal particles, renders it doubtful whether much may be made of the unconditioned μέχρις here. The absence of ἐν, however, and the use of the subj., seem to point to the event as expected, and not as a mere hypothetical possibility; cf. Mark xiii. 30; and see Hartung, Partikl. ii., p. 297; Hermann, Part., ἐν, p. 66; Win.-Moul., pp. 378, 387. κατανικόν, followed in NT by Εἰς, elsewhere also by ἐν, conveys the idea of arriving at a goal (cf. Acts xxvi. 7; Phil. iii. 11), the aor. subj. also having the force of "shall have attained." ὑπὸ τοῦ πιστοῦ ἐνδύουν, as applied to Christ occurs frequently in the Pauline as well as in the Johannine writings, but never in 2 Thess., Phil., Philem., or the Pastoral Epistles. In passages like the present, if they stood by themselves, it might be difficult to say whether the metaphysical, the theocratic, or the ethical idea is in view. But the analogy of such statements as those in Rom. i. 4, viii. 3, 32; 1 Cor. iv. 4, and the general Pauline conception of Christ as a transcendent Personality, different from men as such, and to be named together with God, point to a relation to God in respect of nature, as the force of the designation here.—

τῆς ἐνότητος τῆς ἀλήθειας: unto a perfect man. Τὰλαιον, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20; Heb. v. 14, and as is suggested by the subsequent ἡμιφυία, means perfect in the sense of full grown. The state in which unity is lacking is the stage of immaturity; the state in which oneness in faith and knowledge is reached is the state of mature manhood in Christ (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 11). The singular ἑνδύου instead of ἑνδύοις is appropriately used (as we have already had ὁ καυτὸς ἐνθρωπός) when the idea of unity is in view. The goal to be reached is that of the full grown and experimental knowledge of Him. The point of the clause is not any unity between faith and knowledge themselves, to the effect, e.g., of rising from the former to the latter as a higher Christian endowment (Olah.), but a unity which shall make all the members of Christ's body at one in believing in Him and knowing Him. The title ἑνδύοις as applied to Christ occurs frequently in the Pauline as well as in the Johannine writings, but never in 2 Thess., Phil., Philem., or the Pastoral Epistles. In passages like the present, if they stood by themselves, it might be difficult to say whether the metaphysical, the theocratic, or the ethical idea is in view. But the analogy of such statements as those in Rom. i. 4, viii. 3, 32; 1 Cor. iv. 4, and the general Pauline conception of Christ as a transcendent Personality, different from men as such, and to be named together with God, point to a relation to God in respect of nature, as the force of the designation here.—

τῆς ἐνότητος τῆς ἁλίκας: unto the measure of the stature. A clause in apposition to the former, further defining the ἑνδύοις, and giving a fuller and yet more precise description of the goal which is to be reached. The title ἑνδύοις, however, to be rendered age or stature? The noun appears to have both senses. In Luke xix. 3 it is certainly = stature, and probably so also in Luke ii. 52; while in John ix. 21, 23 it is clearly = age, and most probably so also in Matt. vi. 27 and Luke xii. 25, altho the latter two are held by some to be referable to the other meaning; cf. Field,
13-14.

PROS EFEISOUS

13. 

στοιχειον ταῦτα ἡμῖν γένος, ἀλλὰ ἐν χριστίνᾳ καὶ ἑαυτῷ. 11. 

The ideas of the preference must be given (with Chrysol, Oec., Jer., Luth., de Wette, etc.) to the former, in view of the general tenor of the exhortation introducing the paragraph, the point of iii. 19, the place given to unity and maturity, etc. So Mey. thinks it refers to the Christian condition to be reached "after the last storms and before the Parousia". Not a few of the Fathers, however, take the resurrection to be specially in view, and interpreters like Theod., Calv., etc., think it looks to the perfected life of the other world. But Paul gives no clear indication of the time, and it may be, therefore, that he has in view only the goal itself and the attainment of it at whatever time that may take effect.

Ver. 14. ἵνα μὴ γενοῦν οὕτως: that we may be no longer children. Statement of aim following on the previous statement of goal or limit. The verse is regarded by some (Harl., etc.) as connected immediately with vv. 11, 12, and coordinate with ver. 13. Others understand it as an explanation of what the attainment of the goal spoken of in ver. 13 means. But it is best to take it as subordinate to the immediately preceding statement. That is the purpose set forth the goal to be reached and the limit put upon the bestowal of the gifts referred to as given by Christ, this verse now gives the purpose which was in view in setting such a goal before us and in giving the gifts of Apostles, prophets, etc. (Mey., Ell., etc.). That purpose looks to a change which has to take place in us from the condition of υἱὸν and ἀδιάκορον, ἀνδρὸν, etc. The μὴ γενοῦν implies something different from the existing condition, and that existing condition, we see, is one of immaturity, assailed, wavering faith, and subject to the distracting influence of false teachers. In his address to the elders at Mileitus (Acts xx. 29) Paul had spoken of "grievous wolves" that would enter the Ephesian Church after his departure. But the statement here is wide enough to apply to the Church generally and not merely to the Ephesian. υἱός, literally infants
(Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 11), and then minors (Gal. iv. 1), the immature or untaught (Matt. xi. 25; Rom. ii. 20; Heb. v. 13, etc.). — κωστουσάνοιος: tossed to and fro. κωστυνείς means a dashing or surging wave (Luke viii. 24; James i. 6; cf. Thayer-Grimm's Lex., sub voce); and κωστυνήσασθαι means tossed about by waves (cf. LXX of Isa. livi. 20). In the changefulness and agitation which were the results of their unthinking submission to false teaching their νηπίότης or lack of Christian manhood was seen.—καὶ περιπορεύοντο πάντα ἄνεμον τῆς διδασκαλίας: and carried about by every wind of doctrine. The ἄνεμον is the instrum. dat.; the article τῆς denotes that doctrine in the abstract is meant—"every kind and degree of it" (Ell.). διδασκαλία means teaching, either in the sense of instructing (Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 10, 16; Tit. ii. 7), or in the sense of something to persuade (1 Tim. i. 10, iv. 6, vi. 3; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1, 10). Here AV, RV, Ell., etc., take the second sense. "In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows, now this, now that, wind of doctrine" (Ell.). —ὁ πρὸς τὴν κωστοῦσαν τῶν διδασκαλῶν: in the sleight of men. For κωστοῦσα TWH give the form κωστεῖ. The prep. may be the instrumental ἐν (so Mey., Haupt, etc.). But the contrast with the following ἐν ἀδίκων (ver. 15) points rather to the usual force of ἐν as—in (so Vulg., Copt., etc.), the κωστεῖα being the "element, the evil atmosphere, as it were, in which the varying currents of doctrine exist and exert their force" (Ell.). κωστεῖα means dice-playing (e.g., in Plato, Phaedr., p. 274 d), and then deception, fraud. Some (e.g., Beza, Von Soden, etc.) give it the sense that of the κωστικόν, or κωστεῖα, a shade of meaning occasionally expressed by the verb κωστεῖαι (e.g., Plato, Prot., p. 314 a). The idea expressed here by the κωστεῖα itself might be simply that of hazard, unsettlement, with reference to the uncertainties into which the νοηματα were cast by the diverse forms of false teaching under which they fell (cf. Haupt). But it is in the character, not of gamesters, but deceivers that the false teachers are immediately presented (cf. Mey.). This "sleight of men" is in contrast with "the faith and the knowledge of Christ," or in the more, pure, sure word of God by which the faith and knowledge of the Son of God came.—ἐν τῶν μυθοδευτῶν τῆς πλάνης: in craftiness with a view to the machination of error. The renderings of the great Versions show how difficult it is to do justice to this sentence in English. The AV takes refuge in a paraphrase, "and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Wicl. gives "to the deceiving of error"; Cov., "to the deceitfulness of error"; Bish., "in craftiness to the laying in wait of error"; Rhem., "the circumspection of error"; RV, "in craftiness, after the wiles of error". The Vulg. has in astutia ad circumvallationem erroris. μανουφύα, used in 1 Cor. iii. 9, of a false wisdom, means here, as in classical and also in later Greek, cunning, knavishness, treacherous disingenuousness. The τὸ κωστοῦσαν is taken by some as a definition of the τὸ κωστεῖα, adding to the idea of hazard and destruction contained in the latter, the idea of fraud. But it is rather a distinct clause, emphasising the dishonesty and trickery of the false teaching. Its authors used all the ἀδικίας, "the arts of deception to persuade the false teaching. Its authors used all the "the arts of deception to persuade the false teaching under which they fell (cf. Haupt). The prep. ἐν is nowhere found in the NT except here and once again in this same Epistle (vi. 11), and seems not to occur in non-Biblical Greek, whether that of the LXX or that of the Classics. Its meaning here, however, may be safely taken to be trickery, cunning arts, treacherous wiles; as its verb κωστεῖαι, which means primarily to pursue a plan, whether honest (Diod. Sic., i., 81), or dishonest (Polyb., xxxiv., 4, 10), came to have the sense of following craftily, practising deceitful devices (Diod., viii., 16; 2 Sam. xix. 27). The gen. τῶν μυθοδευτῶν is usually taken as the gen. subj., the κωστεῖα being the object or result of the μυθοδευτῶν, = the cunning art that works to error. The article gives the noun the abstract sense or the force of a personification, = Error. Here, as elsewhere, μανουρία has the passive sense of error, not the active sense of seduction, or misleading (Luther, de Wette, etc.). But the question remains as to the precise idea here. The term means properly speaking error in the sense of straying from the way, wandering hither and thither. That sense is frequent in classical Greek—Aeschyl., Eurip., Plato, etc. In the NT the word is usually said to be used of mental error, wrong opinion, as e.g., in 1 Thess. ii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 18, iii. 17; Jude 11; I John iv. 6.
But it is doubtful whether that sense fully meets the case in some of the passages thus cited, e.g., 1 John iv. 6. In such passages as Romans i. 27; James i. 20, it denotes error in practice, a wrong way of life or action. This seems to be its force here. Consequently the idea of the clause is more definite than “in craftiness tending to the settled system of error” (Ell.). It means “in craftiness, furthering the scheming, deceitful art which has for its result the false way of life that strays fatally from truth.”

Ver. 15. αὐθεντον: but truthing it. A participial clause qualifying the following αὐθεντὸν and introducing the positive side of the change in view as contrasted with the negative aspect of the same in the μηδείς clause. The αὐθεντόν has the force of “but rather” or “but on the other hand”. Opposition of one thing to another is usually expressed by μηδείς; but the advers. αὐθεντόν is also used at times with that force, with the difference, however, that αὐθεντόν connects while it contrasts or opposes; cf. Win.-Moult., p. 551. The precise meaning of αὐθεντον is disputed. The RV marg. makes it “dealing truly”; but that is a doubtful sense. Calvin takes it = veritati operant dare; Rückert, “holding fast the truth”; Ell., “being followers of truth”. But in classical Greek the verb seems to mean to speak truth as opposed to μηδείς (Plato, Rep., p. 589 c; Xen., Anab., i., 7, 18, iv., 4, 15, etc.), and that is its sense also in Gal. iv. 16. It is best to take it here, too, as = “speaking truth”; or more definitely “confessing the truth”. The point of this brief, but significant clause, therefore, may be this—these Ephesians had learned the saving truth (ἁ αὐθεντήθη; cf. Gal. ii. 5, 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 22; Heb. x. 26, etc.) of Christ. They had been exposed to the treacheries and risks of false teaching. Christ had given them Apostles, prophets, and evangelists to secure them against all teachers of craft, and they are here charged to continue to confess the truth in which they had been instructed and so grow to the maturity of the Christian life. —ἐν ἀγάπῃ; in love. The question is—to what is this to be attached? It is connected by many (Syr., Eth., Theophy., Oecum., Erasm., Calv., Rück., Bleek, de Wette, Alfr., AV, RV, etc.) with the ἀληθεύοντες, and it is taken to express the idea that love is the element in which truth is to be spoken (or the truth confessed), if it is to conduce to unity and brotherliness. This construction is supported by the considerations that the simple ἀληθεύοντες αὑθεντόν would be somewhat bald if it stood wholly by itself; that it is natural to associate love and truth; that the position of ἐν ἀγάπῃ, after the ἀληθεύοντες and also the parallel structure of ver. 14 point to this connection; and that we thus get a contrast between πανουργία and ἀγάπη and again between πάθη and ἀληθεύοντες. The main argument for connecting the clause rather with the following αὐθεντὸν (= “speaking truth (or rather, confessing the truth) may in love grow up”) is the fact that in ver. 16, where the climax is reached, ἐν ἀγάπῃ qualifies the main thought—that of the growth or the edification of Christ’s body. This is a consideration of such weight as to throw the probability on the whole on the side of the second connection (Mey., Alfr., Haupt, etc.).—ἀληθεύοντες εἰς αὑθεντόν χάριτα: may grow up unto him in all things, αὐθεντον, which is under the regimen of the ἀγάπῃ, has here, as in ii. 21 and in various other passages of the NT, the intr. sense of growing. In earlier classical Greek it meant to cause to grow. That sense it has in the LXX and also occasionally in the NT (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7; 2 Cor. ix. 10), while the pass. is used to express growing. But from Arist. onwards it came also to have the intr. sense. Meyer takes αὐθεντόν to mean simply “in reference to him”. The idea then would be that it is only by being in relation to Christ that
we can grow. But while it is true that the growth which is set before us as our aim depends wholly on our remaining in living relation to Christ, the phrase εἰς αὐτὸν can scarcely bear this out, but, as restricted by Meyer, would mean only "as regards him." The εἰς αὐτὸν must have a more definite sense. It might mean "to," or "into him," in the sense of becoming wholly incorporated in Him, or made one with Him, or in the sense of tending in all that belongs to our growth; in all the power and circumstances of our growth. The simple ἐν τῷ express the general idea of putting together, but with various shades of meaning, e.g., reconciling one to another (Herod., L, 74); considering or concluding (Acts xvi. 10); demonstrating (Acts ix. 22); instructing (1 Cor. ii. 16); and (as here and in Col. ii. 19) compacting or knitting together into one whole. Distinctions have been drawn between the two terms; e.g., by Bengel, who took the ἐν τῷ to express specially the harmony of the building and the ἐν τῷ ἑκατον its solidity; and by Ellicott, who thinks the idea of the former is that of the aggregation of the parts, and of the latter that of their inter-adaption. But at the most the difference does not seem to go beyond the notion of joining (ἡμέρα = a joint) and compacting or making to coalesce. —

The extent or scope of this growing into Christ is expressed by τῇ τᾶς τεταρτάς (the acc. of def. or acc. of quantitative object.; cf. Krüger, Sprachl., § 46, 4), = in all that belongs to our growth; in all the pecuniary circumstances of our growth. The simple τῆς is so used in 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2. Here τῆς is in place, the idea being, as Meyer rightly observes, the definite idea of all the points in which we grow. — δε ὡς ἡ καθημερινή τῆς ἡμέρας: who is the head even Christ. With Τῇ καθημερινῇ, etc., the Ell. reads, τῆς ἡμέρας. The article is rightly omitted, however, by LTTWHVRV on the authority of the oldest and best MSS., BΝΑC, with Bas., Cyr., etc. Instead of the ordinary form of direct apposition εἰς αὐτὸν, ἡμέρας, the relative form is adopted, probably with the view both to emphasis, and to definiteness in the connection with δε ὡς, κ.τ.λ. Such constructions were usual in Greek of all periods; cf. Win.-Moul., p. 665; also 2 Cor. x. 13; Plato, Apol., p. 41 8; Eur., Hec., 764.

Ver. 16. διὰ τῶν τῶν σώματα: from whom the whole body. Statement of the relation of the whole, following that already made regarding the several members, τῶν τῶν σώματα looks back on the ἔνας. The διὰ has its proper force of origin (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6; κατὰ τὸν Καισάρα, xiii. 4, and especially the precise parallel in Col. ii. 19), and cannot be reduced to mean per quem (Morus., etc.). All growth in the body has its source in Christ, the Head. —συνεργαζόμενοι καὶ συνεργαζόμενον: being fully framed together and compacted and knit together. The participles are presents, as expressing a process that is going on. For the former see on chap. ii. 21 above. The latter, to which TWH give the form συνεργάζομεν, expresses the general idea of putting together, but with various shades of meaning, e.g., reconciling one to another (Herod., L, 74); considering or concluding (Acts xvi. 10); demonstrating (Acts ix. 22); instructing (1 Cor. ii. 16); and (as here and in Col. ii. 19) compacting or knitting together into one whole. Distinctions have been drawn between the two terms; e.g., by Bengel, who took the κατὰ τῶν to express specially the harmony of the building and the συνεργάζομεν its solidity; and by Ellicott, who thinks the idea of the former is that of the aggregation of the parts, and of the latter that of their inter-adaption. But at the most the difference does not seem to go beyond the notion of joining (ἡμέρα = a joint) and compacting or making to coalesce. —

διὰ τῶν ἕκαστος τῆς τὰς ἐνεργησίας: by means of every joint of the supply. Here the AV and the RV are in substantial agreement, the former giving "by that which every joint supplieth," and the latter, "through that which every joint supplieth," with the marginal rendering "through every joint of the supply." The Vulgate gives per omnem juncturam. The Old English Versions vary, e.g., Wicl., "by each jointure of under serving"; Tynd., "by every jointure of the furniture thereof."
Thus it only. Ver. 7 reff. Acts ii. 6 reff. = Plat., Legg., vii., p. 759 e, ἐπιστήμη τοῦ εἰσοδήμου τοῦ μετροῦν ἑαυτῷ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.
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it is used occasionally like the Heb. נ, in phrases expressing the proportion or law in accordance with which something is done (Thuc., i., 77, viii. 89; Heb. iv. 11; see Win.-Moul., p. 483). The clause is connected by some (de Wette, etc.) with της ἐνσωματωμένης καὶ συμβαλλομένης; but it is best attached to the αὐθεντής... τοιεῦται. So it defines the nature, law, or order of the growth, describing it as proceeding in accordance with an inward operation that adapts itself to the nature and function of each several part and gives to each its proper measure. It is a growth that is neither monstrous nor disproportioned, but nor mal, harmonious, careful of the capacity and suited to the service of each individual member of Christ's body. — τὴν αὐθεντήν τοῦ σώματος τοιεῦται: maketh the growth of the body. αὐθεντής, common enough, together with αὐτῷ, in classical Greek, occurs only twice in the NT, here and Col. ii. 19. The Mid. τοιεῦται conveys the idea of making oneself; or it may rather strengthen the sense, suggesting "the energy with which the process is carried on" (Ell.). See especially Donaldson, Greek Gram., p. 438, for the use of the appropriative and intensive Middle. The repetition of the σώμα, "the whole body," is due probably to the desire to avoid ambiguity, as the pronoun might have been taken to refer to the μόρον.— εἰς ἀκολούθην εἰς ἀγάπην: unto the building up of itself in love. εἰς expresses the object and end of the carrying on of the growth, the simplex of the body. The εἰς ἀγάπην might qualify the αὐθεντήν τοιεῦται (so Mey.); but it is more fitly connected with the ἀκολούθην, as denoting the ethical element or condition of that consummation and completion of the Church which is the object of the long-continued process of growth. It is the last clause that takes up again the practical address begun with the first verse of the chapter, but interrupted at ver. 4, and contains solemn exhortations to withdraw from all conformity with the old vain pagan life.

Ver. 17. τούτῳ οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρωμαι: by the Lord, and testify in the Lord. The οὖν has here its simple, resumptive force (cJ. Donald., Greek Gram., § 548, 31; Win.-Moul., p. 555). It takes up the train of thought which had been broken off at ver. 4. The τούτῳ refers to the exhortation that follows. μαρτύρωμαι is used of a solemn declaration, protest, or injunction of the nature of an appeal to God (cf. Acts xx. 26, xxvi. 22; Gal. v. 3, etc.)—ἐν Κυρίῳ, not = by the Lord, nor on the Lord's authority, but in the Lord, the writer identifying himself with Christ and giving the exhortation as one made by Christ Himself (cf. Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; also the classical ἐν τῷ, as in Soph., Oed. Tyr., 314; Ord. Col., 247, etc., and Abb., in loc.).—καὶ τὸ καθαρόν περιτευτικόν: that ye no longer walk. The exhortation began (ver. 1) as a positive injunction to a worthy walk. It is now resumed in the negative form of an injunction against an unworthy Pagan walk. The περιτευτικόν, the ordinary objective inf., expresses the object of the ruling verb. After verbs like μαρτύρωμαι such inf. conveys the idea of what ought to be and has something of the force of an imper. (cf. Acts xxi. 4, 21; Tit. ii. 2, etc.). It requires no ἐν to be supplied (see Jelf, Greek Gram., p. 884, 4; Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 273; Win.-Moul., pp. 403, 405).—καὶ καθαρός τὰ ψυχήν περιτευτικόν: as the [rest of the] Gentiles also walk. ψυχήν is inserted by the TR, before mention of the body. It is omitted, however, by B*δ*AD*G, Boh., Eth., Vulg., etc., and must be deleted here (with LTTRWHRV). The καθαρός τὰ ψυχήν associates the walk which they are charged to continue no longer with that of the Gentiles generally, and with their own for contrast which takes up again the practical address begun with the first verse of the chapter, but
merely the intellectual faculty or understanding, but also the faculty for recognising moral good and spiritual truth (Rom. i. 28, vii. 23; 1 Tim. vi. 5, etc.).

It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (cf. Rom. i. 21, 17, etc.; Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14; Lev. xxii. 14).

Ver. 18. Being darkened in their understanding. For κατακοπτεῖν is the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form κατακοπτέω is given in BpH, etc., and is preferred by LTTTRWH. The dat. is more appropriately attached (with LTTR WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Eill., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following ἀνυπολογισμόν (Beza, Ruck., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the ἄνυπολογισμόν is that known as the dat. of sphere or reference (cf. Bernh., Synt., p. 84; Win.-Moul., pp. 263, 270), or the “local dat. ethnically used” (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., Greek Gram., p. 488).—ἀνυπολογισμόν, a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. כבש, כבש, means vanily in the sense of purposelessness, uselessness. There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of idol-worshippers or to that of the heathen philosophers (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (cf. Rom. i. 21, ἡμανεμέθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν).

Ver. 18. οἱ διανοιαὶ αὐτῶν: being darkened in their understanding. For διανοιαῖς of the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form διανοιαί is given in BpH, etc., and is preferred by LTTTRWH. The dat. is more appropriately attached (with LTTR WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Eill., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following ἀνυπολογισμόν (Beza, Ruck., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the ἀνυπολογισμόν is that known as the dat. of sphere or reference (cf. Bernh., Synt., p. 84; Win.-Moul., pp. 263, 270), or the “local dat. ethnically used” (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., Greek Gram., p. 488).—ἀνυπολογισμόν, a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. כבש, כבש, means vanily in the sense of purposelessness, uselessness. There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of idol-worshippers or to that of the heathen philosophers (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (cf. Rom. i. 21, ἡμανεμέθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν).

Ver. 18. οἱ διανοιαὶ αὐτῶν: being darkened in their understanding. For διανοιαῖς of the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form διανοιαί is given in BpH, etc., and is preferred by LTTTRWH. The dat. is more appropriately attached (with LTTR WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Eill., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following ἀνυπολογισμόν (Beza, Ruck., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the ἀνυπολογισμόν is that known as the dat. of sphere or reference (cf. Bernh., Synt., p. 84; Win.-Moul., pp. 263, 270), or the “local dat. ethnically used” (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., Greek Gram., p. 488).—ἀνυπολογισμόν, a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. כבש, כבש, means vanily in the sense of purposelessness, uselessness. There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of idol-worshippers or to that of the heathen philosophers (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (cf. Rom. i. 21, ἡμανεμέθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν).

Ver. 18. οἱ διανοιαὶ αὐτῶν: being darkened in their understanding. For διανοιαῖς of the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form διανοιαί is given in BpH, etc., and is preferred by LTTTRWH. The dat. is more appropriately attached (with LTTR WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Eill., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following ἀνυπολογισμόν (Beza, Ruck., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the ἀνυπολογισμόν is that known as the dat. of sphere or reference (cf. Bernh., Synt., p. 84; Win.-Moul., pp. 263, 270), or the “local dat. ethnically used” (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., Greek Gram., p. 488).—ἀνυπολογισμόν, a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. כבש, כבש, means vanily in the sense of purposelessness, uselessness. There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of idol-worshippers or to that of the heathen philosophers (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (cf. Rom. i. 21, ἡμανεμέθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν).
pable ignorance in their own nature or heart (cf. the ἐκπονήσεως Ἡ ἐκπονήσεως αὐτῶν καρδία in Rom. i. 21).—διὰ τὴν τφρωσιν τῆς καρδιᾶς αὐτῶν: because of the hardening of their heart. This clause, introduced by διὰ, as the former also is, is taken by most (Harl., Osh., de Wette, Ell., All., etc.) to be an independent statement, coordinate with the διὰ τὴν ἐγνώμην, and giving a further explanation of the alienation. Such coordination of clauses is somewhat frequent with Paul (cf. Gal. iv. 4, etc.). Others (Mey., Abb., etc.) attach it to the former clause, and take it to be a statement of the cause of the ἐγνώμην. Thus their alienation would be due to their ignorance, and this ignorance would be caused by the hardening of their hearts. The τὴν ὀφθαλμόν ἐν αὐτοῖς thus loses its significance, and we should have to regard it as adopted in stead of the simple clituv merely with a view to clearness of connection between the ἐγνώμην and the διὰ τὴν τφρωσιν.

The noun τφρωσις means hardness, not blindness. Formed from τφρός = hard skin or induration, it means literally the covering with a callus, and in its three occurrences in the NT (here and Mark iii. 5; Rom. xi. 25) it is used of mental or moral hardening; as is also the verb τφροῦν (Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 4).

Ver. 19. ὅτι τινες ἄνθρωποι: who having become past feeling. ὅτι has its usual qualitative or explanatory force, = "who as men past feeling". The ἄνθρωποι is naturally suggested by the τφρωσιν. It expresses the condition, not of despair merely (Syr., Vulg., Arm., etc.), but of moral insensibility, "the deadness that supervenes when the heart has ceased to be sensible of the 'stimuli' of the conscience" (Ell.). A few MSS. (DFG, etc.) mistakenly read ἄνθρωπαι or ἄνθρωπος = desparantes (Latt., Syr., Arm., etc.).—ἀπὸ τοῦ παρείσχου τῆς ἀπελευθερίας: gave themselves up to lasciviousness. In Rom. i. 26 Paul gives us the other side of the same unhappy fact—a guilty choice of men and a judicial act of God. ἀπελευθερία is wantonness, shameless, outrageous sensuality (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. vi. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.).—ἐν ἀγωνια ἀκαδημαίας ταύτης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ: to the working of all uncleanness with greediness. The noun ἀκαδημαία is used sometimes of work or business (Acts xix. 25); sometimes of the gain got by such means (Acts xxvi. 19); perhaps also Acts xvi. 17, xix. 24; sometimes of the pains or endeavour (Luke xii. 58). Hence some give it the sense of trade here (Koppé, RV marg. = "to make a trade of"). It might perhaps be rendered here "so as to make a business of every kind of uncleanness" (Ell.)—ἐν ἀκαδημαίᾳ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ. The ἐν denotes the object, the conscious object (Ell.) of the self-surrender. πλεονεξία = every kind of ἀκαδημαία is moral uncleanness in the widest sense; ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ describes the condition or frame of mind in which they wrought the ἀκαδημαία, viz., that of covetousness or greediness. πλεονεξία is taken by some to mean ἀνεργία, inordinate desire or insatiableness (Chrys., Oec., Calv., Trench, etc.). It is repeatedly used with sins of the flesh in the NT (1 Cor. v. 11; Eph v. 3; Col. iii. 5) and is akin to them as they all involve self-seeking. But its own proper meaning is greed, covetousness, and that sense is quite applicable here. See further on v. 3, 5. These two things ἀκαδημαία and πλεονεξία ranked as the two great heathen vices. So the Gentiles, darkened and alienated from the life of God, had become men of such a character that they gave themselves wilfully over to wanton sensuality, in order that they might practise every kind of uncleanness and do that with unbridled greedy desire.

Ver. 20. ὅτι δὲ τίνης ἦν ἐκτὸς ἐκτὸς ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: but ye did not thus learn the Christ. ὅτι, in emphatic contrast with the ἦν ἐκτὸς unconverted. The ἦν ἐκτὸς is an obvious litotes, suggesting more than is expressed. Meyer compares Deut. xviii. 14. The phrase ἐκτὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ has no precise parallel except the following ἐκ τοῦ τάγματος. It is at once a guilty choice of men and a judicial act of God. ἐκτὸς is wantonness, shameless,
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9 ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ. 10 ὡμοίως δὲ οὖχ οὕτως φοβεῖται ἡ συνεκροτήτα καὶ ἡν αὐτός ἣν ἐγένετο τὸν Ἰησοῦν, 21. εἰγε αὐτὸν ἣν οὕτως καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐγένετο τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Paul only.

Prov. vi. 16. r=Here only; see Col. iii. 5. q Constr., Matt. xxiv. 32, Mark, Rom. xvi. 17; t Const., Matt. xiv. 35; Phil. iv. 9; Rev. xiv. 3. s Ch. iii. 2 ref. u Ch. i. 15 ref. v=Ch. i. 15; constr. here only.

For e. erg. ἐκ...—ε... ἀπαίσις πάσης Α.

2 For en τλ...—καὶ πληροφορίας DEFG 39, d, e, f, g, m, Slav. (not rec.), Clem., Ambrst., Aug., Sedul., Pel.-comm.

Χριστόν; Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23, 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15, the γνώμῃ αὐτῶν in Phil. iii. 10, and the παρελάβη τὸν Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον in Col. ii. 6. It cannot = "ye learned the doctrine of Christ"; nor can it be taken as = "ye learned to know Christ"; for there are no relevant examples of such usages. Χριστόν must be taken as the object of the learning, and the form τὸν Χριστόν, especially looking to the following ἠσοῦ (ver. 21), probably indicates that the object of the learning was the Christ, the Messiah, He personally—that was the content of the preaching which they heard, the sum of the instruction they received and the knowledge they gained then.

Ver. 21. εἴγε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε; if indeed ye heard Him. On εἴγε, "if so be that," "if as I assume it to be the case," see in iii. 2 above. In the form of a delicate supposition it takes it as certain that they did hear. The αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε is to be understood as the παρελάβη τὸν Χριστόν. The pronoun is placed for emphasis before its verb. The point, therefore, is this—"if as I take it to be the fact, it was He, the Christ, that was the subject and the sum of the preaching which you heard then"—καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἢν ἠδέχητε: and in Him were instructed. ἐν αὐτῷ is not to be reduced to "by Him" (Arm.; also AV "taught by Him"), or "about Him," or "in His name" (Beng.), but has its proper sense of "in Him". The underlying idea is that of union with Christ. The ἢν ἠδέχητε, therefore, refers probably to instructions subsequent to those which were given to them at their firsthearing (παρελάβη). It was in fellowship with Christ that they received these instructions.—καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾿Ιησοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ: even as truth is in Jesus. WH give καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾿Ιησοῦ ἐν τῷ Ιησοῦ as a marginal reading. The meaning of the clause is much disputed. Some (Arm.) think it expresses in some way the manner or standard of the instructions (ὢδέχθητα) is clear from the καθός. But what the point and connection of the clause are is it by no means easy to determine. Wicl. gives "as is truth in Jesus"; AV and other old English Versions, "as the truth is in Jesus," as if it were a ἀλήθεια. Some (Arm.) take it as a parenthesis (Bez., Ruck., etc.), as if ="if ye were so instructed about Christ, that would be false" (as in Him there is only truth, moral and religious truth). Others (Grot., etc.) make it ="as it really is," i.e., "if ye were instructed in the Gospel as it really is in Jesus." (Jer., Erasm., Est., etc.) they supply a ὁροῦ to the ἀναθέτας and understand the καθός clause to refer to Jesus as the Pattern of moral truth or holiness. Jerome's explanation, e.g., is this—quomodo est veritas in Jesu sic et in vobis qui didicistis Christum. Somewhat similarly others, connecting it with ἰδιος αἰτίας Christum. Somewhat similarly others, connecting it with ἰδιος αἰτίας, take it to mean that as moral truth is in Jesus, so they on their part are to lay aside the old man (Harl., Olsh., etc.). Or, connecting it with ἵδεάτης, they understand the point to be that they were instructed in a way implying a moral change, as in Jesus there is truth and, therefore, holiness (so de Wette substantially). Meyer makes the ἀναθέτας dependent on the καθός clause, so that the sense becomes this—"truth it is in Jesus that ye put off the old man"; and Abbott appealing to the use of ἀλήθεια in ver. 24 and in John iii. 21, makes it ="as it is true teaching in Jesus that ye should put off," etc. All these interpretations involve dubious constructions or impose unjustifiable senses on the ἀλήθεια. Feeling this others have adopted the bolder expedient of making Χριστόν the subject of ἠσοῦ, the sense then becoming "as it is true teaching in Jesus" (Cred., Von Soden). A better turn is given to this by WH, who would read ἀλήθεια and so get the sense "as He (Christ) is in Jesus in truth". In support of this it is urged that the αὐτὸς, ἐν αὐτῷ show that Christ, the Messiah, is the leading subject. But this construction means that it was not enough to be instructed in a Messiah; that they had
also to recognise that Messiah in the historical Jesus, and that in Him they would see the life which signified for them a putting off of the old man. There is no indication, however, in the context or in any word of Paul’s belonging to this period of a form of false Christian teaching which distinguished between Christ and Jesus, or of Gentiles professing to believe in a Messiah but not in Jesus as that in regard of which only remains, the “fore, to fall back on the interpretation “if ye were instructed according to that which is truth in Jesus”. The clause will then describe the nature or manner of the instruction, as the following clause expresses its substance. In form or character the instruction was in accordance with what was true, with what was true in Jesus, that is to say, with truth as seen embodied in Him (cf. Alf., Ell.). And instruction of that kind meant that they should put off the old man.

Ver. 22. αὐτοθεμέναι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀνθρώπου: that ye put off, as regards your former manner of life, the old man. This is best connected with the ἐκκεντρήσεως. It gives the purport or contents of the instruction. The inf., therefore, is the objective inf. (cf. in μετεπερώστην, ver. 17 above, and Donald., Greek Gram., § 584). It has something of the force of an imperative, but is not to be taken as such as it is true in Jesus, that is to say, with truth as seen embodied in Him (cf. Alf., Ell.). And instruction of that kind meant that they should put off the old man.

Ver. 22. αὐτοθεμέναι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀνθρώπου: that ye put off, as regards your former manner of life, the old man. This is best connected with the ἐκκεντρήσεως. It gives the purport or contents of the instruction. The inf., therefore, is the objective inf. (cf. in μετεπερώστην, ver. 17 above, and Donald., Greek Gram., § 584). It has something of the force of an imperative, but is not to be taken as such as it is true in Jesus, that is to say, with truth as seen embodied in Him (cf. Alf., Ell.). And instruction of that kind meant that they should put off the old man.

Ver. 23. αὐτοπεομέναι ἢ: and that ye be renewed. For αὐτοπεομέναι a few MSS. (D 17, 47, etc.) and some Versions (Syri., Copt., Vulg.) read αὐτοποιουμαι, while ἢ is omitted by F. In such connections ἢ expresses both addition and contrast. It introduces a statement connected with the foregoing but giving the other side of that. Here it is the positive clause which must follow the putting off. As the middle of this verb has the active sense, αὐτοπεομέναι must be taken as passive here, = “be renewed,” not “renew yourselves” (Luth.). The verb expresses a spiritual change, a transformation from old to new. Whether it also expresses the idea of a new or a primal state is doubtful, so many compounds with ἄν (ἀνακοινοῦν, ἀνακινοῦν, ἀνευοῦν, ἀνεφειμένον, ἀνεσθαλοῦμαι, etc.) expressing nothing more than change.

For the supposed distinction between
the interpretation which turns upon this idea of union between God's Spirit and our spirit, and not simply on the indwelling of the Divine Spirit in us, really account in any satisfactory way for the νοήμα. It is necessary, therefore, to take οὐράνιον here as = our spirit, and that at once distinguished from and related to the νοήμα. The οὐράνιον, then, appears to be the higher faculty in man, the faculty that makes him most akin to God, the organ of his spiritual life and his fellowship with God, under the bondage of sin by nature, but set free from that and made fit for the purposes of the Divine life by the Holy Spirit. The νοήμα (cf. on ver. 17 above) is the faculty of understanding, feeling, and determining, distinguished by Paul from the υποστάσεις (1 Cor. xiv. 14), represented as capable of approving the law, but incapable of withstanding the motions of sin (Rom. vii. 23), and itself the subject or seat of renewal (ἀνακαινίσεως). Further the regenerate human spirit and the Divine Spirit are described as distinct and yet co-operant (Rom. viii. 16). Here then the οὐράνιον must be taken not as the instrumental dative (for renewal does not take effect by means of our spirit), but as the dat. of ref., and the νοήμα will be the gen. subj. Thus the sense becomes "renewed in respect of the spirit by which your mind is governed" (Mey.). That is, in respect of the spiritual faculty, the moral personality whose organ is the mind or reason. Some, holding by the interpretation of οὐράνιον as our spirit, take the νοήμα to be the gen. of appos. (e.g., August., de Trin., xiv. 16, spiritus quae mens vocatur), or the part. gen., = "the governing spirit of your mind" (De Wette). But the above construction is better, and it is the one adopted substantially by the AV and the other old English Versions, the RV, Mey., Haupt, Abb., and most commentators.

Ver. 24. καὶ ἀνεφάρησθαι τὸν καταν.
IV.

For the new man, put on the new man. For the imper. εὐθυσείαν is read by some authorities of consequence (KBD, etc.). The aor. is appropriately used again, as before in ver. 22; “putting off” and “putting on” being acts, while renewal (ἀνακαινοσθαι) is a process. For κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθῆναι: which after God was created. The aor. κτισθῆναι suggests that the “new man” is regarded here not as a nature created anew for the individual, but as “the holy form of human life which results from redemption,” created once for all in and by Christ, and participated in by the individual convert. (See Ell., in loc., and Müller, Christ. Doctr. of Sin, ii., p. 392). The phrase κατὰ Θεὸν has sometimes the simple sense of “godly,” “in a godly manner” (2 Cor. vii. 6, 10, n). Hence it is held by some to mean nothing more here than created “divinely” (Hofm.) or “according to the will of God” (Abb.). But κατὰ is also used to express likeness (1 Kings xi. 10; Heb. viii. 8; Gal. iv. 28; 1 Pet. i. 15, iv. 6). Here, therefore, it may mean “like God” or “after the image of God”. That this is the sense is confirmed by the use of κτισθῆναι (which recalls Gen. i. 27), and by the fuller parallel statement in Col. iii. 10: τὸν νεόν, τὸν ἀνακαινισμὸν ἐλεγχόμενον εἰς ἑαυτόν καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν τοῦ κτίσματος αὐτοῦ. "It is affirmed a new creation of man, and describes that creation as being according to the image or likeness of God. It neither states nor suggests, however, that the image of God in which man was first created was lost and has been restored in Christ. What it does state is simply that this second creation, like the first, was in conformity with the Divine likeness or after the example of what God is.—ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσίστησι τῆς ἀληθείας: in righteousness and holiness of the truth. For the ἀληθεία some few authorities give καὶ ἀλληλεία (D'FG, Cyr., Hil., etc.). This change distinguishes the text in which the new man was created and in which the likeness between him and God consisted. ἀλληλεία, therefore, denotes the quality or ethical condition in which the creation realised itself. δικαιοσύνη and ὁσίστησι are coupled again in Luke i. 75 (cf. also Wisd. ix. 3; Clem. Rom., First Corinthians, xlviii., 4). Plato distinguishes in two ways between the idea of δικαιοσύνη and that of ὅσιος. He defines δικαιοσύνη as a specific (Enthyr., p. 12 x); and he describes the former as having regard to our relations to men, the latter to our relations to God (Gorg., p. 507 n). The latter distinction is also given by other Greek writers (Polyb., xxiii., 10, 8, etc.). It is not easy, indeed, to say how far this distinction holds good in the NT. But both in profane and in biblical Greek the two words, adjective, adverb or noun, are often combined in one statement (e.g., Plato, Protag., 339 c; Theaet., 176 b; Rep., x. 615 b; Laws, ii., 663 b; Joseph., Antiq., viii., 9, x; Luke i. 75; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Titus i. 8). In many of these cases the distinction between integrity and piety is certain, and it is suitable to all. The NT also clearly distinguishes between δικαιοσύνη and σωτηρία (Luke ii. 25). It may be said, therefore, that δικαιοσύνη and ὅσιος are not used vaguely or interchangeably, but that, while both are of grace and both consequently have a new meaning Godward, the former expresses the right conduct of the Christian man more distinctively in its bearings on his fellow-men, and the latter the same conduct distinctively in its relation to God. Δικαιοσύνη is not to be reduced to “true holiness” as in AV, but is to be taken as the gen. of origin and as qualifying both nouns. Further, ἀληθεία with the article, contrasting with τῇ ἀληθείᾳ of ver. 22, seems to be more than Truth in the abstract or a quasi-personification of Truth. It may mean “the truth” as specific, the evangelical message, the objective truth given in the Gospel (ἡ ἀληθεία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Gal. ii. 5, 14; or simply, as here, ἡ ἀληθεία, John viii. 32, 40, xvii. 19; Gal. v. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xiii. 8, etc.). The creation of the new man in the Divine likeness realises itself, therefore, in acts, in better than the ceremonial rectitude of the Jew or the self-contained virtue of the heathen—in a righteousness and a holiness born of the new truth contained in the Evangel.

Vv. 25-32. A paragraph containing a
series of detached, practical exhortations, dealing with certain evils to be forsworn and duties to be fulfilled. These injunctions are presented as applications of the foregoing charge to put off the old man and put on the new.

Ver. 25. * Διά αντοδημονεῖν τὸ φιάδος, λαλεῖτε ἀληθεῖαν εἰκαστος μετά τοῦ πληροῦν αὐτόν. Wherefore, putting off falsehooj speak ye truth each one with his neighbour. εἰκαστος, with the enlarged forms, is rare in the NT except in Luke and Paul, but frequent with these, especially with the latter. It is = quamobrem, on which account, and refers here to what was said about the new man and his creation καὶ Θεός as the ground for what follows. τὸ φιάδος includes falsehood in every form, of which lying τὸ ψευδόμαι (Col. iii. 8) is one chief instance. The partic. has its proper aor. force, expressing a thing understood to be done, completely and finally, = “having put off then once for all falsehood in its every form.” The prep. prr6. is appropriate here as the prep, of personal association and mutual action (Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 471). It is truth in intercourse between Christian brethren (τοῦ εἰκαστος), not between Christians and their fellow-men in general, that is in view here (cf. Zech. viii. 16).—ὶς εἰκαστος ἀληθεῖας μιᾷ: for we are members one of another. Reason for this practice of truth—a reason drawn not from the common conceptions of duty or social weal, but from the profound Christian idea of union one with another through union with Christ. As in the human body each member is of the other in connection and for the other in service, so in the spiritual body of which Christ is the Head and the members belong one to another and each serves the other; cf. Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 15. But can untruth consist with a union in which each is of and for the other? Why the sin of falsehood is first named, and why the sins of anger, dishonesty and corrupt speech are next dealt with, we have no means of determining. The explanation lies no doubt in local and congregational circumstances which Paul did not need to particularise.

Ver. 26. ὁ ρήματος καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε: be ye angry, and sin not. The words are taken from Ps. iv. 4, and follow the LXX rendering. The original Hebrew, יָשֹּׁר יָשֹּׁר, is rendered by some “Tremble and sin not” (Ewald; AV, “Stand in awe and sin not”), i.e., = “let wholesome fear keep you from this sinful course”; by others, as the LXX gives it (Hitz., Del., etc.). As used by Paul here the words recognise the fact that anger has its rightful place and may be a duty, while they indicate also how easily it may pass into the sinful. Great difficulty has been felt with this, and in various ways it has been sought to empty the injunction of its obvious meaning. Some take the first imperative conditionally, as if = “if ye are angry, do not sin” (Olsh., Bleek, etc.); others, in a way utterly at variance with the quotation, take ὁ ρήματος as an interrogative (Berz., Grot.); others declare it impossible to take the first command as direct (Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 290), or deal with the first imper. as permissive, and with the second as jussive (Winer, De Wette, etc.), as if = “be ye angry if it must be so, but only do not sin.” Such a construction might be allowable if the first imper. were followed by ἀλλὰ καὶ or some similar disjunctive: but with the simple καὶ it is inadmissible. Both imper. are real jussives, the only difference between them being in the μιᾷ—which also throws some emphasis on the second. The καὶ has here the rhetorical sense which is found also in atque, adding something that seems not quite consistent with the preceding or that qualifies it, = “and yet” (cf. Matt. iii. 14, vi. 26, x. 29, etc.). Nor is the difficulty in admitting ὁ ρήματος to be a real injunction of anger anything more than a self-made difficulty. Moralists of different schools, the Stoics excepted,
have recognised the place of anger in a moral nature; cf., e.g., Plato's θυρσι-βόλος. Butler's statement of the function of the anger in a moral system as "a balance to the weakness of pity" and a "counterpoise to possible excess in another part of our nature," Sermons, Carmichael's ed., pp. 126, 128. A righteous wrath is acknowledged in Scripture as something that not only may be but ought to be, and is seen in Christ Himself (Mark. iii.5). So Paul speaks here of an anger that is approvable and to be enjoined, while in the καὶ μὴ ἄμεραστενε he forbids only a particular form or measure of anger. As the following clause suggests, even a righteous wrath by over-indulgence may pass all too easily into sin.—

Ver. 28. οἱ παροργισμοὶ ιρᾶς not = condemnators (Luth., etc.), as if the reference were to heathen slanderers of Christians (Erasm.), but = the devil, the word having always that sense in the NT when used as a noun (in 1 Tim. iii.6; 2 Tim. iii.3; Tit. iii.3 it is probably an adject.); cf. Matt. iv. 1, 5, xiii.39, xxv. 41, etc. It has that sense again in 1 Tim. iii.6. The more personal name Σατάνα occurs more frequently in the Pauline writings, while it is used only once in John's Gospel (xiii.27) and never in his Epistles. On the other hand Σατάνα is strange to Mark.

Ver. 27. τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ θεοῦ not = calumniator (Luth., etc.), as if the reference were to heathen slanderers of Christians (Erasm.), but = the devil, the word having always that sense in the NT when used as a noun (in 1 Tim. iii.11; 2 Tim. iii.3; Tit. iii.3 it is probably an adject.); cf. Matt. iv. 1, 5, xiii.39, xxv. 41, etc. It has that sense again in 1 Tim. iii.6. The more personal name Σατάνα occurs more frequently in the Pauline writings, while it is used only once in John's Gospel (xiii.27) and never in his Epistles. On the other hand Σατάνα is strange to Mark.
scarcely credible indeed, that professing Christians in these Asiatic Churches could have given way to thieving. But the Epistles bear witness to the existence of grosser offences against morality in the Churches (e.g., 1 Cor. v. 1).— poXXov Si Koirtarw: but rather let him labour. poXXov hi has a corrective force, = nay rather, but on the contrary rather; cf. Rom. viii. 34; Gal. iv. 9.— fpyatjoucvos to a-yaflov Tats xipaiv: working the thing that is good with his hands. The readings here vary considerably, notwithstanding the simplicity of the statement. The TR adopts the reading given by L, many cursives, Slav., Chrys., etc. In B, am., etc., the the xeropiv precedes to ayoBov. This latter with ISiaif inserted between to ayaflov and tois x<po-iv is found in K, some cursives, Syr.-Phil., etc.; while tois LSian x€Ptriv to 07060V is the reading of AD'EFG, 37, etc., Vulg., Goth., Capt., Sah., Eth., Arm., Jer., Epiph., etc. This last is the best, and is adopted by LTTr and by WH in the marg., though not in the text, for the reading given by L, many cursives, etc., is the reading of theft = labour, not idleness; honest work, not stealing; the use of one's own hands in toil, not robbing the hands of others. So the x<IPtt usually means /auoMr or benefit, and the phrase SI$oYot x^Plv expresses the idea of doing a kindness to one (Soph., Ajax., 1333;
μέν 1 τὸν πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. καὶ μὴ λυπητέεν ἡμᾶς 4 εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν: ἢ ἀπολυτρώσεως. 31. πᾶν 1 ἀγαθόν 2 ἀνθρώπου. 30. καὶ μὴ λυπητέεν ἡμᾶς ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν: ἢ ἀπολυτρώσεως. 31. πᾶν ἀγαθόν ἀνθρώπου.

Ver. 30. καὶ μὴ λυπητέεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ: and grievenot the Holy Spirit of God. This is not a general exhortation, but one bearing, as the καὶ indicates, particularly on the preceding injunction. The utterance of evil or worthless words is repugnant to the holiness of the Spirit, and is to be refrained from as calculated to grieve Him. The injunction is made the more solemn by the designation of the Spirit as “the Holy Spirit” and “the Holy Spirit of God”. The Spirit is here regarded as capable of feeling, and so as personal. In Isa. lxiii. 10 we have a similar idea, following the statement that Jehovah was afflicted in all His people’s affliction. These terms, no doubt, are anthropopathic, as all terms which we can use of God are anthropomorphic or anthropopathic. But they have reality behind them, and that as regards God’s nature and not merely His acts. Otherwise we should have an unknown God and One who might be essentially different from what we are under the mental necessity of thinking Him to be. What love is in us points truly, though tremulously, to what love is in God. But in us love, in proportion as it is true and sovereign, has both its wrath-side and its grief-side; and so must it be with God, however difficult for us to think it out.—ἐν ὑμῖν ἑαυτῶν: in whom γε ὑμεῖς γεγραμμένοι εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν: ἢ ἀπολυτρώσεως. 31. πᾶν ἀγαθόν ἀνθρώπου: All kindness or service (2 Cor. i. 15, viii. 6; James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5). So it is here. The λύπη is the subj., and the clause gives the Christian object of every speech or utterance, viz., to do good to the hearers, to impart a blessing to them (Ell.). For words with a different result cf. 2 Tim. ii. 14.

Ver. 31. πάντα παράλοιπά: let all bitterness. The noun παράλοιπά occurs thrice again in the NT, and with different shades of meaning (Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14; Heb. xii. 15). Meyer makes it = fretting spitefulness here. But it seems to be more than that (see above) as a description of exceptional wickedness in Acts viii. 23), and to mean resentment, harshness, virulence. In James iii. 11 the παράλοιπά is contrasted with the γλῶσσα, and in ver. 14 it is qualified with ὑπομόνη, the latter again is coupled with ἐλαφρὰ. The παράλοιπά has the force of “all manner of”. Harshness in all its forms whether in speech or in feeling (the latter, perhaps, being specially in view as the contrasting γλῶσσα suggests) is to be put away. —καὶ θυμός καὶ ἀβίαστος καὶ μέμνησθαι ἐν παράσει. These two words are often conjoined in non-biblical Greek, in the LXX and in the NT (e.g., Rom. ii. 8; Col. iii. 8; Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15). So far as they differ, the distinction is that θυμός is fury, the more passionate and passing sentiment, the burst of anger, and ἀβίαστος the settled disposition. In Ecclus. xlviii. 10 we get the phrase κατάθεν ἐπὶ θυμὸν: See Trench, Syn., pp. 123-125. —καὶ κρανὴ: and clamour.
κραυγή is sometimes the cry of distress (Heb. v. 7; Rev. xxii. 4). Here it is the outcry of passion (Acts xxiii. 9). καλὴ βλασφήμια: and evil speaking. Here it is obviously slanderous or injurious speech with reference to brethren (Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19; Mark iii. 28, vii. 24; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4). So κωπία, the harsh, violent temper, works στομα καὶ δρόμην, wrath and anger, and these again induce κραυγήν καὶ βλασφήμιαν, passionate clamour and hurtful speech.—δρόμην ψυχῶν σὺν πάσῃ καιλα. "be put away from you together with all malice. καιλα may mean either wickedness generally (Acts vii. 22; 1 Cor. v. 8, xiv. 20; Pet. ii. 16); or ill-will, malignity in particular (Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3; James i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1). The context points to the latter here. So Wicl., Cov., Rhein., AV, RV; while Tynd. gives "maliciousness," and the Bish. "naughtiness." Ver. 32. γίνοντας εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοὶ: but become ye kind one to another. The εἰς is supplied by B, 4, 77, Clem., etc., while εἰς is substituted for it in D F. It is bracketed by WH and by Tr marg., and is omitted by L. But it is quite in place, having its combined connecting and opposing force; cf. on ver. 15 above. γίνονται (not εἰσπραγήν), = "become ye," or "show yourselves," rather than "be ye." The idea is that they had to abandon one mental condition and make their way, beginning there and then, into its opposite. χρήστοι, = kind, benignant, used of God (Luke vi. 35; Rom. ii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 3), but here it's only occurrence in the New Testament. The adjective conveys the idea of compassion (Pray. of Manass., 7; Test. XII. Patr., Test. Zab., § 9). —χαρίζομενοι ἀνανοίγων: forgiving each other. Partic. co-ordinate with the χρηστοὶ, εὐσπλαγχνοι, denoting one special form in which the kindness and tender-heartedness were to show themselves. χαρίζομαι means either to give graciously (Luke vii. 21; Rom. viii. 32; Phil. ii. 9, etc.), or to forgive (Luke v. 42; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13). Some adopt the former sense here (Vulg., donantes; Eras., largientes). But the second is more in harmony with the context. For the use of ἀνανοίγων as αὐτὴς ἀνανοίγων in classical Greek (e.g., Soph., Antig., 145) see Kühner, Greek Gram., ii., p. 497; Jelf, Greek Gram., § 54, 2. In the NT the same use prevails (1 Cor. vi. 7; Col. iii. 13, 16, etc.). The two forms are often conjoined in the same paragraph or sentence, both in classical Greek (Xen., Mem., ii., 7, iii., 5, 16, etc.) and in the NT (as here, Col. iii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 8, etc.). If there is any distinction between them, it is that the idea of fellowship or corporate unity is more prominent in ἀνανοίγων; cf. Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, pp. 169, 170; Light. and Ell. on Col. iii. 13.—καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐξάραντο ἤμιν: even as also God in Christ forgave you. καθὼς points to the Divine example; καθὼς places the two instances, the Divine and the human, over against each other; the reference and the comparison indicate the supreme reason or motive for our fulfilment of the injunction. ἐν Χριστῷ is not "for Christ's sake" (AV) or per Christum (Calv.), but "in Christ" as in 2 Cor. x. 19; the God who forgives being the God who manifests Himself and acts in the suffering, reconciling Christ. The aor. should be rendered did forgive with Wicl., Tynd., Gen., Bish., RV (not "hath
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a: Cor. iv. 1. γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπηταί, 16. xi. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 13. καὶ παραπταστε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἤγαγεν.

i. 6. ii. 14. Ἡβ. vi. 14. μιμήσει καὶ παρεδόθηνεν ἄνωτέρων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν

i. 6. ii. 14. "προσφέρων καὶ ἔχουσαν" is only.

b: Cor. iv. 14. 17. Tit. i. 2; see Phil. ii. 12. 13. rom. xv. 16. Heb. (g). ch. ii. 10. ref. d gal. ii. 20. ver. 25. only.
e: Acts xxii. 36. xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 16. Heb. (g).
f: Heb. x. 5, from Ps. xxxix. 6.

1 ημῶν DEFGKL, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Syr., Cop., Arm., etc.; ημῶν ΝABP 32, 37, 71, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Clem., Euth., Dam., etc.

2 ημῶν B 37, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Dam., etc.

3 ΊΔΣΝ and ΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΑΝ.

forgiven' as in AV, etc.), the point being the forgiveness effected when Christ died. The reading ημῶν, supported by P, 37, 47, Boh., Vulg., 30th., Eth., etc. is to be preferred on the whole to ημῖν which appears in DKL, 17, 47, Syr., Arm., etc. L gives ημῖν in text; Tr WHRV give it in margin.

Chapter V. Vv. 1-14. A paragraph ruled by the general idea of the imitation of God, in which giving love which has been appealed to in the preceding verse. In the light of that Divine example Paul charges his readers to follow purity, unselfishness, sobriety and other graces, and to avoid all heathen vices and indulgences opposed to these.

Ver. 1. γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ: become ye therefore imitators of God. γίνεσθε, as in iv. 32, = "become ye," rather than "be ye". This γίνεσθε also resumes the former γίνεσθε (iv. 32), and continues the general injunction expressed by it. The οὖν points to the same connection of ideas, while it introduces new exhortations based on the supreme fact of God's forgiving love in Christ. Of the duties inculcated on that basis the first and the one most immediately in view is that of the forgiveness of those who wrong us—a forgiveness which should be free, loving, ungrudging, complete as God's forgiveness is. The term ἠμαυρίας is used of the imitation of men (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; Heb. vi. 12), Churches (1 Thess. ii. 14), things (1 Pet. iii. 13 with ξηρακαί as var. reading). Only here is it used of the imitation of God—the loftiest and most exalting endeavour that can possibly be set before man, proposed to us also by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 45, 48)—ἐσεσθε αἰγαπηταί: as children beloved. Not merely "dear children" (AV). The compar. part. ἐσεσθε points to the manner or character in which the imitation is to be made good, and indicates also the manner in which this immodest is to be preferred to the ημῖν of TR, supported by P, DFLK, etc., is to be preferred on the whole to the ημῖν of B, m, 116, etc., which is regarded by WH as the primary reading and given in marg. by RV. The prep. ἐν σπερμῇ seldom goes beyond the idea of "on account of," "for the benefit of." In classical Greek, however, it does sometimes become much the same as ἐν (e.g., Eurip., Aig., 700; Plato, Gorg., 515 c), and in the NT we find a clear instance in Philem. 13. In some of the more definite statements, therefore, on Christ's death as a sacrifice (2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21; Gal. iii. 13, and here) it is thought that the more general sense is sharpened by the context into that of "in place of". In the idea of substitution, which is properly expressed by ἐν (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45), is not in the ἐν σπερμῇ itself, although it may...
be in the context; cf. Win.-Moul., pp. 434, 435; Mey. on Rom. v. 6, Gal. iii. 13; Ell. on Gal. iii. 13.—προσφέρων καὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ: an offering and a sacrifice to God. The primary idea in the whole statement is the love of Christ, and that love as shown in giving Himself up to death. This giving up of Himself to death is next defined in respect of its character and meaning, and this again with the immediate purpose of magnifying the love which is the main subject. The acc., therefore, is the proess, acc. = "as an offering." The defining τῷ Θεῷ, as a position indicates, is best connected with the προσφέρων καὶ θυσίας; not with παρακεντήσας αὐτός, to which εἶναι δώσεως is the natural supplement; nor with εἶναι δώσης εὐλογίας, for that would place τῷ Θεῷ in an emphatic position not easy to account for. The term προσφέρων is used in the NT of offerings of all kinds, whether bloody or unbloody, whether of the meal offering (Heb. x. 6; Ps. xlv. 7), or of the bloody offering (Heb. x. 10) and the expiatory sacrifice (Heb. x. 18). When it has the latter sense, it has usually some denominator (e.g., ἀμώμωτος, Lev. ii. 9, 13, 17, iii. 5, etc.), and the NT in such passages as Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7, etc., it is used generally. Sometimes it is applied to unbloody oblations (Heb. x. 4). Again (e.g., Heb. ix. 23, x. 5, 26) it is sin-offerings, expiatory offerings that are in view. The two terms, therefore, cannot in themselves be sharply distinguished; but they get their distinctive sense in each case from the context. Here, as in Heb. v. 8, etc., it is possible that the two terms are used to cover the two great classes of offerings; in which case, as in Ps. xl. 6, 8, the θυσίας will refer to the sacrifice of slain beasts. If that is so, the sin-offering, or oblation presented with a view to the restoration of broken fellowship will be in view. And this is in accordance with the particular NT doctrine of Christ's death as a propitiation, which has a distinct and unmistakable place in Paul's Epistles, though not in his only (Rom. iii. 23; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10), and a reconciliation (Rom. v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19), as well as with the OT view of sacrifice offered in order to effect forgiveness and removal of guilt (Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35, v. 10, 13, 16, etc.).—εἰς δωμήν εὐλογίας: for a savour of sweet smell. So Ell.; "for an odour of a sweet smell" (RV); "for a sweet smelling savour" (AV, Gen., Bish.); "in an odour of sweetness" (Wicl.); "in an odour of sweetness" (Rhem.); "sacrifice of a sweet savour" (Tynd., Cov., Cranm.). Statement of the acceptability of Christ's sacrifice, taken from the OT. Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, ii. 12, 15, 17, 19, etc.; cf. Gen. viii. 21; Phil. iv. 18), where δωμήν εὐλογίας is defined as θυσίας δείκνυσι, εὐφάντητον τῷ Θεῷ. The foundation of the phrase is of course the ancient idea that the smoke of the offerings rose to the nostrils of the god, and that in this way the Deity became partaker of the oblation along with the worshipper (Hom., Il. xxiv., 69, 70). The phrase was naturally used oftener of the burnt offering (Lev. ii. 9, 13, 17), and some have argued that there is nothing more in view here than the idea of self-dedication contained in that offering. But the phrase is used also of the expiatory offering (Lev. iv. 31). Ver. 3. πόρεια δὲ καὶ παράκλησις: but fornication and all uncleanness. The better order αἰτιασθε ἐπὶ τคิดαρα: but fornication and all uncleanness. The better order ἀκαθαρσία τῶν ἀτόμων (LTRWHRV) throws the emphasis on τῶν ἀτόμων = "fornication and uncleanness, every kind of it." The metaphor & carries the exhortation over to a prohibition expressed in the strongest terms, which is levelled against one of the deadliest and most inveterate temptations to which Gentile Christians were exposed. The term πόρεια is to be taken in its proper sense and is not to be restricted to any one particular form—the license-prac
tised at heathen festivals, concubinage, marriage within prohibited degrees, or the like. The moral life of the Graeco-Roman world had sunk so low that, while protests against the prevailing corruption were never entirely wanting, fornication had long come to be regarded as a matter of moral indifference, and was indulged in without shame or scruple not only by the mass, but by philosophers and men of distinction who in other respects led exemplary lives.— ἵνα παρελθοῦσα: or covetousness. Here, as in iv. 19, ἵνα παρελθοῦσα: is named along with ἀκαστότητα.

In this passage, as in the former, most commentators take the two terms to designate two distinct forms of sin, viz., the two vices to which the ancient heathen world was most enslaved, immorality and greed; while some understand παρελθοῦσα: to be rather a further definition of ἀκαστότητα and give it the sense of insatiable, inordinate affection, sensual greed. The noun is found ten times in the NT and the verb παρέλθετοι five times. In some of these occurrences παρελθοῦσα: can mean nothing else than covetousness (e.g., Luke xii. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5). But whether it has that sense in all the passages, or has taken on the acquired sense of sensual greed or overreaching in some of them. That is not very easy to decide. The association of the word παρελθοῦσα: with sins of the flesh (e.g., in 1 Cor. v. 1, 11) is urged in favour of the latter application (cf. Trench, Syn. of the N. T., p. 79). But it is argued with reason that the use of the disjunctive ἵνα between πάροντες and παρέλθετοι there and the connecting of παρελθοῦσα: with ἀρεταῖς by καί point to a distinction between the former two and an identity between the latter. So, too, in Col. iii. 5 the noun παρελθοῦσα: is differentiated from the τοποῖοι, etc., by τίνι. On the other hand, the passages in Rom. i. 29 and 2 Pet. ii. 14 seem to suggest something more than covetousness, and it is also to be noticed that the original idea of these terms was that of having or taking an advantage over others. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 the verb παρέλθετοι is used along with ὑπερβαίνειν in this sense, with reference to the sin of fornication. This passage is probably the one, so far as Pauline use is concerned, that most favours the second sense, and it must be added that even the argument from the force of the disjunctive ἵνα must not be made too much of. For in chap. v. 5 we find πάροντες and ἀκαστότητα connected by ἵνα — μὴ γινομαθὲν ἐν ὑμῖν: let it not be even named among you. Cranm., Gen., Bish, render it “be once named”. The strong neg. μὴ δὲ gives it this force — “Not to speak of doing such a thing, let it not be even so much as mentioned among you”. The partial parallel in Herod., i., 128. ἵνα δὴ ἐκείνος οὐκ ἔχῃ τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ταῦτα οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἔχω ἐκείνος, is noticed here by most.— καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐγὼ ἄγιος: as becometh saints. The position of sainthood or separation to God, in which the Gospel places the Christian, is so far apart from the license of the world as to make it utterly incongruous even to speak of the inveterate sins of a corrupt heathenism.

Ver. 4. καὶ ἀκαστότητα: and filthiness. This is taken by many (Eth., Theophr., Oec., Rück., Harl., etc.) to refer to indecent talk, which, however, would be expressed by ἀλογορία (Col. iii. 8). The context shows it to refer to sins of the flesh, but there is nothing to limit it to sinful speech. It denotes shameless, immoral conduct in general.— καὶ μορφολογία: and putrefaction: or foolish talking or (and) jesting. The readings here are somewhat uncertain as regards the particles. The TR has the support of such authorities as Π τρ., Syr.-Harcl., Arm. for καὶ ... ἵνα; AD*G, Vulg., Sah., etc., give ἵνα ... ἵνα: ΒΝ'DK, Boh., Eth,
etc., have καλὸ...καλ. The first is accepted by TRV; the second by L; the third by WH. The choice is between the first and third, and the balance of evidence is on the whole, although not very decided, on the side of καλὸ...καλ. The noun μηρολογία is of very rare occurrence. In common Greek it is found only a very few times (Arist., Hist. An., i., 11; Plat., Mor., 504 α); in the NT only this once. Its sense, however, is sufficiently clear.—καλὸ εὐστρατεία: and jesting. This is the solitary occurrence of the noun in the NT. It is found, however, in Aristotle (who defines it as πεπαιδευμένη ἔρρις, Eth. Nic., iv., 14), Pindar (Pyth., i., 178), etc. It appears to have meant originally versatility, facetiousness, and to have acquired the evil sense of frivolity or scurrility. Here it is taken by some (e.g., Trench, Ell.) to be distinguished from μηρολογία and to denote, therefore, not the sin of the tongue merely, but the “evil ‘urbanitas’ (in manners or words) of the witty, godless man of the world” (Ell.). This depends so far on the acceptance of the disjunctive • as the proper reading, but may be essentially correct. AV and other old English Versions give jesting, except Wicl., who has harlotry, and the Rhein. which gives scurrility.—τὸ σκανδάλιον: things which are not seemly. The RV renders it—“ye know of a surety”. But τὸν (which is supported by Bernal*GP, Vulg., Goth., Sah., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc.) must be preferred. The phrase τὸν γνώσκοντες is explained by some as a Hebr. form, following the well-known use of the inf. with the fin. verb, or as having the force of the participle with the fin. verb in such expressions as γνωστόν γνῶσῃ (Gen. xv. 13); and so the RV renders it—“ye know of a surety”. But in such formulæ the same verb occurs in both cases, whereas here we have two distinct verbs. Hence it is better rendered—“ye know, being aware that”. It is an appeal to their consciousness of the incompatibility of such sins with the inheritance of the Kingdom of God. It is not necessary, therefore (with von Hofmann), to put a full stop between the τὸν and the γνώσκοντες, and make τὸν refer to the preceding statement. Nor is there any reason for taking τὸν as an imper. (so Vulg., Beng., etc.) instead of an indic. The τὸν refers to what follows, and the γὰρ introduces a reason for the former injunctions. These injunctions are enforced by a reference to the reader’s own knowledge, and that reference to their knowledge is made in direct appeal to

Ver. 5. τὸ γὰρ τὸν γνώσκοντες: for this ye know, being aware that. The TR reads τὸν = ye are (with D*KL, Theod., Theophyl., etc.), taking it with the participle as = “ye are aware”. The AV, however, in Aristotelian (who defines it as πεπαιδευμένη ἔρρις, Eth. Nic., iv., 14), Pindar (Pyth., i., 178), etc. It appears to have meant originally versatility, facetiousness, and to have acquired the evil sense of frivolity or scurrility. Here it is taken by some (e.g., Trench, Ell.) to be distinguished from μηρολογία and to denote, therefore, not the sin of the tongue merely, but the “evil ‘urbanitas’ (in manners or words) of the witty, godless man of the world” (Ell.). This depends on the acceptance of the disjunctive • as the proper reading, but may be essentially correct. AV and other old English Versions give jesting, except Wicl., who has harlotry, and the Rhein. which gives scurrility.—τὸ σκανδάλιον: things which are not seemly. The RV renders it—“ye know of a surety”. But in such formulæ the same verb occurs in both cases, whereas here we have two distinct verbs. Hence it is better rendered—“ye know, being aware that”. It is an appeal to their consciousness of the incompatibility of such sins with the inheritance of the Kingdom of God. It is not necessary, therefore (with von Hofmann), to put a full stop between the τὸν and the γνώσκοντες, and make τὸν refer to the preceding statement. Nor is there any reason for taking τὸν as an imper. (so Vulg., Beng., etc.) instead of an indic. The τὸν refers to what follows, and the γὰρ introduces a reason for the former injunctions. These injunctions are enforced by a reference to the reader’s own knowledge, and that reference to their knowledge is made in direct appeal to
their consciousness.—ἐκτὸς ἡμῶν ἢ ἐπεκρίνας: that no fornicator or unclean person. On the Hebr. formula ἐκτὸς . . . ὡς, “every one . . . shall not,” see on iv. 29 above and Win.-Moult., p. 209.—ἡ πλεονεκρία: or covetous man. The πλεονεκρία appears here again to have its proper sense, and not any secondary application.—& ξαρτττις: who is an idolater. This reading of the TR has the support of ADKLP, Syr.-Harcl., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc. But there are two interesting variants, viz., S 4ος Ττποκελετής, which is the reading of G, Vulg., Goth., Syr.-Pes. (probably), and δῶνον εἰδωλολάτρης, which is given by Bss, 69, Jer., etc. The choice must be between this last and the TR. On the whole the former is to be preferred (with LTTRWHVR) on textual grounds, and that reading will then have the force of “which is the same as an idolater”. Some (Hart., etc.) refer the relative (!τίς) to all three previous nouns; but the analogy of Col. iii.5 is against that. It is true that fornication and uncleanness might also well be called forms of idolatry. But the point here seems to be that the covetous, grasping man in particular, who makes a god of Mammon, is much the same as the worshipper of an idol; and the irXtoWwv is thus made synonymous with the tlooiTcOαp-ns in order to stigmatise avarice as a specifically anti-Christian vice, essentially incompatible with the spirit of self-sacrifice which is of the very being of Christianity and was inculcated so strenuously by Paul himself.—οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομαῖν: has inheritance. The ἔχει is taken by Meyer as a case of present for future, marking a looked-for event as just as certain as if it were already with us. But it is rather a proper present, appropriate here.—τὸ δικαίωμα: the expression of a principle or law; cf. Win.-Moult., p. 331.—ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ: in the Kingdom of Christ and God. The clause has been understood as an affirmation of Christ's Godhead, as if = “the Kingdom of Him who is at once Christ and God” (Beng.). But the latter view, with this view of its import, have held it to be an example of the application of Sharpe's rule. But that rule is inapplicable here by reason of the fact that Θεοῦ is independent of the article and occurs indeed without it in the phrase βασιλείας Θεοῦ (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21). Θεοῦ has the same climactic force here as in 1 Cor. iii. 22, etc. The kingdom is Christ's, committed to Him now, but to be delivered up at last to God, who is to be sole and absolute Sovereign (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). Ver. 6. μηδεὶς ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς ἀπατᾶτω κατ' ὑμᾶς λόγους: let no one deceive you with vain words. A solemn warning, made the more pointed by being given without any connecting particle, is “vain” in the sense of empty, without the substance of truth or reality, and so = sophistical; cf. κανονολογία in Isa. viii. 19. But what is the reference? Some think heathen philosophers and Jews are in view (Grot), or Judaisers in particular (Neand.), or antinomian Christians (Olsh.), or teachers of Gentile tendencies (Meyer), or false brethren in the Churches (Abb.). But the expression is a general one, applying to all who sought by their sophistries to palliate the vices in question or make them appear to be no vices. These would be found mostly (though by no manner of necessity exclusively) among the heathen, especially among such Gentiles as heard the truth and remained unbelieving. This is most accordant with the descriptive terms which follow, viz.—κατ' ὑμᾶς τοῦ κατασκεύατος: μὴ . . . συρμένος αὐτοῦ: ἢ τοῦ ἀλοχοῦ, ἢ τοῦ θεοῦ: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God. The ἀπατᾶτω, which is placed emphatically first, refers of course to the sins in question; not to the “vain words,” as Chrys., e.g., strangely thought. The certainty of the Divine retribution is added as an enforcement of the previous warnings. It is given in terms of a solemn present (ἐρχεται) and in the form of “the wrath of God”—an expression which occupies a very large place both in the OT and in the NT. This ἐρχεται τοῦ Θεοῦ is not to be limited (with Ritschl., Rück., Hart.) and some, with this view of its import, have held it to be an example of the application of vindicta Dei, or resolved into a figure
of speech with no reality behind it, or identified simply with certain effects—
the workings of conscience, the shortness and the ills of life, the penalties of the present existence, etc. It is given in Scripture, just as the love, the righteousness, the holiness of God are given, as an affectus and not merely an effectus, a quality of the perfect moral nature of God, an attitude and sensibility of the Divine Mind toward evil. It is exhibited as operating now, but also as looking to fulfill itself completely in the final adjustment. Here its future operation in the ultimate awards may be specially in view, but not that alone. Meyer puts it too narrowly when he says it is “the wrath of God in the day of judgment, which future, as in ver. 5, is realized as present.” — ἔτι τοῦτοι νόεσαν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: upon the sons of disobedience. For ἁμαρτία ὙἹитеWH prefer ἁμαρτίας. The phrase has been used already in ii. 2, and there with reference to the unregenerate. Here, again, it describes the persons in respect of their “essential and innate disobedience” (Ell.). The ἁμαρτία in view is the denial of faith, disobedience to the truth of the Gospel of God, and so to God Himself; see on ii. 2, and cf. Rom. xi. 30, 32, xv. 31; Heb. iv. 6, 11.

Ver. 7. μὴ ὅνω γίνεσθαι συμμέτοχος αὐτῶν: become not ye then partakers with them. γίνεσθαι again = “do not become,” “be not.” What is meant is a possible falling back into ways by grace forsaken. The participation which is negatived is obviously taking part with the sons of disobedience (ἁμαρτίαν), not merely in their punishment or in the ἁμαρτία. The term συμμέτοχος, TWH occurs only here and in iii. 6 above. The ὅνω has the force which it has in v. 1, giving the inference to be drawn from the statement of the wrath of God.

Ver. 8. ἂν γὰρ ποτε σκότος: for ye were once darkness. A consideration in support of the exhortation, viz., the consideration that with them the condition in which such sins could be indulged was wholly past and gone. The ἂν is put emphatically first to throw stress on the fact that all that is now behind them, and surely not a condition to which they could revert. No μὲν requires to be supplied here. Its omission in this clause, while the next has ὅπος, is nothing strange or irregular, the μὲν being inserted only “when the first clause is intended to stand in connection with and prepare the reader for the opposition to the second” (Ell.). See Ell. on Gal. ii. 15; Jelf, Greek Gram., p 765; Donaldson, Greek Gram., pp. 575-578. It has to be remembered also that the correlation of those two particles has by no means the position in NT Greek which it has in classical Greek. In point of fact it has little or no place in the Catholic Epistles except 1 Pet. (to some extent), or in 2 Thess., 1 Tim., Tit., Phil., and the Apoc., and is comparatively rare even in the Gospels; cf. Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, pp. 260, 267. The abstract σκότος, instead of ἰσόκοτον, or similar concrete form, adds greatly to the force of the representation. They were darkness itself,—persons “in whom darkness becomes visible and holds sway” (Thayer-Grimm), so utterly sunk in ignorance of Divine things, so wholly lost in the evils accompanying such ignorance — γῶν δὲ ὄμοι ἐν Κυρίῳ: but now ye are light in the Lord. Instead of what they once were they had become enlightened by the Gospel, discoverers of Divine truth and subjects of the new life which it opens to men. The completeness of the change is indicated again by the use of the abstract term—so possessed and penetrated were they by that truth that they could be described not simply as enlightened but as themselves now light. And this “in the Lord,” for it was in virtue of their fellowship with Christ that this new apprehension of things came to them, transforming their lives — ὑμῖν γὰρ ὅτι περιπατήσετε: walk as children of light. The strong abstracts σκότος, ἄνοι, come in fitly before the exhortation and make it more pointed. The omission of ὄνω or any similar particle adds further to the force of the exhortation. If these Ephesians were now “light in the Lord,” it was not for themselves only but for others. They were called to live a life befitting those to whom Christian enlightenment and purity had become their proper nature; cf. Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5. Nothing is to be made of the absence of the article here in contrast
with \( \text{τοῦ\ φωτὸς} \) of ver. 2, the general practice being to insert or omit the article in the case of the governed noun according as the governing noun has it or wants it (Rose’s Middleton, On the Greek Article, iii., 3, 7, p. 49).

Ver. 9. \( \text{ἐκθέτωσέν} \) τὸ πνεῦμα \( \text{τοῦ\ θεοῦ} \) : for the fruit of the Spirit [the light]. The reading of the TR, \( \text{τοῦ\ φωτὸς} \), which is that of such uncials as D\( ^{P} \)KL, most cursives, Syr.-Chrs., etc., must give place to \( \text{τοῦ\ πνεύματος} \), which is supported by B\( ^{N} \)AD\( ^{P} \)GP, 67\( ^{s} \), Vulg., Goth., Boh., Arm., Orig., etc. The \( \text{πνεῦμα\ τοῦ θεοῦ} \) is probably a correction from Gal. v. 22. The whole verse is in effect a parenthesis, and is printed as such by the RV. But it is a parenthesis with a purpose, the \( \text{ἐκθέτωσέν} \) being at once explanatory and confirmatory. It gives a reason for the previous injunction and an enforcement of it; the point being this—“Walk as I charge you; for anything else would be out of keeping with what is proper to the light and is produced by it”. \( \text{καρπὸς,\ fruit,\ a\ figurative\ term\ for\ the\ moral\ results\ of\ the\ light,\ its\ products\ as\ a\ whole;\ cf.\ Matt.\ iii.\ 8;\ Phil.\ i.\ 11,\ etc.\ In\ the\ corresponding\ statement\ in\ Gal.\ v.\ 22,\ where\ the\ καρπὸς\ τοῦ\ πνεύματος\ is\ contrasted\ with\ τὰ\ ἰδρυμα\ τῆς\ σαρκός,\ the\ singular\ term\ may\ also\ suggest\ the\ idea\ of\ the\ unity\ of\ the\ life\ and\ character\ resulting\ from\ the\ Spirit.—ἐν\ πάσῃ\ ἀγαθωσύνῃ: is in all goodness. ἀντὶ, is, consists, is left unexpressed after καρπὸς. The \( \text{πάνω} \) here again has the force of “every form of,”—in goodness in all its forms. The noun \( \text{ἀγαθωσύνη} \) appears again in Rom. xvi. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11. Thus it occurs only four times in the Pauline writings. It is used in the LXX, but appears not to belong to classical Greek. It varies somewhat in sense. In the OT it means sometimes \( \text{good} \) as opposed to evil (Ps. xxxviii. 20, lli. 3), sometimes \( \text{enjoyment} \) (Eccles. iv. 8), sometimes \( \text{benevolence} \), the bountiful goodness of God (Neh. ix. 25). Here and in the other Pauline passages it is taken by some in the sense of \( \text{uprightness} \), but appears rather to mean \( \text{active goodness, beneficence; cf. Trench, Syn., p. 218.—καὶ\ δικαιοσύνη: and righteousness. Δικαιοσύνη\ here\ has\ the\ sense\ of\ rectitude,\ probity,\ freedom\ from\ the\ morally\ wrong\ or\ imperfect,\ as\ in\ Matt. iii.\ 15,\ v.\ 5,\ 6,\ 10,\ etc.,\ and\ as\ also\ in\ such\ Pauline\ passages\ as\ Rom.\ vi.\ 13,\ 16,\ 18-20,\ viii.\ 10;\ 2\ Cor.\ vi.\ 7,\ 14,\ etc.—καὶ\ ἀλήθεια: and truth. Ἀλήθεια\ here\ in\ the\ subjective\ sense\ of\ moral\ truth,\ sincerity\ and\ integrity\ as\ opposed\ to\ falsehood,\ hypocrisy\ and\ the\ like;\ cf.\ John\ iii.\ 21;\ 1 Cor.\ v.\ 8;\ Phil.\ i.\ 18,\ etc.\ Here,\ then,\ Christian\ morality\ is\ given\ in\ its\ three\ great\ forms\ of\ the\ good,\ the\ just,\ the\ true. Abbott\ compares\ the\ “justice,\ mercy,\ and\ truth”\ of\ the\ Gospels\ and\ Butler’s\ “justice,\ truth,\ and\ regard\ to\ the\ common\ good”. Ver. 10. \( \text{δοκιμάζωσεν\ τὸν\ τούτων\ τῇ\ ὑπάρχῃ} \) τῷ\ Κυρίῳ: proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord. The exhortation given in ver. 8, interrupted by the enforcement introduced in ver. 9, is now continued and explained. The participial sentence defines the walk which was enjoined in respect of the way in which it is to be made good. It is a \( \text{walk} \) which is to be taken up and carried out in the light of a constant trial of what pleases the Lord. The verb \( \text{δοκιμάζω} \) here has its primary sense of \( \text{proving, testing} \) (cf. Rom. xii. 2), rather than its secondary sense of \( \text{approving} \) (cf. Rom. xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 3, etc.). Here, therefore, the \( \text{δοκιμάζω} \) expresses the idea of the careful trial, “the activity and experimental energy” (Ell.), necessary to the walk. The answer of the conscience (Rom. xiv. 23), or conformity to the Gospel (Rom. i. 16; Phil. i. 27), is given elsewhere as the test of the Christian walk. Here its correspondence with what is pleasing to God is given as its final proof and its most distinctive characteristic. \( \text{ἐνθέατρον} \) is better rendered on
the whole “well-pleasing” (RV), especially when Col. i. 10 is compared, than “acceptable” (AV).

Ver. 11. καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρτους τοῦ σκότους: and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. TWH again prefer the form οὖν κυρρήσειν. The verb has its usual force here, and takes us back to the συμμετέχοι αὐτῶν of ver. 7. The only question is whether it governs the ἔργοι itself, or an αὐτοῖς or αὐτῶν understood. Looking to the συμμετέχοι αὐτῶν above, the συγκοινωνεῖτες μὲν τῷ ἐκλείποντι of Phil. iv. 14, etc., some prefer the latter, = “have no fellowship with them in the works.” But the gen. probably would then be the proper case for the things in which the participation took place; cf. the use of συγκοινωνεῖν with τινὶ τινος (Dio Cass., xxxviii., 41, etc.), and συγκοινωνίας τῷ Μίθης, etc. (Rom. xi. 17). Here, therefore, as in the case of the ἐκμαρτλέως in Rev. xviii. 4 and even the ἐκλείπει in Phil. iv. 14, the verb is best understood as governing the ἔργοι directly. Elsewhere we read of ἔργα συναναγή (Col. i. 21), and νεκρὰ ἔργα (Heb. vi. 1); here of ἔργα ἀκάρτα, works which result in no gain, yield nothing pleasant or profitable, bring no blessing or reward with them; cf. the contrast between the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit in Gal. v. 19, 22. — μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ καλὸν ἐλέγχετε: but rather even reprove them. This rendering of the RV is on the whole the best. AV omits the even. The other old English Versions render similarly, except Wicl., who has “but more”; Gen., 2, which gives “but even reprove them rather”; and Bash., “but even rebuke”. The formula μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ, combines the ideas of the corrective (μᾶλλον), the adversative (δὲ) and the ascensive (καὶ), and means, therefore, “but rather even,” not merely “yea, much more.” Without the καὶ the phrase μᾶλλον δὲ has the force of a corrective climax; cf. Mey. on Rom. viii. 34, Gal. iv. 9, and Fritz. on Rom. viii. 34. It was not enough, therefore, for them simply to abstain from such works; they must even reprove them. The question, however, is what is the proper sense of ἐλέγχεται here, and what is the force of the whole sentence? Some give the verb the sense of reproving, but understand the reproof in view to be both in word and in deed (Olah.), or only in deed, i.e., the reproof conveyed by the spectacle of a pure life and consistently moral walk. Others, looking to the following τὰ γὰρ κρυφὴ γινόμενα, etc., and thinking it incongruous to speak of an oral rebuke in connection with a statement of the shame it is even to speak of the sins in question, would give the verb the sense of exposing (Abb.). But both the context and the general idea connected with καλὸν ἐλέγχετε in the Pauline writings (cf., e.g., 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 15) point to the notion of oral reproof. The idea, therefore, is that these Christians were not at liberty to deal lightly with such sins, or connive at them, or be silent about them, but had to speak out against them and hold them up to rebuke, with the view of bringing their heathen neighbours to apprehend their turpitude and forsake them.

Ver. 12. τὰ γὰρ κρυφὴ γινόμενα τοιὸν αὐτῶν ἀληθῶν ἐκτὸς καὶ λέγειν: for the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of. This rendering of the RV, which follows Ellicott’s, does more justice to the Pauline conception of the shame of sins than that of the AV. The term κρυφὴ occurs only this once in the NT; but it is found occasionally in the LXX. Lach., WH, Mey., etc., prefer the form κρυφῷ; most editors and grammarians (Treg., Tisch., Alt., Jelf, Win., etc.) adopt κρυφή; cf. Win.-Moul., pp. 52, 53. The γὰρ introduces a reason for, or a confirmation of, the charge to reprove the sins. What of the special point and connection? Some (e.g., Harl.) would refer the γὰρ to the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε, as if = “do not take part in their sins, for they are too vile even to mention.” But this does not do justice to the difference between the κρυφὴ γινόμενα and the ἔργα τοῦ σκότους. Others, putting more into the λέγειν than it can properly bear, understand it as = “rebuff these sins openly, for to speak of them in any other...
terms than that of rebuke is shameful." Bengel finds in it a reason for the sins being only referred to and not specified by name. Stier, supposing the reproof de facto to be in view, makes it = "do not even name these sins, for if you did so you would yourselves be sinning, whereas your walk in the light will be their reproof". Others (Von Sod., Abb.), adopting the sense of "expose," for ἀλήθευς, take the idea to be—"do not participate in these works, but expose them, for the things they do secretly it is a shame even to mention; but all these things when exposed by the light are made manifest in their true character." But the course of thought is simpler. The secrecy of the works in question is the reason why they require to be openly reproved; and the point is this—the heathen practise in secret vices too abominable even to mention; all the more is the need of open rebuke instead of silent overlooking or connivance (Mey., Ell., etc.). It is not all heathen sins, therefore, that are in view; for it would be an exaggeration to say that all such vices were of a kind too shameful even to speak of; but a certain class of sins, that worst class which are done in secret. This is in harmony with the emphatic position of the κρισίν and with the contrast in the φανερωταί. But if the expression κρισίν γινομένα covers less than the ἑγεῖ τοῦ σκότους, there is nothing on the other hand to indicate that it refers specifically to the immoral licence of the Pagan mysteries, or any other single instance of dark and infamous excess. It includes all those shameless heathen indulgences which sought the cover of secrecy.

Ver. 13. τὰ δὲ πάντα ἀλήθευμα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός φανερωταί, τῶν γὰρ τὸ φανερώμενον φῶς ἐστι: but all, when they are reproved, are made manifest by the light: for everything that is made manifest is light. Both the connection and the import of some of the words here are difficult to determine, and various interpretations have been proposed. The RV renders it "but all things when they are reproved are made manifest," treating it as a general statement. But the point and the harmony of the whole verse are best seen if the phrase τὰ πάντα is taken to refer to the secret practices which have been immediately in view, = "all of them," = "all these things." The ἀλήθευμα, again, must have its proper sense of reproved or rebuked, and cannot be dealt with as synonymous with φανερώτα. The anarthrous participle will express the manner or the time of the action in question, and is not = "all things which are reproved" (Vulg., AV, etc.), but is = "all these things when they are reproved." The τῶν must be accepted as a neuter, there being no reason for taking it (with Bengel) as abstract for concrete and so = "every man." Further, the φανερωμένον and the φανερωταί are naturally to be taken as of the same Voice. That the former cannot have the force of the Middle, "that which makes manifest," appears from the fact that there does not appear to be any instance of φανερωταί being anything else than a pure passive in the NT, although it occurs some fifty times there. Two particular difficulties remain, viz., (a) the connection of τῶν τῶν φωτός, and (b) the sense of φῶς in the two clauses. As to (a), some attach the words to the ἀλήθευμα, = "when they are reproved by the light" (Syr., Copt., etc.). But, as the ἀλήθευτε (ver. 11) was introduced without any specification of the agent, it is more natural to connect with the participle but with the fin. verb, and the best sense is got thereby. As to (b), it is held by some (e.g., Ell.) that the term φῶς must have the same sense in both clauses, whether the primary sense or the metaphorical. But it is difficult to get a clear and consistent sense for the statement on that supposition, neither is it necessary that the τῶν φωτός in the first clause should have identically the same sense as φῶς in the second. In point of fact in the former the idea of the Christian light, the light of the Christian truth previously referred to, seems to be in view; while in the latter clause, which gives a general statement in support of the preceding particular affirmation, φῶς has its primary sense. It should be added that, if φανερωμένον is part of the statement of a general truth, the objection taken by some (e.g., Abb.) to the interpretation that deals with it as a true passive, viz., that it should then be τὰ φανερωμένα, falls to the ground. These considerations, therefore, negative all such inter-
preitations as these—(1) "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one" (Beng.); (2) "for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light" (Olah.); (3) "all things which are tested by the light of the doctrine of Christ, one has no need to keep secret; all, however, which one can reform openly is itself light"; (4) all those constructions which give φανερώμενον the Middle sense, e.g., omne enim illud, quod manifesta factit alia, lux est (Erasm.); lux enim illud est quod omnia facit manifesta (Beza; similarly Calv., Bleek, etc.); (5) and that make the light the agent of the ἀνάγνωσθη (De Wette, etc.).

The sense, therefore, is this—"all these shameful things which are done by them in secret, when they are subjected to the open rebuke which Christians ought to give them, are laid bare by the light of the Christian truth acting in their reproof, so that the doers of them are made to see them in the odiousness of their real nature; for everything that is disclosed in its real colours ceases to be secret and becomes of the nature of light". So substantially Mey., Ell., etc. The συν also has its proper, adverbial force, as if = "these things indeed are done in secret; but (or yet) they are made manifest and displayed in their true character, when you reprove them in the power of Christian truth".

Thus, the whole sentence becomes a further reason, derived from the effects of the act, for practising the ἀνάγνωσθη; and the second clause confirms the particular power ascribed to the Christian φῶς by reference to the general statement of the connection between manifestation and light.

Ver. 14. Βεβαίων, ἑγεῦμαι δ ταύτης ἢ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάγας εἰ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανεῖται σοὶ ὁ Χριστός: Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee. So the RV, better on the whole than the "shall give thee light" of the AV. The verse contains a quotation, but the great difficulty is in ascertaining its source and understanding its precise point. It is introduced by the subordinating, coordinating, and causal particle οὐ (on which see under ii. 11, and cf. Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 233; Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 274) = οὐδέ, "on which account," i.e. "things being as I have stated them we have the Divine word, 'Arise,' etc. The λέγει is taken by some (Haupt, Abb.) as = it is said; but in Paul's general use it is personal, οἷς or similar subject being understood; while φῶς is the formula that may be used impersonally. (See on iv. 8, and cf. Bernh., Syn., xii. 4, p. 410.)"
"Christ will shine upon thee with the light of His truth and bring thee out of the pagan darkness of ignorance and immorality." 

So much for the terms. But whence does the passage come? The answer which best suggests itself, and which is given by many (Calv., Est., Beng., Harl., Olsh., Hofm., Weiss, Alf., Ell., etc.), is that it is a quotation from the OT, as the formula ἀνακοίνωσις indicates, and in fact a very free reproduction and application of Isa. lx. 1. The difficulty lies in the extreme freedom with which the original words are handled. There is but a very slender resemblance between what we have here and the LXX version of the prophectic verse, viz., ἡμὴν ἑκατονταετῶν έν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκεῖ γὰρ σου τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐκ σε ἀναπτύσσεται. Nor should we have a different condition, if we supposed Paul in this case to have followed the Hebrew text. Hence some (Beza, etc.) imagine that Paul has combined with Isa. lx. 1 other Isaianic passages [e.g., ix. 1, xxvi. 19, lii. 1]. But while it is true that Paul does elsewhere use great liberty in modifying, combining, and applying OT passages, it cannot be said either that these words of Isaiah have much relation to the quotation, or that we have in Paul's writings (even Rom. x. 6, etc., not excepted) any case quite parallel to this. Others, therefore, conclude that the passage is from some apocryphal writing, the Apocalypse of Elias (Epiph.), a prophecy under the name of Jeremiah (Geor. Syncell.), one of the writings attributed to Enoch (Cod. G, margin). But though Paul might have quoted from an apocryphal book, and some think he has done it, e.g., in 1 Cor. ii. 9, it is certain that his habit is to quote only from the OT, and further this formula of citation appears always to introduce an OT passage. Meyer tries to solve the difficulty by the somewhat far-fetched supposition that Paul really quoted from some apocryphal writing, but by a lapse of memory took it for a part of canonical Scripture. Others suggest that he is quoting a saying of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels (cf. Resch., Agrapha, pp. 222, 289), or a baptismal formula, or some hymn (Mich., Storr, etc.). The choice must be between the first-mentioned explanation and the last. Notwithstanding the confessed difficulties of the case, there is no OT, and further this formula of citation appears always to introduce an OT passage. Ver. 15. Ἐπηρεάσατε οὖν τοὺς ἄκριβεσιν [ἀκριβοὺς πως] περιποιηθῆναι: take heed then to apply the word of truth (not heed carefully how ye walk). The writer passes from the statement of the need of the ἀκριβία and its profitable effects into which he had been led for a space, and returns to the exhortation of ver. 8. The οὖν has its resumptive force here; as indeed it is a particle not so much of consequence as of "conversation and retrospection" (Donald.), and is better rendered "then," "accordingly," "to proceed," than "therefore" (see Win.-Moult., p. 553; Ell. on Gal. iii. 5; and especially Donaldson, Greek Gram., p. 571). It is out of place to give ἕπηρε τήν as if it had regard to the previous mentioned. It has the simple force of "take heed," as in Matt. xiii. 23, 33; 1 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17. It is followed by ἀκριβεία in Luke viii. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 10. The particular shade of meaning attributable to ἀκριβεία here turns in some degree on the reading. The TR gives τῶν ἄκριβεως, following ΝΔΓΚΛ and most MSS., with the Vulg., Syr., Arm. Versions, and such Fathers as Theod., Jerome, etc. If this order is adopted ἄκριβεως, which = "exactly," "diligently" (Matt. ii. 8; Luke i. 3; Acts xvii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 2), will express the idea of strict conformity to a standard, carefulness against any departure from what is proper to a Christian walk. So the AV and other old
English Versions render it "circumspectly" or (Wicl., Rheym.) "warily"—a very good translation. In B, Origen, etc., the order is ἁκρίβεια τῶν, and this is adopted by T Tr marg. WHRV. In that case the injunction loses its distinctive note, and instead of the charge to take heed how they walked "with strict carefulness," we have the plain exhortation to "take heed carefully" how they walked. The ἅκριτα in either case should have its proper sense "how" (as in Cran., Cov., Rheym. and similarly Wicl.), not "that" (as in AV and the rest of the old English Versions). Further, the προσευχή is not an indic. with a conjunctive force, as if = "take heed how ye walk," but a proper indic.; the point being the need of looking carefully at the way in which the Christian walk was being carried out there and then. See Win.-Moul., p. 376, and cf. ἐνεπίγνωστος βλέπει τὸ σκοτεινὸν in 1 Cor. iii. 10. —μὴ ὑπὸ δοσοφοί, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ σοφοί: not as a very good translation. In the NT the verb ἔξοχος has at times the sense of redeeming, ransoming one from another by payment of a price, and so it is applied to Christ's vicarious death (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5). It has the sense of ransoming occasionly in profane Greek (e.g., Diodor., 36, i, p. 530). Hence some take the idea here to be that of redeeming, as from the power of Satan (Calv.), or from the power of evil men (Beng.), or from the sacrifices of earthly things being taken by some (Chrys. Theophyl., Oec, etc.) to be the purchase-price. But it is doubtful whether any such technical or metaphorical sense can be attached to the word here, where the subject in view is the plain duty of a careful Christian walk. The simpler sense of buying is more appropriate to the context. The ἐξοχή probably has its intensive force, although Ellicott takes it to refer merely to the "undefined time or circumstances, out of which, in each particular case, the καιρὸς is to be bought". Giving the Middle also its proper sense, we get the sense of "buying up for yourselves". The thing to be "bought up" is the καιρός, not "the time," but "the fit time," the "opportunity," and the purchase-money implied in the figure is left undefined, but may be the careful heed expended on their walk. Thus the sense comes to be this—the character of wisdom by which their walk was to be distinguished was to show itself in the prompt and discerning zeal with which they made every opportunity theirown, and suffered no fitting season for the fulfilment of Christian duty to pass unused. Luther's "suit yourselves to the time" would require some such phrase as δοξάσας τῷ καιρῷ (Rom. xii. 11), and is otherwise inappropriate. Other explanations, such as Harless's supposition that the matter in view is the fit time for letting the φλεγμόν break in upon the darkness of sin, are remote from the immediate subject or impart ideas which are not in the text. The RV gives "redeeming the time" in the text, and "buying up the opportunity" in the margin.—διὰ τοῦ ἡμέρας πονηρὰς ἔσον: because the days are evil. Statement of motive for buying up the opportunity, εἰς., the evil of the time. The context makes it clear that what is in view is the moral evil of the days, not merely as, e.g., in Gen.
xlvii. 9, their difficulties and troubles (Beza, etc.). The fact that the times in which they lived were morally so corrupt was a strong reason for making every opportunity for good, which such times might offer, their own.

Ver. 17. ἵνα γίνεσθαι ἀπόφοιτος: for this cause become not ye foolish. The ἱνα γίνεσθαι may refer to the immediately preceding clause (Rück., De Wette, etc.), the evil of the days being a reason for avoiding folly. It is better, however, to refer it to the main idea, that of the walk, than to the subordinate. The manner of walk which they were called to pursue required the cultivation of wisdom, not of folly. The γίνεσθαι, again, is not to be reduced to the sense of acre. Contemplating them as in the Christian position Paul charges them not to suffer themselves to slip back again into folly—a thing inconsistent with the walk required of the Christian. ἀπόφοιτος is a strong term = without reason, senseless, lacking moral intelligence.—ἀλλὰ συνεῖναι [συν-νιστὲ] τὶ τὸ δῆλον τοῦ Κυρίου: but understanding [understand] what the will of the Lord is. The reading varies here between συνεῖναι, as in TR, with D'EKL and the mass of MSS., Vulg., Syr.-P., etc.; συνεῖναι, with D*G, etc.; and συνεινεῖται, with BΠΑΡ 17, etc., which is adopted by LTTr WHRV. For Κυρίου Lachmann gives Θεοῦ in the margin, but on slight authority. The Κύριος, as in Acts xxi. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 19, is Christ. As distinguished from γινώσκειν, συνεῖναι expresses intelligent, comprehending knowledge, more than acquaintance with a thing or mere matter of fact knowledge.

Ver. 18. καὶ μὴ μεθοδευέται οὖν: and be not made drunk with wine. A particular case of the ἀπόφοιτος to be avoided is now mentioned. The καὶ is used here, as, e.g., also in Mark i. 5, to add a special designation to a general, inclusive statement; Win.-Moul., p. 546. The case is the abuse of wine. But there is nothing to suggest any reference to excess at the Ἀγάπαι (1 Cor. xiv. 21) in especial. ἐν γὰρ στὶν δοκίμα: wherein is dissolvedness. Or, with the RV, "wherein is riot". The AV, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., all give "excess"; Worl. has lechery, and the Rhem. riotousness. ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (cf. Prov. xxviii.7) expresses the idea of an abandoned, debauched life; literally, the condition of one who is past salvation. The καὶ ἐν refers not to the οἶνος alone (which might infer a Gnostic view of matter or Montanistic, ascetic ideas of life), but to the whole phrase μεθοδευέται οὖν—the becoming drunk with wine.—ἀλλὰ πληρωτείνεται ἐν πνεύματι: but be filled with the Spirit. The verb πληροῦται is construed with the gen. of the thing that fills (e.g., Acts ii. 28, v. 28, xiii. 52, pass., etc.); or with the Hebraistic acc. (Col. i. 9); or with the dat. (Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4, etc.). The construction with ἐν here is exceptional. Hence some prefer to understand πνεύματι of man's spirit, and render it (as RV margin) "be filled in spirit". The contrast would then be between being filled in one's physical or carnal nature and filled in one's spiritual nature (so Braune, and in effect Abb.). In NT Greek, however, verbs that are followed by the simple dat. sometimes vary it by a prepositional form, e.g., βαπτίζεται οἰκία (Luke iii. 16) and ἐν θεσμῷ (Matt. iii. 11), παντὶ πρῶτῳ (Phil i. 18) and ἐν πᾶσι πρῶτῳ (2 Thess. ii. 16), etc.; and the formula πληροῖται οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι πληροῦσθαι ἐν is not wholly without analogy; cf. τοῦ τα δῶτα ἐν πᾶσι πληροῦσθαι, i. 23 above; and Col. iv. 12, πεπληροφορήθηκας ἐν παντὶ δέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, where indeed the πεπληροφορηθήκας of the TR must give place to another verb, yet one with the same idea, the present probably "filled with everything willed by God" (cf. Win.-Moul., p. 272; Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 117). The ἐν may be taken, therefore, as the instrum. ἐν, and
the sense will be "filled with or by the Spirit". Some (e.g., Ell, Alf.) would combine the ideas of in and by, supposing the unusual phrase to be chosen with a view to convey the fact that the Holy Spirit is not only the instrument by which the Christian man is filled, but that also in which he is so filled. But this is a needless refinement. The contrast, as most commentators recognise, is not merely between the otvap and the irvev-uta, but between the t9o-Keo-6c and the irXiipovo-0e. Otherwise the order would have been u.t|ofvu u.c9vo-Keo-6e, 4XX' ev irvevu.a,TiirXr|poSo-6e (Mey.). The contrast is not between the instruments but between the states—one due to the excitement of wine, the other to the inspiration and enlightenment of the Spirit.

Ver. 19. XoXovvtcs covtols i|raXu,oic kal uuivois xal tfiSaic Trvevu.aTiKa: speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. Lachm. inserts tv before ψαλμοί; Tr and WH place it in the margin, on the authority of BP 17, 67, Vulg., Jer., T, πνευματικά is bracketed by Lach., but is to be retained, as being found in all authorities with the exception of a very few—B, d, e, etc. The AV and the other old English Versions render 6avrioi, cal yourselves," and the RV gives this a place in the margin. But in all probability 6avrioi has the reciprocal sense = ally, as in iv. 32 (cf. Jelf, Greek Gram., § 654, 2). The idea is not that of meditation, but that of converse. There is nothing, however, to suggest the thought of actual worship. The sentence specifies one of the ways in which the condition of being "filled with the Spirit" would express itself. In their intercourse one with another their language would not be that of ordinary convention, far less that of base intoxication, but that of spiritual devotion and thankfulness.

Reference is made by many commentators to Pliny's well-known report of the practice of the Christians of Bithynia and Pontus—carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt secum invicem (Ep., x., 97); but what is in view there is responsive praise in the Lord's Day worship. Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs are mentioned again in Col. iii. 16. What the distinctions are, if any, between the three terms has been considerably disputed. ψαλμοί is a religious song, especially one sung to a musical accompaniment, and par excellence an OT psalm; υψί is properly speaking a song of praise; ψάλτης is the most general term, applicable to all kinds of songs, secular or sacred, accompanied or unaccompanied (cf. Trench, Syn., p. 279; Light, on Col. iii. 16). The three words are brought together here with a view to rhetorical force, and it is precarious, therefore, to build much upon supposed differences between them. There is nothing to warrant Harless's idea that the πνευματικά is the spiritual song for Gentile-Christians and the υψί for Heathen-Christians; or Olshausen's supposition that the term πνευματικά is to be limited to the OT psalms which had passed over into the Christian Church. There were Christian psalms—psalms which the Holy Spirit moved the primitive Christians to utter when they came together in worship (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26), as He moved them to speak with tongues (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6). It is probable, therefore, that these are intended here, especially in view of what has been said of being "filled by the Spirit." If the terms, therefore, are to be distinguished at all, the case will be simply this—that the ψαλμοί and the ψάλτης are specific kinds of ψαλμοι πνευματικαί, and that the former are the Christian psalms which worshippers were inspired to sing, and which no doubt would be like the familiar psalms
of Israel, while the latter were songs of praise to Christ or to God. On this view the adj. πνευματικά is attached to the ἐκκλησία not merely to differentiate these ἐκκλησίαι as religious and not secular, but to describe them as inspired by the Holy Ghost.—ἐκκλησίαι καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ: singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord. The ἐν of the TR is supported by KL, most cursives, Syr.-Harcl., Arm., etc. It is omitted by BY*, Orig., etc., and is deleted by LT[Tr]WHRV. For τῇ καρδίᾳ, Lachm. prefers ταῖς καρδίαις, which is given by ἩΠADGP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. ψάλλοντες, properly = playing on a stringed instrument, and then = singing, especially to an instrument (Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 15; James v. 13). The τῷ Κυρίῳ will have its usual reference, viz., to Christ. The question, however, is whether this clause is to be taken as coordinate or as subordinate. Does it add something to the previous ψάλλοντες clause, or simply explain and extend it? The latter view has been accepted by many from Theodoret downwards, who understand the point here to be that the speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs was not to be a formal thing or a matter of the lip only, but the utterance of the heart, "with the heart " (RV). But this would be expressed rather by ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ or κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν. The rendering "heartily" also would be easier if there were no υἱῶν. Besides the contrast in the context is not between lip-praise and heart-praise on the part of Christians, but between Christian converse expressing itself in praise, and the vain or profligate talk of the heathen. Hence (with Harl., Mey., Ell., Alf.), it is best to give ἐν its proper sense of in, and to understand the clause as referring to the melody that takes place in the stillness of the heart. It specifies a second kind of praise in addition to that of the λαλούντες—the unvoiced praise of meditation and inward worship.

Ver. 20. εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων: giving thanks always for all things. Another coordinate clause giving a third and more particular way in which the being "filled with the Spirit " should express itself. The two preceding sentences referred to praise, both outwardly with the mouth and inwardly in the silence of the heart. This third sentence mentions a special form of praise, viz., thanksgiving. This thanksgiving is described as a constant duty, the πάντως which would have been inappropriate with the λαλούντες and with the ψάλλοντες being in place here where, as in the case of joy and prayer (1 Thess. v. 16, 17), the matter is one primarily of attitude or spirit. The ἐν τῷ πάντω, "for all things" (neut., not masc., as understood by Theodor.), is taken by many in its widest possible extent, as including things evil as well as good. The Epistle does not deal, however, particularly with the sufferings of the Christian, but with what he receives from God and what his consequent duty is. It is most accordant, therefore, with the context to understand the παρακλήσεως as referring to all the blessings of the Christian, the whole good that comes to him from God.—ἐν ονόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. The phrase ἐν ονόματι... Χριστοῦ is different from ἐν Χριστῷ and of wider application. It has different shades of meaning, authority, power, honour, dependence, etc., in different connections. Here probably it expresses the idea of doing something in dependence upon Christ, or in regardfulness of what Christ is; cf. John xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 23; Col. iii. 7.—τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ: to God and the Father. The RV gives "to God, even the Father" in its text, and "to the God and Father" in the margin. But the most appropriate rendering of the title is the above. The title designates One who is God and at the same time Father; the Fatherhood here, as elsewhere, being no doubt primarily the relation to Christ, as is suggested by the ἐν τῷ ονόματί... etc.

Ver. 21. ἀποκαθιστάτε ἀλλήλοις: subjecting yourselves one to another. The connection of this clause is by no means clear. It is taken by not a few (Calv., Matthies, etc.) as an independent clause, the participle being dealt with as an imperative. But there is nothing to suggest the ἀποκαθίστατε which would have to be supplied.
To relate the clause to the paragraph which follows means that it is the introductory, general statement, of which we have a particular application in what is said of the γυναῖκες. But in that case we should expect the duty of the γυναῖκες to be conveyed by a noun distinct from ὑποτασσόμενοι, but denoting a form of behaviour that would come easily under the comprehensive duty expressed by the participle. It is best to connect the clause, therefore, with what precedes it, and to take it as a fourth coordinate clause, giving yet another way in which the condition of being filled with the Spirit should express itself. The former three dealt with spiritual converse, praise, and thanksgiving; this one deals with what is due from ourselves to others. It is appended to the other three as a summary statement of duty in our relations one to another, of which particular applications are to be made. Thus it leads easily on to the special obligations which are next enforced. The same comprehensive statement of Christ's duty in our earthly relations as summed up in the one idea of mutual subjection as contrasted with pagan self-seeking and self-assertion, is given in 1 Pet. v. 5.—

Vv. 22-33. A paragraph which, in dealing with the duties of wives and husbands as seen in the new light of Christian truth, gives the Christian ideal of the marriage relation. It is the loftiest conception of that relation that has ever come from human pen, and one that which no higher can be imagined.
master. If the husband's supremacy had been in view, it would have been expressed by τοῖς κύριοις. The ὲς denotes more than similarly, and more than "just as they are submissive to Christ so should they be to their husbands". The next sentence, and the whole statement of the relation between husband and wife in the following verse in terms of the relation between Christ and the Church, suggest that the point of the ὲς is that the wife is to regard the obedience she has to render to her husband as an obedience rendered to Christ, the Christian husband being head of the wife and representing to her Christ the Head of the whole Christian body.

Ver. 23. ὥστε εἶπεν ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικὸς, ὥστε καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας: because the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the Church. Reason for a wisely subjection of the kind indicated. It is found in the relation of headship. In the marriage union the husband holds the same relation, viz., that of headship, as Christ holds to the Church, and the headship of the one represents the headship of the other. For τοῖς κύριοις, B, Vulg., etc., give κεφαλῶν, which W places in the margin. The ὥστε before ἔπειτα rests on the slenderest authority, and is omitted by LTTrWHRV on the testimony of BHKL, etc. The anarthrous ὡς καὶ as a definite relation is expressed there "a husband is head of his wife". The ὲς καὶ indicates the point common to the two subjects—each is head, though in relation to different objects. —[καὶ] ἀυτῶς [ὁ Χριστὸς] σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος: and He is Himself the Saviour of the body. The καὶ and the ἀυτῶς of the TR have considerable authority (AD*E*KLP, most cursive, Syr., Arm., etc.); but they are not found in BHK*ADG, Vulg., etc., and are to be omitted (with LTTrWHRV). The clause then might be construed as in opposition to the previous δ ἐκκλησίας, as "as Christ is the Head of the Church—He, the Saviour of the body". But it is best taken as an independent clause, stating in a definite and emphatic way an important point in which Christ, who resembles the husband in respect of headship, at the same time differs from the husband. It is best rendered, therefore, "He, He Himself (i.e., = He alone) is the Saviour of the body". The RV less happily makes it "being Himself the Saviour of the body". The ἀυτῶς can only be Christ, and the σῶμα is the Church—the body to which He brings salvation. The husband is head of the wife, and in that he is like Christ; but Christ is also that which the husband is not, viz., Saviour of that whereof He is Head.

Ver. 24. ἀλλὰ ὡς ἦν ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω καὶ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἱδίοις ἀνδραίς ἐν γυναικί: nevertheless as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be subject to their husbands in everything. For ἀλλὰ the best editors give ἀλλά. For the σωτήρ of the TR, supported by D*KL and most cursive, read (with LTTrWHRV) ὡς, which is found in AD*GP, 17, 67, etc. But B reads ἡ. The ὡς inserted by TR (after AD*KLP and various versions, etc.) before ἄνδραν is wanting in BHK*D*G, 17, 67, etc., and should be deleted. It has crept in probably from ver. 22. The question here is as to the force of the ἀλλά. Some suppose a suppressed negation before it, e.g. "be not disobedient," "do not disallow the marital headship, but," etc. (Eadie). Others give it a resumptive force (Harl., etc.). But the supposed digression, which can only be the brief clause οὕτως σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος, requires no such resumption. Others give it a certain syllogistic force, understanding it to introduce a proof of the preceding statement, presenting the relation in a new light, or an inference from the statement (De Wette, Olsh.); but ἀλλά does not draw conclusions like ὡς, nor is it ὡς, although it may introduce a minor proposition; cf. Win.-Moul., p. 297; Hartung, Parthk,
oúte kai ai γυναῖκες τοις ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντὶ. 25. oi ἀνδρεῖς, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας ἡσυχῶν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐγκλώπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐνασύνην ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, 26. ἵνα αὐτὴν ἐν θερ. ref. 1. Before ἀδρ. insert ἰδίως AΔΕΠΚΛ, etc.; Ὀσ. Fathers; or om. ΝΒΔΕ*FG 17, 677, 11. 

17: Before ovap. insert ἰδιος AD'E'KLP, etc., Vss., Fathers; or om. ΒΔ*Ε*FG 17, 557, 5, 69, Clem., Orig., Cyri., Chr.; insert DEKL, etc. (Ταυειαν.) Chr., Thdr., al.; add ἰδίων FG, Thdr., etc. ii., p. 384. Others make it = "but them, which is the main thing," etc., supposing ver. 24 to give a second proof of the fact that wives should be obedient to their husbands as to the Lord—a proof drawn from the position held by Christ and by the husband, vis., that of being head (Win.-Moult., p. 565). This, however, would be expressed rather by μεταποιήσας, the former being the particle that in opposing also continues and connects, adding something distinct from what has preceded, while the latter has the full opposing significance, disannulling or discounting something mentioned before (Win.-Moult., p. 553). The μεταποιήσας, therefore, must have its full adversative force, and is best rendered "nevertheless," "for all that." The twenty-fourth verse thus looks to the peculiarity mentioned as belonging to Christ's headship in distinction from the husband's, vis., the fact that He is not only Head, but Saviour. And the idea becomes this—"Christ indeed is Saviour of the body, and that the husband is not; nevertheless the question of obedience is not affected thereby; for all that, as the Church is subject to Christ, so too are wives to be subject to their husbands" (so subst. Calv., Beng., Mey., Ell, Alf., etc.).

Ver. 24. καὶ ταύτων παραβεβηκαίν υπὲρ αὐτῆς: and gave Himself up for it. παραβεβηκαίν, as in v. 2, Gal. ii. 20 (παραβαλλόντος ταύτων), Rom. iv. 25 (παραβαλλόντος), without explanation of that to which He gave Himself; that being understood to be the death. This is the measure, therefore, of Christ's love, and this is the manner of love with which the husband is to meet the wife's obedience. Ver. 26. ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγάπη: that He might sanctify it. Statement of the great object with which Christ in His love for the Church gave Himself up to death for it. An object worthy of the self-sacrifice, described in definite terms and with a solemn significance—the sanctification and cleansing of the Church with a view to its final presentation in perfect holiness at the great day. The verb ἀγάπη, a later form of ἀγαπάω (used, e.g., by Soph., Oed. Col., 1405; Pindar, O., iii., 34, etc.), frequent in biblicaland patristic Greek, means to set apart to a sacred use, to consecrate, by external or ceremonial cleansing (Heb. ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5); by an expiation (1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 10, 14, 20); or by inward, ethical purification (1 Thess. v. 23). Most exegestes take ἀγάπη in the third sense here, and this is favoured by the terms which follow in ver. 27. On the other hand, both in the Pauline writings and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (cf. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, Engl. transl., vol. ii., 68, etc.) the dominant application of the verb is deliverance from the guilt of sin by means of an expiation. —καθαρίσας: cleansing it. The verb καθαρίζω, Hellenistic for καθαρίζω, has certain occasional applications in the NT (e.g., literal cleansing, Matt. xxiii. 26; Luke xi. 39; pronouncing ceremonially clean, Acts x. 15, xi. 9; consecrating by cleansing, Heb. ix. 22, 23); but apart from these it has two main senses—that of ethical purification (2 Cor. vii. 1; James iv. 8), and that of forgiveness, freeing from the guilt of sin (Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7, 9). In the case of this verb,
again, the prevailing idea is that of the changed, rectified relation to God. The two ideas probably are not sharply divided in the writer's mind. They are brought together again, both as definite acts of the past, in 1 Cor. vi. 11, ἀλλὰ ἀφειλομένους, ἀλλὰ ἁρπαστὶς, ἀλλὰ βιγκισθῆναι. But the latter is the more probable view here (Syr., Vulg., Harl., Abb., etc.), especially as the aor. ἀφείλησε points to a single, definite act, and one predicated of the Church as a whole.—τῷ λοντρῷ τοῦ ἔσαστον: by the bath of the water. Designation of the manner by which a purification takes place. The phrase is a difficult one. The word λοντρόν occurs only once again in the NT (Tit. iii. 5). It is used in both cases with reference to baptism (although some do not admit this), and it is so used in ecclesiastical Greek. In classical Greek it has the occasional, secondary sense of a libation for the dead (Soph., El., 84, 434; Eurip., Phoen., 1667), but it is used properly as = "bath, bathing-place" (e.g., Homer's θερπά λοντρά, Π., xiv., 6; λοντρά Πλανενοί, Π., xviii., 459, etc.); bathing (Herod., vi., 52; Xen., Cyr., vii., 5, 20); or the water for bathing (Sop., Oec. Col., 1599). It is doubtful whether any clear instance can be found of its use as = washing. The ἔσαστον is prob. the gen. materia, and the article marks the λοντρόν as the well-known bath of the baptismal water. The Versions vary in their renderings. The Vulg. gives lavacrum, and similarly the Syr. and the Goth. The Rhem, follows the Vulg. and renders laver. But the other old English Versions have either "the washing" or "the fountain" of water. The RV gives "the washing of water" in the text, but "the laver" in the margin. But "laver," in the sense of the vessel, does not appear to be a legitimate translation. The only legitimate rendering is "the bath of water," i.e., the bath of the baptismal water. Many interpreters find in the phrase an allusion to the bath taken by a bride before her wedding. The subsequent imagery, and especially the ἔστασις, may favour that; but the fact that the Subject here who cleanses by the bath of the water is Christ, while it was not the bridegroom who administered the pre-nuptial bath to the bride, makes that doubtful.—ἐν ἱματι: with (or through) the word. In respect both of sense and of connection this is a peculiarly difficult phrase. With respect to the latter the ἱματι is connected by some with the ἀφείλησε = "sanctify it by the word," i.e., being taken as the instr. dat. (Winer, Rück., Bisp., Bleek, Mey., etc.; cf. Win.-Moul., p. 172). The objection to this is the remoteness of the defining phrase from the verb. On the other hand it may be the case that the order is selected with a view to bringing things together, first the subject of purification, then the two defining terms (so Meyer). The analogy of John xvii. 17, ἀφαίσασθαι αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ αἵματι, is also urged. Others connect it with the λοντρῷ τοῦ ἔσαστον, = "the bath of water in or by the word." But to this there is the serious objection that the ἱματι is not the bridegroom who administered the pre-nuptial bath to the bride, makes that doubtful.—ἐν ἱματι: with (or through) the word. In respect both of sense and of connection this is a peculiarly difficult phrase. With respect to the latter the ἱματι is connected by some with the ἄποθνησεν, or with the idea expressed by the ἀφε alternate-see; that it is accompanied by it; or that it takes the place in it as its element or condition. How difficult it is to obtain a satisfactory meaning appears at once from the variety and the peculiarity of the interpretations proposed. Some, e.g., take it to refer to the baptismal formula, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or "in the name of Jesus" (Chrys.); in which case, however, we should expect either καὶ ἱματος or ἐν τῷ ἱματι. Others give the noun the simple sense of "an utterance" and take the phrase to mean "attended or conditioned by an utterance," "had a connection with an utterance," but that the particular utterance in view is "the revelation of salvation embodied in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy..."
Ghost " (Moule). Haupt, again, makes it = "by means of a word," supposing the term to be added in order to bring out the wonderfulness of the purification as seen in the fact that it is effected simply by a word, that is to say the word spoken by the person who baptizes. Hofmann also gives it the sense of "with a word," i.e. = cleansing it by the utterance of His effective will. Others make it = "by the bath resting on a word," viz., the Divine command (Storr, KÌ., etc.). If we look, however, at the use of the word ἰπμα in the NT we find that it is applied to anything spoken produced by the voice (2 Cor. xii. 4; Heb. xii. 1); a declaration (Matt. xxvi. 75; Mark ix. 32, Luke ii. 50, etc.); doctrine or instruction (Rom. x. 17, if not = command); or a saying, whether in the form of a message (Rom. x. 8), a command (Luke v. 3), or a promise (Luke i. 38, ii. 29). In Paul's Epistles and in Hebrews, it appears to be used mostly, if not exclusively, of a word proceeding directly or indirectly from God (cf. ElT. in toe.). It has indeed another sense, that of "thing," corresponding to the Hebr. לַעַל, "the thing spoken of," "the thing enjoined," etc. (e.g., Matt. xviii. 16; Luke i. 37, ii. 15; Acts x. 37, 2 Cor. xiii. 1). This sense is claimed for it by some in Rom. i. 8, 13-21. But it is scarcely applicable here. Hence here it may best be taken to refer either to the word of promise, that is the Divine promise of forgiveness (Mark xvi. 16), or to the preached Gospel. It has also the great advantage of being in harmony with the ἰπμα Θεοῦ in chap. iv. 17. It is true that ἰπμα is not quite the same as λόγος, but carries with it the definite sense of the spoken word; and that, consequently, it may not be taken to designate the Gospel here in the subjective sense of divine truth, the Word of God in respect of its spiritual contents, or as a revelation of grace. But it may have the sense of that truth as proclaimed, the preached Word or Gospel. With the former sense the clause will define the purification as being accordance with or dependent on the Divine promise, or having that promise as its ground. The latter interpretation (which is preferred by Meyer, etc.) is thought to be most in harmony with Rom. x. 8, 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, and it gives a good sense however the ἰπμα is construed. The main objection urged against these two interpretations is the absence of the article, and the fact that where ἰπμα has such a sense it is accompanied by some defining term, Θεοῦ (Eph. vi. 17), Χριστοῦ (Rom. x. 17) or the like. To this the only reply is that the omission of the article is due to the presence of the proposition—a sound, Middleton, Gr. Artie., vi. 1; cf. Ell. in loc.), or that ἰπμα may have become, like νόμος, χάρις, etc., so well-understood and constant a term in the sense of "the spoken word" par excellence, that it could dispense with the article (Mey.). Thus the import of the whole verse will be—"that he might set apart and consecrate the Church by cleansing it of guilt in accordance with the Divine promise " (or, "on the ground of the preached word of the Gospel "). The clause defines the ἁγιάζως as one that does not take effect by means of the λογος του θεου in and by itself, but by that only as administered in the power or on the ground of the preached Word. It is to be observed also that the sanctifying and the purifying are referred to Christ's giving up of Himself, His death being that in virtue of which these things take place.

Ver. 27. Ἰνα παραστηθῇ αὐτῆς ἐν θεου λόγω τῆς ἁγιάζης: that He might Himself present to Himself the Church, glorious. Statement of the remote, ultimate object with which Christ "gave Himself up " to death; as the immediate object, which has that final purpose in view, is expressed by the ἡκατον. For αὐτῆς of the TR, supported by D*K, most cursives, Syr.-P., etc., the reading αὐτῷ is to be substituted on the authority of B̄ Macedonia*GL, Syr.-Har., Vulg., etc. It is Christ Himself who is to present the Church, and it is to Himself He is to present it. He is at once the Agent and the End or Object of the presentation. The
The article gives this the force of anything belonging to the class of such things as deform and defile.—allel' ἡ ἁγία καὶ ἀμμος: but that it should be holy and unblamable. The regular construction would have taken some such form as ἀλλ' ἁγία ἀμμος. It is changed here, perhaps with a view to variety, as if the paragraph had begun with ἢ μὴ ἔχειν.

Such oratio variata was common in Greek, and there are numerous examples of it in the NT generally (e.g., Mark xii. 38; John viii. 53; Acts xx. 34, xxii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 23). The Pauline writings (Rom. i. 14, iv. 12, xii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 13, xiv. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 23; Phil. ii. 22). See Jelf, Greek Gram., § 909; Win.-Moult., p. 722; Buttm., Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 241. On ἀμμος see under i. 4 above.

Ver. 28. οὐτος ἐφελονον [κα] ὅ ἀνδρες ἀγαπην τὰς γυναικας: even so [also] ought husbands to love their own wives. The reading and the order vary somewhat. The ἐφελονον precedes of ἀνδρες in most manuscripts, and KL 17, etc.; in others (ADGP, etc.) it follows it. The TR, supported by KL, etc., omits κα'; which is inserted, however, before of ἐφελονον by BADFG 17, and most Versions, etc. It is accepted by TrRV, and is bracketed by WH. The οὐτος is taken by some (De Wette, etc.) to refer to the following ἀγαπην, = "husbands ought to love their wives just as they love their own bodies". To this there is no serious grammatical objection; for οὐτος does not look always to what precedes, but may refer to what follows (e.g., 1 Cor. iii. 15, οὐτος δι' ὥσπερ τὸ καθος; also 1 Cor. iv. 1). When this is the case, however, whether in classical Greek or in the NT, there appears to be a certain emphasis on the οὐτος, and its more familiar reference is to what precedes. Here, too, the κα' favours the relation to the preceding καθος κα' δ' ἥρωτος, etc. The idea, therefore, is that even as Christ loved the Church so too ought husbands to love their wives.—οὕτως ἡ ἁγίων συνο-
29. οδεις γαρ ποτε την έαυτου σαρκα 1 δμύοσεν, ἅλλα ἐκτρέφει εις Χρ. vi. 4 καὶ οθωρκει αὐτήν,4 καθεσ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς 5 την ακελπήσαν. 30. δει και των σώματος αυτοῦ, εκ τῆς σαρκὸς αυτοῦ, καὶ εκ τῶν θεοῦ Θεσ. ii. 7 only; Deut. xii. 6.

1 την εαυτου σαρκα Ν, Method., Orig., Victorin., etc.; την σαρκα αυτου Vulg., Tert., Ambst., Jer., etc.

2 εκτρ. Αν. κ. θ. DEFG, d, e, f, g, Goth.; some Vss. repeat αυτην; Method. om. -
alog.

3 ὁ ευρος DEKL, etc., Ar.-pol., Slav., Oec.; ὁ Χριστος Ν, ABDFGP 17, etc., It., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Sah., etc., Greek-Lat. Fathers.

μαται: as their own bodies. This is not to be reduced to "like themselves" (Rosem., etc.); nor does ὑπερ here mean simply "like," as if all that is meant is that the husband's love for his wife is to be similar to his love for his own body. The ὑπερ has its qualitative force,"as it were," "as being". Christ and husband are each head, as Paul has already put it, and as the Church is the body in relation to the former, so is the wife in relation to the latter. The husband, the head, therefore, to love the wife as being his body, even as Christ loved the Church as forming His body. The idea of husband and wife as being one flesh is probably also in view. ὁ ἄντων εις τῆς λαύσα τον ἄντων ἄγατον: he that loveth his own wife loveth himself. The relation of head and body means that the wife is part of the husband's self. To love his wife, therefore, in this character as being his body, is to love himself. It is a love, consequently, not merely of duty, but of nature — καθα φισεων as well as κατο ὑπερ- λη (Ell.).

Ver. 29. οδεις γαρ ποτε την έαυτου σαρκα δμυοσεν: for no one ever hated his own flesh. The γαρ gives a reason for the preceding statement, looking to the thought, however, rather than to the form of the statement. The thought is the oneness of husband and wife, the position of the wife as part of the husband's self; and the connection is this — "he should love her even as Christ loved the Church, for the wife, I say, is as the body in that natural relationship in which the husband is the head, so that in loving her he loves himself; and this is the reason in nature why he should love her, for according to this to hate his wife is to hate his own flesh, which is contrary to nature and a thing never seen."

σεβασμος has here its non-ethical sense, practically σεβασμος (as in Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16, etc.); ἅλλα ἐκτρέφει και θωρακει αὐτήν: but nourisheth and cherisheth it. The form ἅλλα is preferred again by LTTR WHRV. The εις in the comp. ἐκτρέφει may point to the careful, continued nourishing from one stage to another, nourishing up to maturity. Ell. takes it to express "the evolution and development produced by the τρέφειν" (so, too, Mey., etc.). θαλαμει means primarily to warm, some give it the literal sense here, supposing it to look to the covering and protection of the body as ἐκτρέφει looks to its nourishment — "fovet" spectat amic-tum, says Bengel, ut "nutrit" victum; and so Mey. But the secondary sense seems more appropriate here, especially in view of the following affirmation regarding Christ, and as it is in 1 Thess. ii. 7. — καθας και τον Κυριον [Χριστον] την ακελπην: even as the Lord [Christ] also the Church. For the Κυριον of the TR (with DKPL, etc.) read with the best critics Χριστος, which is given in BNADF 17, and most Versions and Fathers. That is, "even as Christ also nourisheth and cherisheth the Church" — a broad statement of Christ's loving care for His Church, into which no reference to the Lord's Supper (which is nowhere in view here) as the means by which the nourishing is effected can be dragged (as, e.g., by Kahnis, etc.).

Ver. 30. διει μηλη ειςυν τον σωματον αυτον: for we are members of His body. The μῆλη, which is the heart of the statement, has the emphatic position. We are not something apart from Christ, nor do we occupy only an accidental relation to Him. We are veritable parts of that body of which He is head, and this is the reason why He nourishes and cherishes the Church; cf. the detailed description in 1 Cor. xii. 27-29. — εκ της σαρκος αυτον, και εκ των σωματων αυτος: being of His flesh and of His bones. This sentence, which is added by the TR, has considerable documentary testimony — Ν, GLP, most cursives, such Versions as the Syr. and the Arm., and such Fathers as Iren., Jer., etc. If it is retained, as is
done by Mey., Ell., Reiche, Alf., etc., it will be an explanation of the affirmation that we are μηδή τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, drawn from the thought of our origin (ἐκ). We are members of Christ's body, as having the source of our spiritual being in Him. This statement of our spiritual origin is expressed in terms like those used of the origin of our physical life, the allusion being probably to the record of the formation of Eve in Gen. ii.23. As the first woman derived her physical being from Adam in the way there recorded, so we Christians draw our spiritual being from Christ. The evidence, however, is decidedly adverse, the clause not appearing in BN*AD*FG, 17, Vulg., Arm., etc. It is found in fr$3AD3KLP, Syr.-P., Boh., etc. These words, whether Paul gives them professedly as a quotation in a free form, or uses them directly, making them his own (Mey.), are substantially those which in Gen. ii.24 follow the statement regarding Eve as bone of Adam's bone and flesh of his flesh. ἀνθρώπου corresponds to the ἐμάκρυτον of Gen. ii.24; ἀνθρώπου, the prep. of exchange and succession, being used also, like the Hebrew הָנֹעַ, in the sense of "for that," and occasionally as = "wherefore"; cf. ἀνθρώπου, Luke xii.3; cf. Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 125; Win.-Moult., p. 456. Thus ἀνθρώπου may refer either to the immediately preceding statement regarding our being members of Christ's body (so Mey.), or to the leading idea of the previous verses, viz., the husband's duty to love, nourish, and cherish the wife even as Christ loves, nourishes, and cherishes the Church. The former connection leads, as in Meyer's case, to an allegorising interpretation. The latter is to be preferred as in harmony with a simpler and more natural view of what follows. Another turn is given to the phrase, e.g., by Von Soden, who makes it = "instead of this," supposing the point to be that in place of hating, as mentioned in ver. 29, the husband ought to love and cleave to his wife. But this is far-fetched. The ἐκτακθήσεται, especially in view of its application in the OT passage cited or used, must be taken here as the ethical future, the future expressing what should, can, or must be, as, e.g., in Matt. vii.26; Luke xxii.49; John vi.68; Rom. x.14, etc.; cf. Win.-Moult., p. 348; Donaldson, Greek Gram., p. 407. Meyer insists on its being a pure future, and refers it to what is to take place at the Parousia. The verse as used here has been strangely handled by many commentators, who have found secondary, mystical meanings in the words. Not a few of the Fathers (Chrys., Theod., Theophyl., Jerome, etc.) interpreted it of the Incarnation; and later
exegetes expounded it as referring in one way or other to Christ's present connection with the Church (Grot., Beng., etc.); some understanding Christ's separation from His nation (Mich.), or from the synagogue, to be indicated by the phrase "leave His Father," and others even explaining it of the Lord's Supper (Harl., Olsh.). Alford applies it mystically to "that past, present, and future which constitutes Christ's Union to His Bride, the Church—His leaving the Father's bosom, which is past—His gradual preparation of the Union, which is present—His full consummation of it, which is future". Even Meyer puts a forced, allegorical sense upon it, taking it to be used typically of the perfect union which takes place between Christ and the Church only at His Second Coming, before which time He is not Husband, but Bridegroom. So the ἀνθρωπός becomes Christ, at the Parousia; the leaving father and mother becomes mystically Christ's leaving His seat at the right hand of God; etc. two becoming one flesh is the descending, returning Christ making one ethical person with the Church, etc. But all this is in the highest degree unnatural. When Paul allegorises he gives intimation of the fact (ἐν κυριεύοντι ηὐληγρημόναι, Gal. iv., 24), and certainly there is no such allegory as this would be anywhere else in the Pauline writings. Its incongruities condemn it. What is to be made, e.g., of the leaving of the mother, which Jerome, e.g., is driven to say means the leaving of the heavenly Jerusalem? We take the verse, therefore, in its simple and obvious sense, as referring to the direct and ruling idea of the paragraph, viz., the natural marriage relation and the duty of husbands to wives; and we read it as an enforcement of that duty based upon the natural identity of the wife with the husband, as stated in the narrative of the Creation and illustrated in its highest ideal in the Church's relation to Christ. —καὶ προςκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ δύο ἔσονται ἕνα σῶμα: and shall cleave unto his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. "Cleave to" represents very well the force of the verb ψωροκολλᾶμαι, the Sept. representative of ψωροκολλάω, to glue to, stick to. For ψωροκολλάω, the reading of TR, with BCDKLM, Orig., etc., τῇ γυναικὶ is given in ADG, etc., and is preferred by LTTr, while WH place it in the margin. The αὐτοῦ is omitted by T with Ν, etc. For ψωροκολλήσεται there is also the variant κολληθήσεται in ADGF. Ver. 32. τὸ μνητήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν: this mystery is great. Not "this is a great mystery," as it is rendered by the AV and Rhem.; nor "this is a great secret," Tynd., Cran., gen. The term μνητήριον (on which see under i.9 above) cannot mean allegory or dark-saying, but must have its usual sense of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret disclosed. It cannot refer, therefore, as Mey. makes it do, to the quotation from Gen. ii. 24 as a passage with a hidden typical or mystical meaning, one deep (μέγα) and difficult to reach. Nor can it well refer to the spiritual union of Christ and the Church by itself (Beng.), or to the comparison between the union of husband and wife and that of Christ and the Church (Est.), as the τοῦτο θέλει would then lose its point. It is simplest to take it as referring to Christian truth touching the relation between husband and wife as set forth in these verses. That truth is described by μέγα as great, i.e., in the sense of grandeur and importance. The Vulg. rendering sacramentum (followed by Wicl. and the Rhem.) has induced many Roman Catholic theologians to found on this as a passage presenting marriage in the character of a sacrament—a perverted interpretation which was disavowed indeed by distinguished scholars like Cajetan and Estius in the Roman Catholic Church itself. It may be added that Alford understands by the μνητήριον "the matter mystically alluded to in the Apostle's application of the text just quoted; the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ with our humanity, typified by the close conjunction of the marriage state". And Von Soden, taking the τοῦτο, as in 1 Cor. xv. 51, to refer to
what follows, supposes the sense to be ""this secret, that is, what I am about to say as the secret sense of this sentence, is great"". Hatch, again, who regards μυστήριον as closely related in sense to τόνως, συμβολον and μαραθλή and interchangeable with them, gives μυστήριον the sense of "symbol" (which he thinks is its meaning also in Rev. i.20, xvii.7), and renders it "this symbol (sc. of the joining of husband and wife into one flesh) is a great one" (Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 61).— υἱός τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ ἡτέρων ἡ μνήμη: but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church. The second el is omitted by LWH, as not found in BK, Iren., Tert., etc.; it is inserted, however, in MADFL, Orig., Meth., Theodor., Cypr., Hil., etc. The formula λέγω ἔδω is used in various Pauline passages where an explanation of something previously said is in view (e.g., 1 Cor. i. 12; Gal. iii. 17, iv. 1, v. 16; cf. τοῦ καὶ φημι, 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50). Here too, the sense is not "I interpret it," but simply "I say it." "I mean it". The ἔδω has here its disjunctive force, introducing an explanation and separating it from what it explains (Thayer-Grimm, Greek-Engl. Lex. of N. T., p. 125). The ἔδω is the prep. of ethical direction, indicating that towards which the mind is looking (Thayer-Grimm, ut sup., p. 184; and cf. Acts ii. 25), = "with reference to Christ," not "of Christ," far less "to Christ" as the Vulg. unhappily renders it. The emphatic position of the ἔδω gives it to be understood that what immediately follows is the writer's own way of putting the matter just stated, or his own application of the words of Scripture. The sense, therefore, is this—"the truth of which I have spoken, the relation of husband and wife as one flesh, is a revelation of profound importance; but let me explain that, in speaking of it as I have done, my meaning is to direct your minds to that higher relation between Christ and His Church, in its likeness to which lies its deepest significance."

Ver. 33. πάντα καὶ ὅσα γὰρ οἱ καθ' ἑαυτόν ἡ ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκα
in Paul:
1 Cor. xi.
 οὕτως αὐγαθέτω οὕτω αὐτῶν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἡ ἑαυτῆς τοῦ ἀνδρός.

and in Matt. and Luke (Gosp., vi. 24 al.), in Mark (xii. 32), John (viii. 10, but ?), and Acts viii. 1 al., with gen. "except".

11 al.

v Constr., Mark v. 23.

1 ἐκαύτος FG 13, DIE.
  ἐστὶν εὐαγγ. DEFG (εὐαγγ.)

1 εκαύτος always 33. 'τὰ πάντα καὶ ὅσα γὰρ οἱ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἡ ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκα
VI. 1—2.

VI. 1. Τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακοῦετε τοῖς γονέοις ὑμῶν ἐν κυρίῳ. 2. Ἰδία τῶν πατέρα σου καὶ τῆς μητέρας.

1. Omit in kuryw BD*FG, d, e, f, g, Clem., Tert., Cypr.; insert ἙΝΔΕΚΛΠ, all cursives (appry.), most Versions, Orig., Bas., Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst., Jer.
2. After τὴν μ. insert σου FG 37, 47, 115, 219, 238, etc., Syr., Copt., Eth., Orig., etc.

Chapter VI. Vv. 1-4. Other relative duties—those of parents and children.

With this the concise paragraph in Col. iii. 20, 21 is specially to be compared.

Ver. 1. τά τέκνα, γονέοιν (ἐν Κυρίῳ): children obey your parents in the Lord. The duty of the wife has been described by the terms subjection or submission (ὑποταγέσθαι) and fear (πνεύματι). The duty of the child is now described in terms of obedience (ὑγιείας τοῦ νεανίτου) and honour (ὑγιείας, ver. 2). In these words the whole distinctive duty of the child is summed up, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. The "eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it" (Prov. xxx. 17). Disobedience to parents is named among the dark sins of the heathen of reprobate mind (Rom. i. 30), and the evils of the " grievous times " in " the last days " (2 Tim. iii. 2). Disobedience to parents is named among the dark sins of the heathen of reprobate mind (Rom. i. 30), and the evils of the " grievous times " in " the last days " (2 Tim. iii. 2).

Ver. 2. Ημιοταυ τοῦ πατέρα καὶ τῆς μητέρας: honour thy father and mother. Obedience is the duty; honour is the disposition of which the obedience is born. The authoritative terms of the OT Law (Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16), given in the exact words of the LXX, are adopted in order to enforce regard for that disposition.—ἡμιοταυ τοῦ νεανίτου πρώτη ἐν ἀναγκῇ: which is the first commandment in point of promise. 

The prep. ἐν is understood by some (e.g., Alfr.) to be the local ἐν, expressing the sphere of the commandment, and so conveying the idea of being " accompanied by ". But more probably it expresses the simple sense of relation, " in regard of," " in point of" (Mey., Ell.; cf. Win.-Moult., p. 488). πρώτη, like other ordinals, being specific enough in itself, dispenses with the article. But what is meant by this definition of the fifth commandment as the first in point of promise? The second commandment also has a kind of promise. But if that commandment is discounted because its promise is general, not peculiar to itself, but applicable to all, and if the fifth alone has attached to it a promise relevant to itself, why is it called the "first" and not rather the "only" commandment in point of promise? Some meet the difficulty by supposing it to mean the first in the second table (Mich., etc.). But in the second table it would still be not only the first but the only one (cf. per contra Matt. xix. 19), given; and if the Jewish division of the Decalogue, which assigned five commandments to each of the two tables, reaches thus far back, it would not be even in the second table. Nor can πρώτη be taken in the sense of first in importance; for it is never described as such (cf. πρώτη ἡ ἱερά Εννεα τὰ πρῶτα, etc.). The most probable explanation is that Paul has not the Decalogue alone in view, but the whole series of Divine Commandments...
VI.

1. "the which is the first commandment, with the promise that," etc. But this still leaves it unexplained why this commandment is called the first. The whole sentence is dealt with as a parenthesis by the RV. But this is to miss the real point of the statement, which is to advance from the duty of obedience (inraKovcre) enforced by its relation to the requirement of law (the SUaiov), to the higher idea of filial honour as inculcated in the highest summary of Divine Law, the Decalogue. The ftris clause, therefore, is an integral part of the statement, and instead of being a remark by the way conveys an advance in the thought.

Ver. 3. hat it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the land. The quotation of the commandment is continued according to the LXX, but with some variations, viz., Ser for ylv-q, and the omission of Trjv a-ra-STJfrjs (Exod. xx. 12, or tvs alone as in Deut. v. 16) Kvpios o 6c6s o-ov 818W1.

Ver. 4. and, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath. The Kat continues the statement of this second of the relative or domestic duties, presenting now the other side. The duty is one not only of children to parents, but also of parents to children. The parental duty is set forth in terms of the father's obligation without particular mention of the mother's, not because children of maturer age are in view (Olsh.), but simply because the father is the ruler in the house, as the husband is the head of the wife; the mother's rule and responsibility being subordinate to his and represented by his. The parental duty is given first negatively, as avoidance of all calculated to irritate or exasperate the children — injustice, severity and the like, so as to make them indisposed to filial obedience and honour. 5 a

ments, Mosaic and later (Mey., etc.). Westcott and Hort notice another possible pointing, vis., πρεσπην, επάγγελσθαι, = "the which is the first commandment, with the promise that," etc. But this still leaves it unexplained why this commandment is called the first. The whole sentence is dealt with as a parenthesis by the RV. But this is to miss the real point of the statement, which is to advance from the duty of obedience (inraKovcre) enforced by its relation to the requirement of law (the SUaiov), to the higher idea of filial honour as inculcated in the highest summary of Divine Law, the Decalogue. The ftris clause, therefore, is an integral part of the statement, and instead of being a remark by the way conveys an advance in the thought.

Ver. 3. hat it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the land. The quotation of the commandment is continued according to the LXX, but with some variations, viz., Ser for ylv-q, and the omission of Trjv a-ra-STJfrjs (Exod. xx. 12, or tvs alone as in Deut. v. 16) Kvpios o 6c6s o-ov 818W1. This clause is omitted perhaps as less suitable to those addressed (Abb.); or it may be with a view to generalise the statement and relieve it of all restrictions but those which necessarily condition the promises of temporal blessings (Ell.). Meyer strangely supposes that the quotation is left unfinished simply because the readers could easily complete it for themselves. In that case it might have been even shorter. The first clause promises temporal good generally; the second the particular blessing, so associated in the OT with the idea of the Divine favour, of length of days. The phrase is explained by not a few (Erasm., De Wette, Win., etc.; cf. Win.-Moul., p. 361) as a case of oratio variata, a transition from the fta construction to direct narrative, = "and thou shalt be," as the RV margin puts it. But there is no necessity for supposing such a change in the construction, as in with the fut. indic., though strange to Attic Greek (which yet uses δος with that tense and mood), is found in the NT (Cor. ix. 18; Rev. xxii. 14). In Attic Greek the idea would have been expressed not by ετε γεννησαι, but by ετε πανεκαμοι, ετε πανεκαμοι or similar form (Mey.). In the OT original, ει της γης refers of course to the land of Canaan. Meyer thinks it must retain its historical sense here. But that, in its literal completeness, would be something inapplicable to Paul's Christian readers. The fact that the quotation is broken off at this point, and that the more restricted, national terms of the OT promise are omitted, might warrant us in giving the phrase the larger sense of "on the earth" (with RV text). But it is best to take the phrase as far as possible in its historical sense, and translate it "on the land" (RV marg.), i.e., the land on which your Christian lot is cast.

Ver. 4. and, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath. The Kat continues the statement of this second of the relative or domestic duties, presenting now the other side. The duty is one not only of children to parents, but also of parents to children. The parental duty is set forth in terms of the father's obligation without particular mention of the mother's, not because children of maturer age are in view (Olsh.), but simply because the father is the ruler in the house, as the husband is the head of the wife; the mother's rule and responsibility being subordinate to his and represented by his. The parental duty is given first negatively, as avoidance of all calculated to irritate or exasperate the children — injustice, severity and the like, so as to make them indisposed to filial obedience and honour. 5 a
5. Oi douloi, upakouste tois kuriou 1 kata stara 2 meta 1 (Acts ii. 37) kai 3 trophos, en 4 aplhthi tis kardias 2 uwm, os to 5. Phil. ii. 15.

Paul only; = stara or ev stara. 1 Pet. iii. 8 al.

m = ch. iv. 2 ref. n = Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Phil. ii. 15 only.

1 tois kuriou kata stara DEFGKL, al. pler., Chr., Thdrt., Oec., etc.; tois katap. kuriou kai stara DEFKL, al. pier., Chr., Thdrt., Oec., etc., Clem., Chr., Dam., Thl.

2 tis kardias ABDEFGKL, etc., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; omit tis 3, 48, 67*, 72, 114, 115, 122, Orig., Bas., etc.

PAP 17, 31, 37, 38, 47, 57, 73, al. 8, Clem., Chr., Dam., Thl.

aTiakos ABDEFGKL, etc., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; omit aTiakos N 3, 48.

67*, 72, 114, 115, 122, Orig., Bas., etc.

cf. (it)ipc6(6t in Col. iii. 21. — ALLA et-

tradoe aota en taideia kai voutheros

taideia, but nurture them in the disci-

pline and admonition of the Lord. For

ALLA TT; WHRV prefer ALLA as before.

We have now the statement of parental
duty on the positive side. etpopev has

here obviously the sense of bringing up

(cf. Prov. xxiii. 24), not that of nourishing

as in v. 29 above, since it is not instrumen-
tal here but local, denoting the ethical sphere

or element in which the taideia and the

voutheros taake place. taideia in classical
Greek means education, the whole instruc-
tion and training of youth, including the

training of the body. In the NT as also

in the OT and the Apocrypha voutheros

and its verb vouthetaeos mean education per-
molestias (Aug., Enarr., in Ps. cxix. 66),
discipline, instruction by correction or

chastening (Luke xxiii. 16, Heb. xii.

5, 7, 8; Rev. iii. 9; cf. Lev. xxvi. 18;

Ps. vi. 1; Isa. liii. 5; Ecclus. iv. 17,
xxii. 6; 3 Macc. vi. 12). Of the general
Greek sense there is but one instance in

the case of the verb in the NT (Acts vii.

22); and as regards the noun the passage

in 2 Tim. iii. 16 suits the idea of disci-

plinary instruction. There is no reason,

therefore, for departing from the usual

biblical sense of the word here, or for

giving it the wide sense of all that makes

the education of children. The term vou-

theros, not entirely strange to classical

Greek (e.g., Aristoph., Ranar, 1009), but

current rather in later Greek (Philo,

Joseph., etc.) in place of the earlier form

voutheros (voutheros also appearing to

occur occasionally), means admonition,

training by word, and in actual use,

mostly, though not necessarily, by word

of reproof, remonstrance or blame (cf.

Trench, NT Syn., pp. 104-108). The

Vulg. translates very well, "in disciplina et

corrupcione ". The distinction, therefore,

between the two terms is not that between

the general (voutheros), but rather that between training by act and
discipline and training by word (Ell.).

The Kuplos is taken by some as the gen. obj.,

"about Christ " (so the Greek commenta-
tors generally); by others as " accord-
ing to the doctrine of Christ " (Erasm.,

Est., etc.), or as " worthy of the Lord "

(Matth., etc.). But it is best understood

either as the possess. gen. or as the gen.
of origin, = " the Lord's discipline and

admonition ", i.e., Christian training, the

training that is of Christ, proceeding from

Him and prescribed by Him.

Ver. 5. Oi douloi, upakouste tois

touis kuriou kata stara: servants obey them

who according to the flesh are your

masters. As in the case of the two re-

lations already dealt with, so here the

statement begins with the dependent

member, the servant, who in these times

was a bond-servant. Many questions

would inevitably arise with regard to

the duties of masters and servants in a

state of society in which slavery pre-
vailed and had the sanction of ancient

and undisputed use. Especially would

this be the case when Christian slaves (of

whom there were many) had a heathen

master, and when the Christian master

had heathen slaves. Hence the con-
siderable place given in the NT to this

relation and the application of Christian

principles to it (cf. 1 Cor. v. 21, 22;

1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10; and Phile-

mon, in addition to Col. iii. 22, iv. 1 and

1 Pet. ii. 18-25). Here, as elsewhere in

the NT, slavery is accepted as an existing

institution, which is neither formally con-
demned nor formally approved. There

is nothing to prompt revolutionary ac-
tion, or to encourage repudiation of the

position. Onesimus, the Christian con-
vert, is sent back by Paul to his master,

and the institution is left to be under-

mined and removed by the gradual oper-

ation of the great Christian principles of

the equality of men in the sight of God,

a common Christian brotherhood, the

spiritual freedom of the Christian man,

and the Lordship of Christ to which every
378

nP02 E<J>E2I0Y2

VI.

p Col. iii. 21 xpioTw,1 6. fir) kot' '' 6$6aXu.o8ouXciay - us n drdpuirdpco-Koi, dXX'
q Col. iii. » ci>s SoCXoi xpiOTOU,' itoiouktcs TO 8e'Xr|fJ.a tou 9eou, ~. in ' 4,UX*1'>
only ; Pt.
lit 5.
r Col. iii. 33 only.
1 For Xpio-Tu, icvpiu AL 17, 39, 47, Vulg.-ms., Copt., Chr.,.
2 o$8aXu,oSowXiav fc^DEFGLP 37, 120, 121, etc. ; o<^8aXu,oSovXtiav ABK and most.
'tow Xp. D^EKL, etc., Chr., Thdrt. ; om. tow ^ABDFGP, al. plu., Bas., Euth.,

other lordship is subordinate. See espe
cially Goldwin Smith's Does the Bible
Sanction American Slavery? ; Kostlin's
Christliche Ethik, pp. 318, 480, etc. ;
Mangold's Humanitat und Christenthum ;
Lightfoot's Colossians and Philemon, pp.
319-329. vtrcucovcTf, as in the case of
children so in that of slaves obedience is
the comprehensive name for duty, and
this as a duty lying within the larger prin
ciple of the recognition and honour due
to constituted authority (Rom. xiii. 1-7;
1 Pet. ii. 13-17). For toi* icvpiots Kara
o-apKo (TR, with DFKL, etc.), the better
order is tois Kara o-dpica Kvpiois (LTTr
WH RV, with B^AP, etc.), = " those who
according to the flesh are your masters "
(RV), not " your masters according to the
flesh " (AV). In the Pastoral Epistles
and 1 Peter the slave's master is called
Seo-ir^Tijs. The word Kwpios, limited by
the Kara o-apxa to the designation of
a lordship which holds only for material
interests and earthly relations, may per
haps have been selected here with a view
to the contrast with the Kwpios whose
lordship is absolute, inclusive alike of mas
ter and of slave, of earthly and of heav
enly relations.—ucra ^ofJov ical Tpopov :
with fear and trembling. The use of the
same phrase with regard to Paul himself
(1 Cor. ii. 3), the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii.
15), and the Philippians (Phil. ii. 12), is
enough to show that nothing more is in
view here than solicitous zeal in the dis
charge of duty, anxious care not to come
short. —iv oirXorir)Ti rf\% KapSias tiu,uv:
in singleness of your heart. A clause
qualifying the obedience itself; not the
"fear and trembling," in which case we
should have expected tow iv o/irX^T-nTi,
etc. It states the spirit in which the
obedience was to be rendered, —not in for
mality, pretence, or hypocrisy, but in
inward reality and sincerity, and with an
undivided heart. The noun oirXdrns =
the condition of being without folds, sim
plicity, as contrasted with pretence, dis
simulation, insincerity, in the NT is
found only in the Pauline writings, and
there seven times, with slightly different

shades of meaning (Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor.
viii. 2, ix. 11, 13, xi. 3 ; Eph. vi. 5 ; Col.
iii, 22 ; in 2 Cor. i. 12 the preferable
reading is iv a-ytoi-nTi.). The phrase ir
oirXd-rriTi occurs again in the first and the
last of these passages.—A« iy Xpurrw :
as to Christ. That is, with an obedience
regarded as rendered to Christ Himself;
cf. »t tu Kvpiu in v. 22, and see also
Rom. xiv. 7-9.
Ver. 6. ut) kit' 6<t>8aXp.oSowXtiav : not
in the way of eye-service. TWH prefer
the form o$8aXp,oSowXiav. Negative ex
planation of what airXon|f ttjs icapStas
means. Kara points to the principle or
rule of action. The noun occurs only
here and in Col. iii. 22 ; but o$8aXp,dSovXot is found also in the Constit.Apost.,
iv. 12. It is the service that is done only
when one is under the master's eye—an
obedience to save appearances and gain
undeserved favour, which is not rendered
when the master is absent as it is when
his scrutiny is on us.—Cm avdpun-dpcoiroi :
as mcn-pleasers. av8pwirapco~KOs is an
other non-classical word, occurring only
in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and in
the NT limited to this passage and Col.
iii. 22 ; cf. Ps. liii. 6, Ao-to. avSpuwapc'o-k»v in LXX, and Ps. Salom., iv., 8, 10. —
aXX* u>s SouXoi [tow] Xpurrov : but as
bond-servants of Christ, tow is found in
D»KL, etc., but not in BMAD*F, etc.,
and is omitted by LTTrWH. The con
trast is with av9puirap£o-KOi, servants of
Christ, not pleasers of men. The SowXoi
XpioTov, therefore, is a clause by itself,
only explained by what follows. Some,
mistaking this, make it one sentence with
iroiowvrcs, etc. ; in which case it loses
its force, and the emphasis is on the
itoiouvt<«.— iroiovvTCf to 6lXi]ua tow
Stow €k <|<vxtjs : doing the will of Gfd
from the heart. Statement of what is
appropriate to the " bond-servants of
Christ ". It belongs to the character (it%)
of the bond-servant of Christ to do the
will of God, the God and Father of Christ,
in his condition in life, and to do that
not grudgingly or formally, but ex animo,
with hearty readiness — ck i|>wxi)S> lit.


6—8. 

μετ’ αὐτοῖς δουλεύοντες ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὖν ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτοῦ. 8. αὐτὸ κορίστευται 4

1 ὁμιλοῦντος οὐκ ἀλλὰ ἐγγὺς ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτοῦ. 3 τούτο τὸ κορίστευται 4

1 Omit ὁμιλοῦντος οὐκ ἀλλὰ ἐγγὺς ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτοῦ. 3 τούτο τὸ κορίστευται 4

2 ἀνθρώπος Β. Εθ. Dam.

3 ἐκαστὸς ἁπάντως οὐκ ἀδελφὸς τίνι. 3 τούτῳ τὸ κορίστευται 4

4 κόμισται Ν*AD*FGP (-ἰστηται), Petr. ; κόμισται Ν*DEKL, Bas., Euth., Thdrt., Dam.

“from the soul,” cf. ὅλα τῆς ψυχῆς σου “with all the soul,” Mark xii. 30. The ἐκ ψυχῆς is attached by not a few (Syr., Chrys., Beng., Hazl., De Wette, Alfr., Abb., WH) to the following clause. But it is not attached both ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ’ εὔνοιας to the τοιοῦτος τὸ δῆλον τοῦ Θεοῦ. But on the whole the simplest and most congruous connection is as it is given both in the AV and the RV. The addition of ἐκ ψυχῆς to the τοιοῦτος τὸ δῆλον τοῦ Θεοῦ is not superfluous; for to be true to the character of the bond-servant of Christ requires not merely the doing of God’s will, but the doing of that will ex animo. But such definition is enough, and there is no need of the further description καὶ ἐκ αὐτῶν. On the other hand the μετ’ εὔνοιας is as pertinent as an explanation of the τοιοῦτος as ἐκ ψυχῆς is as an explanation of the τοιοῦτος.

Ver. 7. μετ’ εὔνοιας δουλεύοντες [ὡς] τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὖν ἄνθρωπος: with good will doing service [as] to the Lord and not to men. Further explanation of what is meant by the bond-service of Christ, viz., a service rendered in good will and as a service to the Lord Himself, not to men. μετ’ εὔνοιας means not simply with readiness, but with the disposition that wishes well. In the NT the noun occurs only here; in 1 Cor. vii. 3 the accredited reading is not εὔνοια but δεῖλαν. The TR omits ὁμιλοῦντος οὐκ ἀδελφὸς (with D*KL, etc.). It is given, however, by Β*GAD*GP, Vulg., Syr., etc., and is rightly inserted by LTTRWHRV. It got a place in Beza’s edition of 1598.

Ver. 8. ἐλθότας ὅτι οὐκ ἐκαστὸς τοιοῦτος ἀγάθου: knowing that whatsoever good thing each shall have done. Or, according to the text of T and WH = “knowing that each, if he shall have done any good thing”. Participial clause subjoining a reason or encouragement for a service rendered in sincerity, with hearty good-will, and as to the Lord Himself. The encouragement lies in their Christian knowledge of the Lord’s reward. The encouragement is best rendered “shall have done”. The readings vary greatly. Passing over minor diversities, e.g., εἰσόβλεπες for εἰσόβλεπες, ἐν τῇ ἑκαστῇ δὲ ἑκαστὸς τοιοῦτος with omission of ἐν τῇ, etc., we find exceptional uncertainty in the text of the ἐν clause. The TR reads ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἑκαστῇ which is given in L* and most cursives. In that case ἐν is the potential ἐν, the δὲ and the τῇ being separated by ἐνίσθεν (cf. ἐν τῷ καισαρίᾳ, Plato, Laws, ix., 564 e), and the sense being = “whatsoever each,” etc. But in a considerable number of Manuscripts and Versions (ADGP, 17, 37, Vulg., Arm., etc.) we find δὲ ἑκαστῶς ἐν (or ἐνά) τοιοῦτος; in Ν* δὲ (probably δὲ τῇ) ἐν τοιοῦτος, while Ν* inserts ἐν τῷ before ἑκαστῷ; in L*, and one or two cursives (46, 62, 115, 129), δὲ τῇ ἑκαστῶς; and in B d e Petr. ALX. SCL 6, δὲ ἑκαστὸς ἐν τῇ τοιοῦτος. This last reading is preferred by Tisch., ed. viii.th, Alfr., WH, and is placed in the margin by Lach. In this δὲ is the conditional particle and the sense is = “knowing as ye do that each, if he shall have done any good thing”. The Manuscripts constantly vary between ἐν and ἐνά. In classical Greek the conditional ἐν, if, took also the contracted form ἐν, especially in Thucydides and Plato, and this possibly is the explanation of the biblical use of ἐν as = the potential ἐν. In any case the use of ἐν, attached to relative pronouns and adverbs, δὲ ἐν,
Act vi. 38
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u Acts xvi. irapd itupiou,1 citc SouXo? tin IXcuOcpof. 9. xal 01 xupioi, to aoTo

Heb. iroiflrt irpos auTous, " avUrrti Tr)* t dirciX^f. eiSo-rec.on kcu auTwr

xiii.5

only; Deut.xxxi.6. v Acts iv.17, 29, i iz.1 only; Job xxiii.6

1tov icvp.,with KL, etc., Fathers ; icvpiov NABDEFGP, Petr., Euth., Dam., etc.
or lav, ov lav, oo-okis lav, etc.,with

the potential force, appears to occur
(making all due allowance for uncertain-
ties in the texts) with some frequency
both in the LXX and in the NT, and
it is found in the papyri; cf. Thayer-
Grimm, Lex., p. 168 ; Buttm., Gram. of
N. T. Greek, p. 72 ; Blass, Gram. of N.
T. Greek, pp. 60, 61, 216.—τοῦτο κομι-
tai [κομισταί] παρά [τοῦ] Κυρίου: this
shall he receiveagain from the Lord. The
κομισταί of the TR is supported by fc$'Ds
KL, Bas., Ch., Theodor., etc.; P gives
κομισταί. The best reading is κομί-
σταί, which is that of B^*AD*G, etc.

In the NT the verb κομίσεως is used once
in the simple sense of carrying or bring-
ing to one (Luke vii.37, of the woman's
αΣλαβάρην); oftener in the sense of ob-
taining (1Pet.i.8; 2Pet. ii.13; Heb. x.36;
xi.39), or in that of receiving back, recover-
ing one's own (Matt. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v.10;
Col. iii.25). The word has this last sense
also in classical Greek (e.g., τὴν ἀδελφὴν,
Eurip., Iph. T., 1362 ; Thuc., i.,113,etc.).

Here the idea is that of receiving back.
The "good thing" done is represented
as being itself given back to the doer;
the certainty, equity and adequacy of the
reward being thus signified(cf.especially
2 Cor. v.10). Whether the Middle is to
be taken as the appropriate Middle,
expressing as it were the receiving back
of a deposit (Ell.)is doubtful in view of
the fact that in every NT occurrence but
one (Luke vii.37) Middle forms are used.
The best uncials omit τοῦ before Κυρίου,
and so LΤTrWHRV.—εἰς δὲ σουλ, εἰς δὲ
λαβήσεως: whether bond or free. The
reward in view is that of the Great Day,
the Parousia, which will have regard not
to social distinctions or external circum-
stances, but only to spiritual conditions.

Ver. 9. καὶ οἱ Κύριοι, εἰς τὰ αὐτά ποιεῖται
πρὸς αὐτῶν: and ye masters [or lords,
RV marg.], do the same things unto them.
The καὶ has the same force as in vi. 4
above. The duty of the masters is a
corresponding duty, essentially the same
as that of the servants (τὰ αὐτά), and it
is stated first in respect of what is to be
done and then in respect of what is to be
left undone. It is to put a forced sense,
however, on the phrase ποιεῖται τὰ αὐτά
if it is made to refer only to the preceding

δουλεύσεως (Chrys.), as if the point were
that the masters had a service to render
to the δούλως as these had a service to
render to them. Nor does it seem to
look back to part of the same regem, and in
πως ἐποιεῖτε τὸ θῆλμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Prob-
ably the µετ' εὐνόμων is more immediately
in view, and the meaning is that the
masters were to act to their servants in
the same Christian way as the servants
were called to act to them—in the same
spirit of consideration and goodwill.—
ἀνθέλετε τὴν αὐτή: giving up your
threatening. The τὴν, pointing to the
too well-known habit of the masters, may
be best rendered by "your". αὐτῆς is
used in the NT in the sense of loosening
(Acts xvi. 20, xxvii. 40), and of leaving
(Heb. xiii.5, from LXX). In classical
Greek it is used metaphorically both of
slackening, releasing (Aristoph., Veep.,
574), and giving up (Thuc., iii.,10, of
εὐθα). The latter sense is most in
point here. As Ell. rightly observes:
"St. Paul singles out the prevailing vice
and most customary exhibition of bad
feeling," one as represented
as being itself given back to the doer;
the certainty, equity and adequacy of the
reward being thus signified(cf.especially
2 Cor. v.10). Whether the Middle is to
be taken as the appropriate Middle,
expressing as it were the receiving back
of a deposit (Ell.)is doubtful in view of
the fact that in every NT occurrence but
one (Luke vii.37) Middle forms are used.
The best uncials omit τοῦ before Κυρίου,
and so LΤTrWHRV.—εἰς δὲ σουλ, εἰς δὲ
λαβήσεως: whether bond or free. The
reward in view is that of the Great Day,
the Parousia, which will have regard not
to social distinctions or external circum-
stances, but only to spiritual conditions.

Ver. 9. καὶ οἱ Κύριοι, εἰς τὰ αὐτά ποιεῖται
πρὸς αὐτῶν: and ye masters [or lords,
RV marg.], do the same things unto them.
The καὶ has the same force as in vi. 4
above. The duty of the masters is a
corresponding duty, essentially the same
as that of the servants (τὰ αὐτά), and it
is stated first in respect of what is to be
done and then in respect of what is to be
left undone. It is to put a forced sense,
however, on the phrase ποιεῖται τὰ αὐτά
if it is made to refer only to the preceding

δουλεύσεως (Chrys.), as if the point were
that the masters had a service to render
to the δούλως as these had a service to
render to them. Nor does it seem to
look back to part of the same regem, and in
πως ἐποιεῖτε τὸ θῆλμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Prob-
ably the µετ' εὐνόμων is more immediately
in view, and the meaning is that the
masters were to act to their servants in
the same Christian way as the servants
were called to act to them—in the same
spirit of consideration and goodwill.—
ἀνθέλετε τὴν αὐτή: giving up your
threatening. The τὴν, pointing to the
too well-known habit of the masters, may
be best rendered by "your". αὐτῆς is
used in the NT in the sense of loosening
(Acts xvi. 20, xxvii. 40), and of leaving
(Heb. xiii.5, from LXX). In classical
Greek it is used metaphorically both of
slackening, releasing (Aristoph., Veep.,
574), and giving up (Thuc., iii.,10, of
εὐθα). The latter sense is most in
point here. As Ell. rightly observes:
"St. Paul singles out the prevailing vice
and most customary exhibition of bad
feeling," one as represented
as being itself given back to the doer;
the certainty, equity and adequacy of the
reward being thus signified(cf.especially
2 Cor. v.10). Whether the Middle is to
be taken as the appropriate Middle,
expressing as it were the receiving back
of a deposit (Ell.)is doubtful in view of
the fact that in every NT occurrence but
one (Luke vii.37) Middle forms are used.
The best uncials omit τοῦ before Κυρίου,
and so LΤTrWHRV.—εἰς δὲ σουλ, εἰς δὲ
λαβήσεως: whether bond or free. The
reward in view is that of the Great Day,
the Parousia, which will have regard not
to social distinctions or external circum-
stances, but only to spiritual conditions.

Ver. 9. καὶ οἱ Κύριοι, εἰς τὰ αὐτά ποιεῖται
πρὸς αὐτῶν: and ye masters [or lords,
RV marg.], do the same things unto them.
The καὶ has the same force as in vi. 4
above. The duty of the masters is a
corresponding duty, essentially the same
as that of the servants (τὰ αὐτά), and it
is stated first in respect of what is to be
done and then in respect of what is to be
left undone. It is to put a forced sense,
however, on the phrase ποιεῖται τὰ αὐτά
if it is made to refer only to the preceding
its cognates προσωπολήμψις (Acts x. 34), προσωπολήμψις (Jas. ii. 9), ἐπιστολή (1 Cor. i. 17), are Hellenistic forms, occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. προσωπολήμψις itself is found only four times in the NT (Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1). Cf. also the phrases θέλεων εἰς πρὸς τὸν ἱπποτικόν (Matt. xxvi. 16; Mark xii. 14), λαμβάνειν πρὸς τὸν ἱπποτικόν (Luke xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6), which in the NT have always a bad meaning,—to judge partially, to have regard to the person in judging or treating one. In the LXX the phrase λαμβάνειν οὐ θυμάμεθα πρὸς τὸν ἱπποτικόν is also used in the sense of having respect to one's person, being partial (e.g., Job xxxii. 21), where it is conjoined with giving flattering titles), but admits at the same time of the better sense of showing favour to one (Gen. xix. 21).

Vv. 10-20. General concluding exhortation, following up the injunctions bearing on the particular, domestic duties. This comprehensive charge, which is expressed in terms of the Christian's spiritual warfare, the powers of evil with which he has to contend, and the weapons with which he is to arm himself, brings the Epistle worthily to its close.

Ver. 10. To the λοιπόν (ὁ λοιπόν) μοι, οὖν προσωπολήμψις [προσωπολήμψις] ἐν Κυρίῳ: finally (or, henceforth) [my brethren], be strengthened in the Lord. For to λοιπόν, the reading of TR with DFKL etc., τοῦ λοιποῦ, is to be preferred (with LTTr WHRV) as sustained by B*N*D, 17, etc. The form τοῦ λοιποῦ (also the simple λοιπόν) is used in classical Greek both as = "as for the rest," quod superest, "finally" and with the temporal sense of henceforth.

In the NT it has both these applications (e.g., Phil. iii. 2, iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1, etc., for the former, and Matt. xiv. 41, xxvi. 45; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Heb. x. 13 for the latter). It occurs also once in the sense of "at last," or "already" (Acts xxvii. 20). The form τοῦ λοιποῦ, properly a temporal gen., both in classical Greek (Herod., ii., 2; Xen., Cyr., iv., 4, 10, etc.) and in the NT (Gal. vi. 17), has the sense of "henceforth". τοῦ λοιποῦ can be used for τοῦ λοιποῦ, but it does not appear that τοῦ λοιποῦ is equally interchangeable with τοῦ λοιποῦ. Here τοῦ λοιποῦ might mean either "as for what you have still to do in addition to what has been said" (Mey.), or "henceforth". τοῦ λοιποῦ is = "in the future," "henceforth" (cf. Blass, Gram. of N. T. Greek, pp. 94, 109; Ell. on Gal. vi. 17; Thayer-Grimm, Lex., p. 382). The TR inserts ἀκέφαλοι μοι, with B*KL, most cursives, and Syr., Boh., etc. ἀκέφαλοι, without μοι, is read by AFG, Vulg., Theod., etc. But the best accredited text (B*N*D, 17, Eth., Arm., Cyr., Luc., Jer., etc.) omits the phrase (so LTTr WHRV). The ἐνυπακοόντες of the TR is supported by the mass of authorities, but is displaced by the simple ἐνυπακοόντες (which occurs in Col. i. 11) in B 17; which latter is given a place in the margin by WH. ἐνυπακοόντες is a proper passive = "to
be strengthened," as in Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 10; 2 Tim. i. 1; Heb. xi. 34. The Κυρίος (ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν ᾧ *) defines the strengthening as Christian strengthening, such as can take effect only in union with Christ.—καὶ ἐν τῷ πρῶτο τῇ ἁγίασιν ἑνός: and in the power of his might. On the distinction between the various words for strength, etc., cf. on chap. i. 19 above. The phrase is not to be reduced to "in his mighty power," but has the full force of "in the active efficacy of the might that is inherent in him". Meyer takes the ἐν as instrumental = "by means of" his inherent might. But it has its proper force of "in," the efficient, energetic power of the Lord's inherent might being the principle or element in which the increase of strength which is possible only where there is union with Christ is to realise itself. By the καὶ, therefore, this clause adds something to the preceding and does more than merely explain it. In 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν δύναμιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the idea is that of the strength of Christ descending to rest on one.

Ver. 11. ἐνθύματε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ: put on the whole armour of God. Further explanation of what has to be done in order to become strong enough to meet all enemies, even the devil. τοῦ Θεοῦ is the gen. of origin or source, = the panoply which comes from God or is provided by Him. To put the emphasis on the Θεοῦ (Harl.) is to miss the point and to suppose a contrast which there is nothing here to suggest, etc., with some other kind of panoply. The emphatic thing, as most exegetes notice, is the πανοπλίαν, the idea being that we need not only a Divine equipment, but that equipment in its completeness, without the lack of any single part. The fact that, in order to meet our spiritual foe, we need to take to ourselves all that God provides for living and for overcoming, is expressed in a telling figure drawn from the world of soldiery. The figure of the Christian as a warrior with his arms, wages, etc. (βολα, ὄψιν, etc.), continues repeatedly through the Epistle, e.g. Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). In briefer form the figure of the armour appears in 1 Thess. v. 8, and in its rudiments also in Isa. lix. 17; cf. also Wisd. v. 17, etc. πανοπλία is not armour simply (Vulg. armatura, Harl., etc.), but whole armour, the complete equipment of the Roman ἀρματος: or "man of arms," consisting of shield, helmet, breastplate, greaves, sword and lance; cf. Thuc. iii., 14; Isocr., 352 b; Herod., i., 60; Plato, Laws, vii., p. 796 b; and especially Polybios, vi., 23, 2, etc. The word occurs only once again in the NT (Luke xi. 22). No doubt the Roman soldier is particularly in view, and we would think of him, and it was the Roman military power that filled the eye where Paul laboured and wrote.—πρὸς τὸ δύναμιν ἑνός στήνεται πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου: that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. Statement of the object of the putting on of this panoply. The general sense of direction conveyed by the flexible prep. πρὸς when followed by the acc. takes a wide variety of applications. In this short sentence it expresses mental direction, aim or object, and local direction, against. The phrase ὀπροσ becomes longer to the soldier's language, being used for standing one's ground, in opposition to taking to flight (Thuc., v., 104, and cf. Raphel., Annot., ii., p. 493). In Jas. iv. 7 we have ἀντίστασιν with the dat. For μεθοδείας TWH prefer μεθοδείαν. On this rare term, found neither in profane Greek nor in the OT, and in the NT only in the two occurrences in this Epistle, see on chap. iv. 14 above. The plural denotes the various forms which the μεθοδεία, the craftiness, takes, and is fitly rendered either stratagens (which brings out the fundamental idea of method or plan in the deceit) or wiles. The Rhem. gives decetis; Tynd., Cov., Gran., Gen., Bish., assaults or crafty assaults. The Devil, διαβόλος, is mentioned here as the author and practiser of all subtle, malicious scheming. The malign powers of which he is the prince are noticed next.

Ver. 12. οὐκ ἐπίσκοπόν τινι ἐφημερί: The piece of armour which is not against flesh and blood. Reason for speaking of the μεθοδείας τοῦ
διαδόνον as dangers against which the Christian must stand his ground. The διά is explanatory, = "the wiles of the Devil, I say, for it is not mere men we have to face". The term πάλη, which occurs only this once in the NT, is used in classical Greek occasionally in the general sense of a battle or combat (in the poets, e.g., Aesch., Cho., 866; Eurip., Herac., 159), but usually in the specific sense of a contest in the form of wrestling. If it has its proper sense here, as is most probable, there is a departure for the time being from the figure of the panoply, and a transition to one which brings up different ideas. Has Paul, then, who elsewhere uses the more general figures of the μάχη, the ἄγων, etc., any special object in view in selecting πάλη here? There is nothing to indicate any such special object, unless it be to bring out the hand to hand nature of the conflict, "the personal, individualising nature of the encounter" (Ell.). The ἣ διά of the TR has the support of ΝΔΚΛΠ, most cursives, and most Versions; ἵνα in the margin; Lach., Tisch., etc., keep ἵνα. The form αἷμα καὶ σάρκα occurs only here and (acc. to the best critics) in Heb. ii. 14. Elsewhere it is σαρκίς καὶ αἷμα; but the sense is the same, = feeble humanity. The phrase occurs four times in the NT, always with the same general sense of man in the character of his weakness and dependence, but with slightly varying references; e.g., with regard to our corporal being in 1 Cor. xv. 50; Heb. ii. 14; our intellectual power in Matt. xvi. 17; our spiritual capacity as contrasted with invisible, diabolic agents (cf. Ell. on Gal. i. 16). The idea of carnal desires or passions which is ascribed to the phrase here by some (Jer., Mauth., etc.) would be expressed by σάρκις without αἷμα.—Ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχαν: but against the principalities. The formula οὕτω—Ἀλλὰ indicates not a comparative

negation, as if = "not so much against flesh and blood as against the ἄρχαν," but an absolute. Meyer regards the clause as a case of brachylogy, some term of more general sense than πάλη, e.g., μάχη or μαχητὰριον having to be understood, = for us there is not a wrestling with flesh and blood, but a fight with the principalities". This on the ground that the idea of wrestling is inconsistent with that of the panoply. But while it is true that there is a change in the figure for the time being, there is nothing to indicate that, neither is there any incongruity in representing the Christian's conflict as a wrestling—an individual encounter and one at close quarters. On the sense of ἄρχαν, principalities or rulers applied here to the powers of evil, see on i. 21 above.—ϕρός τῶν ἑξουσιῶν: against the authorities. On ἑξουσία, here designating demonic authorities, see on i. 21 above.—ἀλλὰ τῶν κοσμοκράταρος τοῦ σκότους [τοῦ ἀλώνος] τοῦτον: against the world-rulers of the darkness of this world (or, of this darkness). τοῦ ἀλώνος is inserted after σκότους by the TR, and is found in most cursives, and in such uncials as ΝΔΚΛΠ. It is omitted in ΝΔΘΦΓ, 17, 67[*], etc., and is rejected by LTTrWHRV. In the NT we have such designations as δ ἁρμόν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον (John xiv. 30), δ Θεός του ἀλώνος τοῦτον (2 Cor. iv. 4), applied to Satan. The phrase κοσμοκράτωρ τοῦ σκότους τοῦτον occurs only here. The noun κοσμοκράτωρ is found in the Orphic Hymns (iii., 3, of Satan), in inscriptions (C. I., 5892, with ref. to the emperor), in Gnostic writings (of the devil), and in the Rabbinical literature in transliterated Hebrew form (of the angel of death, and of kings like the four pursued by Abraham, and Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Mero'dach, Belshazzar; cf. Wetstein, in loc.; Fischer's Buxtorf, Lex., p. 996, etc.). According to usage as well as formation, therefore, it means not merely rulers (Eth., Goth.), but world-rulers, powers dominating the world as such and working everywhere. τοῦ σκότου limits their dominion, however, to the world as it now is in the darkness of its ignorance
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the LXX as the rendering of ἐπιθετῶν = the two loins, and so it is used here and in Acts ii.30; Heb. vii.5, 10. The ἐπιθετῶν in II Esdras is the instrument, perhaps with some reference to the other parts being within the girdle (Ell.; cf. περιπτερούμενος ἐν δυναστείᾳ, Ps. lxiv.7).

But what is this ἄλληλα, which is to make our spiritual cincture? It has been taken in the objective sense, the truth of the Gospel (Oec.). But that is afterwards identified with the sword (ver. 17). It is subjective truth (cf. v. 9 above). But in what sense again? In that, says Meyer, of "harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the Gospel"; in that, as Ell. puts it, "of the inward acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Him" (Christ). But in its subjective applications ἄλληλα means most obviously the personal grace of candour, sincerity, truthfulness (John viii.44; 1 Cor. v.8, xiii.6; 2 John 1; 3 John 1), as it is used also of the veracity of God (Rom. xv.8). It seems simplest, therefore, most accordant with usage to take it so here (with Calv., etc.). And this plain grace of openness, truthfulness, reality, the mind that will practise no deceptions and attempt no disguises in our intercourse with God, is indeed vital to Christian safety and essential to the due operation of all the other qualities of character. In Isa. xi.5 righteousness is combined with truth in this matter of girding — ἐπιθετῶν ἐκείνων τοῦ ἄνδρος καὶ ἄλληλα ἐκείνων τοῦ πλευρᾶς — in the case of the Messianic Branch out of the roots of Jesse. — καὶ ἐνυπνομένου τοῦ ἄνδρος τοῦ πλευρᾶς καὶ ἄλληλα τοῦ πλευρᾶς: and having put on the breastplate of righteousness. As the soldier covers his breast with the θῆραξ to make it secure against the disabling wound, so the Christian is to endue himself with righteousness so as to make his heart and will proof against the fatal thrust of his spiritual assailants. This δικαιοσύνη is taken by some (Harl., etc.) as the righteousness of justification, the righteousness of faith. But faith is mentioned by itself, and as the ἄλληλα was the quality of truthfulness, so the δικαιοσύνη is the quality of moral rectitude (cf. Rom. vi.13), as seen in the regenerate. The gen. is to be understood as that of opposition or identity, = "the breastplate which is righteousness". In the analogous passage in 1 Thess. v.8 the breastplate is faith and love, and with it is named the helmet, which is introduced later in this paragraph. In the fundamental passage in Isa. lix.17 we have the breastplate and the helmet again mentioned together, and the former identified as here with righteousness— ἀγαθή σωφροσύνη ὑπό δίκαιου.

Ver. 15. καὶ ἐπιθετῶν τοῦ νῦν ἐπιθετῶν: and having shod your feet. So the RV; better than "and your feet shod" of AV. The reference comes in naturally in connection with the στήριγμα. The soldier, who will make this stand, must have his feet protected. The Heb. כַּפָּא, sandal, is represented in the LXX by ἔσσομαι, which also occurs repeatedly in the Gospels and Acts, σάκαλον being also used both in the NT (Mark vi.9; Acts xii.8), and in the LXX, as well as in Josephus, with the same sense. Here, however, the military sandal (Hebr. כַּפָּא, Isa. ix.4; Lat. caliga; cf. Joseph., Jer. Wars, vi.1, 8, and Xen., Anab., iv.5) is in view, which protected the soldier's feet and made it possible for him to move with quick and certain step.— ἐσεραυπάρατον: with the preparedness. The form αὐτῶν is from the Greek (e.g., Hippocr., p. 24; Joseph., Antiq., x.1, 2) and in the LXX (cf. Ps. x.17), for the classical ἐσεραυράτω. It means (a) preparation in the active sense of making ready (Wisdom, xiii.12); (b) a state of preparedness, whether external (e.g., ἐσεραυράτω τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς), or internal (Ps. x.17); perhaps also (c) something fixed, a foundation (= Hebr. קַדָּשׁ; Dan. xi.7). Some have given it this last sense here, either as = steadfastness in keeping the faith, or as = on the foundation, the strong and certain ground, of the Christian religion (Beng., Bleek, etc.). But in harmony with the general idea of the ethical equipment of the Christian, it means readiness, preparedness of mind. The ἐν is again the instrum. prep.— τοῦ θεογένεσιν ἡ εὐφυνία: of the Gospel of peace. The first gen. is of origin, the second that of con-
tents, = "the preparedness which comes from the Gospel whose message is peace". The εὐσκηνία here is doubtless peace with God (Rom. v. 1), that peace which alone imparts the sense of freedom, relieves us of what burdens us, and gives the spirit of courageous readiness for the battle with evil. The phrase "the Gospel of peace" is elsewhere associated with the idea of the message preached (Isa. iii. 7; Nahum i. 15; cf. Rom. x. 15). Here, however, the readiness is not zeal in proclaiming the Gospel, but promptitude with reference to the conflict. The preparedness, the mental alacrity with which we are inspired by the Gospel with its message of peace with God, is to be to us the protection and equipment which the sandals that cover his feet are to the soldier. With this we shall be helped to face the foe with courage and with promptitude.

Ver. 16. εἰς [ἐν] πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν θυρεόν τὴν πίστιν: in addition to all (or, withal) taking up the shield of faith. The readings vary between εἰς and ἐν. The former, that of the TR, is supported by ADGKL, most cursives, and such Versions as the Syr.-P, and the Arm.; the latter, by B^P, 17, Syr.-H., Boh., Vulg., etc. The latter is accepted by L (non-marg.) TTrWHRV; and with it the sense is "in or among all," aptly rendered withal by the RV. With εἰς the sense will be neither "above all" (AV) as if = most especially, nor "over all," with reference to position; but, in accordance with the general idea of "accession," "super-addition" expressed by εἰς (cf. Ell.), in addition to all (cf. Luke iii. 20). θυρεός, in Homer = a stone put against a door (ἄποστα) to block or shut it (Od., ix., 240, etc.), but later = a shield. Lat. scutum, as distinguished from the smaller, circular σαρκί, the Lat. clipeus. It is described by Polybius (vi., 23, 2) as the first portion of the σαρκία, and is appropriate here where the Christian is presented under the figure of a heavy-armed soldier. τῆς πίστεως, the gen. of appos. or identity, = "the shield which is, or consists of, faith"; πίστεως having here also its distinctive NT sense of saving faith—the faith by which come the Divine forgiveness and the power of a new life.—ἐν ὑπηφορείᾳ πάντα τὰ βαλή τοῦ γινώσκει. The shield of faith which we shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. ὑπηφορεία = "by means of which," as the shield is placed before us to cover us from the stroke. There is no necessity for putting ὑπηφορείᾳ the sense of the remote future, as if the last conflict preceding the Judgment (Mey.) alone were in view. It refers to the future generally—to any time in our Christian course when we shall need special power for special assault. The art. τὰ is omitted before παραραμένεται by BD^G, etc., but inserted by the mass of authorities. Lach. deletes it; Treg. and WH bracket it. The anarthrous participle might have the qualitative sense, = "fire-tipped as they are" (so Abb.). If the article is retained, it would be implied, as Meyer remarks, that the wicked one has also other arrows to discharge besides these fearsome and pre-eminently destructive ones, which are mentioned here in order to express in its utmost force the terror of the attack. The βαλή in view are not poisoned arrows (referred to, as is supposed, in Job vi. 4; Ps. xxxviii. 2), which were not flaming missiles; but arrows tipped with tow, pitch or such like material, and set on fire before they were discharged, the παραμένεται (Thucyd., ii., 25, 4), or βαλής χαλίας (Diod., xx., 96), the malleolus used by the Romans (Cic., Pro Mil., 24), the Greeks (Herod., viii., 52), and, as it would seem, the Hebrews (Ps. vii. 13). The σαρκία has its own appropriateness here, the σαρκία being constructed of material (wood and leather, Polyb., Hist., ii., 23, 23), which not only prevented the missile from penetrating, but was proof against its fire and let it burn itself out. τὸν γινώσκει, in harmony with the general idea of a personal stand against spiritual foes, must be masc., "the Evil One," the Devil.
Ver. 17. And receive the helmet of salvation. The construction changes here, as is often the case with Paul, and passes from the participial form to the direct imperative. There is no necessity, however, for marking this by a full stop at the close of the preceding sentence (with Lach., Tisch., and RV). cWgoo-oc is omitted by D*FG, Cyp., etc., and becomes Sc{ao4oi in AD'EKLP, 17, etc. The verb has its proper sense here, not merely "take," but "receive," i.e., as a gift from the Lord, a thing provided and offered by Him. The helmet required for the defence of the head is introduced both in Isa. lix. 17 and 1 Thess. v. 8. It is noticed before the sword; for, the left hand holding the shield, when the sword is grasped by the right, there remains no hand free to put on any other part (Mey.).

tov o-urnpCov is again an appos. gen, = "the helmet which is salvation." In 1 Thess. v. 8 the helmet is not the salvation itself, as here and in Isa. lix. 17, but the hope of it. Paul's usual term is o-urnpio. In Tit. ii.11 he uses the adj. o-uTijpios in the sense of "bringing salvation". This is the only instance of his use of the abstr. neuter for o-w-rnpia. It occurs, however, in Luke's writings (Luke ii. 30, iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28, and in the LXX), — καὶ τὴν μέχαρα τοῦ πνεύματος; and the sword of the Spirit. The gen. here cannot be that of appos. (although it is so taken by Harl., Olsh., etc.), for the following explanation renders that inept. It must be the gen. of origin, = "the sword supplied by the Spirit".—διὰ τῆς προφ. Θεοῦ: which is the word of God. Some strangely make the 6 refer to the πνεύματος = "the Spirit who is the Word of God" (Olsh., Von Sod., etc.); but nowhere else is the Spirit identified with the Word. The 6 is explanatory of the μέχαρα, the neut. form being due to the usual attraction. In Heb. iv. 2 we have the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ compared in respect of superior sharpness or penetrating power to a two-edged sword. Here we have the phrase βήμα Θεοῦ, which is to be understood, in accordance with the proper sense of the βήμα, as the spoken Word, the preached Gospel, and this in its length and breadth—not in the commandments of God only (Flatt), nor in His threatenings alone (Koppe), nor even yet in the sense of the written Word, the Scriptures (Moule). The sword is the only offensive weapon in the panoply. But it is indispensable. For while the Christian soldier is exhibited here mainly in the attitude of defence, as one who stands, in order to take his position and keep his ground, thrust and cut will be required. The preached Gospel, "the power of God" (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18), is the weapon provided by the Spirit for meeting the lunges of the assailant and beating him back. With this the description of the panoply comes to an end. It has not followed the usual way, but has left out certain parts (spear or lance, and greaves, to wit), and has introduced others (the girdle and the sandals) which are not enumerated in Polybius's list of the accoutrements of the man-at-arms. It has kept only in part by the Isaianic description (Isa. lix. 17), including the breastplate and the helmet, but passing over the "garments" and the "cloke." Nor has it much more in common with the fuller description in Wisd. v. 18, 20, which may also have been more or less in the writer's mind—λήφθη τοίς γενειαίς τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . ἐνυπάρχοντα ὅρθρα δικαιοσύνης, καὶ περιβάλλοντα κόρειν ἀνυπάρκτον. Λήφθη τοίς ὀπίσω ἀκατακόρμων δεσμώτα, δετίνις δέ ἑαυτοῦν ἐφύγει ἐκ τοιούτων. It differs also in the application of the figures of the breastplate and the helmet from the briefer Pauline description in 1 Thess. v. 8. But the capacity of bearing a variety of applications, each as just in its place as the other, is the quality of all figurative language that is apt and true to nature.

Ver. 18. διὰ τῆς προφ. Θεοῦ καὶ
Deeds is προσευκαλέματος: with all prayer and supplication praying. This clause is a further explanation of the manner in which the injunction στέψε τίνι is to be carried. It is connected by some with the preceding δέσποινα, but it is not appropriate to the δέσποινα, which represents a single, definite act, while it is entirely suitable to the continuous attitude it portrays. The great requirement of standing ready for the combat can be made good only when prayer, constant, earnest, spiritual prayer, is added to the careful equipment with all the parts of the panoply. Meyer would separate προσευκαλέματος from the διὰ πάσης, etc., and make it the beginning of a new, independent clause. His reason is that it is impossible to pray with every kind of prayer on every occasion. But the absoluteness of the statement is only of the kind that is often seen in Paul, as, e.g., when he charges us to pray διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς, Luke viii. 4; or διὰ δράματος, Acts xviii. 9; τῷ λόγῳ διὰ θυσίων, 2 Cor. v. 11, etc.; Grimm-Thayer, Lex., p. 133. The πάσης has the force of "every kind of." The distinction attempted to be drawn between προσευκαλέματος (= ἴπτης) and δέσποινα (= ἴπτης), as between prayer for blessing and prayer for the witholding or removing of evil, cannot be made good. The only difference between the two terms appears to be that προσευκαλέματος means prayer in general, προσευκαλέματος, and δέσποινα, a special form of prayer, πέριτος, rogatio. — διὰ πάσης καίρος: in every season. Not merely in the crisis of the conflict or on special occasions, but habitually, in all kinds of times. — διὰ πάσης: in the Spirit. The reference is not to our spirit, as if it = with inward docility or with heart-felt pleading (Erasm., Grot., etc.), nor as opposed to σταυρολογία (Chrys.), but "in the Holy Spirit," the Holy Spirit being the sphere or element in which alone true prayer of all different kinds can proceed and from which it draws its inspiration; cf. the great statement on the intercession of the Spirit (Rom. vii. 26,27); also Gal. iv. 6, and especially Jude 20, ἰν πνευματί ἄγρια προσευκαλέματος. Thus the praying is defined in respect of its variety and earnestness (διὰ πάσης, etc.), its constancy (διὰ πάσης), and its spiritual reality or its "holy sphere" (cf. Ell.). — καὶ αὐτῷ [τοῦτο] ἄγρια προσευκαλέματος: and thereunto watching. The τοῦτο of the TR inserted after αὐτῷ has the support only of such MSS. as D*FG, etc.; it is omitted in BA*, etc., while αὐτῶν alone occurs in D*G. τοῦτο, therefore, is to be deleted, as is done by LTRWHRV. The καὶ τοῦτο refers not to what is to follow, as, e.g., to the ἤν μοι δοθή (Holzh.), but to what immediately precedes. The clause, therefore, expresses (by the καὶ) a more particular requirement to the general statement just made, specifying something that is to be done with a view (ἐν τούτῳ) to the fulfilment of the large injunction as to praying. That is watchfulness, readiness, and, as the next words state, watchfulness in intercession, ἄγριεν = to keep awake or to keep watch, and then to be attentive, vigilant (Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36), is much the same as γυμνοπείις and γυμνά. So far as any distinction is made between them it may be that γυμνοπείις expresses alertness as opposed to listlessness, γυμνοπείις watchfulness as the result of effort, and γυμνά wariness, the wakefulness that is safe against drowsiness (Sheldon Green, Crit. Notes on the N. T., sub Mark xiii. 33). — ἰν πάσης προσευκαλέματος καὶ δέσποινα: in all perseverance and supplication. The only occurrence of the noun προσευκαλέματος. The verb, however, is found a number of times, both in prose Greek and in the NT, especially in Acts (Mark iii.
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19. For myself, I beseech you—youth and age together—also to make every request and supplication on my behalf; and pray with me in this matter, that there may be a full realization of the grace which God has promised; and that with all prayer and supplication in every season in the Spirit.

And for me, and for all the saints, 

That to me may be given utterance, 

that I may be bold and undisturbed in the faithfulness of speech which the Lord has given me, 

so that I may deliver the mystery of the Gospel, 

which was made known to me in secret, 

as I have already briefly indicated. 

For this reason I beseech you, brethren, by God's grace, so that in everything I may be bold and free in speaking.
mystery contained in the Gospel or belonging to it. On μυστήριον see under i. 9 above.—The connection of the several clauses in this verse is variously understood. Some connect in Διοίξει του στόματος μου with the following εν παρασσεία. So Grotius, who explains it thus—" ut ab hac custodia militarib per omnem urbem perfere posse sermonem "; but παρασσεία does not apply to freedom of movement, and here it has a sense in harmony with the following preβηκαται. Others attach the εν Διοίξει closely with the λόγος as a definition of it, = "that utterance may be given me by the opening of my mouth " (Cornel. a Lap., Harl., Oish., Von Soden, Abb., etc.). This makes the "opening of the mouth" the act of Gospel; in such a case, which interpretation appeal is made to the terms in Ezek. iii. 27, xxix. 31, xxxii. 22; Ps. li. 15. The absence of the article, and the analogous passage in Col. iv. 3 are also thought to favour this. But the terms in Col. iv. 3 are different—Εν Θεος Διοίξει ελθείν φθοράν τοῦ λόγου, and the construction makes the Θεος and the Διοίξει του στόματος practically one and the same thing. The simplest constructions are these two—(1) to connect εν παρασσεία with what precedes, and with the λόγος not the Διοίξει, = "that utterance, and that with boldness, may be given to me when I undertake to open my mouth with a view to make known the mystery of the Gospel "; and (2) to connect εν παρασσεία with what follows, to wit, the γνωρισαι, = "that to me utterance may be given when I open my mouth, that with boldness I may make known the mystery of the Gospel. " It is followed by the RV text, "in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness," etc.; while the RV margin gives "in opening my mouth with boldness," etc.; while the RV margin gives "in opening my mouth with boldness, to make known the mystery," etc. The former construction gives a good sense for each particular term and a simple connection of the εν παρασσεία is taken to define not the opening of the mouth, but the utterance, the λόγος, which is the main thought. On the whole the latter is perhaps to be preferred, the need of utterance, power of speech, when occasion offers itself to teach, being first mentioned, and this gift of utterance being next defined in respect of its object, viz., to give fearless confidence in making the Gospel known. 

Ver. 20. εν Διοίξει του στόματος μου with the following εν παρασσεία. So in Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι). So Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι). So in Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι). So Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι). So in Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι). So in Col. iv. 3 it is this μυστήριον that the writer is to utter (γνωρισαι).
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PROΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ

1 Col. iv. 7: 21. "Iva δὲ εἴδητε καὶ ὑμεῖς 1 ἃ τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ, τί πρῶτον, πάντα 2 eh Here ὑμῖν 2 γνωρίσαν 2 Τυχικὸς ὁ ἅγιατός ὁ ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς ἡ δια- 
only. h (Ch. v. 1 ref); see 1 Cor. xv. 58 ref. 1 Col. iv. 7 only.

1 καὶ υπὲρ (ὁ AD*FG, al.) ΜΑΔΕFG, 108-14-18-20, al., lt., Vulg., al., Thdt., some Lat. Fathers; εἴδητε καὶ υπὲρι BKL, etc., Syr. Arm., Eth., Chr., Dam., Jer., Ambrost., etc.

2 τάντα om. D*FG, it., Syr., Jer.

3 γν. ΜΑĐΕFGP 37, 116-20, lt., al., Ambrost.; υπὲρ γνωρίσαν AKL, etc., Vulg., Syr.-P., Chr., Thdt., Dam., etc.

16; Beza, Grot., Paley, Steyer, etc.). That is possible, and indeed even probable, so far as the custodia is concerned. But the description might apply to the imprisonment in Cesarea as well as to that in Rome. The real point of the clause is in the view it gives of the need of the παρουσία and of the intercessions that should bring that gift.—Iva ἐν αὐτῷ παρουσίασαν μὲ διε μὲ λαλήσαν: in order that, through in every sense I should speak boldly, as I ought to speak. How is this purpose-clause to be connected? Some attach it to the πρεσβεία (Beng., Meyer, Von Soden), as if= "I act as ambassador in a chain with the object of speaking boldly," etc. Others connect it with the whole foregoing clause, making it subordinate to that, and an explanation of the object of the gift of utterance, = "that utterance may be given to me to make known the mystery, with the view that I should speak boldly " (Harl.). But Iva is repeatedly used to introduce something that is not subordinate to, but coordinate with, what is stated in a former Iva-clause (Rom. viii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 3). It is best, therefore, to take it so here, and to understand the clause as giving a second object contemplated in the πρεσβεία and αἴτησιν, etc. First the gift of utterance, and now something more particularly of a boldness or freedom (παρουσίασαν) in preaching such as became the Apostle's office and responsibility (ὡς διἐ μὲ λαλή-
σαν). The αὐτῷ refers to the μνειτρῖον which was to be preached. The ἐν is taken by some (e.g., Harl.) to denote the source or ground of the boldness in speaking (παρουσίασαν). But it is God who is named as the source of such boldness (παρουσίασας ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, 1 Thess. ii. 2). It might be an instance of ἐν expressing that on which a certain power operates or in which it shows itself (as in ἐν ᾧ γίνεται ἡ κατ' ἐμὲ, 1 Cor. iv. 15; ἐν ᾧ μᾶρτσθή, 1 Cor. vi. 6; cf. Thayer-Grimm, Lex., p. 210). But it is best understood as the note of that in which one is busied (cf. Acts xxii. 12: 1 Tim. iv. 15; Col. iv. 2, etc.), and so= "that, occupied with that mystery, i.e., in proclaiming it, I may speak boldly" (Mey.).

Vv. 21-22. Statement regarding Tychicus and his mission.

Ver. 21. Iva δὲ εἴδητε καὶ ὑμεῖς [καὶ ὑμεῖς εἴδητε] τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ, τί πρῶτον: but that ye also may know my affairs, how I do. The metabolic ἐν, passing on to a different subject. The order τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ εἴδητε is given in ΜΑΔΕ, etc.; εἴδητε καὶ ὑμεῖς in BKL, Syr., etc. The evidence is almost equally balanced. LTTr prefer the former order; WH give it in the margin. The εἴδητε has its proper force of "also," and points, therefore, to others as well as the Ephesians as possessing or being interested in the knowledge of Paul's affairs. Those who take the Epistle to the Colossians to be prior to this one, naturally think of the Colossians in view. But in the Epistle itself there is nothing to indicate who these others were. For τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ = "my circumstances," cf. Phil. i. 22; Col. iv. 7; also Tob. x. 8; 1 Esdr. i. 22. τί πρῶτον, not = "what I do," but "how I fare," in the reflexive sense (Lat., me habeo) common from Aeschylus downwards. Here it is explanatory of τὰ κατ᾽ ἐμὲ.—πάντα ἐν ᾧ γνωρίσαν [γνωρίσαν ὑμῖν] Τυχικὸς: Tychicus shall make known to you. πάντα is omitted in D*P, Syr., etc. ὑμῖν is placed by the TR before γνωρίσαν (as in ΜΑΔΕ, Syr.-P., Chr., Theod., etc.; after it by LTTR WHV in ΜΑĐΕFGP, 17, 37, 116, 120, Syr.-Sch., Copt., etc.). Tychicus, usually so accented, but Τυχικὸς in WH, is mentioned again in Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12. We gather from these passages that he was a native of proconsular Asia (Acts xx. 4), possibly of Ephesus itself (see Light., Phil., p. 112); that he was with Paul towards the close of his third missionary
21—23.

PROS EPHESIOUS

21. in kuriax, 22. de ephyma pros omous eis auto touto, iva gynete eis Acts xxiv. 25

22. en kuriax prois omous eis auton touto, iva gynete eis Acts xxiv. 25

23. Eirhny tois adelphois kai = anagyn 1 meta pistew ev theou eis Acts xiv. 22

journey (Acts xx. 4); and again at the time when the Epistle to the Colossians was written; and yet again at the end of the Apostle's career (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12). It is probable that he went to Jerusalem as Trophimus did (Acts xxii. 29), in all likelihood as a delegate of his Church, the words ephyma, eis Asia not belonging to the true text of Acts xx. 4. We find him here charged with the delivery of the circular letter known as the Epistle to the Ephesians, probably at the chief centres, Laodicea, Colossae, etc., where Christian communities had been formed in Asia. He is mentioned also in connection with missions to Crete and to Ephesus (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12).—

22. Eipoty tois adelphois kal = anagyn 1 meta pistew ev theou eis Acts xiv. 22

—the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord. In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of Kal oiv Kupi: the beloved brother and faithful ministe
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Add φιλίμας ΝΔΚΛΠ, etc., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Goth., Eth., Thdr., Victorin., Ambros.; om. φιλίμας ΝΔΑΒΦΓ 17, 73, l. g., Arm., Euth., Orig.

ler's notion that in the δικαιοσύνη Jewish Christians are saluted, while the υπάρχειν in ver. 24 refers to Gentile Christians. 

ἐξήνε, not = concord one with another, but = the OT Ὄνοπος in salutations or farewells, = "may it be well with the brethren"; with the Christian connotation, however, of well-being as mental peace and good due to reconciliation with God. In his expression of what he would have them enjoy he couples with the blessing of a new mental peace that also of love—the Christian grace of love, that is to say, and such love as is associated with faith (μετὰ πίστεως). μετὰ, as distinguished from συν, expresses the simple idea of accompanying. So here it is not "love and faith," but, faith being presupposed as making the Christian, it is love which goes with faith, not the Divine love (Beng., etc.), but the brotherly love which shows itself where faith is and by which faith works (Gal. v. 6).—δρα μετὰ πίστεως: from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. The two-fold source of the blessings desired for the reader—God as Father, the Father of Christ Himself, the causa principalis and fons primarius; Christ as Lord, Head over all with a sovereignty which is founded in God (1 Cor. xi.3; Phil. ii.9; Eph. i. 17), as causa mediandas and fons secundarius. The phrase occurs again (though with some variations in the readings) in 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. In the opening benediction it is "God our Father." Here the relation of God to Christ is more in view, in respect of their joint-bestowal of spiritual blessings.

Ver. 24. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἅγια

πάντων τῶν Κυρίου ἤμων Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν δόθησιν. [Ἀφύσιν]: Grace be with all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness. As in Colossians, the three Pastoral Epistles, and also in Hebrews, we have here ἡ χάρις, "the grace," the grace beside which there is none other, the grace of God in Christ of which Christians have experience. In the closing benedictions of Cor., Gal., Philip., Thess., Philem. (as also in Rev.), we have the fuller form ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ, or ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἤμων Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ; also in Romans according to the TR, the verse, however, being deleted by the best critics. The former benediction was for the brethren, probably those in the Asiatic Churches. This second benediction is of widest scope—for all those who love Christ. The difficulty is with the unusual expression ἐν δόθησιν, both as to its sense and its connection. The noun δόθησις is used in Plutarch of τὸ δόμενον (Arisl., c. 6), in Philo of the κόμης (De incorr. Mundi, § 11), in the LXV and the Apocr. of immortality (Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 19; 4 Macc. xvii. 12). In the NT it is found, in addition to the present passage, in Rom. ii. 7 of the "incorruption" which goes with the glory and honour of the future; in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, of the "incorruption" of the resurrection-body; in 2 Tim. i. 10, of the life and "incorruption" brought to light by Christ. The occurrence in Tit. ii. 10 must be discounted in view of the adverse diplomatic evidence. The Pauline use, therefore, is in the sense of "imperishableness," the quality of the changeless and undecaying; and that as belonging to the future in contrast with the present condition of things. There is nothing, therefore, to bear out the sense of sincerity adopted by Chrys., the AV, the Bish.; cf. Tynd., "in pureness"; Cov. Test., "sincerely"; Cov. Cran., "unfeignedly." This would be expressed by ἀμφοτέρως or some similar term (cf. Tit. ii. 7). Nor can it be simply identified with all imperishable being in this life or in the other (Bleek, Olsh., Matthies, etc.); nor yet again with ἁθανασία, as if it described the ἀποκαλύψις of the ἀγιασμός. There remains the qualitative sense of "imperishableness" (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb., and most), which best suits linguistic use, the sense of the adj. ἁθανασίας (cf. Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25, xv. 52; 1 Tim. i. 10; 1 Pet. i. 4, 23, iii. 4), and the application here in connection with the grace of love. The ἐν, therefore, is not to be loosely dealt with, as if = εἰς (Beza, as if it meant the same as εἰς τὸν ἀληθὲν, or διὰ (Theophr.), or εἰς (Chrys.)), or even μετὰ (Theodor.); but has its proper force of the element or
manner in which the love is cherished. Further, the simplest and most obvious connection is with the ἐγγορτωτος, as it is taken by most, including Chrys., Theod., and the other Greek commentators. Some, however, connect the phrase with ἡ χάρις, as = "grace be with all in eternity" (Bez., Beng., Matthies), or, "in all imperishable being" (Harl.), or as a short way of saying "grace be with all that they may have eternal life" (Olsh.). This construction, though strongly advocated recently by Von Soden, fails to give a clear and satisfactory sense, or one wholly accordant with the use of ἀκατάστατος; while there is against it also the fact that the defined noun and the defining phrase would be further apart than is usual in benedictions. Still less reason is there to connect the phrase immediately with τὸν Κύριον Ἰμων Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν as if it described Christ as immortal (Wetst., etc.)—a construction both linguistically and grammatically (in the absence of τὸν before ἐν ἀκατάστατος) questionable. The phrase, therefore, defines the way in which they love, or the element in which their love has its being. It is a love that "knows neither change, diminution, nor decay" (Ell.). The closing ἐν ὑμῖν added by the TR is found in ΜΠ ΚΠ, most cursives, Syr., Boh., etc.; but not in ΒΝΛΔ, 17, Arm., etc. It is omitted by LTTRWHRV.

The subscription πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἀγάθῳ ἑτέρῳ ἡμῖν ἑντού Τιμόθεον is omitted by LTWH; while Treg. gives simply πρὸς Ἐφεσίους. Like the subscriptions appended to Rom., Phil., and 2 Tim., it chronicles a view of the Epistle that is easier to reconcile with fact than is the case with others (1 and 2 Thess., Tit., and espec. 1 Cor., Gal., 1 Tim.). In the oldest MSS. it is simply πρὸς Ἐφεσίους. In the Versions, later MSS., and some of the Fathers it takes various longer forms. The form represented in the TR and the AV is not older than Euthalius, Deacon of Alexandria and Bishop of Sulca, who flourished perhaps in the middle of the fifth century.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

PHILIPPIANS
INTRODUCTION.

THE CHurch Addressed. The town of Philippi occupied a commanding situation on the rocky slopes of a steep hill which overlooked, on the one side, the spacious plain of Drama watered by the Gangites (or Angites, Herodot., vii., 113), and, on the other, the pass between Mount Pangæum (south-west of Philippi) and the spurs of Hæmus. Through this pass ran the famous Roman road, the Via Egnatia (see Tafel, De Via Militari Romanorum Egnatia, Tübing., 1842), connecting Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic with the Hellespont. Its importance as a strategic position was manifest. Its value as a commercial centre was no less evident, standing as it did on the busy Roman thoroughfare which joined East and West, and being itself the emporium of a large industry which circled about the rich gold mines dotted over the surrounding region. Originally it had borne the name of Ἰππείδας (or οἱ Ἰππείδαις), derived, perhaps, from the copious streams which flowed through the plain (Strabo, vii., Frag. 34, ταῖς Ἰππείδαις δυτοῦ νῦν οἱ Φιλιππικοὶ πόλεις ἔδρομαι; Appian, B. C., iv., 105, οἱ δὲ Φιλιππικοὶ πόλεις οὕτως ἔτιν ἡ Δαμανίς ὄνομάζετο παλαι καὶ Ἰππείδαις ἐτὶ πρὸ Δαμανίς). Philip of Macedon, in his victorious career, quickly discerned the value of the country bordering on Mount Pangæum. He recognised a source of vast profit in the gold and silver mines, which, up till now, had only been partially exploited. But a local centre of influence was necessary to command this coveted territory. Accordingly, by enlarging the former Krenides, he founded a new city, to which he gave his own name, Philippi (see Diod. Sic., xvi., 8, 6, ταύτην μὲν ἐπαυξήσας οἰκετηρων πλήθει μεταφόρασε Φιλίππους ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ προσαγωγόρωσε· τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν χώραν χρυσεία μετάλλα παντελώς διοικησάντα καὶ ἀδελφὰ ταῖς κατασκευαῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἔξθεσαν ὅπως δύναται φέρειν αὐτῷ πρόσωπον πλείον ἢ ταλάντων χιλίων).

This Greek city attracted the notice of Augustus after his defeat of Brutus and Cassius in its immediate neighbourhood in 42 B.C. Having to find places of settlement for Italian soldiers who had served their time and could not be maintained in Italy, he established at Philippi, among other towns, a Roman colony, to which he granted
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the *jus Italicum* as an attraction to settlers. This privilege included (a) exemption from the oversight of the provincial governor, (b) immunity from the poll and property taxes, (c) rights to property in the soil regulated by Roman law (see Marquardt-Mommsen, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Bd. I., pp. 363-364; Mommsen, *Provinces of Roman Empire*, i., pp. 299-302).

But, in addition to its industrial and military importance, Philippi could boast of the religious zeal of its inhabitants. MM. Heuzey and Daumet, in their exhaustive and invaluable *Mission Archéologique de Macédoine* (Paris, 1876), have pointed out that the rocks near the ancient site of Philippi are "a veritable museum of mythology" (p. 86). Traces have been found of a temple dedicated to Silvanus, one of the most popular deities of the Imperial epoch, who was worshipped as the sacred guardian of the Emperor (pp. iii, 75). The Oriental god Mên seems also to have had his votaries there, and in the neighbouring mountains Dionysus, the favourite divinity of the Thracians, had "the most revered of his sanctuaries" (p. v). This was the spiritual soil upon which the Gospel of Christ had to work, a picture in miniature of the strangely cosmopolitan character of religion in the Roman Empire at that stage in its history. We can easily conceive how, amidst these surroundings, the maiden "possessing a spirit of divination" was sure to drive a flourishing trade.

The account of Paul's work at Philippi is given in Acts xvi., a chapter belonging, in part, to the "we-sections," which are regarded as extremely valuable even by the most negative critics. (For attacks upon the authenticity of this account see Knowling on A. xvi., *ad fin.* in vol. ii. of this work.) It was thoroughly in accordance with the Apostle's well-weighed plan of operations to choose as the starting-point of his labours in Europe a typical city of the Roman Empire, lying on one of the main trade-routes, where he might count upon protection against violence, and from which any strong influence he might exert must extend itself towards East and West (see Ramsay, *Church in Rom. Emp.*, pp. 56, 70, 148 *et al.*). Paul seems to have attached himself to a little company of Jews and proselytes (A. xvi. 13 ff.). Mention is only made of some women who assembled for prayer by the riverside on the Sabbath day. From this it may probably be gathered that Judaism had no firm hold at Philippi. It is worthy of note that the charge of being Jews is set in the forefront by the enraged Philippians who drag Paul and Silas before the Praetors.¹ (For the ancient hatred of

¹ See Henle, *Tüb. Theol. Quartal-Schr.*, 1893, Hft. 1, p. 82.
Jews in the Roman world, see esp. Reinach, *Textes . . . relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.) Lydia, a seller of purple dyed garments, a native of Thyatira, famous for its dyeing trade, became the nucleus of a Christian congregation. She was already a God-fearer (σεβομένη τοῦ θεοῦ, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, ii., 2, p. 314). As the result of Paul's preaching she and her household were baptised, and the Apostle, with his companions, accepted her hospitality (see esp. A. xvi. 15). This spirit of generosity was to become characteristic of the Church at Philippi and of early Christian life as a whole.

It is needless to dwell on the sharp crisis through which Paul and Silas had to pass. The arrest, the illegal flogging (cf. Cic., *in Verr.*, v., 66: *facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari, prope parricidium necari*), the extraordinary deliverance, the repentance, conversion and baptism of the jailor, the release in presence of the panic-stricken magistrates,—all these experiences must have made a deep impression on the minds of the Philippians. Already there were brethren there (A. xvi. 40), whom they exhorted as they were on the point of leaving Philippi for Thessalonica. Strangely enough, the "we" introduced at A. xvi. 10 ceases with ch. xvi., only to be resumed at ch. xx. 6, when Paul leaves Philippi after another visit. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to believe with Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 219) that Luke was left behind at Philippi to extend and consolidate the good work which had been done. In any case the Church must have made rapid progress. For Paul had scarcely left Macedonia when the Philippian Christians began to minister to his needs. From that time onwards they occupy a chief place in his affections.

It is difficult to point to anything like fixed data as regards the component parts of the Church at Philippi. Schinz in his important dissertation, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi* (Zürich, 1837), brings forward many arguments to prove that it was essentially a heathen-Christian community (see esp. p. 57 ff.). Certainly much, both in the Epistle and in the narrative of its founding, goes to confirm this opinion. As we have seen, it was a proselyte, a woman of Asiatic birth, who took the leading place in the early fortunes of this Church. Jews seem to have been a negligible quantity at Philippi, for, apparently, there was no synagogue in the town. From the evidence of the Epistle, devoted women of heathen extraction (as their names show, see ch. iv. 2) stood in the forefront of Christian work. This was not peculiar to Philippi. Nothing is more remarkable than the place taken by women in the Apostolic Church as a whole. The Christian faith was their true emancipation. It gave scope for their most characteristic activities (see an interesting sum-
mary in Rilliet, Commentaire sur l'Épitre . . . aux Phil., pp. 312-313; also Renan, St. Paul, pp. 147-150; Lft., Philippians, pp. 55-56, who hints with good reason, on the evidence of Inscr., that women occupied a specially favourable position in Macedonia; H. Achelis, Zeitsch. f. N. T. Wissensch., i., 2, pp. 93, 97-98, and cf. notes on ch. iv. 2). It is worthy of notice that the only definite information we have as to any friction in the Philippian Church attaches itself to two of these Christian matrons, Euodia and Syntyche. In all likelihood the friction was slight. The Apostle does not deal with it in strong terms. Evidently it was some personal variance connected with Church life and work, or, perhaps, associated with the possession of particular spiritual gifts. We know how this latter endangered unity at Corinth (see 1 C. xii.). It is possible that we have a hint of its character in the warnings given against a false self-satisfaction in ch. iii. 12-16. Here and there, throughout the Epistle, there are echoes of it (see ch. i. 27, ii. 2-4, 14, iv. 5), and these point to a certain danger of selfish assumptions of superiority. But there are no traces of doctrinal controversies like those which rent some of the other Pauline Churches. On the whole, Paul feels unmingled satisfaction and joy in their condition. It is evident, therefore, that if there were any Jewish-Christians in the Church, they had not made themselves obnoxious by laying special emphasis on the characteristic tenets of their party. Indirect evidence on this point is afforded by incidental statements in the Epistle. Paul was accustomed to accept gifts from the Philippians. This was a course which he took care to avoid in Churches where a minority of Jewish-Christians could bring it up as a reproach against him. (Contrast his attitude, e.g., towards the Church at Corinth.) Further, when he does burst forth in words of solemn warning against his adversaries (ch. iii. 2), it may be clearly seen that he is dealing with persons entirely outside the Philippian Church, but persons who may at any moment intrude into their midst and work serious havoc (see notes ad loc.). It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that this Church was composed mainly (if not exclusively) of heathen-Christians, at one in their loyalty to the Faith and to him who had first proclaimed it in their hearing; exposed, at the same time, to hurtful influences which might invade them from outside, and liable to those mutual differences of feeling which make themselves manifest in every Christian community.

The Occasion of the Letter. In ancient times letters were written to correspondents at a distance when a favourable opportunity presented itself of forwarding them to their destination (cf. Cic., ad Attic., i., 9, 1). In the present instance this was afforded by the
return of Epaphroditus to Philippi (ch. ii. 28). From ch. iv. 15-16 it may be inferred that Paul had frequent communications with the Philippians. The letter before us is evidently the reply to one which Paul had received. The recognition of this gives the proper clue to its interpretation. Dr. Rendel Harris, in a suggestive paper in the *Expositor* (v., 8, p. 403), advances the hypothesis that “when Paul replied to a letter he held the letter that he was replying to in his hand, and followed closely the points in it that needed attention” (see also Lock, *ibid.*, v., 6, p. 65 ff.). We believe this to be, in large measure, true of *Philippians*. Traces of a definite reply seem to emerge at i. 12 (where he answers their eager inquiries as to his health and prospects), i. 26 (they had probably spoken of him as their φιλόν, cf. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 178), ii. 19 (where he reminds them that he is as much concerned to hear good news as they are), ii. 26 (their reference to the illness of Epaphroditus), iii. 2 (the abruptness with which the warning is introduced is best explained by some disconcerting tidings from Philippi), iv. 10 (they had apologised for their remissness in attending to his wants), and perhaps iv. 14-15 (they may have felt a little doubtful whether Paul would be willing to accept their gift, for here and there in the Epistle we have the slightest hints that he has to disabuse them of a notion that he had not been entirely pleased with them. See notes on i. 3).

It is manifest that the Apostle had received a gift from the Philippian Church through Epaphroditus, who spent some time, at least, in his company at Rome (ch. ii. 30). We cannot tell whether a letter had accompanied this gift, or, if so, whether Paul had acknowledged it in any way before. At all events, our Epistle is written considerably later, and presupposes a communication which came to Rome from Philippi while Epaphroditus was still at Paul’s service. This is necessary from ch. ii. 26, ἀνημονών διότι ηκούσατε ὅτι θεωρήσατε. Perhaps even the order of subjects in the Letter is regulated by the arrangement of topics in that from Philippi. The chief matter involved, the acknowledgment of their gift, is introduced at the beginning (ch. i. 3-5, this is at least a likely interpretation) and end (ch. iv. 10-19) with a graciousness and delicacy of feeling unsurpassed in the annals of letter-writing.

**Place and Date of Writing.** (a) It is all but universally agreed that this Epistle was written from Rome. That is the early

---

1 No argument, however, can be based on the fact that Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philipp.*, iii., says of Paul: ὃς καὶ ἐπόν ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπον ἐπιστολάς, as the plural is frequently used to describe a single letter. See *Lft. ad loc.*
tradition, and no contrary evidence has been forthcoming strong enough to refute it. Of course the matter must be determined by comparing what we gather concerning Paul’s circumstances from the Epistle itself with our information from other sources. The Apostle is a prisoner. He is residing in some centre of activity where the preaching of Christ has extended with amazing rapidity. His trial is about to reach a critical point. There is still the possibility that he may have to suffer as a martyr. But, on the whole, his outlook is very hopeful, and he can speak with joyful confidence of the speedy prospect of seeing his friends at Philippi again. Incidentally he mentions that the real character of his offence is now known in the “Prætorium,” and he concludes his letter by sending greetings from the Christians of Caesar’s household. It seems to us that this situation can only correspond to one particular epoch in the Apostle’s history, that the beginning of which is outlined in A. xxviii. 16, 30-31. The only alternative hypothesis which has ever been seriously put forward is that of Cæsarea. This was first done by H. G. Paulus (in a Programm, Jena, 1799), and later, more acutely, by Böttger (Beiträge, ii., p. 47 ff., Gött., 1837). Böttger lays stress on the point that prisoners at Rome could not have experienced the delay which is presupposed in this Epistle in the case of Paul. This argument is invalidated by the fact that processes of appeal were peculiarly subject to protracted delays. These were caused in particular by the necessity of having all the declarations of witnesses, informations, etc., handed in writing to the appellant before the higher court heard the appeal (see Geib, Geschichte d. röm. Criminal processes, esp. pp. 688-690). Böttger also tries to show that πραιτόριον (ch. i. 13) and οἰκία Καίσαρος (ch. iv. 22), almost the only local references in the Epistle, apply equally well to Cæsarea. This argument is emphasised by O. Holtzmann (Th. L.Z., 1890, col. 177), who adds these others, (a) that we know nothing of a sojourn of Timothy at Rome, (b) that the bitterness against the Judaisers is far more intelligible on the supposition that Paul’s experiences of the Jews at Jerusalem were fresh in his remembrance. No one would deny that πραιτόριον is used of an Imperial residence outside Rome. And possibly οἰκία Καίσαρος might be equivalent to πραιτόριον, i.e., in this case, according to Holtzmann, τὸ πραιτόριον τοῦ Ἡρώδου (A. xxiii. 35). This supposition Holtzmann believes to be the best explanation of μάλιστα (ch. iv. 22), for he considers the use of that word to point to those in Paul’s immediate neighbourhood. But the assumption is quite gratuitous. He has already sent greetings from οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί, and in adding those of the ἄγιοι he singles out οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. This was
most natural, since we know from other sources (see notes ad loc.) that there was a large body of Christians in the Imperial household, some of them perhaps connected with Philippi, and, in all probability, this movement had assumed greater proportions during Paul's sojourn at Rome. His converts there, in their new-born enthusiasm, would be likely to show a peculiarly lively interest in that far-distant Church which had manifested so remarkable an appreciation of their father in the Faith. An unbiased reader must feel that there is something far-fetched in the reference of oiKia Kaistoros to Caesarea. The context of πραματίαν indicates that Paul writes from a centre of eager Christian activity, a place of much higher importance than Caesarea, which had long since heard the Gospel (A. x.), and could scarcely in any case, be supposed to exert a pre-eminent influence. As to the other arguments of Holtzmann, there is nothing to oppose the hypothesis that Timothy visited Rome; in fact, it would be surprising if he had never seen his beloved master during so long a period of suspense. And certainly it did not require any recent experiences of Paul to call forth stern denunciations of those Judaisers who had dogged his steps from the beginning to the close of his career.

But the decisive argument for Rome, in our judgment, is Paul's situation. He expects a speedy termination of his case. How could this be possible at Caesarea? There, on the first favourable opportunity that presents itself, he appeals to Caesar. Only when that appeal has been heard can any decision be come to. And many hints in the Epistle suggest that the all-important moment was close at hand (see ch. i. 12, 13, 19, 20, 26, ii. 24, probably i. 7; also a discussion by the author in Expository Times, x., 1, pp. 22-24, and an excellent dissertation, The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial, by R. R. Smith, Camb., 1899). It is perhaps needless to deal with Spitta's argument in favour of Caesarea (Apostelgeschichte, p. 281) that the expectation of Felix that he should be offered a bribe by Paul was roused by the gift of money which the Apostle had lately received from Philippi.

(b) We believe that the arguments adduced above are sufficient to fix Rome as the place from which the Epistle was written. They also suggest a late date in Paul's sojourn at Rome, for he is awaiting the final decision in his trial. Lightfoot has attempted to show that Philippians stands first in order among the Imprisonment-Epistles. His main argument is greater similarity (especially in thought) to Romans than to Colossians and Ephesians. But this method of reasoning is precarious. Are we at liberty to break up the thinking of a man like the Apostle Paul, as it is
expressed in a small group of occasional letters, into a series of well-marked stages? These letters were, after all, the products of special circumstances, of special situations. Paul did not write as one who gradually, in successive works, presents a system of thought to the world. We may readily admit that more parallels may be found, on careful search, between Philippians and Romans than between it and the other Imprisonment-Epistles (although this statement must be made with caution, see Von Soden, Hand-Comm., iii., 1, p. 16, on the marked resemblances between Phil. and Coloss.). But that does not touch the question of date. Paul's letters must be interpreted from the historical background of each of them. To use as an argument for the ante-dating of Philippians the fact that the other two letters of the Captivity "exhibit an advanced stage in the development of the Church" (Lft., Phil., p. 45) seems, to say the least, hazardous, when, on Lightfoot's own showing, no more than a year can have elapsed between the earlier and the later writings. The "advanced stage in the development of the Church" emerges suddenly in view of the dangerous situation in which the Christians of Asia were placed at the time. 

It is more difficult to speak with any confidence as to the actual date. The chronology of Paul's life has recently been the subject of keen discussion. For our purpose the crucial date is that of the arrival of Festus as Procurator of Judæa. Everything depends on determining the year in which the Procurator Felix was recalled and replaced by Festus (see Harnack, Chronologie d. altchristl. Litt., p. 233). It is impossible here even to give a sketch of the various lines of argument used to fix approximately the all-important date. O. Holtzmann, who depends upon the authority of Tacitus and Josephus, and is followed, among others, by Harnack (who emphasises, in addition, the testimony of the Chronicle of Eusebius), argues for the end of the year 55 or the early part of 56. This would make 57 the year of Paul's arrival in Rome, and thus, if our former arguments are valid, Philippians would have to be assigned to the year 59, as he approached the close of his two years' captivity at Rome. This dating is much earlier than the received chronology, which would refer the recall of Felix to 60 and the Apostle's arrival in Rome to 61. In that case our Epistle would fall somewhere within the year 63. We are inclined, however, to accept the view of Mr. C. H. Turner in his masterly article on the Chronology of N. T. in Hastings' Bible Dict. After a fair-minded and cautious survey of all the arguments, he is led to adopt 58 as the year of the recall of Felix and the arrival of Festus in the province of Judæa. Paul would thus have reached

**Genuineness.** (a) There is no lack of external evidence for this Epistle. References are found to it in Church writers from the earliest times. These begin with Polycarp (πρὸς Φιλ., iii., 10 [Παύλους] . . . δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ ὅμιν ἐγραψαν ἑπτώκες), and include the ancient letter from the Christians of Vienne and Lyons (Eusebius, *H. E.*, v., 2), as well as the *Fragment* of Muratori on the Canon.

(b) The internal testimony is equally convincing. Perhaps no Pauline epistle bears more conclusively the stamp of authenticity. There is an artlessness, a delicacy of feeling, a frank outpouring of the heart which could not be simulated. Like 2 Corinthians, this letter is a mirror of the Apostle's personal life. It reflects his varying moods at a great crisis in his history. It throbs from first to last with eager emotion. It gives a most vivid picture of Paul's intimate relations with the Churches which he has founded. The whole composition of the letter is devoid of any artificial plan. The Apostle moves from subject to subject by rapid transitions and unexpected turns of thought. If this Epistle betrays the compiler's hand, no internal proof of authenticity may be held valid at all, and literary criticism becomes irrelevant. For, in the case before us, every circumstance can be understood from the conditions existing in the life and times of Paul. This is the problem with which criticism has always and alone to deal.

None the less has the genuineness of *Philippians* been stoutly challenged. Baur was the first to enter the field in his *Paulus*, Bd. II., p. 50 ff. The objections he raised were: (1) the echo of Gnostic ideas in ch. ii. 6-9, (2) the lack of a genuine Pauline content, (3) the extraordinary nature of some of the historical details. To a sober judgment these difficulties do not exist. The Gnosticism of ch. ii. is the phantasy of a biased imagination. If the content in this Epistle be not Pauline, we may be said to know nothing of the Apostle's
thoughts or feelings. The historical details, so far from being extraordinary or unaccountable, afford us some of the most valuable sidelights we possess on a particular epoch of Paul's history, otherwise obscure. Since Baur's time comparatively few critics have been bold enough to renew the attack on our Epistle. A complete history of its criticism will be found in Holsten's articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* (1876), pp. 328-372. No more searching scrutiny of the Epistle with a view to proving its spuriousness has ever been carried out than that of Holsten himself (*op. cit.*, 1875, p. 425 ff.; 1876, p. 58 ff.). In these discussions he brings all his well-known acuteness and subtlety of reasoning to bear upon the minutest points of the letter. He willingly admits that it belongs to the Pauline school, but decides from such indications as the method of dealing with the Judaisers in ch. i., the conception of Christ in ch. ii. 6-9, etc., etc., that it cannot be the work of Paul. But any fair-minded reader of Holsten's articles will feel bound to agree with the verdict of an unbiased scholar like Schürer that his "arguments are so foolish that one is sometimes tempted to put them down as slips of the pen" (*Th. L.Z.*, 1880, col. 555). Probably Pfleiderer's statement may be taken as representative of present-day opinion: "The genuineness of this letter is not to be doubted. The accounts of *Philippians* tally thoroughly with the presuppositions of *Romans*" (*Urchristenthum*, p. 153). Among many elaborate defences of the authenticity of *Phil.* we may mention as especially worthy of note those of Hilgenfeld in *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, xvi., 2, p. 178 ff.; xviii., 4, p. 566 ff.; xx., 2, p. 145 ff.; xxvii., 4, p. 498 ff.

The unity of the Epistle has also been questioned. This was done as early as the beginning of last century by Heinrichs (*N. T.*, ed. J. Koppe, vol. vii., pars 2, prol., p. 31 ff.), who supposed it to consist of two letters, one (ch. i. 1-iii. 1; iv. 21-23) being addressed to the Church in general, the other (ch. iii. 2-iv. 20) to the more prominent authorities in it. (For a full account of such attempts see Clemen, *Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe*, 1894, p. 133 ff.) Völter (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1892, pp. 10-44, 117-146) put forward the theory that we have here a genuine Epistle consisting of ch. i. 1-7, 12-14, 18b-26; ii. 17-29; iv. 10-21, 23, and also a spurious one made up of ch. i. 8-10, 27-30; ii. 1-16; iii. 1b-iv. 9, 22, the remaining verses being added by the redactor whose compilation is before us. It is difficult to take so arbitrary a scheme as this seriously, and Völter entirely fails to show what aim or motive his hypothetical redactor had in his work. This would require to be stated with some appearance of reason before we could consider the likelihood of finding in a simple,
apparently spontaneous letter, a document so complicated as that which Völter discovers. C. Clemen, in the work above cited and also in his Chronologie d. paulin. Briefe, 1893, attempts to prove that two genuine letters have been combined in one Epistle. The first, composed of ch. ii. 19-24; iii.; iv. 8-9, he holds to be the earliest of the Captivity Epistles, the second, embracing ch. i. 1-ii. 18, 25-30; iv. 1-7, 10-23, to be the latest (see Table in Chronol., p. 292). While laying stress upon the presence of numerous repetitions and paragraphs which have no connexion with their context, he bases his position mainly on what he conceives to be inexplicable contradictions between ch. ii. 20 and ch. i. 14, 16, and also between ch. iii. 2, 18 and ch. i. 18, 28. The theory, at first sight, is certainly plausible. There is no a priori reason (cf. the case of Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians) why two letters or fragments of letters to the Philippians should not, by some accidental circumstances of which we know nothing, have been combined. Only there must be some strong basis for such an hypothesis, derivable from the Epistle itself. We cannot feel that such a basis is presented by the arguments briefly alluded to above. In the groups of passages brought forward the contradiction appears to us imaginary. An exegesis which takes careful account of the historical background of the Epistle and recognises that the Apostle, like other men, had his moods of strong feeling, leaves no ground for maintaining that his statements in the one group are irreconcilable with those in the other1 (see, for the details, the notes on these passages, and a most interesting parallel drawn from the criticism of Cicero's Letters in Deissmann, Bibelstudien, pp. 220-222, 250).

Special Characteristics. The perusal of the Epistle cannot fail to produce the impression of artlessness. That is another way of saying that it precisely fulfils the conditions of a letter. Had this most prominent characteristic been always kept in view, much futile theorising both in the exegesis and in the criticism of the Epistle would have been avoided. The only plausible objections that have been brought against its genuineness or integrity would have been recognised as the natural consequences of its epistolary character (Brieflichkeit, a more convenient expression than English affords). For here, as in all his letters, the Apostle speaks for the occasion. He pictures his Christian brethren at Philippi as listening to his conversation. All is spontaneous and free. He draws up no fixed scheme which has to be followed, although, perhaps, the letter (or

1 Clemen has recently withdrawn his objections to the unity of Philippians (see Th. L.Z., 1901, col. 293).
letters) from the Philippian Church may in some degree have suggested the course which his thought pursues. He feels thoroughly at home with his readers. Thoughts crowd in upon him as he writes. His reminiscences of Philippi supply secret links of connexion between paragraphs which might seem isolated from one another, links of connexion which we can no longer trace. Many of his ideas he does not require to elaborate. A brief hint will bring his readers into touch with the Apostle's mind.

It is quite plain, from a comparison of this with his other letters, that no Church held a deeper place in Paul's affection. This may be accounted for in various ways. Evidently the Judaising section of the Church had not, as yet, been able to gain a footing at Philippi, although there is little doubt that attempts must have been made. The Christians there refused to lend their ears to insinuations against their well-tried teacher and friend. They believed in the Gospel as Paul had presented it to them. This unflinching loyalty of theirs would be a genuine consolation to the Apostle amidst so many disheartening experiences endured through the fickleness of once promising converts. No wonder that he calls them his joy and crown.1

But, besides, there was, in all likelihood, a certain frank open-heartedness, an affectionate simplicity of nature, which appealed directly to the mind of Paul. The Macedonians, as a people, had preserved the manners of a more artless time. They had suffered comparatively little from the corruption of an enervating age. They had maintained, perhaps, above all other parts of Greece, a healthy tone of life, a sturdy morality (cf. Renan, St. Paul, pp. 136-139). When the Gospel came to them they received it with a child-like responsiveness. And their appreciation of its worth remained no mere empty feeling. It took practical shape. No sooner had Paul left Philippi than they began to consider his needs and, with unhesitating generosity, to minister to them (see ch. iv.15-16). And when the Apostle made his great collection for the poorer Christians at Jerusalem, the Churches of Macedonia amazed him by their liberality. It was natural that Paul should be drawn into a specially cordial intimacy with such a people. He had proved their loyalty; he had received numerous tokens of their affection. A man of his open and enthusiastic temperament would rejoice to find a Church to which he could unveil his heart without any doubts or misgivings.

The undertone of the Epistle is a deep, restrained joy. This springs partly from his unalloyed satisfaction in the Christians

1 On fidelity as characteristic of the Macedonian people see an interesting note in Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, p. 248, note 5.
at Philippi. All that he has experienced at their hands, all that he has heard of them by report, calls forth from him nothing but thankfulness. Even any word of warning which he may feel to be needful is uttered with the most delicate courtesy and tact. But further, his mood at the time of writing is cheerful and bright. He is a prisoner, but, none the less, the work of Christ has richly prospered. He has discovered that it is altogether independent of the human agents employed. Hence, although enmity or opposition may silence the preacher, the Gospel has free course. It remains the power of God unto salvation. But the progress of events, also, has led him to believe that his work is not done. Things seem to be shaping towards his release. The clouds, indeed, have not wholly vanished. Therefore a dark shadow flits, for a moment, across the page. But hope returns, a hope not baseless, but resting on what he feels to be the mind of God. So his farewell greeting can utter itself in exulting strains: “Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice”.

LITERATURE. (1) Earlier Commentaries. The most valuable are those of Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (ed. H. B. Swete, Camb., 1880) and Theodoret; in the Reformation period, Calvin.


Of a more homiletic or practical character are the works of Braune (in Lange’s Bibelwerk), Vaughan (1882) and Von Soden (1889, a model of its kind). To the same category belong Rainy’s exposition of the Epistle (Expositor’s Bible, specially valuable on the theology), and Moule’s Philippian Studies (1897, devotional). Bengel’s Gnomon is always worth consulting.

Most valuable articles dealing with the Epistle are those of Holsten (Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol., 1875, 1876, see section on “Genuineness” in the Introduction supr.), Zahn (Luthardt’s Zeitsch. f. kirchliche Wissensch. u. kirchl. Leben, 1885) and Henle (Tübingen
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Quartal-Schrift, 1893). See also the articles quoted in the Introduction.

Useful dissertations are those of Schinz, Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi (Zürich, 1833), Mynster, Kleine theolog. Schriften, p. 169 ff., Rettig, Quoestiones Philippenses (Giessen, 1831), Laurent, Neuestamentliche Studien, and R. R. Smith, The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial (Cambr. 1899). For the literature on Phil. ii. 6-11 see the notes ad loc. A good list of discussions against and in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle will be found in the Com. of Lipsius, pp. 211-212. A very full and interesting examination of all matters of Introduction is presented in Zahn's Einleitung in d. N. T., Bd. I., pp. 368-398.

On points of grammar and language, in addition to the ordinary grammatical works, frequent use has been made of Hatzidakis, Einleitung in d. Neu griechische Grammatik (Leipz., 1892), Viteau, Études sur le Grec du N. T. (I. Le Verbe; II. Sujet, Complément et Attribut), 2 vols. (Paris, 1893, 1896), W. Schmid, Atticismus, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1887-1897), and especially G. A. Deissmann, Bibelstudien (Marburg, 1895) and Neue Bibelstudien (Marb., 1897).

Quotations from LXX follow Swete's ed. For the critical notes, besides the great editions of the text, Weiss, Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe (Leipz., 1896), has been largely used.

The abbreviations used in the notes which may require explanation are:—

al. = other passages.
Chr. = Chrysostom.
Comm. = Commentators.
CT. = Cambridge Greek Testament.
Dsm. = Deissmann (BS. = Bibelstudien, NBS. = Neue Bibelstudien).
Edd. = Editors.
Ell. = Ellicott.
esp. = especially.
Gw. = Gwynn.
Hfm. = Hofmann.
Hltzm. = Holtzmann.
Inscr. = Inscriptions.
Kl. = Klöpper.
Lft. = Lightfoot.
Lips. = Lipsius.
MT. = Moods and Tenses (Burton, Goodwin).
Myr. = Meyer.
Pfl. = Pfleiderer.
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Phil. = Epistle to the Philippians.
SH. = Sanday and Headlam (Romans).
SK. = Studien und Kritiken.
Thdrt. = Theodoret.
Th. LZ. = Theologische Literaturzeitung.
TK. = Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe (Weiss).
W.M. = Moulton's Ed. of Winer's Grammar.
W-Sch. = Schmiedel's Ed. of Winer.
Wohl. = Wohlenberg.
Ws. = Weiss.

The recognised contractions have, as a rule, been used in the critical notes.
CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-2. Salutation.—

Ver. 1. The only significance belonging to the mention of Timothy is that he was a well-known figure at Philippi (Acts xvi. 1-12, xix. 22, xx. 3-6), that they owed much to him, and that he was about to visit them again. The Epistle claims, of course, to be exclusively Paul's own. —

So FGKLP, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Tisch., W.H., Ws. X. I. with ΝΒΔΕ, d, c, cop. X. I. more prob., as copyists were more likely to write the common expression I. X. for the other, which is characteristic of Paul (cf. Ws., TK., pp. 131-134). —

Brückner (Chronologische Reihenfolge d. paulin. Bbr., Haarlem, 1890, p. 222) would omit the whole clause as interpolated.

1 proso Philetaiou: so ΝΑΒΚ 1, 37 (-ευμένες), 113. αρχηγεια proso DEFG (DE -ευμένες). The title in T.R. comes from the ed. of Elzevir, without MS. authority.

2 So FGKLP, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Tisch., W.H., Ws. X. I. with ΝΒΔΕ, d, c, cop. X. I. more prob., as copyists were more likely to write the common expression I. X. for the other, which is characteristic of Paul (cf. Ws., TK., pp. 131-134).

3 Brückner (Chronologische Reihenfolge d. paulin. Bbr., Haarlem, 1890, p. 222) would omit the whole clause as interpolated.

most glaring contrast with the impurity and sensuality of the Gentiles, holiness of heart and conduct. This would naturally come into view as the result of the working of the Holy Spirit; see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 190 ff.; *Introd.* N.T. Theol., ii., p. 152. The best commentary on the expression is John xvii. 11, 14, 15-23. In his salutations Paul uses the word as practically = δικαίωσις (cf. 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. i. 1, with 1 Thess. i. 1). For the Christian Church is the spiritual successor of the sacred community of Israel. Ideally, all Christians are "saints," cf. δικαίωσις εἰν' Χ. " (1 Cor. i. 2). The Spirit is, of course, the Sanctifier, but He only deals with those who are in Christ Jesus.—ἐν Χ. " These words sum up Paul's Christianity. They denote the most intimate living union that can be conceived between the soul of the believer and the Risen Lord. He, as Spirit, is the atmosphere in which the new life is lived. Cf. the Rabbinic use of ὅριον (place or space) as a name of God; see Taylor, *Sayings of Jewish Fathers*, and ed., p. 39. The same idea is expressed by Χριστὸς ἐν ᾧ ἐστι; see esp. Gal. ii. 20. "The gist of this formula ἐν Χριστῷ is nothing else than Paul's mystic faith, in which the believer gives up himself, his own life, to Christ, and possesses the life of Christ in himself, and Christ in him; he dead with Christ, and Christ become his life" (Pfl., *Paulinism*, E. Tr., i., p. 198). For the extraordinarily central place of the idea in Paul's teaching, see Deissmann, *Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo fęs"
(Marburg, 1892).—ὁ ἡγομένως καὶ δικαίωσις. These keenly-discussed terms can only be most briefly examined. Who were the ἡγομένοι? In LXX almost always = an official in charge of work being done (e.g., repairs in Temple; rebuilding of Jerusalem) or an officer in the army (much less frequently). In N.T., besides this precedent, (a) Acts xx. 28, applied by Paul to the ἡγομένων of Ephesus, whom the Holy Ghost has made ἡγομένους ποιο-μάλιν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; (b) 1 Pet. ii. 25, of Christ, who is called τῶν ποιο-
μάλιν καὶ ἡγομένον τῶν ψυχῶν φίλων; (c) 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Tit. i. 7, where it is almost universally admitted to be synony-
mous with προφθάρων. Two points are clear from N.T. evidence: 1. The ἡγο-
mένος is, at least, often the same person as the προφθάρων. 2. The ἡγο-
mένος is concerned with shepherding the flock of God. Have we any information in corroboration of these facts? As to the first there is the strong tradition of the early Church, e.g., Jerome, Ep., 69, 3: *apud veteres idem episcopi et presbyteri*; there is the admitted fact that in 1 Clem. the name προφθάρων is given to the ἡγο-
mένος. The name προφθάρων designates the officials who preside over the congregation probati quaque seniores; see esp. F. Loofs, SK., 1890, pp. 639-641. The second fact mentioned above conflicts with the celebrated theory of Hatch and Harnack (who has, however, greatly modified his standpoint; see his important review of Loening's *Die Gemeindever-
fassung des Urchristenthums in Th. L.Z.*, 1889, coll. 418-429), that the ἡγομένοι were distinct finance and cultus officials, who only gradually came into possession of more spiritual functions. But it seems hazardous to narrow down the duties of these officials in certain cases, have been suggested by that of the ἡγομένος or (more commonly) τύμαλητης, who exercised administrative control over the property of private associations and guilds existing at that-time in the Hellenic world and existed in the Christian Church still less clearly marked. An additional reason for this would lie in the pre-eminent authority of the Apostles and the high place assigned to the possessors of "gifts". Accordingly it appears wise to use great caution in making any distinction between προφθάρων and ἡγομένος. Probably the truth lies in the direction of regarding προφθάρων as a title of status, while ἡγομένος is one of function. Probably all ἡγομένοι were προφθά-
ρων, while the converse may not be true. The difference of name may point to some early (and unknown) difference of admin-
istration. The ἡγομένος may have had some special connexion with the celebra-
3. ἐξχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου ἕνα πάση τῇ 'μειρά ὁμοί, 4. πάντωτε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῇ ἁγιασμοῖς τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῦ Ἅγιον θεόν. Ver. 3. Paul in this phrase is not concerned with the idea of the Eucharist as the central rite of Christian worship (see Sohm's strong insistence on this point, Kirchenrecht, pp. 84 ff., 121 ff.) and with the management of Church property, which would originally consist of voluntary gifts offered to God in Christian worship. Gradually, as those endowed with extraordinary "charisms" (e.g., prophets, teachers, evangelists) passed away, their functions would tend to be assumed by the leading office-bearers in each congregation. So the sphere, e.g., of the ἐκκλησία, would be greatly enlarged. But we must be content, for lack of evidence, to do without precise definitions, only concluding as to the general equivalence in the earliest times of προεσπανυκτείον and ἐκκλησία, and granting that their oversight and guidance were concerned with the spiritual as well as the material well-being of the organisation. Deacons are first mentioned here in the N.T. It is often tacitly assumed that they hold the office or function whose institution is described in Acts vi. This was an early tradition; e.g., Iren., iii., 12, 10: Stephanus . . . qui electus est ab apostolis primus diaconus. But there are considerable arguments against this view. These are admirably summarised by Gwatkin (Hastings' B.D., i., 574). (1) The seven are nowhere in N.T. called ἱεραρχοὶ. (2) The qualifications laid down (Acts vi. 3) for the seven are much higher than those of 1 Tim. iii. 8. (3) Stephen was largely a preacher and Philip an evangelist. (4) The seven evidently rank next to the Apostles at Jerusalem. Hpt. (Mjr. ad loc.) holds that ἱεραρχοὶ and διάκονοι denote here the same persons, the διάκονοι being a δικαιῶσα towards the Church, and compares 1 Thess. v. 12, τέκνα τούτων καὶ προεσπανυκτεία, and the vague use of the word to denote any kind of Christian service (in earlier parts of N.T.) might seem to justify the idea. But considering the late date of Phil., it appears more reasonable to connect the office with that of 1 Tim. iii., where a clear distinction is drawn between the διάκονος and the ἱεραρχοῦ. In the early Church the most necessary Christian service would be the care of the sick and poor. So the deacon must neither be double-tongued (βιαζόμενος) nor a "lover of dirty gain" (so Gwatk. tr. ὑποθαλάξας), for in his work of visiting he would have temptations to "gossip and slander" on the one hand, and to "picking and stealing from the alms" on the other (Gwatk. loc. cit.). Many reasons are assigned for the mention of these officers here. But it seems quite natural that Paul should specify those who stood in the forefront of the Church's work and life, more especially as the letter is one of thanks for the gift which has been sent to him, a gift the management of which would be in the hands of the controlling authorities in the Church.

Ver. 2. Paul feels that the ordinary Greek salutation καλεῖς or the Eastern χαῖρεῖς σοι is too meagre for Christian intercourse. But closely connected with χαῖρεῖς is his own great watchword χαῖρε, a word which, perhaps, above all others, shows the powerful remoulding of terms by Christian thought and feeling. χαῖρε for Paul is the central revelation of the fatherly heart of God in the redemption which Christ has accomplished for unworthy sinners. And its direct result is χάρις, the harmony and health of that life which is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ; see an interesting discussion of the Apostolic greeting by F. Zimmer, Luthardt's Zeitschr., 1886, p. 443 ff. Of course ὁ διὰ κυρίου is impossible in view of Tit. i. 4 (so Gw. ad loc.).—Κυρίων. The favourite designation of Jesus Christ in the early Church. See on chap. ii. 11 infr. Cf. the extraordinary frequency of the term Κυρίων as applied to God in Apostolic Fathers, etc. On the whole subject see Harnack, Dogmen-Geschichte, i., pp. 155-158.
Vv. 3-8. His thankfulness, love and confidence for the Philippians.

— Ver. 3. Much may be said in favour of the reading ἐν μὲν εἴχαμετε (see crit. note) from the point of view of sense. The antithesis would then show that the letter is a direct reply to one received from Philippi, and the emphasis on Paul's own thanksgiving would be accounted for (with Zahn) by the supposition that the Philippians imagined a slight lack of cordiality on his part. This supposition is favoured by the prominence given in the Epistle to Paul's delight in them.— ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ (Hatz., Einleit., p. 389).— ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ σοι ἐνεπεμβαλόμενον (Hatz., Einleit., p. 388).— ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (Hatz., Einleit., p. 388).— ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκαστὶ (Hatz., Einleit., p. 388).— ἐν μὲν τῇ ἑρμην...
on the other. Hort (Christian Ecclesia, p. 44) points out that there is something concrete in the koinwnia of Acts ii. 42. The same is true of Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 13, Heb. xiii. 16. This concrete notion in k. (almost equiv. to "contribution") is supported by the use of εἰς, which is employed technically in context like this to denote the destination of money-payments, collections, etc. So 1 Cor. xvi. 1, τὸς λαός τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους; Acts xxiv. 17, ἐλημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἄνοιγμα. Important exx. from Papyri in Dsm., BS., pp. 113-114, NBS., p. 23. Cf. on the whole idea the most apt comment of Chr. ad loc.:

Stov yap eKelpov τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, o-v στήρισσαν ἀντὶ τῶν οὐκ ἔστατον. e-ξεπεμύττων αὐτῷ τῶν στεφάων. ἕκα καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐξωθησμὸν ἀγίων συν τῷ ἄγων μένου μόνου ὡς εἰς τοῖς στέφονες ἅλλα καὶ τῷ πειραματίζοντος καὶ στάντων ἀπό τῶν ἀκούσαντα τῶν ἀληθειῶν.—τῇ σέκυ. It is unnecessary to narrow this down to the preaching of the Gospel. Used comprehensively.— ἀντὶ πρῶτου. Cf. the account of their generosity in chap. iv. 10. —ἐξελέυσον τοῦ νῦν. The same phrase in Rom. viii. 22. Cf. Papyr. of Paphlagonia μέσον τοῦ νῦν in Dsm., NBS., p. 31.

Ver. 6. ἀπὸ τοῦτο. Accus. of the "inner object," where the neuter pronoun takes the place of a cognate substantive: cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 1, τρίτον τοῦτο ἡρκομαι (see Blass, Gram., p. 89). ἀπὸ τοῦτο is characteristic of Paul, "the firm touch of an intent mind" (Moule, C. ad loc.). "Having this firm persuasion." Curiously enough, the same confident assurance, although based on very different grounds, is characteristic also of the later Jewish theology, e.g., Apocal. of Baruch (ed. Charles), xiii. 3.

"Thou shalt be assuredly preserved to the consummation of the times." Also xxv., 1; lxvi., 2. "Christianity, by its completely rounded view of the world, guarantees to believers that they shall be preserved unto eternal life in the kingdom of God, which is God's revealed end in the world" (Ritschl, Justification, E. Tr., p. 200).—ἐναρξάμενοι. This cor. vii., although a word of ritual in classical Greek, is found in LXX (Pentat.) apparently in the simple sense "begin." In its only other occurrence in N.T., Gal. iii. 3, it is combined with ἐπιτελεῖν as here.—ἐργάζον ἐκάθορον. De W., Lft. and others refer this to koinwnia of ver. 5. Is it not far more natural to regard it as "the work of God" par excellence, the production of spiritual life, the imparting of the χάρις of ver. 7? Cf. chap. ii. 13 and esp. Rom. xiv. 20, μὴ ἔμενεν ἐρωματοσκοπεῖν τὸ ἐργον τοῦ Θεοῦ.—ἡμερής ἡμέρας. On the order ἡμέρας, see ver. 1 supr. ἡμ. lacks the article on the analogy of ἡμέρας Κυρίου (LXX). This favourite conception of O.T. prophecy refers to "the time when the Lord reveals Himself in His fulness to the world, when He judges evil and fulfils His great purposes of redemption among men. . . . But the judgment has not its end in itself, it is but the means of making Jehovah known to the world, and this knowledge of Him is salvation" (Davidson, Nahum, etc., p. 105). It is easy to see how the N.T. idea grows out of this. Paul probably assumes that the day is not far off, but indulges in no dogmatizing. This name is given to the day because Christ as Κύριος is to be judge. Belief in the Parousia of Christ has a most prominent place in Paul's religious thought. He never attempts to specify the time. But it cheers him, esp. in crises of his history (as
in this Epistle), to believe that the Lord is near. (See Teichmann, *Die paulin. Vor- 
stellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht*, p. 11 ff.). There is perhaps no part of 
Paul's thought in which it is so difficult to trace a fixed outline of ideas as the 
eschatological. And yet there is no part more regulative for him than this. 

Ver. 7. Βίκασαι = our "right" or 
"natural".— τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑμ. Not 
"think this concerning you," but "have 
this care on your behalf"; cf. chap. iv. 
10, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν φρονεῖν. τοῦτο of course 
refers to the finishing in them of God's 
"good work". φρ. seems always to keep 
in view the direction which thought (of a 
practical kind) takes. ὑπὲρ usually has 
the sense of "interest in" (so Lft.).— 
πίλα τὴν κ.τ.λ. Paul's only use of πίλα with 
infin.— ἐν τ. καρδίας. Perhaps it is best 
(with Zahn) to take κ. here not so much 
as the seat of the softer feelings, but rather 
as the abode of the stronger thoughts, 
resolutions, etc. A regular Greek usage. 
Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9, 2 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 6 et al. 
Thus the whole expression would almost 
be equiv. to "I know that you," etc.; 
cf. δειπνάτην ὑμῶν περιέρχεται τὴν 
μυθήν (Thdrt.). His love is expressed in the 
next verse.—Evidently ἐν τ. τοῖς δισμ. 
c. τ.λ. goes with the following clause, for 
it is much more natural to suppose a break 
at the first μυθή, which is resumed by 
the second. Ὑπὸ before τ. ἐνόλω. see crit. 
ote. Paul separates here (so also Wohl.) 
between his δισμ. and his δισμ. 
idea with βεβαιώσεως. 
It seems to us clear that this ἐνόλω. marks 
a crisis in his circumstances of which the 
influence is seen all through the Epistle; 
cf., e.g., vv. 19, 25, chap. ii. 23, 24. 
Ought it not to be taken in its ordinary 
judicial sense of a defence against a re- 
gular charge? (as against Lft. and Moul. 
*CT*, who refer ἄν. and β.β. to Paul's 
missionary work at Rome, and Hpt., who 
thinks of Paul's whole activity in refuting 
opponents, both public and private). The 
correctness of this view receives strong 
confirmation from Dsm. (BS., p. 100 sq.), 
who shows that Paul, like the Transla- 
tors of the LXX, was well acquainted 
with the technical sense of βεβαιώσεως 
(Lat. *evictio*), the obligation under which 
the seller came to the buyer to guarantee 
against all claims his right to what he 
had bought. So Paul's defence before 
the emperor is a guarantee of the Gospel, a 
warrant of its value and claim. For 
ἀπολ. see 2 Tim. iv. 16. "My defence 
and confirmation of the Gospel."—συν. 
μ. τ. χάρις, χάρις here must be the great 
central gift of God's grace, which Paul 
always keeps in the foreground. Cf. 1 
Cor. xv. 10, χάριν καὶ θεος χαίρει 5 εἴη, 
καὶ οὐ χάριν εἵνεκα οὐ υμῖν υπὸ λαμβάνων. 
There is no need to limit it to 
the grace of apostleship or to that granted 
to him in his trials and sufferings. Their 
love and kindness towards him and his 
great work, even at the darkest moments 
in his career, are proof enough that they 
share along with him in the grace of God. 
It is probably better to separate μον from 
χάριτος. [J. Weiss (*Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 
265)] would read χρισάω, comparing chap. 
ii. 25, iv. 16, Rom. xii. 13. Certainly this 
would give good sense and be more pointed. 

Ver. 8. An exact parallel is Rom. i. 
9-11. μάρτυς γὰρ μον ὑποτεύχαν δ. Θεὸς . . . 
ὅσα διάλειπτως μνημον ὑμῶν τοὔμεραι . . . ἐσπηποθό χαρὰ ὑμῖν ἑώρηκα. Such 
adjudication of God he uses only in solemn 
personal appeals; cf. Gal. i. 20. Perhaps 
this goes to justify Zahn in supposing
9 So Ti., W.H. (f. 1), Lft., Myr., Hpt., Alf., Trg. with ΝΑΚ**L, Clem., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Περιτονέμον. Lachm., Ws., W.H. (mg.), Trg. (mg.) with BDE 37, κκ. Myr. accounts for -ης by similarity of sounds in terminations of επιγρα-σεις, εικόνες, παράγων. Ws. thinks, conversely, that -ης was transformed into -η under the influence of present περιτονέμον (TK., p. 42).

that the Philippians had imagined some lack of cordiality in Paul's reception of their gift. Comm. have noted the intensity of language manifested in the compound εντικότερος. But it is needful to remember the londness of later Greek for compounds which had lost their strong sense. Calvin, with practical insight: neque enim parum hoc valet ad idem doctrina faciendum cum persuasus est populus a doctore se amari. — εν ψυχέ-ве,. “With the heart of Jesus Christ” (with which his own has become identi-ified). This amounts to the same thing as love. Cf. Gal. ii.20, which is the best comment. Possibly Paret (Zahrb. f. deutsche Theol., iii., 1, p. 25) is not too fanciful in finding here a definite recollec-tion of Jesus' nature, of which εναπάγωρος (in the Gospels) is a common expression. Every genuine pastor has some experience of this feeling.

Vv. 9-11. Prayer for their increase in Christian discernment.—Ver. 9. Zahn would put this clause under the government of διε in the preceding sen-tence. No strong argument can be used against this, but it is doubtful whether the explanation is necessary. In the use of ἐνα here, “purport” (to adopt Ellicott's expression) seems to be blended with “ purpose”. There are certainly passages in which the full “ telic” force of ἐνα cannot be fairly asserted. This accords with the development of the later language. See Hatz., Einl., p. 214 ff. Possibly ἐνα in this passage is rhetorically parallel to ἐνα in ver. 10. (See J. Weiss, Beiträge zur Paulin. Rhetorik, p. 9.)— ἢ γάλα ὄμ. can scarcely mean anything else than “your love towards one an-other”. This has been already exem-plified in their κανώνα with Paul.— Περιτονέμον. In LXX, chiefly in Sirach. It is mainly in Paul's writings that it reaches the derivative sense of “abound”. In the Synoptics it still means (usually), as in ordinary Greek, “to remain over”. Sola charitas non admittit excessum (Bacon, de Augm. Scient., viii., 3, quoted by Gwynn).—εἰς ἡπειρωτικ. Apparently an eager and enthusiastic spirit pre- vailed in this Church. As so commonly, it might be accompanied by a slight want of discernment. That would lead, on the one hand, to misunderstandings over trilling matters (cf. chap. iv. 21), on the other, to giving heed to plausible teachers. As the Galatians combined enthusiasm and fickleness, perhaps, at Philippi, enthusiasm was apt to prevail over spiritual common sense. Is not Lft. mistaken in annotating “Love imparts a sensitiveness of touch,” etc.? This is not before Paul's mind. His prayer is that the sensitiveness of touch may be added to love.—ἐπιγρα-σεις. A favourite word in the Epistles of the imprisonment. A good example of its intensive force is 1 Cor. xiii. 12, ἐπιγρα-σεις ἕκαστος καὶ επιγρα-σεις. Very frequent in Justin M., e.g., a definition of επιστήμη ( Dial., 221 A), επιστήμη τῆς ἐπιγρα-σεως καὶ τῶν αἰτήσεων καὶ τῶν διδασκαλίων ἡ γνώσις καὶ τῆς νοημονώτητος καὶ διδασκαλίων ἡ γνώσις. Cf. Dial., 220 D; Ἀπόλ., ii. 10, 19. Here = a firm con-ception of those spiritual principles which would guide them in their relations with one another and the world.—ἀλοιφά. Moral sensibility, quickness of ethical tact. Originally of sense-perception, but applicable to the inner world of sensi-bilities. Kl. quotes aptly from Hippocrates, de Off. Med., 3, ἐ ὡς καὶ τῇ διψῇ καὶ τῇ διήθη καὶ τῇ ἀκοή καὶ τῇ βιον καὶ τῇ γλυστρα καὶ τῇ γνώσει καὶ τῇ νοημονώτητος καὶ τῆς νοημονώτητος. A complete parallel is Heb. v. 14, where the writer defines the πνεύμα (cf. Phil. iii. 12, 15-16) as τῶν διὰ τὴν ἐπίτευξιν τῆς αλοιφήρα γνωσμοναί σωμάτων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ καὶ κακοῦ. —πάσης. Probably “all kinds of”.

Ver. 10. δοκ. τὰ διαφ. Ὑμῶν. ζοφ. τοῦ Ἥλλου. ζοφ. δοκ. (in the N.T. the last is very rare.) Two possible renderings. (1) “Approve things that are excellent.” (2) “Test things that
d Rom. i. 11, 10. 
4 έλει το δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ίνα ἴητε εἴλακρυμεῖς καὶ
εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ίνα ἴητε εἴλακρυμεῖς καὶ
ἦν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 11. πεπληρωμένοι εἴς καρποῦ 1
Wend. vii. 25.
11. πεπληρωμένοι εἴς καρποῦ 1. ἔλει δεδέον καὶ ἦτοις θεοῦ.
Rom. i. 11. 
12. Γιγάντων δὲ ἀμείοντα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἔσω ἡ κατέ ἐμε
Cor. v. 8. 
12. Γιγάντων δὲ ἀμείοντα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἔσω ἡ κατέ ἐμε
Sci. 1. 17. 
f Acts xiv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 32. Scarcely found in secular writers.
g Heb. xii. 11; Jas. iii. 18; Prov. xi. 30 al. h Chap. ii. 11; Rom. xv. 7; Eph. i. 6, 14; i Jude 5.

So P, syr. cop., Chr., Thphyl. καρποῦ . . . τὸν. All cdd. with ΝΑΒΔΕΖΚΟΠ
who assigns the omission to carelessness.

The important cursive 37 reads X. I. with amiat.

differ," i.e., good and bad. Lft. opposes
(2) on the ground that "it requires no
keen moral sense to discriminate between
good and bad ", but was not this not this
precisely the great difficulty for heathen-
Christians? Theophyl. defines τὰ διαφ.
by τί διαφαίνεται καὶ τί δια ὑπαράσται.
The idea seems to be borne out by the
following εἴλακρ. and ἄπειρον. We are
therefore compelled to decide for (2).
"It is quite clear that at their core in
believing has to be reiterated continually
in a just application of it to a world
of varying and sometimes perplexing
cases" (Rainy, Expos. Bib., p. 37).
There are exx. of τὰ διαφ. in chap. iii.
passim. Of course this δοκιμάζειν is
made possible by the guidance of the
indwelling Spirit. It shows us "the
highest point which Paul reaches in his
treatment of moral questions" (Hitzlm.,
N.T. Thcol., ii., p. 149, who points out as
instances of his delicate moral tact the pre-
cepts given in 1 Cor. viii.-x., Rom. xiv.).
—εἴλακρ. καὶ ἄπειρον. There is no war-
rance for adhering to the common deriva-
tion of εἴλακρ. from ἄληε with either ἄλη ("heat of sun") and so
= "tested by sunbeam," or ἄλη (= ἄλη
"troops") and so "separated into ranks".
The word is the equiv. of Lat. sincerus,
"pure," "unmixed." A favourite term
in Plato for pure intellect and also for
the soul purged from sense. Cf. Phaedo,
66 A, 67 A, 81 B. Naturally transferred to
the moral sphere. T. H. Green (Two
Sermons, p. 41) describes εἴλακρεῖα as
"perfect openness towards God". ἄπειρον.
will then mean, in all probability, "not giving offense" to others,
the adverse side of εἰλακρεῖα. This sense
seems to us to be proved by 1 Cor. x. 32
with the context, which is simply an
expansion of Paul's thought here. Cf.
also 1 John ii. 10.—εἰς ἡμέραν Ἱρ., εἰς
has the meanings "with a view to" and
"until," which here shade off into
each other. The conception of ἦμ. X.
"grew in Paul's hands to a whole
μόνον, lasting from the πεπληρομένοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἴς
deed, and ἦμ. θεοῦ.
Cor. v. 8.
12. Γιγάντων δὲ ἀμείοντα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἔσω ἡ κατέ ἐμε
Sci. 1. 17. 
f Acts xiv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 32. Scarcely found in secular writers.
g Heb. xii. 11; Jas. iii. 18; Prov. xi. 30 al. h Chap. ii. 11; Rom. xv. 7; Eph. i. 6, 14; i Jude 5.

Ver. 11. Critical evidence (see above)
fixes καρποῦ . . . τὸν as the correct
reading. We should, of course, expect
the gen. (see the v.l.), but one of the most
marked features in later Greek is the
enlarging of the sphere of the accus. It
is quite clear that at their core in
believing has to be reiterated continually
in a just application of it to a world
of varying and sometimes perplexing
cases" (Rainy, Expos. Bib., p. 37).
There are exx. of τὰ διαφ. in chap. iii.
passim. Of course this δοκιμάζειν is
made possible by the guidance of the
indwelling Spirit. It shows us "the
highest point which Paul reaches in his
treatment of moral questions" (Hitzlm.,
N.T. Thcol., ii., p. 149, who points out as
instances of his delicate moral tact the pre-
cepts given in 1 Cor. viii.-x., Rom. xiv.).
—εἴλακρ. καὶ ἄπειρον. There is no war-
rance for adhering to the common deriva-
tion of εἴλακρ. from ἄληε with either ἄλη ("heat of sun") and so
= "tested by sunbeam," or ἄλη (= ἄλη
"troops") and so "separated into ranks".
The word is the equiv. of Lat. sincerus,
"pure," "unmixed." A favourite term
in Plato for pure intellect and also for
the soul purged from sense. Cf. Phaedo,
66 A, 67 A, 81 B. Naturally transferred to
the moral sphere. T. H. Green (Two
Sermons, p. 41) describes εἴλακρεῖα as
"perfect openness towards God". ἄπειρον.
will then mean, in all probability, "not giving offense" to others,
the obverse side of εἰλακρεῖα. This sense
seems to us to be proved by 1 Cor. x. 32
with the context, which is simply an
expansion of Paul's thought here. Cf.
also 1 John ii. 10.—εἰς ἡμέραν Ἱρ., εἰς
has the meanings "with a view to" and
"until," which here shade off into
each other. The conception of ἦμ. X.
"grew in Paul's hands to a whole
μόνον, lasting from the πεπληρομένοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἴς
for Christ’s sake, and not on account of any breach of law. yev. must be translated by the English perfect, for, as Moule (CT.) well points out, “our English thought separates present from past less rapidly than Greek.” Of course we must supply δημα. as predicate with φαν. yev. —δημα. τ. πρατ. is one of the most keenly contested expressions in the Epistle. Four leading interpretations are found. (1) Those forming the praetorian guard. So Lft., Hfm., Abbott, Hpt., Vinc. This explanation has much in its favour. Those coming up on appeal from the Provinces were handed over for surveillance to the praefecti praetorio (see Marquardt-Momms., ii. 25, p. 972 and n. 2). And Lft. (Com., pp. 99-104) has shown conclusively that the word admits of this meaning. (2) The barracks or camp of the praetorian guard. So Lips., Kl., Alf., De W., Myr., Ws., Von Soden. But none of these Comm. bring direct evidence to show that the name praetorium was ever definitely applied to the castra praetoriana, built under Tiberius at the Porta Viminalis (Tac., Ann., iv., 2). (3) The emperor’s palace. So Chr., Th. Mps., Thdrt., Beng., Mynter (Kleine theolog. Schriften, p. 184, some strong arguments), Gwynn, Duchesne. In all other passages of N.T. πρατ. = residence of the ruler. It is said that it would be impossible for anyone writing from Rome to call the palace πρατ. But, as Gw. observes, this is a provincial writing to provincials, and using the word in a familiar sense. Further, the change for the better in Paul’s circumstances is connected with the knowledge that his bonds are in Christ. Is it because the authorities (emperor, etc.) have already begun to take a favourable view of his case that the preaching is allowed to prosper without hindrance and that his associates take courage? This interpretation cannot be dismissed altogether lightly. (4) The judicial authorities. So Mommsen (op. cit., p. 498) and Ramsay (St. Paul, etc., p. 357 ff.). These would be the praefecti praetorio (either one or two) with their assessors and other officials of the imperial court. Momms. quotes from a letter of Trajan to Pliny (Ep. Plin., 57 [65]), in which he decides that a criminal condemned to exile, but, in spite of this,
lingering in the province, should be sent in chains ad praefectos praetorio mei, who are not the prison officials but those concerned with the hearing of cases. This explanation also would agree well with what Paul says about his bonds and the progress of the Gospel. We would hesitate to decide between (1) and (4), the context seeming to support the latter, while, perhaps, ἐπί favours the former.— καὶ τοὺς λαούς τῇ. Cf. CIG., i., 1770, ἐπί καὶ ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς ἔχειν φανεροὶ προφήταις τήν τε ἱδίων καὶ τοῦ δῆμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου προφητεύειν. Apparently a vague phrase = everywhere else.

Ver. 14. τοὺς πλεῖστον. Vaughan holds that "from the universal practice of deciding matters by the vote of a majority the term comes to mean the main body, the society as a whole," but this scarcely seems needful.— τῷ ἄν. ἐν Κ. These words surely make up one phrase (so Alf., Weizs., Ws., etc., as against Lft., Lips., Myr., etc.). Cf. Col. i. 2. It is difficult to see where the tautology, which is said to be involved in this interpretation, comes in. Probably it is an almost technical combination. Dsm. (BS., p. 82) notes from Papyri a precisely similar technical use of ἀδελφός in the language of the Serapeum at Memphis.— παντοθέν. τ. θεσμ. μοῦ. "Having confidence in my bonds," i.e., being encouraged by the favourable light in which his imprisonment was beginning to be regarded when seen in its true character. [This tells in favour of (4) in ver. 13.] Cf. Philm. 21. παντοθέν τῷ ὑπακοῆς σου.—λαλεῖν. Hpt. believes that λαλ. is used here expressly instead of λέγειν as emphasising the physiological process rather than the word spoken. In the later language these refinements were apt to be overlooked. Still it is interesting to find that in LXX ἔστερν is almost invariably transl. by λαλεῖν and ῥήσαν by λέγειν.

Vv. 15-18. The result of his more favourable circumstances: Christ preached, whether of spite or goodwill.—Ver. 15. τινὲς. Are these included in the πλεῖστον of ver. 14 or not? We prefer to believe (so also Weiss, Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1876, p. 78 ff.) that the Apostle has changed his point of view. For is it conceivable that those who "had confidence" in his bonds should, on the other hand, "raise affliction" (ver. 17) for those bonds? He thinks now not so much of the emboldening of his Christian brethren as of the fact that the Gospel is being preached with great vigour over a wide area. Accordingly τινὲς may be taken by itself.—Probably καὶ goes with φθονον. "Some preach . . . actually from envy and rivalry." — ἐπί = "rivalry" (not "strife"), as often. Cf. Thuc. vi., 31, 4; Ἑσ. Eumen. (ed. Paley), 933 (where used in a good sense). To whom does Paul refer? It has usually been taken for granted that it must be to his unwearying opponents, the Judaisers. So Myr., Alf., Lft., Franke (esp. SK., 1895, p. 772), Duchesne and others. But, as Hpt. clearly shows, we have no grounds for assuming the existence of a definitely anti-Pauline Jewish-Christian party at Rome (so also Hort, Judaistic Christianity, pp. 112-113). At the same time this jealousy of the Apostle, a matter of personal feeling, may well have arisen in the Jewish wing of the Roman Church. They would naturally be roused to some bitterness by Paul's emphasis on the universality of the Gospel and his neglect of its specially Jewish setting. But it is unreasonable to divide all the Christians of the Apostolic Age into Gentile-Christians and Judaisers. There would be many Jewish-Christians who never favoured the extreme methods or even doctrines of the latter. (Cf. M'Giffert's instructive discussion, Apost. Age, pp. 393-395, and Pfl., Urchrist., pp. 147, 151.) It is indeed quite possible that those re-
ferred to here are Pauline Christians who for some reason have a personal pique at the Apostle. (Cf. Ws., Amer. J. of Theol., i, 2, pp. 388-389, who throws out the interesting suggestion that they may have been old teachers of the Church who had become jealous of Paul's high position, and so wished to outstrip him and destroy his popularity.) "Paul says nothing here which I have not experienced" (Calv.).— ἄπαντα ἢ καί. Although not explicitly, these, of course, belong to the ἔρως of ver. 14. καί marks the contrast with the preceding clause.— ἀλλῷ, εὐθυσία. The word can mean nothing else here than "goodwill". For it is placed in antithesis to ἐγκάρσεις and ἐπιθυμίας, and resumed by ἐδούρεσθε below. Cf. Sirach, ix, 12, εὐθυσίας ἐν εὐθυσία ἐστίν.

Vv. 16-17. An overwhelming mass of authority is in favour of transposing these verses as above (see crit. note). TR. is simply an emendation based on the order in ver. 15.—Ver. 16. οἱ μὲν ἢ ἐξ ἀγάπης. Is this a complete phrase or does ἢ ἐξ qualify the predicate τῷ ἔργῳ, supplied from ver. 15? The latter seems most natural, as it preserves the complete parallelism of the clauses, which would otherwise be disturbed by ὑμῖν ἐγκάρσεις.—κείμαι has practically become perf. passive of τίθημι. τέθεις is seldom used. (See Gildersleeve on Justin M., Apol., i., 11, 6.) Exactly parallel are Luke ii, 34, οὗτος καὶ τῶν πέντε ἔναντι ἐκάρτανέν τοῖς πόλεις; 1 Thess. iii, 5, καί ἕκατεν τοῦ ἐν εἴδωτον ἔργῳ. "Am appointed."—Ver. 17. ἢ ἐρνήσας. Here virtually = "selfishness" (rather than "factiousness"). Originally, the character of a worker for pay. Now that which degraded the hired worker, in the estimation of antiquity, was his labouring wholly for his own interests, while it was a sign of the noble to devote himself to the common weal. This sense suits all N.T. passages (Rom. ii, 8, 2 Cor. xii, 20, Gal. v, 20, Jas. iii, 14, 16). See Hpt.'s valuable note from which the above is condensed.—τῷ Χ. It is hard to say whether τὸν ought to be retained. It would easily be accounted for as an assimilation to τὸν Χ. in ver. 15.—καταγγέλλω. A distinction has been drawn between καταγγέλλω, as confined to those sent by Christ and καταγγέλλω, as applying to all preachers, including our Lord Himself. Probably they are quite synonymous here. Cf. an excellent note in Westcott (on 1 John i, 5) on the special signification of καταγγελλομαι. among compounds of ἄγγελλω = "proclaim with authority, as commissioned to spread the tidings throughout those who hear them".—ὀλοίρα ἢ. "With mixed motives." Cf. Pind., Ol., iii., 37, μεγάλων ἄγγελων ἄνω ἄγγελων κρίσεως (quoted by Alf.).—οἰκονομεῖ. "Purposing." So frequently in later Greek. Schmid (Alticismus, i., 128) quotes from Dio Chrys., Aristides, and Philostratus. Cf. Phryn. (ed. Lobbeck), τῷ Βιβλίῳ. οἷον ὁ πόρος ἐκεῖνος ἐξεστίν. There is a sharp contrast between ἐκεῖνος in ver. 16 and οἴκονομοι here.—οἶκον τῷ θεῷ. The balance of authority is in favour of οἶκον. οἴκον ἢ is probably an ancient gloss, which may have crept into some text from the margin. The phrase apparently means "to stir up vexation for me in my imprisonment". They attributed their own jealous feelings to the Apostle, and could
not conceive a greater worry to him than that he should hear of their success in preaching.

Vv. 18-20. His joy in the preaching of Christ and expectation of success in his cause.—Ver. 18. There seems little doubt that we should read χαίρω δὲν, as there would be a tendency to omit either word to simplify the sense. Ws. holds that χαίρω was inserted because copyists did not notice that δὲν is causal, introducing a protasis. But it is difficult to imagine this misunderstanding if δὲν stood alone. τί γὰρ probably goes closely with ἔστωμι preceding. “Supposing they purpose, etc., what then? Only that . . . Christ is preached.” τί γὰρ has its usual classical sense. For πάντα δὲν in this usage, cf. Acts xx. 22-23, τὰ . . . συνντάγματα ἐμοί μὴ εἴπῃς, χαίρω δὲν τί το πείνα . . . διαμαρτυρεῖται.—προφατίζει ε. ἄλλην. A common antithesis. The one party preached the Gospel, ostensibly for Christ’s sake, really to gain their own ends.—The best punctuation of the next clause is that of W.H., who place a colon after χαίρω and a comma after χαρπ.—ἐν τούτῳ. Must not τ. mean “the fact that, in spite of my imprisonment, Christ is preached”? It seems far-fetched to refer it to his imprisonment.—χαίρω. Assuming that Paul’s opponents here were Judaisers, Comm. have been driven to desperate shifts to explain his joy in their preaching. This verse was quoted in the early Church in favour of heretics, so that Chr., Th. Mps. and Thdrt. have to protest against the abuse of it (see Swete, Th. Mps., i., p. 209). When reasonably interpreted it presents no serious difficulties.—καί χαρπ.
18–21. ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ

γίας τοῦ Πνεύματος ἵσυον Χριστοῦ. 20. κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐπίθετο μου. ὦν, ἐν εὐθείᾳ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἐν πάθῃ ἀρρηστία, ὡς πάντοτε, καὶ ὄν ἀναλυόμεθα Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ σώματι μου, εἶτε διὰ λαβητ εἶτε διὰ Θανάτου. 21. Ἔμοι γὰρ τὸ Ὧμην ἤρθον ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ οὐ διὰ μυριστατοῖ τούτων ἐλεημόρῳ ἀλλ' ἐν πάτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς 

at passim. d Luke i. 46; Acts xix. 17. e Cf. 2 Cor. v. 6.

1 Prob. to be spelt thus in N.T. See W-Sch., i., § 5, 11, d.

2 F, Gkt, d, e, f, vg. go. add εστίν.

victory in a contest for the right. Cf. also 2 Cor. i. 10 ff., a passage precisely akin to this, which favours the above idea of ὑπηρεσία. [We find that Zahn uses almost the same arguments, Luthardt's Zeitschr., 1885, p. 300.] This verse is linked to ver. 12 by ver. 18. He desires their prayers for deliverance, and the promised Spirit of Christ (Luke xii. 12) to give him wisdom that he may know how to act. In any case (the thought crosses his mind that he may still be condemned) he hopes to glorify Christ whether in life or death.— ἐνπίστει. The absence of the article is no reason for joining τον closely with ὑπερ. under the government of νεων. The gen. τοῦ πν. Ἡ. Χ. is quite sufficient to isolate τον. "The supply given by the Spirit of Jesus Christ." This is the Spirit possessed by Christ Himself and communicated to all who abide in Him as members of His body. Of course Paul, at times, really identifies Christ with the Spirit, e.g., 1 Cor. xv. 45, 2 Cor. iii. 17. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 17. This identification springs directly from his own spiritual history. "The first 'pneumatic' experience Paul had was an experience of Christ" (Gunkel, Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes., p. 91). Cf. for the word τα-πό-σει. Ἰν. ad Diogn., i., 10, to ὁκόν ὁκόν τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγοῦντος. "A suitable and common word for the Giver God. . . . The generosity of its origin survives in the transfer" (Gildersleeve ad loc.).

Ver. 20. ἀποκαραδ. The concentrated intense hope which ignores other interests (ἀπό), and strains forward as with outstretched head (καρπ., δοκεῖν). Cf. Rom. viii. 19, ἢ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τῆς ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν θεῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέκδεχεται. The verb ἀπο- 

Ver. 21. ὀμην. The concentrated intense hope which ignores other interests (ἀπό), and strains forward as with outstretched head (καρπ., δοκεῖν). Cf. Rom. viii. 19, ἢ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τῆς ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν θεῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνέκδεχεται. The verb ἀπο- 

caradaokein is found in Polyb., Plut., Joseph., Aquila. Paul here is probably referring, in the main, to his own conduct, the danger of denying his Lord under stress of hardships, but there is also involved the thought of Christ's treatment of him. This gives the true antithesis to μεγαλ. — ἐπιφορησία. We are inclined to believe that ὅ. has its literal meaning, boldness of speech, for he has before him the danger of denying Christ. Of course there is implied the idea of courage in his whole bearing. The word is typical of the attitude of the early Christians.— καὶ νῦν. His trial is in process.— μεγαλ. . . . Θανάτου. There is some force in Meyer's suggestion that passive verbs are used here because Paul feels himself the organ of Divine working. ἐν τῷ σώματι. "In my person." ὁ in Paul is always a colourless word, the organ of the ψυχή or the νεων, and taking its character from its constituting principle. If he lives, it will be for the service of Christ, which is the highest honour he can pay his Lord. If he has to die, then his readiness to endure death and his calm courage in enduring will be the most eloquent testimony to the worth of his Lord.

Vv. 21–23. DEATH OR LIFE MEANS CHRIST FOR HIM.—Ver. 21. ὢμην. Why this emphasis? He knew that, after the expression of his joyful confidence and hope, the word Θανάτου would come as a shock to their minds. There could be no question as to how men in general felt concerning life and death. But he, the Apostle, occupies a different standpoint. This standpoint he must explain. In spite of Haupt's strong arguments for taking τῷ ὑμᾶν, not as bodily life, but as life in its general conception (including the future existence), we cannot help feeling that the antithesis of ζωῆς and Θανάτου (ver. 20) necessitates the same contrast between τῷ ζωῆς and τῷ ἀποκαραδ. [Kabisch, Eschatologie d. Paulus, p. 134, goes the length of saying that Paul does not know the conception of life as an ethical quality; that it always meant for him simply existence. Probably there may be more truth in this than we are at first sight, from our different modes
of thought, inclined to admit. To the Jewish mind non-existence was certainly one of the most terrible ideas conceivable. If life meant for Paul wealth, power, self-gratification and the like, then death would loom in front of him with terror. But life for him means Christ. He is one with his Lord. And he knows that death itself cannot break that union, it can only make it more complete (because death is σών Χ. ένειά). Thus it must be actual gain, a definite addition to his joy. Contrast the thought of Apoc. of Bar., xiv., 12, in some degree similar: "the righteous justly hope for the end, and without fear depart from this habitation, because they have with thee a store of works preserved in treasuries".—καπρός. Cf. Wisd. iii. 13. Ει'το καρποί τῶν ἐργῶν σου καρπωτέρεις έσται ή γη; Wisd. iii. 15. ἀγάθω γάρ τῶν καρπῶν εὐλύκεια. Aply Thphyl., καλ τό έρημον σου έκαρπόταν άντίστοιχον καλοτεμένον γάρ διδάσκεσθαι καλίσθενον τάκτως. — καπρός. τι has practically ousted τόντως from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. instead in the first clause. For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13. ἀπό καρπῶν τῶν ἐργῶν σου καρπωτέρεις έσται ή γη. Wisd. iii. 15. ἀγάθω γάρ τῶν καρπῶν εὐλύκεια. Aply Thphyl., καλ τό έρημον σου έκαρπόταν άντίστοιχον καλοτεμένον γάρ διδάσκεσθαι καλίσθενον τάκτως. — καπρός. τι has practically ousted τόντως from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. instead in the first clause. For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13. ἀπό καρπῶν τῶν ἐργῶν σου καρπωτέρεις έσται ή γη. Wisd. iii. 15. ἀγάθω γάρ τῶν καρπῶν εὐλύκεια. Aply Thphyl., καλ τό έρημον σου έκαρπόταν άντίστοιχον καλοτεμένον γάρ διδάσκεσθαι καλίσθενον τάκτως. — καπρός. τι has practically ousted τόντως from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. instead in the first clause. For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13. ἀπό καρπῶν τῶν ἐργῶν σου καρπωτέρεις έσται ή γη. Wisd. iii. 15. ἀγάθω γάρ τῶν καρπῶν εὐλύκεια. Aply Thphyl., καλ τό έρημον σου έκαρπόταν άντίστοιχον καλοτεμένον γάρ διδάσκεσθαι καλίσθενον τάκτως. — καπρός. τι has practically ousted τόντως from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. instead in the first clause. For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13. ἀπό καρπῶν τῶν ἐργῶν σου καρπωτέρεις έσται ή γη. Wisd. iii. 15. ἀγάθω γάρ τῶν καρπῶν εὐλύκεια. Aply Thphyl., καλ τό έρημον σου έκαρπόταν άντίστοιχον καλοτεμένον γάρ διδάσκεσθαι καλίσθενον τάκτως. — καπρός. τι has practically ousted τόντως from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. instead in the first clause.
From this passage and 2 Cor. v. 8 (but see also 1 Thess. v. 10) as compared with others, e.g., 1 Thess., iv. 15, 1 Cor. xv. 51, Bessell. (N.T. Theol., ii., 269) Teichmann (op. cit., pp. 57-59), Grafe (Abhandl. C. v. Weissäcker gewidm., p. 276) and others conclude that the Apostle changed his views on eschatology in his later years, and esp. when death stared him in the face. Instead of supposing a sleep (κοιμώμεθα) until the Parousia, or else the direct experience of that event, he now believes that after death the soul is immediately united to Christ. It is, however, hazardous to build up eschatological theories on these isolated utterances of the Apostle. He has, apparently, no fixed scheme of thought on the subject. The Resurrection is not before his mind at all in this passage. His eschatology, as Dsm. (Th. L.Z., 1898, col. 14) well observes, must rather be conceived as ψωμί. Death cannot interrupt the life in Χριστῷ. This is the preparation for being συν Χ. Even contemporary Jewish thought was familiar with a similar idea. So, e.g., Tanchuma, Wajjikra, 8: "When the righteous leave the world they ascend at once and stand on high" (Weber, Lehren d. Talmud, p. 323). See also Charles, Eschatology, 399 ff.—πολλά. It seems necessary for the sense to insert yap with the best authorities. The double comparat. is fairly common.

Vv. 24-26. His presentiment that he will visit them again.—Ver. 24. ἐφημ. seems common with Paul in a colourless sense.—ἐπὶ. It is hard to decide whether it should be retained or not. No difference is made in the sense.—ἀναγ. It is characteristic of the Apostle that the first thing which strikes him is the need of others. Wetstein quotes aptly from Seneca, Ep. ad Lucil., p. 104, ingenti animi est aliena causa ad vitam reverti quod magni viri saepe fecerunt.

Ver. 25. καὶ τ. τ. οἴδα. "With this conviction (sc. that his life is needful for them) I know," etc. Paul does not claim to be infallible, but he is so confident of the Philippians' need of him that he cannot doubt that this will be God's purpose too. There is every reason to believe that his hope was justified (see Introduction).—παραμένω (which is best attested) has in later Greek the special sense of "remaining alive". See Schmid, Atticismus, i., p. 132, who quotes Dio., i., 62, 8; 333, 29; Herod., i., 30, and compares Plat., Phaed., 62 E, 86 C.—ἐκ τ. τ. πρ. κ. τ. λ. Probably προς should be taken apart from πιστεύω, which goes closely with χαράν. "With a view to your progress and the joy of your faith." οὕτω στηρίζωσι, μαλλον ὡς καθάπερ καθαύτες δεσμάς τῆς μυχῆς ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς παγη τὰ περα (Chr.).

Ver. 26. "In order that your ground of glorying may increase in Christ Jesus through me, by reason of my," etc. Their καθαύτης is their knowledge and possession of the Gospel. Christ Jesus is the sphere in which this blessing is enjoyed. Cf. Sirach ix. 16, ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου ἔστω τὸ καθαύτης σου.—ἐν ἀμωμι is defined by the following clause. Paul looks on his presence with them as an occasion of advance in their Christian
Usually in the sense of a community, Paul uses the term “live” or “behave” to refer to the common, spiritual life implanted in them by the direct working of the Holy Spirit. Certainly this is its most usual significance in Paul. See an instructive discussion in Holsten, *Paulin. Theol.*, p. 11, who shows that Paul uses to denote the human spirit, apart from Divine working, it is when he is obliged to emphasise it as the inner power which moves in the hidden life, or when he draws a sharp contrast between the inner and outer side of human nature, laying stress upon the former as the essential, in opposition to the senses which cannot truly know.

1 So Alf., Myr. (Lft. mg.) with Ν*ACD=EFGL*, Chr., Euth. cod., Thdrt. Lach., Ti., W.H., Ws. Ακων with Ν*BD*P 47, 57.
of camaraderie which binds the soldiers of a country together. For an exhaustive discussion of xṓn, see Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, pp. 101-109.— ǾÒ1̲X.’X.P. A comparison with iv. 3 would suggest "striving along with the faith" (so Lft., Vau.). This is certainly harsh. The parallel in Jude 3, eir-o.Ywvit<o-8air§ irtoTei, favours the sense, "striving together (trvv) for the faith". Conjungat vos evangelii fides, praesertim cum ilia vobis sit communis armatura adversus eundem hostem (Calvin).— ὑπάρχει. Christianity regarded in its most characteristic aspect as the acceptance of God's revelation of mercy in Christ, and the resting upon that for salvation. ὑπάρχει gradually becomes a technical term. See Hatch, Hibbert Lectures, p. 314; Harnack, Dogmengesch., i., p. 129 ff.

Ver. 28. παραμερίζω. is apparently used esp. of scared horses. So Diod. Sic., xvii., 34, 5. ήδη ἡ πλήθος τῶν περὶ αὐτῶν συνριμένων μετὰ παραμερίζων. It is found in Plut., Repub. Ger. Praxe., p. 800, of a multitude. See Kypke ad loc.— τ. ἀντικείμενων. Who are their adversaries? In ver. 30 he speaks of them as having the same conflict as he had when at Philippi and now has at Rome. In both these instances, most probably, his opponents were heathen. Further, when warning his readers against Jewish malice, what he usually fears is not that they will be terrified into compliance, but that they will be seduced from the right path. And, as Franke (Myt. ad loc.) points out, the conflict here is for the πίστις, not for the λόγος of the Gospel. It is no argument against this that some of his reasoning would only have force for Jews, e.g., suffering as a gift of God (so Holst., Jahrb. f. prot. Th., 1875, p. 444). For he is speaking of the impression made upon them (the Philippians), and he uses Christian modes of expression. Probably therefore he thinks chiefly of their heathen antagonists, as, in any case, Jews seem to have formed a very small minority of the population. The pagans of Philippi, on the other hand, would struggle hard against a faith which condemned all idol-worship, for the extant remains at Philippi and in its neighbourhood show that they were an extraordinarily devout community. See esp. Heuzey et Daumet, Mission Archéologique de Macédoine, pp. iii., 84-86. At the same time we cannot exclude the possibility that he had non-Christian Jews in his mind as well.— ἐν ὅσῳ. "Inasmuch as this" (sc, the fact of their not being terrified). The relative is, as frequently, attracted to its predicate. So ἐφέσις, agreeing with ὑπάρχει, for τοῦτο. In the following words the true reading is τρίτοι αὐτῶν. That of TR. has arisen for the sake of symmetry with the succeeding clause.— ὑπάρχει. An Attic law-term. In N.T. only in Paul. Not found in LXX. It denotes proof obtained by an appeal to facts. See SH. on Rom. ii. 15.— ἀνθρώπως has its usual Pauline antithesis σωφρίστα. Paul has never defined ἀνθρώπως. All edd. read ὅμοιον. Not only is it better attested (see crit. note), but it also deserves preference as being the harder reading and sufficient to explain...
the other. It really includes ἡμιν. The emphasis in Paul's mind changes from the persons to their destinies. It was quite natural to assimilate ἡμιν to αὐτοῖς preceding. But there is also the thought that they (the adversaries) will be affected not only by the proof of their own destruction, but also by that of the Philippians' salvation.—τοῦτο seems to refer to ἐνδείξεις. "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Ver. 29. στι... ἐγκρίσει. We are inclined to join this clause immediately to μὴ παράδεισον (so also Hpt.). The prospect of suffering was apt to terrify them. But when they view suffering in its true light, they will discover that it is a gift of God's grace (ἐξοπλ.) instead of an evil.—τὸ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. The Apostle intended to insert πάσχαν after Χρ., but for a moment he pauses. To emphasise the real value of suffering for Christ's sake, he compares it with that which they all acknowledge as the crowning blessing of their lives, faith in Him. As to the form of the sentence, this is a favourite rhetorical device of Paul's. See J. Weiss, Beiträge, p. 11 n.—ὁθεμοῦ. μὴ might have been expected. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative οὐ is used instead of μὴ. This principle applies esp. in the case of the adverb μονον" (Burton, MT., p. 183).—εἰς αὐτῶν. The deepest aspect of faith, the intimate union into which the soul is brought.

Ver. 30. ἀγώνα. For the fact, see Acts xvi. 19 ff. and cf. 1 Thess. ii. 2. The metaphor has been prepared for by στρεφεῖν καὶ συναθλοῦντες. Cf. Epictet., iv., 4, 32 (quoted by Hatch, Hibb. Lects., p. 156). "Life is in reality an Olympic festival: we are God's athletes to whom He has given an opportunity of showing of what stuff we are made". ἀγών was constantly used in later Greek of an inward struggle. See some striking exx. from Plutarch in Holden's note on Timoleon, xxvii., 8.—ἐξουσίες. A broken construction. It ought strictly to be dative agreeing with ἡμιν. It can scarcely be taken as parallel with συναθλ. and παράθυριοι. See ref. above.—ἀγνοεῖν. His Roman trial.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-4. EXHORTATION TO UNITY OF SPIRIT AND LOWLINESS.—Ver. 1. εἰς τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. "If exhortation in Christ, if the appeal of love, if fellowship in the spirit, if compassion and pity have any effect."—οὐ probably refers back to i. 27.—παράδεισον has the two senses of "exhortation" and "consolation". But the whole context, supported by such passages as Eph. iv. 1, 1 Cor. i. 10, is in favour of the former. No doubt the idea of encouragement and stimulus is implied. This is an exhortation in Christ. That itself must gain for it a favourable reception.—παρακαλεῖν. Only here in N.T. Once in LXX, Wisd. iii. 18. Almost equiv. to παραθύριον, but having a suggestion of tenderness involved. It springs from his love towards them.—κοιν. παράδεισον. The community of believers is the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, is the unifying Principle of life. Cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 13. οἱ κοινωνία τοῦ ἡγείδιν παράδεισον. As Gunkel well observes (Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes br. Paulus, p. 69 ff.), Paul rendered an unspeakable service to the Church by emphasising this conception. By so doing he saved the exuberant spiritual gifts of the Apostolic Age from degenerating into mere unnatural excitement. All these came to be estimated according to the value for the community of believers as a whole.—τινὰ στρατιά. There can be no doubt that an overwhelming weight of authority lies on the side of the reading τινά. τινά is simply an emendation. How can τινά be accounted for? We had hit upon the conjecture that originally τι may have stood in all the clauses. (See Euth. reads before παράδεισον.) It would be quite natural that from a slight misunderstanding of its meaning it should be changed into τινα before παράδεισον. And κοινωνία. The τι before στράτευμα (found in several
1—3.

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ 433

μοι. 2. ἕλπισάτα μου τὴν χάραν, ἵνα ὁ αὐτῷ φρονήση, τὴν αὐτῇν ἴδῃν [John iii. 29. For constr. cf. John xv. 13: 1 Cor. iv. 3; g Chap. iv.]

διὰ τὰ πολλὰ ἔχοντες. 3. μὴ δὲν κατὰ

2: Rom. xii. 16. xiv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. h Only here in N.T. i See note on i. 16. k Only here in N.T.; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 al. joh., B.J., 4, 9, 2, "einebdei eis to kov. = craven-heartedness.

1 So Alf., Trg., Lach. with ΝΒΔΕΚΛΡ. συμφ. Ti., W.H., Ws. with ΑΒCD*FG.

2 So most edd. with Ν*:BD*FGKL, d, e, g, syrr. arm. aeth., Clem., Bas., Hil., Ambrst., to αὐτῷ W.H. (mg.) with Ν*:AC 17, 73, vg. go., Euth.cod.

3 So Myr. with Διν-Ε*FGKL, f, g, syrr. go., Chr., Thdrt., Hil. Edd. μῆδε with Ν*:ABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. arm. aeth., Euth.cod., Victor.in, Ambrst., Aug.,

4 Om. κατὰ TR., Myr. with Ν*:DEFGKL, f, g, go., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. κατα with Ν*:ABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. syrr. arm., Euth.cod., Vict., Hil., Aug., Ambrst.

minn., including 37) might easily assimilate the following σ. At this stage the type of text found in the leading uncials happened to arise. And so the error was stereotyped, although corrected later by Greek Fathers. Curiously enough this same conjecture has been made by Hpt. We do not overlook the difficulties involved, but allow it to stand for want of anything better.—σωλήνα. See on i. 8. He appeals to their pity.

Ver. 2. Semper in discordiis aperta est janua Satanae ad spargendas impias doctrinas, ad quas repellendas optima munitio est consensus (Calv.).—αἱρ. . . . ἦν. The two clause seems exactly = Latin gerund. Cf. an infinitive used in the same way in Acts xv. 10, τὰ περί τῶν θεῶν εὐδαιμονία κ.λ.α., also Polycp., Martyr., x., 1 (quoted by Burton, M.T., p. 92). ἦν is probably "hypotelic" as Ell. (on Eph. i. 17) terms it, i.e., "the subject of the wish is blended with and even (at times) obscures the purpose."—τὸ α. φιλ. The general expression of agreement which is analysed and defined in the succeeding clauses. Perhaps a common phrase in popular language. See Sepulchr. Inscri. (Rhodes, 2nd cent. b.c.), of a married couple, ταῦτα λέγοντες ταῦτα φρονοῦντες ἐξασφάλως ταυταρατοῦν ἄσων εἰς Ἀθήναν (Dsm., NBS., p. 84).—τ. αὐτ. αὐτ. The same feelings.—οὐκ. The same point of view in their common interests.—τὸ εἰς expresses the one concrete aim of their views, perhaps with special reference to the unity of the Church (so Lips.). Minute distinctions, however, must not be forced, as there is doubtless here much of what Vaughan terms "the tautology of earnestness".

VOL. III.
preferring the latter, both on account of the variety of its witnesses and its aptness in the context. Besides, as the more difficult, it would be very liable to correction. *σκοτώνης has overwhelming authority in its favour. "No party having an eye for its own interests alone but also for those of the rest." (κροτοί (frequent in this sense in classical Greek) = each group, each combination. — ἄρμ. Used with strict correctness as opposed to ἄκρων. It often has a less strict usage in N.T. From the gentle way in which he deals with them, we cannot suppose that there was as yet any serious rent in the Philippian Church. Probably he has already in mind the party feeling roused by the disagreement between Euodia and Syntyche. The opinion of the Christian community was divided. This might, of course, lead to serious issues. He has already implored them to be of the same mind (ver. 2). The way of reaching this harmony is unselfishness. "Paul's ethic is at least as much a social as an individual ethic" (Hitzm., N.T. Th., ii., 162. Instructive discussion).

Vv. 5-11. THE CONDESCENSION AND EXALTATION OF CHRIST. As to form, vv. 5-10 appear to be constructed in carefully chosen groups of parallel clauses, having an impressive rhythm (see J. Weiss, Beitr., pp. 28-29).—Ver. 5. ὑπὲρ ought probably to be rejected with the best group of MSS. ὑπὲρειδάσκω, as the harder reading, has much in its favour, but ὑπὲρειδάσκω is far better attested. τὸ τετελεσμένον ὑπὲρειδάσκω Χ. The ordinary translation runs, "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus." This means the supplying either of ὑπὲρειδάσκω (ὑπὲρειδάσκω) or ἐν in the latter half of the verse after ὑπὲρ. Certainly any past tense (passive) of ὑπὲρειδάσκω is not only very harsh, but, when analysed, yields no appropriate sense. ἐν is scarcely less harsh, for it would presuppose τοῦτο ὑπὲρειδάσκω (not τοῦτο alone) as the antecedent of ἐν. Deissmann (following Hf.m.) supplies ὑπὲρειδάσκω (cf. parallel construction in 2 Tim. i. 5), and translates, "Have this mind within your community (so also Hoelemann) which ye have also in Christ Jesus." This keeps the local meaning with both occurrences of ἐν (for we have here the common Pauline phrase ἐν Χ. Ἰ., as the sphere of the Christian life). It gives a vivid force to ταλ. It gets rid of the apparently superfluous use of ἐν after ὑπὲρειδάσκω. And ὑπὲρειδάσκω is, of course, the easiest word to supply. The sense is thoroughly apt. Christians then, as now, were often different in their ordinary dealings and relations from what they were in their strictly Christian life. The two spheres were at times kept distinct. Those who professed to have made great sacrifices for the sake of Christ might never dream of making even the slightest for a brother. The keenest zeal may be displayed in religious work, accompanied by singular laxity of principle in the common concerns of daily business and social intercourse. At first sight the interpretation, perhaps, repels by its unfamiliarity. But it appears less difficult than the other possible expositions.
For Lft. and Vinc. practically ignore the difficulty, the former taking ἐφόρωντο = δὲ καὶ Χ. 'τ. ἐφόρωντε ἐν δανυψ. But that begs the question. Kl. thinks it impossible to separate the two spheres. (See Dam. Das N.T. Formel, p. 133 ff.; also Zahn, Luthardt's Zeitschr., 1885, p. 243, who quotes with approbation Victorinus ad loc., Hoc sentite in vos quod sentitis in Christo.) [O. Hain, SK., 1893, pp. 169-171, following the same lines, takes the second ἐφόρωντε = imperat. "As indeed ye must have in Christ Jesus." This is difficult to arrive at.—ἐν φαύν. Correct N.T. writers would usually employ εἰρωνία. Classical authors use θεών ἀνθρώπων. Vv. 6-11. In the discussion of this crux interpretum it is impossible, within our limits, to do more than give a brief outline of the chief legitimate interpretations, laying special emphasis on that which we prefer and giving our reasons. As regards literature, a good account of the older exegesis is given by Tholuck, Disputatio Christologica, pp. 2-10. Franke (in Meyer*) gives a very full list of modern discussions. In addition to commentaries and the various works on Biblical Theology, the following discussions are specially important: Räbiger, De Christologia Paulina, pp. 76-85; R. Schmidt, Paulinische Christologie, p. 163 ff.; W. Grimm, Zw. Thk., xvi., 1, p. 33 ff.; Hillgenfeld, ibid., xxi., 4, p. 498 ff.; W. Weissenbach, Zur Auslegung d. Stelle Phil., ii. 5-11 (Karlsruhe, 1884); E. H. Gifford, Expositor, v., vol. 4, p. 161 ff., 241 ff. [since published separately]; Somerville, St. Paul's Conception of Christ, p. 188 ff. It may be useful to note certain cautions which must be observed if the Apostle's thought is to be truly grasped. (a) This is not a discussion in technical theology. Paul does not speculate on the great problems of the nature of Christ. The elaborate theories reared on this passage and designated "kenotic" would probably have surrounded the Apostle. Paul is dealing with a question of practical ethics, the marvellous condescension and unselfishness of Christ, and he brings into view the several stages in this process as facts of history either presented to men's experience or else inferred from it. [At the same time, as J. Weiss notes (Th. L.Z., 1899, col. 263), the structure of the passage (two strophes of four lines) shows that the thought has been patiently elaborated.] (b) It is beside the mark to apply the canons of philosophic terminology to the Apostle's language. Much trouble would be saved if interpreters instead of minutely investigating the refinements of Greek metaphysics, on the assumption that they are present here, were to ask themselves, "What other terms could the Apostle have used to express his conceptions?" (c) It is futile to attempt to make Paul's thought in this passage fit in with any definite and systematic scheme of Christology such as the "Heavenly Man," etc. This only hampers interpretation. Ver. 6. ἐν. The discussions as to whether this refers to the pre-existing or historical Christ seem scarcely relevant to Paul's thought. For him his Lord's career was one and undivided. To suggest that he did not conceive a pre-existence in heaven is to ignore the very foundations of his thinking. Probably he never speculated minutely on the nature of Christ's pre-existent state, just as he refrains from doing so on the nature of the future life. He contents himself with general lines. The interpretation of the passage depends on the meaning assigned to (1) μορφή, (2) διαφανές, (3) τὸ ἔναν ἡμέρας. In LXX μορφή denotes the form, appearance, look or likeness of some one, that by which those beholding him would judge him. See Job iv. 16, Dan. v. 6 and three other places. Wisd. xviii. 1, 4 Macc. xv. 4. Plainly, from the context of these passages, the word had come, in later Greek, to receive a vague, general meaning, far removed from the accurate, metaphysical content which belonged to it in writers like Plato and Aristotle. It seems, therefore, to us of little value, with Lft. and Gifford (op.
to discuss the relation of \( \text{μορφή} \) to terms such as \( \text{φύσις} \) and \( \text{εἴλος} \) in their philosophical refinements. It is far more probable that Paul uses \( \text{μορφή} \) here "in a loose, popular sense, as we use 'nature'" (Guardian, Jan. 1, 1896). He means, of course, in the strictest sense that the pre-existing Christ was Divine. For \( \text{μορφή} \) always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it. But in trying to reach a conception of the pre-existing nature of his Lord, he is content to think of Him as the \( \text{εἴλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) (Col. i.15), as sharing in that \( \text{φύσις} \) (on the close relation of \( \text{μορφή} \) to \( \text{φύσις} \) see Nestle, SK., 1893, pp. 173, 174) which is the manifestation of the Divine nature (cf. John xvii.5, Heb. i.3), as possessing, that is to say, the same kind of existence as God possesses, without indulging in speculations on the metaphysical relationship of the Son to the Father. So in 2 Cor. viii.9 (the closest parallel in thought to this) he describes the same condition by the words \( \text{νύμφαι} \). And this reminds us of the point of emphasis, the unspeakable contrast between the heavenly and earthly states, the \( \text{φύσις} \) and the \( \text{μορφή} \). The Apostle's mind is overpowered by the profound ethical meaning and value of the Humiliation.

Cf. Liturgy of S. James (Hammond, Lit., p. 45, quoted by Giff.), \( \text{φασιν} \) \( \text{γένος} \) \( \text{φύσις} \) \( \text{θεοῦ} \). At the same time, in later Greek, it is often a mere copula. Cf. Gildersleeve on Justin M., Apol., i., 2. This participle represents the imperfect as well as the present tense. So probably here.—\( \text{ανάργυρος} \). In the absence of relevant evidence for this word, its precise significance must largely be determined by the context. Accordingly it must be discussed in close connection with \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \). "Did not consider \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) as an \( \text{ανάργυρος} \)." What is the relation of \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) to \( \text{μορφή} \)? The words mean "the being on an equality with God" (R.V.). It is surely needless to make any fine distinctions here, as Giff. does (op. cit., p. 249), between \( \text{εἴλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Φαθοῦ} \) as equality of nature and \( \text{εἴλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) as pointing to "the state and circumstances which are separable from the essence and therefore variable or accidental," or, with Lft., to say that \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Φαθοῦ} \) would refer to the person, while \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) has in view the attributes. As a matter of fact the adverb \( \text{τοῦ} \) (neuter plural) is used in the most general sense, without any metaphysical subtleties, e.g., Job. xi. 12, \( \text{αὐτῷ} \) \( \text{εἴλος} \) \( \text{θεόν} \) \( \text{θεόν} \), etc., without any reference to the nature or essence of God. Thus no theological speculations can be based upon the word. Is \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) equivalent to \( \text{τό} \) \( \text{μορφή} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \)? In spite of some Comm. there is absolutely nothing in the text to justify the supposition. Plainly \( \text{μορφή} \) has reference to \( \text{φύσις} \); \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) to a relation. In fact it is only a particular rendering of \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \) which suggested their equivalence. A more important question is whether \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) was possessed by Christ in virtue of His being \( \text{τό} \) \( \text{μορφή} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \). This will depend on the sense of \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \). It is generally admitted now that \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \) may be regarded as \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \). (See esp. Zahn, Luthardt's Zeitschr., 1885, pp. 240-241.) Cf. \( \text{αποφαίνεται} \), lit. = "the laying down," "ordaining" of a thing, which comes to mean "the thing laid down," "the ordinance or statute; \( \text{διαπλήτης} \), lit. = a propitiating, appeasing, but usually the propitiatory offering, that by which propitiation is made (see Hatz., Einl., p. 180). Myr., Hym., Beest and others wish to keep the active meaning, and translate, "Did not consider the being on an equality with God as a means of robbing." But it seems impossible to accept this sense when we have no hint of what is to be robbed. Lft., Hpt., Vinc. and others, regarding \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \) as \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \), translate, "Did not look upon His equality with God as a prize to be clutched." That is to say, \( \text{τό \ εἰλος} \) \( \text{τοῦ} \) \( \text{Θεοῦ} \) is something which He already possessed and resolved not to cling to. But will \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \) admit of this meaning? We cannot find any passage where \( \text{ἀνάργυρος} \) or any of its derivatives has the sense of "holding in possession," "retaining." It seems invariably to mean "seize," "snatch violently." Thus it is not permissible to glide from the true sense "grasp at" into one which is totally dif-
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ferent, “hold fast”. Are we not obliged, then, to think of the aptraypos (= apu-aypo.) as something still future, a res rapienda? Cf. Catena on Mark x. 41 ff. (quoted by Zahn), Jesus’ answer to the sons of Zebedee, οὐκ ἑδύναμεν ἀρπαγέναι ἡ τιμή, “the honour is not one to be snatched.” Observe how aptly this view fits the context. In ver. 10, which is the climax of the whole passage, we read that God gave Jesus Christ as a gift [ix*pi-(tiito) the name above every name, i.e., the name (including position, dignity and authority) of Κύριος, Lord, the name which represents the O.T. Jehovah. But this is the highest place Christ has reached. He has always (in Paul’s view) shared in the Divine nature (μ. Θεόν). But it is only as the result of His Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection and Exaltation that He appears to men as on an equality with God, that He is worshipped by them in the way in which Jehovah is worshipped. This position of Κύριος is the reward and crowning-point of the whole process of His voluntary Humiliation. It is the equivalent of that ΤτΧΚΑΝΓΙЦ of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks. This perfection “He acquired as He successively seized the occasions which His vocation as author of salvation presented to Him, a process moving on the lines of His relations to mortal, sinful men” (Davidson, Hebrews, p. 208). Along the same lines He was raised to the dignity of Κύριος, which is a relation to mankind. (See on the relation of Christ as Κύριος to God, Somerville, op. cit., pp. 140-142.) This equality with God, therefore, consists in the κυριάρχησις, the Lordship to which He has been exalted. “He did not regard the being on an equality with God as a thing to be seized, violently snatched.” Cf. Heliodor., Ethiof., vii., 20, οὐκ ἄρσεναν οὐδὲ ἄρμαιον ἤγεται τὸ πράγμα. He might have used the miraculous powers inherent in His Divine nature in such a way as to compel men, without further ado, to worship Him as God. Instead of that He was willing to attain this high dignity by the path of humiliation, suffering and death. Is not this interpretation strongly corroborated by the narrative of the Temptation? In that mysterious experience the Lord was tempted to teach ἁλατε ἐν τῷ Ἱεροσόλυμον ἐν τῇ ὑπάρξει, forcing men out of sheer amazement to accept His claim and exalt Him as Lord. (Perhaps the curious negative expression οὐκ ἄρσεναν κ.λ. has been suggested by a comparison with the first Adam who sought to reach “equality with God” by means of ἐρπάσειν.) It is to be noted that the increased glory which Paul and all the N.T. writers regard as pertaining to Christ after His Resurrection has only to do with His dignity, His “theocratic position,” not with His essential personality. (Cf. Ménégos, Le Pâché et la Rédemption, p. 164.) He has simply become ἐν θυραμ, that which He already was substantially. Cf. Rom. i. 4, τοῦ ἁρματίτου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν θυραμ, κατὰ πτέρωμα ἀναστάσεις, ἐν ἀνεφάσεως καὶ ἀρετοῖς Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Also Luke xxiv. 26.—Ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν. Instead of appearing among men in the Divine μορφή and thus compelling them to render Him the homage which was His due, He “emptied Himself” of that Divine μορφή and took the p. of a bond servant. The Apostle does not specify that of which He emptied Himself, as the stress is laid upon the “emptying,” but with μορφ. δύναμιν λαβὼν added to explain what ἔδωκεν means, we are bound to conclude that He has in view its antithesis, μ. Θεόν. (So also Myr., Htm., Alf., Weiffenb., Hpt., Bruce, Gore, etc. Fairbairn, Christ in Mod. Theol., pp. 476-477, tries to show that Christ emptied Himself of the “physical attributes” of Deity while retaining the “ethical”. But does this lead us any nearer a solution of the mystery in the depths of the Son’s personality?)

Ver. 7. A question arises as to punctuation. W.H. punctuate as in the text. Calvin, Weiffenb. and Hpt. would place a comma after ὑπάρξει and a colon after ἀρπαγέναι of ver. 8. This would co-ordinate the three clauses and make a new sentence begin with τῇ ὑπάρξει. The division does not seem natural or necessary.—μ. δύναμιν λ. The clause defines ἔδωκεν. Christ’s assumption of the “form” of a δύναμιν does not imply that the innermost basis of His personality, His “ego,” was changed, although, indeed, “there was more in this emptying of Himself than we can think or say” (Rainy, op. cit., p. 119). 8. simply describes the humility to which He condescended. It is needless to ask whose δύναμιν He became. The question is not before the Apostle.—ἐν ἄξωμι ἀνθρ. γεν. γεν. as opposed to ἐπερχόμενος, “the coming” as opposed to “being by nature”. This clause, in turn, defines μ. 8. λ. “Being made in the likeness of men.” ἄξωμι expresses with great accuracy the Apostle’s idea. Christ walked this earth in the real likeness of
men. This was no mere phantom, no mere incomplete copy of humanity. And yet Paul feels that it did not express the whole of Christ's nature. It was not "an hereditary likeness of being" (Hiltsm. See N.T. Th., ii., pp. 70-72). It was, in a sense, borrowed. — ἀνθρ. Almost = "mankind," "humanity".

Ver. 8. κα τον σταυρον ἥκιν. Only here in N.T.; Ps. xcvi. 9.


Ver. 9. ἐξερευνατο. "Gave as a gift." This is the Father's prerogative, for undoubtedly the N.T. teaches a certain subordination of the Son. Cf. John xiv. 28, Rom. i. 3-4, 1 Cor. viii. 6, and, most memorable of all, 1 Cor. xv. 28, where the Son, having accomplished His work, seems, according to the Apostle's view, to recede, as it were, into the depths of the Divine Unity.

The universal outburst of worship proclaims that Jesus Christ is Κύριος, Lord, the equiv. of O.T. Jehovah, the highest title that can be uttered. The full significance of the name will only be realised when all the world acknowledges the sovereignty of Christ. As J. Weiss notes (Nachfolge Christi, pp. 63-64), this is not a specially Pauline conception, but belongs to the general faith of the Church. [It is amazing how Alf., De W. and Ead. can refer to "Jesus," Myr. and Vine, to "Jesus Christ," while Lft. and Hpt. regard it as = "dignity," "title," without specifying.] On the whole conception cf. Heb. i., esp. vv. 3-4. Perhaps the Apostle has in his mind the Jewish use of the Name, as a reverent substitute for "Jehovah." Cf. Sayings of Jews Fathers (ed. Taylor), iv., 7, and Additional Notes, pp. 165-167,
10. ηπειρείναι καὶ καταχθονίων, 11. καὶ πάσα γλώσσα ἐξαρμολογηθήται. οὗτος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός.

in N.T. c Perhaps closest parallels are Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; Ps. liii. 8

1 Χριστοῦ added by Ἡ* 47, 73, 114, 115, Or., Chr., Cyr., Marc. 2 καρπάς P.

where Taylor compares with vv. 7-8 of our chap., Isa. liii. 12 and with ver. 9, Isa. lii. 13. Most appropriate to our passage is his Quotation from Jeremy Taylor (Works, vol. ii. p. 72): "He hath changed the ineffable name into a name utterable by man, and desirable by all the world; the majesty is all arrayed in robes of mercy, the tetragrammaton or adorable mystery of the patriarchs is made fit for pronunciation and expression when it becometh the name of the Lord's Christ." — τὸ ὄνομα τῶν ἄνωμα. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 22, "Angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him"; Eph. i. 21.

Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ ὄνομα. 1. Perhaps the best explanation is that of Weiffenb. (op. cit., p. 51), "On the ground of this name (Κύριος)," i.e., because of what it means for every worshipper. Of course, the worship is rendered to Him as Lord. Abbott (Notes on St. Paul's Epistles, p. 93) compares Ps. lixiii. 4, "Thus will I bless Thee while I live: I will lift up my hands in Thy name." Cf. also Ps. xx. 5, liv. 1. This name, which declares the true character and dignity of Jesus Christ, is both the basis and the object of worship. See the somewhat parallel use of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in Inschr. (Dam., BS., pp. 144-145). For the history of the phrase and its Semitic basis consult Die biblische "im Namen," by J. Böhmer (Giessen, 1898). — ἔνωσις κ. ἐντύλις κ. καταχθονίων καὶ τῶν ὀρέων δυσάρειμα, ἐπιγείους καὶ τῶν ἐκ τούτων ἐκφαντωτός καὶ καταχθονίων τούτων ταχυντώς. — ἔνωσις. The heavenly spirits. "Paul regards the higher world as divided into a number of ascending spheres," says Hyrrsch., N.T. Th. (E.Tr.), ii. 100. — καταχθονίων. It is needless to think of these in connexion with the Descent into Hades, although this subject had an extraordinary place in the minds of the early Christians (cf. Bruston, La Descente du Christ aux Enfers, Paris, 1897). Here simply = a general term for the dead. Often in sepulchral Inschr. For the division of all beings into three regions Everling compares Ignat. ad Traill., 9, ἐναρπαζοντα καὶ ἐναποθεον, ἐντυλίς τῶν ἐπιφυλακτίων καὶ ἐπιγείους (see his Paulinische Angelologie u. Dämonologie, Gött., 1888, pp. 83-84).

Ver. 11. Κύριος. See on ver. 6 supr. This is the characteristic confession of the Apostolic Church. It is most significant that Κύριος has no article, which shows that it has become virtually one of Christ's proper names. See Simcox, Lang. of N.T., p. 49, and cf. Acts ii. 36, "Know assuredly that God made Him Lord as well as Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (so Hort); 1 Cor. xii. 3, Rom. x. 9, 1 Cor. viii. 6, where "One Lord" is parallel to "One God". Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 3) compares our verse with vv. 2-5. The invocation of one Lord is a bond of unity. The term "Lord" has become one of the most lifeless words in the Christian vocabulary. To enter into its meaning and give it practical effect would be to recreate, in great measure, the atmosphere of the Apostolic Age. (See, on the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Apostolic Age, an interesting essay by T. Zahn in Stüzen aus d. Leben d. alten Kirche, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 1-38.)— ἐν υἱοθετ. The whole purpose of the working out of salvation is the glory of God the Father. This end is attained when men yield to His operations and acknowledge Christ as Lord. Cf. esp. Eph. i. 9-12.

Vv. 12-16. The Christian life to be led in a spirit of awe and watchfulness, as in the presence of God's working. On vv. 12-13 see two important discussions, Schaeder, Griffs-
12. Ἀπεστάλη ἁγνύτου μου, καθὼς πάντας ὑπηκοούσατε, μὴ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁπατής τῆς ἁγνύτου μου, οἵ τε δὲ ἅπατος μου, διδάσκων σοίς μᾶλλον ἄλλα ἐπιτελεῖς τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίαν ὶ κατεργάζετε. ἦσαν οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγαθοὶ πρᾶγμα τοῖς ἐπιτέλεσθε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίᾳ τοῖς προσφέρετε, διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν, ὡς ἄνυστος ἐπιτελεῖς τὸν προσφέρετε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίᾳ τῷ παῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑμῶν, διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν, ὡς ἄνυστος ἐπιτελεῖς τὸν προσφέρετε τῷ ἑαυτοῦ σωτηρίᾳ τῷ παῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑμῶν.

With what does it link the following verses? Paul has returned to practical exhortation. So we should naturally expect him to take up the thread which he dropped at ver. 6 on turning to the example of Jesus Christ. At that point he had been urging them to be of one mind. But with what aim? Especially in order that they might present an unbroken front in their conflict for the faith. But that brings us back to i. 27 ff. and the connexion of our passage with the earlier paragraph is not arbitrary we may gather from the occurrence of the same idea in both, viz., that of his own presence and absence. Cf. i. 27 b with ii. 12 b. At the same time there is also a link between vv. 12-13 and the passage immediately preceding. He introduces his admonition with obedience (ὑπηκοούσατε). But Christ’s lowliness consisted precisely in His ὑπηκοοῦσα (ver. 8, ὑπήκοος). Christ has been exalted as the result (ὑπηκοοῦσα) of humble obedience. Corresponding to His exaltation will be their σωτηρία—ὑπηκοοῦσατε. We believe that this means obedience to God. See on ἀπεστάλη supr.—κατεργάζετε. Cf. Gal. iv. 18.—μετὰ φ. κ. τρ. Cf. Eph. vi. 5, ὃι δοῦλοι, ὑπηκοοῦσατε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίους μετὰ φόβον καὶ τρόμον. In both passages the phrase expresses the solemn responsibility to God which is always felt by those conscious of the Divine Presence, whether they are occupied with common tasks or the concerns of their spiritual life. Nihil enim est quod magis ad modestiam et timorem erudire nos debet quam dum audimus nos unum Dei servitutem esse (Galvin). Gun- kel (Wirkungen, etc., p. 70) well contrasts the fear with which the Jew looked upon the Divine Presence with the calm joy which the Christian feels in such an experience.—τῆς ὑπηκοούσατε. Such a use of ὑπηκοούσατε for ὑπηκοοῦσας is much more common in N.T. than in classical Greek. But cf. Demos., Olynth., i., § 2, ἐνωπίον σωτηρίας αὐτῶν φρονήσατε. The emphasis is on ὑπηκοούσατε. Each of them is responsible for his own salvation before God. Their absence must make no difference. “For the race is run by one and one and never by two and two” (R. Kipling).—ὑπηκοοῦσατε. This is the end and aim of their faith. See 1 Pet. i. 9, ταῦτα τῶν πίστεως ὑμῶν σωτηρίας ψυχῶν.—κατεργάζετε. The best comment on the distinctive force of κατεργάζετε is 2 Cor. vii. 10, ἐπειδὴ θεὸς λίτφυμεν μετάνοιαν αἰώνια σωτηρίας . . . ἐργαζόμενα, ὅ ἐπὶ τούτου λίτφυμεν ἀπελευθέρωσεν κατεργάζετε, where ἐργαζόμενα refers to a process in its mediate workings, while κατεργάζετε looks solely at the final result. So here almost = “make sure of your salvation,” “carry it into effect”. Cf. 2 Pet. i. 10. As Kühler (op. cit., p. 500 ff.) points out, the Apostle does not think here so much of the moral effort, their deliberate conduct as such (so Schaeder). This, as the presupposition of salvation, would be alien to the Pauline point of view. Lowliness and obedience (ὑπηκοοῦσα πίστεως) are needful, that they may look away from themselves to Jesus Christ, who is the “author and finisher of their faith”. Ver. 13. ὅδε must certainly be omitted with all the best authorities. “For God is He that works,” etc. The emphasis lies on ὅδε for two reasons. First, in the matter of attaining salvation they have to do not with Paul, but with God. Second, the Apostle speaks of this momentous course not lightly, but “with fear and trembling,” for if they miss the goal it means that they have deliberately
rejected the purpose of God. This explains the connecting yap.—ένεργευον. It seems always to have the idea of effective working. In N.T. the active is invariably used of God. The middle is almost always intranisive. The verb has become transitive only in later Greek (cf. Krebs, Rection d. Casus, ii., 21). Many exx. occur in Justin M.—τὸ θέλειν. The first resolution in the direction of salvation takes its origin from God. So also does the ἐνεργεύον, the carrying of this inward resolve into practical effect, the acting on the assurance that God's promise is genuine. Cf. Eph. ii. 8, τῇ γὰρ φαρμακείᾳ δι' αὐτοῦ συμφωνεῖ καὶ τούτῳ σὺν ἐς ψυχήν, θεοῦ τὸ δοθον'. To Paul the Divine working and the human self-determination are compatible. But "all efforts to divide the ground between God and man go astray" (Rainy, op. cit., p. 130). οὐκ οὐκ θὰ θεοῦ τὸ δοθον'. To carry out His own gracious will." So Thdrt. (see also Gennrich, Sk., 1808, p. 383, n. 1). His great purpose of mercy is the salvation of men. To realise this He surrounds them with the influences of His gracious Spirit. For the word cf. Ps. Sol. viii. 39, ἡμιν καὶ τοις πάνω ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ἐκσκέψεις εἰς τὸν θόλον. Conyb.-Howe and Hfm. would join ἐνεργεύον σὺν θεοῦ with the words following, but this would be unintelligible without αὐτοῦ. Blass boldly reads ἐνεργεύον (σὺν θεοῦ) τὰ ἐνεργεύον τὰ πάντα τοῦ (N.T. Gramm., p. 132). Such procedure is arbitrary. Zahn and Wohl. (with Pesh. and O.L. versions) connect the words with τὸ ἐνεργεύον. preceding, and, comparing Rom. vii. 15-21, make ἐνεργεύον = human inclination to goodness, i.e., practically equiv. to θελεῖν. But this is the interpretation of a subtle exegete, which would scarcely appeal to a plain reader. The interpretation given above, connecting ἐνεργεύον with τὸ ἐνεργεύον, is thoroughly natural and has many parallels in Paul, e.g., Eph. i. 5, 9, etc. See esp. SH. on Rom. x. 1. These verses are a rebuke to all egotism and empty boasting (see ii. 3).

Ver. 14. γόγγος. Many Comm. understand γόγγος and διαλογίς as referring to God. This interpretation appears far fetched and unnecessary. The whole discussion preceding has turned on the danger to their faith in being disunited. Is it not natural that when he speaks of "grumblings" and "discussions" he should point to their mutual disagreements? Would not these be the common expressions, e.g., of the variance between Euodia and Syntyche? May they not be connected with the ἐνεργεύον τὸ γενόμενον of chap. iii. 15? There has never been a hint of murmuring against God up till now. Cf. 1 Peter iv. 9, Wisd. i. 11, φωλάξωσεν . . . γογγωσάμενον ἀνθρώπινον καὶ τὰ καταλαλία φαίεσθαι γλώσσαι. On γόγγος see esp. H. Anz, Dissertationes Halenses, vol. xii., pars 2, pp. 368-369.—διαλογίς. Probably = disputes. Common in this sense in later Greek. Cf. Luke ix. 46. Originally = thoughts, with the idea of doubt or hesitation gradually implied. See Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, p. 8.

Ver. 15. γένομεν. "That ye may become." A high ideal before Paul's mind to be reached by a gradual process.—ἀμετ-τοί. οὐ μικρὰς γὰρ προσάγεται προκείμενον ἑνεργεύον (Chr.). Perhaps ἀμετ-τοί refers to the judgment of others, while ἀκραῖοι denotes their intrinsic character (so Lft.). Cf. Matt. x. 16, where Christ exhorts the disciples to be ἀκραῖοι ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀλήθείας. —τῆς ἡμῶν. This whole clause is a reminiscence, not a quotation, of Deut. xxxii. 3. ήράτρησαν, ὡς αὐτῷ τέκνα, μιμήτας γενέσθαι καὶ διατιμάσθηναι. It is impossible to say whether Paul uses τής ἡμῶν.
in the strict sense common in N.T., or whether he employs the term more loosely as in Eph. v. 8.—The best authorities read ἐπάνω, the more usual N.T. word. ἐπάνω may be due to μετά of LXX.—μᾶς is certainly to be read instead of ἐν μᾶς, with all leading authorities. It is one of those adverbial expressions which, in the later language, perhaps under the influence of Semitic usage, took the place of prepositions. Cf. Hatz., Eiri., p. 214, where several exx. are quoted from Porphyrogenitus, de Caer.—σκολ. ήδρον. The latter epithet is precisely = the Scotch expression "thrawn," "having a twist" in the inner nature.—εἰς οἷς. Sense-construction.—φαίν. Comm. differ as to whether φ. means here "appear" or "shine". Surely the appearing of a φωτήρ, a luminary, must be, at the same time, a shining. Both interpretations really converge in this context. [Calv. takes φαίν. as imperative, and compares Isa. ix. 2. This is opposed by no means unlikely.] Probably κόσμος (= the whole universe of things) goes closely with φωτήρες, emphasising the contrast, while nothing is said as to their influence on others. Christ Himself is ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (John viii. 12). His followers are φωτήρες ἐν κόσμῳ. For κόσμος see Evans' excellent note on 1 Cor. ii. 12.

Ver. 16. ζωή. For the connexion between this expression and φωτήρες see John i. 4, ἦ ν στίχων ἐν τῷ φως τῶν ἄνθρωπων. When Paul speaks of "life" as belonging to the Christian he means not merely the new power of holy living imparted to him, but the real presence of a truly Divine life which, although largely concealed for the present by the fleshly nature, is the pledge and actual beginning of life eternal. This is, in the Apostle's view, the supreme goal of the Christian calling. The Christian gospel, therefore, is a λόγος ἐκείνος.—ἐπάνωτες. Its common meaning (as in Homer, etc.) is "holding forth." But the Apostle is not thinking of the influence exercised by his readers upon others. It is their own steadfastness in the faith that is before his mind in this passage. That tells against the interpretation of Field (Oisium Norvicensis, iii., pp. 118-119, following Pesh. with Michaelis, Wetstein, etc.), who translates, "being in the stead of life" (to it, sc., the world), "holding the analogy of life." No doubt there are good exx. of the phrase in later Greek, but we are safe in saying that the ordinary N.T. reader would not understand ἂν.  ἐν this sense. Chr. and Thphl. take it as = "having in them" (a strengthened ἐκείνος). Th. Ms. has "holding fast," which is also the gloss of Heaschius on the word (κρατούν- 
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16—19.

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ

πῶςν ὑμῖν. 18. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ὡμείς χαίρετε καὶ συνχαίρετε 

μου.

19. Ἐλπίζω δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι ἡμᾶς ὑμᾶς ταχέως πέμψατε ὑμῖν, ἵνα

1 Lach. Xριστῷ with CD*FG 38, 71, 74, d, e, cop.

2 D*, O.L. vg., προς νας.

Vv. 17-18. Mutual rejoicing in Christian service.—Ver. 17. "Nay, although I should even be offered (lit. 'poured out as a libation') upon the sacrifice and sacred service," etc. εἰς καὶ leaves abundant room for the possibility, as distinct from καὶ εἰς, which barely allows the supposition. See esp. Hermann on Viger, no. 307. The metaphor of this verse has given rise to much discussion. It is admitted that o-ιρένος = to be poured out as a drink offering. Cf. 2 Tim. iv.6, εἰς τό θεόν τε καὶ τὸν κόσμον. But what is the meaning of ιρεύω? Is it "upon," "over," or "in addition to," "concurrently with"? Ell. and others, holding that the Apostle refers to Jewish sacrificial usages in which, it is said, the drink-offering was poured, not over the sacrifice but round the altar, decide for the latter sense. Paul's life would be a sacrifice additional to that of their faith. But, in writing to the Philippians, it is far more likely that he should illustrate from heathen ritual in which the libation took so prominent a place. In that case we have an apt parallel in Hom. II, xi., 775, εἰς θεόν οὖσαν αὐτῷ εἰς ἀληθεῖαν 
λειτούργει, where ιρεύω can scarcely mean anything but "upon." After all, the decision between the two does not affect the sense. The offering of Paul in either case, instead of being a cause of sadness and despair, is really the climax of their sacrifice, the libation which crowns it. Zahn (op. cit., p. 296-297), followed by Hpt., joins ιρεύω with χαίρει in the sense of "I rejoice on account of the sacrifice," etc. This is certainly attractive, but seems too bold in view of the order of the words. —τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Ἰ. τ. τ. πιστ. Here, again, unnecessary difficulties are raised over the question whether Paul or the Philippians are to be regarded as offering the sacrifice. There is no evidence that the Apostle wishes to strain the metaphor to the breaking point. He has been urging them to preserve their Christian faith pure and unaltering. That will be a joy to him in the day of Christ. But now another thought crosses his mind. What if in his Christian labours he should fall a victim? The idea gives a sacrificial cast to his thinking, and he regards their faith (i.e., virtually, their Christian profession and life), on the one hand, as a θυσία, an offering presented to God (cf. Rom. xii. 1), and, on the other, as a λαυρευμα, a sacred service, the presenting of that offering. (For the ritual use of λαυρ in Egyptian Papyri see Dam., BS., pp. 137-138). "Even although I should fall a victim to my labours in the cause of Christ, I rejoice because your faith is an accomplished fact. I rejoice on my own account (χαίρει) because I have been the instrument of your salvation. I also share in the joy (συνχαίρει) which you experience in the new life you have received." This paraphrase, perhaps, expresses the real force of the words in their close connexion with the context. We can see no grounds for translating συνχαίρει (with Lft. and others) as "congratulate," a translation which surely misses the point of the language. Cf. i Cor. xii.26.

Ver. 18. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ. Adverbial use = διακήρυκαί. Cf. Matt. xxvii. 44.—συνχαίρει. This is, of course, a different joy from that which he shares with them. It is their joy in his obtaining the martyr's crown.

Vv. 19-24. His purpose to send to them Timothy, a genuine friend of their community.—Ver. 19. Clemens (Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe, p. 138) seeks to prove that vv. 19-24 do not belong to this context. This is to forget the flexibility and rapid transitions natural to a friendly letter. The last paragraph, in spite of its joyful tone, ended with a note of anxious foreboding for the Philippians. He will dispel the dark shadow.—ἐν Κ. Ἰ. οὐ πᾶν πᾶσαν ιμπρ., and the repeated occurrence of this and cognate phrases all through Paul's Epistles. See the note on chap. i. i ιμπρ. His intention depends on the will and power of Christ, just as its
II.

**Verse 20.** Performance will be regulated with a view to His glory—

"The performance will be regulated with a view to His glory. We should expect future infinitive, but the aorist is often used instead "after verbs of hoping and promising in which wish or will intrudes" (Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 12, 23).—καίω. He takes for granted that the visit of Timothy will cheer the Philippians. It will cheer him also to know how they do.—εὐφράξει. Common in sepulchral Inscri. in the form εὐφράχθην, farewell! There are a few exx. elsewhere, e.g., Joseph., *Ant.*, xi., 6, 9, of Ahasuerus, καὶ τὴν Ἑσθήραν εὐφράξει καὶ τὰ κρατῶν προσδέχεται παρεθάρρησεν.—γνώσις has probably a slightly progressive force, "when I come to know".

**Verse 21.** Only here καίω "εὐφράξει, γνώσις τὰ περὶ ἐμών. 20. οὖν δὲνα γὰρ ἔχω "ίασησθαι, in N.T. Πα. litt. i. 14 ἐκαίων "ἐξωθοῦν, οὐ τὰ τοῦ Ἠρωδοῦ ἧπνου. 22. τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γυμνότετε, ὅτι ἐπὶ πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμὶ ἔδοξευσέντο εἰς τὸ κορ. vii. 25; ἔσωδ. v. 9; Bar. iii. 18. f In N.T. only in Paul, e.g., Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9. Rare word. Pa. lavil. 31 (Symm.).

1 L ὅπερ.

2 So some minn., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. om. τού with ΑΜΒΚΕΓΚΛΠ, Clem.


**Verse 22.** That character which emerges as the result of testing. Cf. Phocyl., 2, γνήσιος φίλος; Pind., *Olym.*, ii., 21, γνήσιος ὃς ἐστὶν ἔρτατε. Cf. chap. iv. 3.—μεριμναία. "One's thoughts to a matter". Cf. *Cor.* vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on *Soph.*, O.T., 1124.

Ver. 21. οἱ πάντες . . . ἔτη. This verse has roused surprise. Where were all Paul's faithful brethren in the Lord? Has he no one but Timothy to call back upon? It must be borne in mind that we have to do with a simple letter, not a treatise, or history of Paul's work. The Apostle speaks in an outburst of strong feeling, for he is a man of quick impulses. He does not for a moment mean that he has no genuine Christian brethren in his company. But he had found, in all probability, that when he proposed to some of his companions, good Christian men, that they should visit far-distant Philippi, they all shrank, making various excuses. Timothy alone is willing, the one man he can least afford to spare. It is hard to part with him at such a critical time. No wonder that he should feel hurt by this want of inclination on the part of the other brethren to undertake an important Christian duty. No wonder that he should speak with severity of a disposition so completely opposed to his own. Cf. *Cor.* x. 33, μὴ ἐπιτύχῃ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατατάξειν. See esp. Calvin's excellent note ad loc.—

X. I. The authorities are almost equally balanced as to the readings. See on chap. i. 1 *supr.*

**Verse 22.** "Approvedness." That character which emerges as the result of testing. Cf. *Jas.* i. 12.—Se ev. τικ. κ.τ.λ. A mixed construction, the result of refined feeling. Paul first thinks of Timothy as his son in the Gospel, serving him with a son's devotion. But before the sentence is finished, his lovefulness reminds him that they are both alike servants of a common Lord, equal in His sight.—μεριμναία. "One's thoughts to a matter". Cf. *Cor.* vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on *Soph.*, O.T., 1124.

Ver. 21. οἱ πάντες . . . ἔτη. This verse has roused surprise. Where were all Paul's faithful brethren in the Lord? Has he no one but Timothy to call back upon? It must be borne in mind that we have to do with a simple letter, not a treatise, or history of Paul's work. The Apostle speaks in an outburst of strong feeling, for he is a man of quick impulses. He does not for a moment mean that he has no genuine Christian brethren in his company. But he had found, in all probability, that when he proposed to some of his companions, good Christian men, that they should visit far-distant Philippi, they all shrank, making various excuses. Timothy alone is willing, the one man he can least afford to spare. It is hard to part with him at such a critical time. No wonder that he should feel hurt by this want of inclination on the part of the other brethren to undertake an important Christian duty. No wonder that he should speak with severity of a disposition so completely opposed to his own. Cf. *Cor.* x. 33, μὴ ἐπιτύχῃ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατατάξειν. See esp. Calvin's excellent note *ad loc.*—

X. I. The authorities are almost equally balanced as to the readings. See on chap. i. 1 *supr.*

Ver. 22. "Approvedness." That character which emerges as the result of testing. Cf. *Jas.* i. 12.—Se ev. τικ. κ.τ.λ. A mixed construction, the result of refined feeling. Paul first thinks of Timothy as his son in the Gospel, serving him with a son's devotion. But before the sentence is finished, his lovefulness reminds him that they are both alike servants of a common Lord, equal in His sight.—μεριμναία. "One's thoughts to a matter". Cf. *Cor.* vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on *Soph.*, O.T., 1124.

Ver. 21. οἱ πάντες . . . ἔτη. This verse has roused surprise. Where were all Paul's faithful brethren in the Lord? Has he no one but Timothy to call back upon? It must be borne in mind that we have to do with a simple letter, not a treatise, or history of Paul's work. The Apostle speaks in an outburst of strong feeling, for he is a man of quick impulses. He does not for a moment mean that he has no genuine Christian brethren in his company. But he had found, in all probability, that when he proposed to some of his companions, good Christian men, that they should visit far-distant Philippi, they all shrank, making various excuses. Timothy alone is willing, the one man he can least afford to spare. It is hard to part with him at such a critical time. No wonder that he should feel hurt by this want of inclination on the part of the other brethren to undertake an important Christian duty. No wonder that he should speak with severity of a disposition so completely opposed to his own. Cf. *Cor.* x. 33, μὴ ἐπιτύχῃ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κατατάξειν. See esp. Calvin's excellent note *ad loc.*—

X. I. The authorities are almost equally balanced as to the readings. See on chap. i. 1 *supr.*

Ver. 22. "Approvedness." That character which emerges as the result of testing. Cf. *Jas.* i. 12.—Se ev. τικ. κ.τ.λ. A mixed construction, the result of refined feeling. Paul first thinks of Timothy as his son in the Gospel, serving him with a son's devotion. But before the sentence is finished, his lovefulness reminds him that they are both alike servants of a common Lord, equal in His sight.—μεριμναία. "One's thoughts to a matter". Cf. *Cor.* vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on *Soph.*, O.T., 1124.
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εδαγγέλων. 23. τότεν μήν οὖν ὁλίγων πέμψα ἡς ἠν ἀνίμω 1 τά ἔ

περὶ ἐμ, 2 ἐπάνως: 24. πέριδε δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἀδέσποτον, 3 καὶ

ἐλέεομαι. 25. ἀναγκαίον δὲ ἡγησάμην Ἑπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἀδέσποτον καὶ

καὶ συνεργόν 8 καὶ 8 συντραπεῖτάς μου, ὅμως δὲ 1 ἀπόστολον, καὶ

Paul's writings. See esp. Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21; Philm. 24; 2 Macc. viii. 7. k Philm. 2.
1 John xii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Kings iv. 6 (A.).

1 So Ws. with B, C, D*EFGKL, Chr., Thdrt., Ti., Trg., W., H., Alp. afBe with πapyri. See esp. Matt. 12:31, Euth. cod. Wa. admits that afBe is better attested, but considers it, nevertheless, to be an ancient copyist's blunder, due to the analogy of ἀπουμ. He compares εἰσπράξει in Thess. v. 3. See also Acts iv. 29, v.l., afBe. (TK., p. 141. See also W-Sch., p. 39, a).

2 So edd. with πανθ. d, e, g, supp. aor. aor. g, Eleuth. cod., Thdrt., Dam., Victorin. προς ἐμαυτῷ ανεποίητο αποθεμενον). Ws. (TK., p. 109) gives exx. of prepositional additions of this kind appearing in ancient as well as later MSS.

3 Om. D*, d, e, Victorin., Ambrst.

4 So πανθ. Edd. παντεποτε with ACDEFG. This is one of the orthographical points on which Bousset (Textkrit. Studien, pp. 102, 103) bases a grouping of N.T. MSS., assigning πανθ. to the Hesychian recension. See his very important discussion.

Schmid, Atticismus, i., p. 91; Krummacher, Kuhn's Zeitschr., 27, pp. 543-544. One can hardly discover here the idea of purpose.

Ver. 23. µέν. He emphasises the coming of Timothy as distinct from his own.

— ὡς ἐν. Cf. Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xi. 34. "As soon as I shall have thoroughly ascertained my position." This temporal use of ὡς ἐν seems foreign to classical prose. It almost means "according as I shall...", and marks the uncertainty which surrounds the whole prospect. (See W-M., p. 387; Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 126.) — ἐνπρία. On the form see the crit. note supra. ἐνπρία emphasises his turning away his attention from other things and concentrating it upon his own situation, i.e., gaining a definite knowledge of how his affairs stand. Mystère (Kleine Theolog. Schriften, p. 173) points out that this verse proves that the Epistle could not have been written at Cæsarea. — ἐνπρίε. Chiefly in Acts in N.T. = Latin illicco. A Hellenistic word. See Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck), 47.

Ver. 24. ἐν Κυρίω. See on ver. 19. Every mood of Paul's inner life he desires to regulate by the mind and will of Christ. — ἤτοι. "When an action is to be produced, ἐπίθυμεν takes the infinitive, when belief, ἤτοι (of objective knowledge) sometimes infinitive" (Gildersl. on Justin Apol., i., 8, 8).

Vv. 25-30. NEWS OF EPAPHRODITUS: A CORDIAL WELCOME FOR HIM AT PHILIPPI

BESPOKEN.—Ver. 25. This verse opens a passage which Clemen (op. cit., pp. 138-141) assigns to the second of the two letters into which he proposes to divide the Epistle. See our Introduction. The Apostle, as a matter of fact, passes most naturally from the two visits which he half promises to the return of Epaphroditus, which is an immediate certainty. — ἡγησάμην. Epistolary aorist. He writes from the point of view of those who receive the letter. — Ἐπαφρόδιτος. Only mentioned in this Epistle, unless we are to suppose him to be the same person as Ἐπαφράδιος of Col. i. 7, Philm. 23. Such contractions of names were quite common, e.g., Ζῦπαν = Ζυγόφυλος, Μενεστασ = Μενεστράτος (see W-Sch., pp. 142-143). But this hypothesis ill accords with the description in Col. iv. 12, ἐκ τοῦ τιμητικοῦ ἐπίσκοποῦ. Aitoo-toXos is always used of some one entrusted with a mission; it is a word of dignified tone. Moule (PS., p. 133) thinks we have here "a gentle pleas.
antr'y, their gift being a sort of Gospel
to him. But its ordinary Greek use as
= "delegate" makes this unnecessary.
—λειτουργόν. "Minister." Evidently
the technical, ritual use of this word and
its cognates which prevailed in the post-
classical age and is found in LXX (of
priests and esp. Levites) and Egyptian
Papyri (see H. Anz, Dissertationes
Philol. Halenses, xii., 2, pp. 346-347;
Dam., BS., p. 137 ff.) suggests the idea
of their gift as being a sacrifice, an obla
tion to God. In chap. iv. 18 he calls it
expressly a οΔα. See an interesting
discussion of Paul's use of pagan terms
in Expository Times, x., Nos. 1-5, by
Prof. W. M. Ramsay.

Ver. 26. εὐερέτ. Only three times
elsewhere in Paul. The difference be-
tween it and εξάει is tersely stated by Ell.
(ad loc.), who notes that it "involves
the quasi-temporal reference which is
supplied by δι', and thus expresses a
thing that at once ensues (temporarily or
causally) on the occurrence or realisation
of another".—εὐερετ. ἥν. A common N.T.
construction. Perhaps the use of the
imperfect may be due to Aramaic influence
(see Schmid, Atticizmus, iii., p. 113 ff.).
In classical Greek it is fairly frequent with
the perfect and pluperfect. See Kühner,
Ausführliche Gramm., ii., p. 35, n. 3.—
τάντας. The Apostle wishes to disarm all
prejudices against Epaphr.—διεκρήσεν.
"In sore anguish." In its two other
occurrences in N.T. it describes the agony
in Gethsemane. While not found in
LXX (but several exx. in Symmachus)
it occurs a few times in later Greek.
The derivations usually given are doubt-
ful.—ὑπεφέρεν. Probably we must sup-
pose that the Philippians, on hearing that
Epaphrod. was ill, had written a letter
to which this is the answer.—αὐλάτωμα.
We might translate, "had fallen sick," an
ingressive aorist. But with the same tense
in ver. 27, perhaps it is better to look upon
the aorist as summing up the whole ex-
perience of Epaphrod. as a single fact, and
viewing it in this light. This is a common
Greek usage (see Burton, MT., p. 20).

Ver. 27. καὶ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. "For truly
he was sick," etc., καὶ intensifying the
force of θρήνω.—θαν. The more common
construction of παρασκ. backed by a pre-
ponderating weight of authority, favours
the dative. The endings -ον and -ει were
frequently interchanged in the MSS. (see
Ws. TX., p. 18).—λέγων ἐν λέγων.
The reading λέγων is merely a simplifying
of the construction. The accusative
must be read. The usage is practically
= εἰς with dative. It denotes the heap-
ing up of one thing upon another with
the notion of addition predominant. Cf.
Matt. xxiv. 2, όμ. μὴ ἀκολουθεῖ ὁ λόγος ἐν
λόγῳ; Isa. xxviii. 10, θλίψειν ἐν θλίψεως
προσέγχειν; Ps. Sol. iii. 7, ὂκ αὐλάτωμα
ἐν ὀψε ἱστοῦ ἄμφρα ἐν ἄμφρα.
See Buttm., Gram., p. 338.—οὐχι. Equiv.
to our "get". This is the force of
the aorist.
29. 'προσδέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἐν Κύριε μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς, καὶ τοὺς ποιούσας ἐντύμους ἐχετέ. 30. δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐργὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἡγιασθε, ἐναντιοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ὑστέρᾳ τῆς τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας.'

1 So DEKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Lach., Ti., Trg., Ws. Χριστοῦ alone with BFG 73, 80 (W.H. mg.). W.H. ('II) Κυρίων with ΝΑΠ 17, 31, 47, cop. syrP arm. æth., Euth. cod. (Trg. mg.). Alf., Myr., Lft., Hpt. τὸ ἐργὸν alone with C. Ws. (TK., p. 7), arguing in favour of Χριστοῦ, holds that, through misunderstanding, it was either omitted or (on the analogy of 1 Cor. xv. 58, xvi. 10) altered into Κυρίων.

2 So CKLP, Chr., Euth. cod., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. παραβολευσάμονος with ΝΑΒΔΕFG 177, 178, 179, d, e, g (parabolatus de anima sua).

3 οὐκ ἐπηρήμην τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἐντύμους θανάτου, and chap. ii. 8.—παραβεβλέπον. Here, with the great majority of the best authorities, we must read παραβεβλέπον. It is a ἀκ. λεγ., probably formed from παράβλεπος, rash, reckless. Cf. the legal term παράβλεπος (later, παράβλεπτος), the stake which has to be deposited by an appellant, and is forfeited if the action be lost. "Having hazarded his life." Cf. the exact parallel in Diod., 3, 36, 4, παραβεβλέπει ταῖς ψυχαῖς. What risk did he run? Hm. suggests that his illness was produced by his arrival in Rome during the hot season of the year. Chr. thinks of danger at the hands of Nero. Wohl. supposes that his illness was the result of his severe missionary labours in Rome. May it be that the Apostle was now confined in a far more unwholesome bondage than before (one of the noisome State-prisons? See Introduction), and that the assiduous services of Epaphrod. to him there, brought on this severe illness? We believe that this interpretation is justified by the next words τοῦ ὄψιν προτέρᾳ... λαντ. In what was their service towards the Apostle lacking? Evidently in nothing save their own personal presence and personal care of him. This would be the more urgently needed if Paul's outward surroundings had become less favourable. For the phrase ἀντιλήματα τοῦ ὄψιν cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 17, ὑστέρα τοῦ ὄψιν ὡτερίημα οὐδὲ ἀντιλήματα; 2 Cor. xi. 9.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-3. A salutation changed into a warning.—Ver. i. τὸ λατρεύτων. Probably A.V. rightly trans-
The whole section from iii. 2 to iv. 3 belongs to an old letter to the Philippians. Chap. iv. 4 is the continuation of chap. iii. 18.] Franke, on the occurrence of this strong warning towards the close of the letter, well compares the parallel case of Luther who, in prospect of death, could not depart without wishing for his followers not only the blessing of God but also hatred of the Pope (Myr., p. 13).

Ver. 2. It is difficult to understand how anyone could find three different classes in these words (e.g., Ws., who divides them into (a) unconverted heathens, (b) self-seeking Christian teachers, (c) unbelieving Jews. See also his remarks in A. J. Th., i., 2, pp. 389-391). The words are a precise parallel to Paul's denunciations of Judaising teachers in Galatians and 2 Corinthians. Cf. Gal. i. 7, 9, v. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 13, ii. 17. The persistent and malicious opposition which they maintained against him sufficiently accounts for the fiery vehemence of his language. To surrender to their teaching was really to renounce the most precious gift of the Gospel, namely, "the glorious liberty of the sons of God". For, in Paul's view, he who possesses the Spirit is raised above all law. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 17, and see Gunkel, Wirkungen, etc., pp. 96-98.

t'ircTt. Thrice repeated in the intense energy of his invective. Literally = "look at" them, in the sense of "beware of" them. It is not so used in classical Greek. Apparently some such significance as this is found in 2 Chron. x. 16, βλέψε τῶν ὄλων αὐτῶν, δανείλ. Frequent in N.T. (see Blass, Gram., p. 87, n. 1). He would have used a stronger word than βλέψε, had the Judaisers already made some progress at Philippi. There is nothing to suggest this in the Epistle. But all the Pauline Churches were exposed to their inroads. At any moment their emissaries might appear. — τούτων. The names of the parties would naturally suggest some emphasis on the shamelessness of dogs, others their
impurity, others their roaming tendencies, others still their insolence and cunning. Most probably the Apostle had no definite characteristic in his mind.  ἓνωμεν was a term of reproach in Greek from the earliest to the latest times. E.g., Hom., II., xiii., 623. Often in O.T. So here.—τ. κατατομήν. A scornful parody of their much-vaunted ἐπίταξιν. W.-M. (pp. 794-796) gives numerous exx. of a similar paronomasia, e.g., Diog. Laert., 6, 24, τήν ἐκ τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ σολήν πληγή χολήν, τήν τοῦ πλάτους διατρίβην κατατρίβην. Lit. = "the mutilation ". Their mechanical, unspiritual view of the ancient rite reduces it to a mere laceration. The verb occurs in CIG., 160, 27; Theophr., Hist. Plant., 4, 8, 10; Symm. on Jerem., xlviii., 37 = notch, cutting, incision. It is only found here with any reference to circumcision.

Ver. 3. ἡμείς. The contrast drawn, which has already been before his mind in the ironic expression ζητάτων, has come to be a token of participation in the covenant with God and of obligation to maintain it. The verb ψηφιστὴν is very common. Perhaps the choice of this particular compound to denote the rite of circumcision is due, as Dsm. (BS., p. 151) suggests, to the Egyptian use of it as a technical term for the same custom, long in vogue among the Egyptians. Examples are found in the Papyri. Paul uses it here in its strict sense as a token of participation in the covenant with God and of obligation to maintain it. But the further idea belonged to it of being the outward symbol of an inward grace. Cf. Deut. xxx. 6. As the rite was regarded essentially as one of purification, the grace associated with it was a cleansing process. This explains expressions like that in Jer. ix. 26, etc.—οί . . . λατρεοῦντες. The participle has become a noun denoting a class of men, spiritual worshippers. Contrast Heb. viii. 5, xiii. 10, and cf. Heb. ix. 14. Most edd. with a number of high authorities read θεοῦ (see crit. note supr.). This gives a peculiar combination: "who worship by the Spirit of God". But the occurrence of σαρκί immediately after leaf suggests the favourite Pauline antithesis of νεκρά and σάρκες. In that case θεοῦ, which is supported by some excellent evidence, would be the natural reading, governed by λατρεοῦντες. Aptly parallel is Rom. i. 9, ὁ Θεὸς ὁ λατρεύων ἐν τῇ πνευματικῇ μοι. Certainly θεοῦ, as the more difficult reading, must be considered. But as λατρεύω had come to have the technical sense of worshipping God, the word might be altered at an early date to get rid of a superfluity.—λατρ. In LXX it is used exclusively of the service of God, true or false. But it is distinguished from its synonym γείω as including the worship of the people as well as the ritual of the priests and Levites. See esp. SH. on Rom. i. 9.—καταχείμανοι. One of the Apostle’s most characteristic words. It expresses with great vividness the high level of Christian life at which he is living: "exulting in Christ Jesus". It belongs to the same triumphant mood which finds utterance so often in this Epistle in χαίρω. This victorious Christian gladness ought to sweep them past all earthly formalism and bondage to "beggarly elements"—οἱ ἐν σ. παρθεν. oίκν (instead of μν) emphasises the actual condition of their own Christian life.—ἐν σαρκὶ. On the phrase see Dsm., N.T. Formel "in Christo," p. 125, who regards it as following the analogy of the Pauline ἐν χριστῷ. This is manifestly so in our instance where the expressions stand in juxtaposition. Carnem appellat quidem est extra Christum (Calvin). Here ςαρκὶ has a double antithesis, both X. 'i, and
III.

The ordinary use of "self" in the popular religious vocabulary corresponds with wonderful accuracy to the Pauline σαφεῖ (so also Moule). For a strangely kindred conception cf. Seneca, ad Marc., 24, 5: illis (animō) cum hac carne grave certamen est (quoted by Hitzm., N.T. Th., ii., p. 21). Of course σαφεῖ has become a technical term in Paul's controversy with the Judaisers, and that particular side of its meaning must always be kept in view (see Romans and Galatians passim).—τεταρτακτον. The word occurs no less than six times in this short Epistle. Paul has reached firm convictions on the highest things. He knows what he believes and what he rejects. That is the real explanation of his strong, exultant joy.

Ver. 4. A very close parallel to the thought is found in 2 Cor. xi.18-23. —καταρχεῖ. A rare construction in N.T. xxoc occur in Hebrews. Viteau (who regards it as a survival of the literal language, see Le Verbe, p. 189) would resolve the clause and its context into καταρχεῖν, ἑκάστων καὶ ἑκάστῳ, ἥμερας ἑκάστῳ διὰ δέκα ἃ περιεχόταται. The Apostle realised in the full what was involved in being a Jew. He felt the high prerogatives of the chosen people of God. Cf. Rom. iii.1-2. They were the heirs of the promises in a unique manner. But these remarkable privileges ought to have produced in them willing submission to God's universal purpose of mercy instead of being incentives to mere self-complacency and bitter prejudice.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges.—ώς πατρικὸς. This tribe stood high in Jewish estimation, not only as descending from Rachel, Jacob's best-loved wife, but as remaining loyal to the house of David, and after the exile, forming with Judah his Christian boasting. But καταρχεῖ seems quite in place, as Paul is simply, for the moment, regarding himself from a purely Jewish standpoint.—εἰς τὸ πάντα. "If anyone else presumes to trust." A complete parallel is Matt. iii.9, μὴ δύνηται λέγειν εἰς τὸν αυτοῦ συναφείαν. Cf. 1 Cor. xi. 16. Akin to this use of δύνηται is such a passage as Aristoph., Ran., 564, μαίνεσθαι δύνηται, " Pretending to be mad ". We cannot help thinking that the usage is based on the impersonal use of the verb. In later Greek δύνηται frequently means "think," e.g., Acts xxvii.13; Acta Philipp., 95, 1; Plat., Timol., viii., 3. In official Greek it is the regular equivalent of Latin censere, the technical term to denote the opinion of the Senate (see Viereck, Sermo Graecus, etc., p. 72). Holst acutely notes that " δύνηται puts the τὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς σαφεῖν subjectively, and denies that there is a reality corresponding to this false opinion. In this subjectivity there is irony."—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖν. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. —τεταρτακτον. The dative of ὀπὲρ must be read, expressing the sphere to which τεταρτακτον belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision." A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—καταρχεῖ. A rare construction in N.T. xxoc occur in Hebrews.
the foundation of the future nation.—


The force of these words has been variously estimated. Lst. and others draw a contrast between Ἑβραῖος and Ἐλληνικός, the former being a Jew who retained the Hebrew language and custom (see Acts vi. 1). But Euseb., H.E., 2, 4, 2, to Aristobulus, both of them Greek-speaking Jews with little if any knowledge of Hebrew. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 22. The Greek Comm., Th. Mps. and Thdr., believe that, in using the ancient name, Paul wishes to emphasise the purity of his lineage. Probably they are right.—κατὰ νόμον. Are we to distinguish between νόμος and ὁ νόμος in Paul? Attempts have been made (notably that of Gifford, Romans in Speaker’s Comm., pp. 41-48) to show that when Paul omits the article he is thinking mainly of the principle of law as a method of justification in opposition to faith, etc. In our judgment it has been made abundantly clear by Grafe (Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz, pp. 1-11) that, for the Apostle, νόμος with or without the article means the O.T. revelation of the will of God. He makes no distinction between a general conception of Divine law and the special one of the Mosaic law. The Mosaic law is for him the Divine law pure and simple, and therefore has a universal bearing. There are, of course, modifications of this central idea, but they can all be satisfactorily accounted for. Often the insertion or omission of the article with νόμος is entirely a question of formal grammar. Here νόμος is plainly the law of Moses.

Cf. Acts xxiii. 6. For an interesting discussion of the influence of the school of Hillel upon Paul see Wabnits, Ῥεµ. 2, 4, 2, applied xiili., p. 267 ff. The survivals of Rabbinic doctrines and methods in Paul’s thought, however, must neither be exaggerated nor, because they are Rabbinic, be contemptuously dismissed. "If God was not moving in the Rabbinic thought of Christ’s day, what reason have we to say He... moves in the thought of to-day?" (P. T. Forsyth). Almost certainly Paul’s family must have been in thorough sympathy with strict Judaism. No doubt he would be disowned by them, and this, as Ramsay notes (St. Paul, p. 36), would give special force to his words in ver. 8 infr.

Ver. 6. Probably ἴδιος (neuter) is the correct form here. In N.T. the neuter occurs only in 2 Cor. ix. 2, but it is found in Ignat., and, alternately with ὁ, in 1 Clem. It is perhaps colloquial (so W-Sch., p. 84), although ὁ is that used in LXX. ἴδιος would almost have a technical meaning for a strict Jew at that time in connexion with the fanatical party among the Pharisees who called themselves ἱλικται (cf. Schürer, i., p. 50 ff.). Cf. Gal. i. 14. τιμονιστὴς. ἤτοι ὁ ὀρθός ὁ πάπας ὁ παπατέων.—ἐν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ ὑποτατοῦ. ὁ ὅπως ἐστιν, in classical Greek, the technical term for the “pursuer” or prosecutor in the law-courts. Strangely enough it was by means of prosecutions that Paul usually persecuted.—κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν ν. 4

"According to (i.e., tested by the standard of) the righteousness which belongs to the sphere of the law. Of course this righteousness, which is here equivalent to right conduct as a whole, is regarded from the point of view of that which justifies before God. For the exceptional prominence which righteousness has in Jewish religious thought, see esp. Weber, Lehren des Talmud, pp. 169-270, and Charles’ admirable note on Apoc. of Baruch, xxiv. 1. Cf. Ps. Sol. ix. 5 for a very precise formulation of Jewish thought on this subject. It would be wrong to limit δικ. here merely to ceremonial observances. It includes, most probably, the ordinary moral precepts of the law as well.—ἀμέμπος. Exactly parallel to this description is the case of the rich young man in the Gospels. He also could claim to be κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν νομ. ἀμέμπτος. It was at the next step (ver. 7) that
he stopped short. He was unable to "count all things loss for Christ."

Vv. 7-9. Earthly gains counted loss that he might win Christ.—Ver. 7. Ἀλλὰ ἄνω. Although in later Greek ἄνω had lost almost all its peculiar force and become simply = ἀπό (e.g., Matt. xxii.2, etc. Cf. Jebb in Vincent and Dickson's Handbook, p. 302), one feels that something of that force is present here. "But these things, although they were of a class that was really gain to me." Non de ipsa legi, sed de justitia quae in lege est (Estius). The prerogatives mentioned above were real privileges viewed from his old Jewish standpoint, might even be justly regarded as paving the way to salvation.—κρίσις. In the plural it usually refers to money (see Jebb on Soph., Antig., 1326). Perhaps the idea of separate items of profit is before the Apostle's mind (so also Vaughan). For the antithesis between κρίσις and ἥμαρα cf. Aristotle, Eth. Nicom., 5, 4, 6, τὸ μὲν τοῦ ἄγαθος πλῆθος τοῦ καυχός δὲ πληθυσμὸς κρίσις, τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον ἥμαρα.—ἡμαρα...ἐμὴ. "I have considered and still consider." Tersely, Thdrt., περιτοθεί...δὸ λέγω, τοῦ ἄνω φανερῶς.

On vv. 8-11 see Rainy's admirable exposition in Expos. Bible, pp. 200-256.—Ver. 8. Ἀλλὰ μενοῦν. Probably we ought to read (see crit. note supr.), as its absence in some good authorities is accounted for by the ease with which it could be omitted (so D omits it in 2 Cor. xi.16; DFG in Rom. viii.32; B in Rom. ix.20). Almost = "Nay, that is a feeble way of expressing it; I can go further and say," etc. Ἀλλὰ suggests a contrast to be introduced, μὲν adds emphasis, while τὸν gathering up what has already been said, corrects it by way of extending his assertion (ὡς can scarcely be translated, representing, rather, a tone of the voice in taking back the limitations implied in ἄνω...κρίσις). "Nay rather, I actually count all things," etc. We cannot well see, in view of the natural translation of Ἀλλὰ μενοῦν, how the emphasis could be laid on any other word than μενοῦν. There is no need for contrasting ἥμαρα and ἀγαθόν. He does not compare present and past. ἀγαθόν already expresses the fixed decision to which he has come. He has spoken of regarding his important Jewish prerogatives as "loss" for Christ's sake. Now he widens the range to μενοῦν. This is the goal of Christian life. It is not to be divided up between Christ and earthliness. It is not to express itself in attention to certain details. "If we should say some things, we might be in danger of sliding into a one-sided puritanism" (Rainy, op. cit., p. 191).—τὸ ὑπερέχον τ. γενοῦ. Χ. Ι. κ.π.λ. An instance of the extraordinary predilection of the later language for forming abstract substanc-
This knowledge on which Paul is so fond of dwelling is, as Beysch. well expresses it, "the reflection of faith in our reason." It is directly connected with the surrender of the soul to Christ, but, as Paul teaches, that always means a close intimacy with Him, from which there springs an ever-growing knowledge of His spirit and will. Such knowledge lays a stable foundation for the Christian character, preventing it from evaporating into a mere unreasoning emotionalism. The conception, which is prominent in Paul's writings, is based on the O.T. idea of the knowledge of God. That is always practical, religious. To know God is to revere Him, to be godly, for to know Him is to understand the revelation He has given of Himself. Cf. Isa. xi. 2, Hab. ii. 14. It is natural that in the later Epistles this aspect of the spiritual life should come into the foreground, seeing that already the Christian faith was being confronted by other explanations of man's relation to God. To know Christ, the Apostle teaches, is to have the key which will unlock all the secrets of existence viewed from the standpoint of religion.— τοῦ Κυρίου μου. It was as Κύριος, the exalted Lord, that Paul first knew Christ. And always it is from this standpoint he looks backwards and forwards. To recognise this is to understand his doctrinal teaching.— διὰ τοῦ νου καιροῦ. Διὰ τοῦ νου καιροῦ is found in Herod., Joseph., LXX, etc. See Kühner-Blass, Gramm., ii., p. 457.)— τοῦ ο ierrάνω. "That I may win Christ." There is nothing mechanical or fixed about fellowship with Christ. It may be interrupted by decay of zeal, the intrusion of the earthly spirit, the toleration of known sins, the easy domination of self-will, and countless other causes. Hence, to maintain it, there must be the continuous estimating of earthly things at their true value. Accordingly he looks on "winning Christ" as something present and future, not as a past act. (As to the form, an aorist £ Ke'pe'T) o-ai found in Herod., Joseph., LXX, etc. See Kiihner-Blass, Gramm., ii., p. 457.)— τοῦ ο ierrάνω. It is probably used here in the semi-technical sense which it received in post-classical Greek = τῶν ἐσχατῶν with participle (French se trou- ver), "turn out actually to be". "And actually be in Him," from the eschatological standpoint (see Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 192). The idea is involved of a revelation of real character. Cf. Gal. ii. 17, ικ ι και τοῦ νου καιροῦ. Διὰ τοῦ νου. The central fact of Paul's religious life and thought, the complete identification of the believer with Christ.— μη δικαιος. μη either depends directly on ο ierrάνω or is used to express Paul's own view of what is implied in ο ierrάνω. In a. This last thought must be regarded as the basis on which the clauses immediately following rest.
added to defining, and then the definition is elaborated by the clause with the article. An instructive parallel is Gal. ii. 30. The precise connexion and wording of the Θεου (see an important note in Green, Gram. of N.T., pp. 34-35). δικαιοσύνη, as usually in Paul's writings, means a right relation between him and God. The retention of the word by Paul to denote the position of the Christian before God is, as he points out, a proof of his close connexion with the Jewish consciousness. We may call it a "forensic" word, for certainly there always lies behind it the idea of a standard appointed by God, a law, the expression of the Divine will. The qualifying words here show what Paul has in view.—τὴν τὸ δόμου. Cf. the lament for the destruction of Jerusalem in Apoc. of Bar., lxvii. 6, "the vapour of the smoke of the incense of righteousness which is by the law is extinguished in Zion" (and see Charles' note on xv. 3). This hypothetical δικαιοσύνη, which he calls his own, could only spring from complete conformity to the will of God as revealed in precepts and commands. That is the kind of relation to God which Paul has found to be impossible. On νομος without the article see on ver. 5 supra. τὴν δὲ δίκαιον εἰς Χρ., τὴν δὲ Θεοῦ δικ. εἰς τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. The exact character of this δικαιοσύνη, which Paul prizes must be carefully noted. The presupposition of possessing it is "to be found in Christ". It is not a righteousness which he can win by legal observances. It springs from God. What does this new relation to 20. εἰς δικαιοσύνη precisely mean? The one condition of understanding the Apostle's language is to remember that he combines in his thinking two conceptions of δικαιοσύνη, or perhaps we should rather say that his own experience has made vivid for him a two-sided conception of this relation. On the one hand, he thinks of δικαιοσύνη as connected with God, the Judge of men. God, strictly marking sin, might condemn men absolutely, because all have sinned. Instead of that, because of His grace manifested in Jesus Christ the Crucified and working through Christ's death, He deals mercifully with sinners, treats them as righteous on account of the propitiation made by the Righteous One, treats them as standing in a right relation to Himself, i.e., pardons them. δικαιοσύνη thus comes to be God's gracious way of dealing with us, the forgiveness with the Forgiver in it" (Rainy, op. cit., p. 231), the relation with God into which we are brought by His grace for Jesus' sake, regarded more or less as an activity of His, practically = salvation (which, already in O.T., rested upon the rectitude of God's character, see, e.g., Isa. li. 5-8, Ps. xc. 2). God's justifying of us makes us δικαιοσύνη in His sight: we possess δικαιοσύνη. That, however, might appear arbitrary. But the Apostle gives no ground for such a suspicion. This δικαιοσύνη is only reached "through the faith of Christ," i.e., the faith which Christ kindles, of which He is the author, which, also, He nourishes and maintains (see esp. Hausseleiter, Greifswald. Studien, pp. 177-178). This δικαιοσύνη is securely founded on faith in Christ (ἐν τῷ π. τῇ τ. τ. π.). But what does such faith effect? It is that which makes the believer one with Christ. He shares in all that his Lord possesses. Christ imparts life to him. Christ's relation to the Father becomes his. But this is no longer a being regarded or dealt with by God as if he were δικαιοσύνη. Union with Christ makes it possible for the Christian to be δικαιοσύνη, to living through Christ in actual behaviour. Thus δικαιοσύνη may express something more than the relation to God into which believers are brought by God's justifying judgment (which for their experience means the sense of forgiveness with the Forgiver in it). It embraces the conduct which is the response to that forgiving love of God, a love only bestowed on the soul united to Christ by

**Vv. 10-11.—Conformity to Christ's death and resurrection.**

This infinitive of purpose or motive is frequent in N.T. and later Greek. Among classical authors it is chiefly found in Thucyd., who favours it (see Goodwin, MT., p. 319; Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 169 ff.). It is perhaps connected with the use of the genitive after verbs of aiming, hitting, etc. Paul has already spoken in ver. 8 of the yvuvai of Christ. This thought again appeals to him, but now as being the natural development of winning Christ and being found in Him. For with Paul this Christian Gnosis is the highest reach of Christian experience. Cf. Wordsworth, Excursion, Bk. iv.:—

For knowledge is delight, and such delight breeds love; yet suited as it rather is to thought and to the intellectual, it teaches less to love than to adore; if that be not indeed the highest love.

yvuvai is the necessary result of intimate communion with Christ. No better comment on the thought can be found than Eph. i. 11-20. Cf., as a most instructive parallel, John xvii. 3. The precise force of yvuvai as opposed to tvScvai is admirably brought out by Lft. on Gal. iv. 9, where he shows that yv. (1) has in view "an earlier state of ignorance" or "some prior facts on which the knowledge is based," and (2) contains "the ideas of thoroughness, familiarity, or of approbation". yv. emphasises "the process of redemption". —την δυναμιν της άνερ. . . . κοινωνιας ταθμ. . . . συμμορφ. . . τη θανατη. As to readings, τη must be omitted (with the best authorities) before κοινωνιας, because the latter forms one idea with the preceding clause. In the case of την it is more difficult to decide. But the evidence, both external and internal, is, on the whole, against it. συμμορφηζομενος is clearly right, having unassailable attestation. —In this passage we have the deepest secrets of the Apostle's Christian experience unveiled. *Qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget* (Anselm). Two things Paul this Christian of which can not be separated: the experimental knowledge of the believer embraces (1) the power of Christ's resurrection, (2) the fellowship of His sufferings, conformity to His death. Paul puts the resurrection first, because it was the Risen Christ he came to know; it was that knowledge which gave him insight into the real meaning of Christ's sufferings and death. But here he thinks altogether of a spiritual process which is carried on in the soul of him who is united to Christ. He has no idea of martyrdom before him (so, e.g., De W., Myr.). Nor is any earthly suffering present in his mind except, perhaps, a discipline which overcomes sin. Thus Col. i. 24 is not a true parallel (so also Hpt.). The passages which illuminate his meaning are especially Rom. xii., viii. 29, Gal. ii. 19-20, vi. 14. Christ, in Paul's view, carries the man who clings to Him in faith through all the great crises which came to Him on the path of His perfecting. The deepest of men's saving experiences run parallel, as it were, to the cardinal events of the Christian revelation, more especially to that atoning death accomplished once for all for the remission of sins. Cf. Rom. vi. 5, συμφωνησε γεγονα τη δομηματι του θανατου αυτου. This is the "crucifying of the flesh" in fellowship with Christ, which results in "newness of life." (Rom. vi. 4). On the Cross Christ died, i.e., the earthly part in Him died—His human flesh. But that was the only element in Him that could be tempted. And, as regards that element of His being, He died victorious, able to offer up His human life without spot unto God. They that are Christ's are enabled, by His power communicated to them, through a process of overcoming, to die to earthliness and the appeals made to their fleshly nature. But in dying on the Cross Christ identified Himself with the sin of the world, acknowledging that God's judgment upon sin was righteous and true, as the Head of mankind representing sinners and bearing the burden of their transgression. So, in the Apostle's view, they that are Christ's have the firm assurance that in Him they have made full confession of their sin to the holy and gracious God. They know, by the fitness of the Holy Spirit, that God accepts that confession and forgives them freely and joyfully. For they know that Holiness has accepted Love, and that Love has acknowledged Holiness, or rather, that the holy love of the Father and the Son is revealed in its unity on the Cross of Christ. The result of death with Christ is life in Him. This new life depends on Christ's resurrection. "Because I live, ye shall live also." The power (δυναμιν) of His resurrection as experienced by the
believer is the effect of His victory over death and sin; that victory which has given Him all power in heaven and earth; which enables Him to impart of His own life to those who are in His fellowship. It is not they who live but "Christ liveth in" them. The organic connexion between Christ and the Christian is the regulating idea for the Apostle. Christ is, as we have said, the Head and representative of humanity. Hence conformity to Christ (Rom. viii.29, irpoupio-cv o~vu.u,dp$ovcttjs cikovo; toO vlov uvtov) all along the line, both in living and dying, is a return to the divinely-purposed type, for man was made in the image of God (see loc.cit.,ctvai oItov irpuroTOKOv Iv iroXXots aSc-<fiois). "In this appropriation of the death and rising of the Lord Jesus . . . there are three stages, corresponding to the Friday, Saturday and Sunday of Easter tide. Christ died for our sins: He was buried: He rose again the third day. So, by consequence, 'I am crucified with Christ: no longer do I live: Christ liveth in me' (Findlay, Galat. in Expos. Bible, p. 159). On the whole thought of this passage, see Pfeiderer, Paulinism, i., pp. 169, 192-207; Denney, Expos., vi., p. 299 ff.

Ver. 11. ei τως καταντ. This construction closely corresponds to the Homeric usage of ei se or δε (as in Odys., 3, 83, παρθενος εῖσθαι μὴ μετα- χομαι, δεν τον ἄκοντον) where the pro- tasis really contains in itself its own apodosis "which consists of an implied idea of purpose" or hope (see Goodwin, MT., p. 180; Burton, MT., § 276; Viteau, Le Verbe, pp. 62, 116). Here the clause is almost equivalent to an indirect question. The Resurrection is the Apostle's goal, for it will mean perfect, unbroken knowledge of Christ and fellowship with Him. Paul knows by experience the difficulty of remaining loyal to the end, of being so conformed to Christ's death that the power of sin will not revive its mastery over him. So his apparent uncertainty here of reaching the goal is not distrust of God. It is distrust of himself. It emphasises the need he feels of watchfulness and constant striving (cf. Siuku, ver. 12), lest "having preached to others" he "be found a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 27). Vv. 24-27 of this chap., along with Rom. viii.17, are the best parallel to the passage before us). But, on the other side, he is always reminded that "faithful is He that calleth you" (1 Thess. v. 24).—KaTavTTJo-iu. Probably aorist subjunctive (as corresponding with Ka/raXaPu in ver. 12).—την ἅμα. τ. νεκρ. Authority, both external and internal, supports the reading την εικ νεκρων. δανος, is found nowhere else in N.T., and never in LXX. In later Greek it means "expulsion". It occurs only here in this sense. Hoist, suggests that δανος, is used here of the actual resurrection, because ἀνάστασις was used above of
belivers with an ethical, ideal meaning. We are disposed to believe (with Ws. and others) that Paul is thinking only of the resurrection of believers (cf. Ps. Sol. iii. 13-16 for Jewish thought on this subject, the thought which had been Paul's mental atmosphere). This is his usual standpoint. In the famous passage 1 Cor. xv. 12 ff. it is exclusively of Christians he speaks. We have no information as to what he taught regarding a general resurrection. But considering that it is with spontaneous, artless letters we have to do, and not with theoretical discussions, it would be hazardous to say that he ignored or denied a general resurrection. For him the resurrection of this phrase in classical and in N.T. is rhetorical= " not only, but ". In N.T. the resurrection of believers (cf. Ps. Sol. iii. 12 f., Ps. 16. 9, etc.) is exclusive of a general resurrection. But considering the resurrection of Christians depends on and is conform to the resurrection of their Lord. Teichmann (Ausschreibung u. Gericht, p. 67), comparing chap. i. 23 with this passage, holds that Paul, although he had, in his opinion by faith, that of a continuous existence after death, occasionally (as here) uses the traditional termis technici. This may be so. More probably at one time he would give prominence to the thought of uninterrupted fellowship with Christ after death, while at another his longings would centre round the great crisis when Christ should acknowledge all His faithful servants and make them full sharers in His glory. It is not to be doubted that Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, expected that crisis soon to come.

DISC. i. 12. THE MARK OF THE MATURE CHRISTIAN.—TO PRESS FORWARD.—Ver. 12. Οὐχὶ δὲν. There is a curious difference (see W.-M., p. 746) between the use of this phrase in classical and in N.T. Greek. ἔγνω is understood in both cases, but in the classical language the usage is rhetorical = " not only, but ". In N.T. its purpose is to guard against misunderstanding, " I do not mean that," etc.— Πᾶσιν. The aorist sums up the Apostle's experiences as far as the point he has reached, looking at it (with the usual force of the aorist) as a single fact. In English, of course, we must translate, " Not that I have already attained " (so R.V.). In Greek a sharper distinction is made between past and present. Cf. John xviii. 4, ἔγνω οὖν ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸ ἐργόν ταῖς ἔφοβοις. It is needless to ask what is the object of Πᾶσιν. None is required, just as we speak of "attaining". He has in view all that is involved in winning Christ and knowing Him. Probably the remaining verses of this paragraph are a caution to some at Philippi who were claiming high sanctity, and so affecting superior airs towards their brethren. This would naturally lead to irritation and jealousies.—πεπληρωμένοι. The interesting variant δεδικασμένοι (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4) is plainly very ancient, the gloss, probably, of some pious copyist who imagined that the Divine side of sanctification was left too much out of sight. πεπληρωμένοι is a favourite word of the writer to the Hebrews. It means literally "to bring to the end" determined by God. See Bleek, Heb. Brief., ii., 1, p. 299. A striking parallel to our passage is Philo, Leg. Alleg., iii., 23 (ed. Cohn), τὸν θεὸν, ἰδίως, μάλιστα νεκροφορεῖν σαντιν ὑπολήφι ήρᾶ γε σῦ χταν τελειωθέντα καὶ πρεσβεύοντα σφέτανιν ἀξιωθείς; ἤτο γαρ τότε πιθήκους, οὐ φιλοσόφους. It is unnecessary to assume the metaphor of the race-course. θεατήρεσιν and καταλαμβάνων are correlative words (θεατ. esp. frequent in Paul) = seeking and finding, "seek and find," "pursue and overtake". Cf. Rom. ix. 30, Exod. xv. 9 (LXX). Of course both may be used with a metaphorical colour. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24, and also 2 Clem. xvi. 2 (quoted by Wohl.). —εἰ καὶ καταλάμβανε. See on εἰ τῶν καταλαμβάνων. The subjunctive has its derivative as being in an indirect question (see Blass, Gramm., p. 206). We believe it ought to be read, as it would very easily slip out before καταλάμβανε. It emphasises the correspondence with the following κατελήφθην, and may possibly be a sort of correction of εἰ τῶν in the previous verse, "in the hope that I may really grasp (do my part in grasping) ". Hpt. quotes aptly from Luther: " ein Christ ist nicht im Zeitgenosse sondern im Werden, darum wer ein Christ ist, ist kein Christ".— φίλος. Two distinct interpretations are possible and equally good. It may (1) be εἰς τοῦτο φίλος, "for this reason," φίλος, "that with a view to which I," etc. Whichever be chosen, the sense remains the same. Paul lays, as it were, the responsibility of his attaining upon Christ. Christ's grasp of his whole being (κατελήφθην) must have a definite purpose in it. Paul's Christian progress is the only thing that can correspond (καταλαμβάνεις) to his experience of Christ's power.—Χ. ι. τοῦ is certainly to be omitted. It is difficult to decide whether ι. ought to be read or not. There is some force in the remark of Ws. that there would be no motive for adding ι., while Χ. alone would follow the analogy of vv. 8-9 (see Ws., TK., p. 88).
Ver. 13. ἀδελφοί. This direct appeal to them shows that he is approaching a matter which is of serious concern both to him and them.— ἐγὼ ἦματον. Why such strong personal emphasis? Is it not a clear hint that there were people at Philippi who prided themselves on having grasped the prize of the Christian calling already? Paul has been tacitly leading up to this. He will yield to none in clear knowledge of the difference between the old and the new life. He knows more surely than any how completely he has broken with the past. Yet, whatever others may say, he must assume the lowly position of one who is still a learner. It makes little difference whether οὗ or οὗτος read. The authorities are pretty evenly balanced.— λογίζομαι. The word (often used by Paul) has the force of looking back on the process of a discussion and calmly drawing a conclusion. Cf. Rom. viii.18 (with note of SH.). The Apostle expresses his deliberately formed opinion.— ἐν δὲ. There is no need to supply a verb. His Christian conduct is summed up in what follows. Never has there been a more unified life than that of Paul as Apostle and Christian. "When all is said, the greatest art is to limit and isolate oneself" (Goethe).— τὰ μὲν ὄντως ἐνιαυτόν. There are a few exx. in classical Greek of ἐνιαυτός with the accusative, e.g., Aristoph., Nub., 631. But in the later language there was an extraordinary extension of the use of the accusative. (See Hatz., Eini., p. 320 ff.) Does τὰ ὄντως mean the old life, or the past stages of Christian experience? If the metaphor were strictly pressed, no doubt the latter alternative would claim attention. But pressing metaphors is always hazardous. And parallel passages seem rather to justify the first meaning, e.g., Jer. vii. 24, ἐγενήθησαν εἰς τὰ διαθήκην καὶ σὺ εἰς τὰ ἐναρθρωμένα (of disobeying God's commands); Luke ix. 62, βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω; John vi. 66, ἠκούειν τῶν μαθητῶν... ἀνθέλων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. — τὸν ἡμῶν ἐνεργ. τὸ καὶ τὸ ἱππότ. are found in Herodot. and Xenoph. Wetstein quotes most aptly from Luc., de Cal., 12, οὖν τι καὶ έπὶ τοῖς γυναικίων ἀγάπην ἐπὶ τῶν δριμῶν γίνεται. καθε γὰρ οὗ ἁγιάζει θρόμως τῆς δοξής πόνοι καταπνίγεται, μόνον τοῦ πρὸν ἠζημονοι καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀνενείπει πόθος τῷ τέρμαν τὰ τοῦτο τὴν κατάθλησιν τῆς σκέψεως τῶν εὐφροσύνων τῶν ἄνθρωπων κατοικίας. In using this comparison, Paul, of course, adapts himself, as among Greeks and Romans, to a custom of their national life. On this kind of adaptation see an excellent discussion in Weizsäcker, Apost. Zeitalter, pp. 100-104. Ver. 14. κατὰ σὲ. "In the direction of the mark." Exactly parallel is Acts viii. 26, τοπέρσευ κατὰ μεσομβρίαν. Perhaps akin are uses like Thucyd., 6, 31, καθα διὰν ἦρεν; Hom., Odys., 3, 72, κατὰ πρῆμιν ("for the sake of business," Amel.-Hentze). It is needless to distinguish between σκοπὸν and βραβεῖον in the Apostle's thought. Both really point to that unbroken and complete fellowship with Christ which is attained through the power of His resurrection, that resurrection being the condition of the believer's victory over sin and death, and making it possible for him to enter the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens". The purified life in heaven is, in a word,
both the goal and the prize. Contrast with this exulting thought Omar Khayyám, xxxviii.: "The stars are setting and the caravan starts for the dawn of nothing."—τέλειον ἔφυμεν. The word occurs in Comedy, Inscr. and N.T. (1 Cor. ix. 24). Cf. 1 Clem., v. 5, ἐν Παύλου ἑνεργητεῖ τέλειον, where it is perhaps suggested by our passage. It is possibly one of those words which must have been common in colloquial Greek (cf. the frequent use of ἔρως), but have survived only in a few books. ἔστε be must be read with the best authorities, for, as Lft. notes, "the prize marks the position of the goal". ἔστε is an explanatory gloss.—τέλειον ἔστε. "The upward calling." The Apostle seems to mean that the τέλειον is the ἔστε κλήσεως (so also Lips.). κλήσεως is the technical word in the Epistles for that decisive appeal of God to the soul which is made in Jesus Christ: the offer of salvation. Those who listen are designated κλήσεως. Cf. Rom. viii. 30 and Hitzm., N.T. Th., ii., p. 165 ff. This κλήσεως is not merely to "the inheritance of the saints in light". Its effect must be seen in the sanctification of the believer's life on earth. But here the addition of τέλειον suggests that the Apostle has before him the final issue of the calling which belongs to those who have endured to the end, who have run with patience the race set before them. The κλήσεως seems to carry much the same meaning as Heb. iii. 1, κλήσεως ἐννοησιοῦν. Cf. the suggestive comment of Chr., τοὺς μάλητα τιμημένους τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ στεφανοῦσιν ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῗ ἑστήκατε, ἀλλὰ ἐν κλήσεως ἐν Χριστῷ στεφανοῦσιν.—ἐν Χ. ἔστε. Although it would give a satisfactory sense to take these words with δικαιοί (so e.g., Myr., Ws.), it is far more natural to join them closely with τ. ἔστε κλήσεως. This is emphatically ἐν Χ. ἔστε. Only in connexion with Him has the κλήσεως either in itself or in its goal any meaning.

Ver. 15. τέλειον. What Paul understands by τέλειον we can easily discover from Eph. iv. 13-14, Col. i. 28, iv. 12, I Cor. ii. 6 (cf. also the definition of the word in Heb. v. 14 taken in connexion with vi. 1). In all these passages τέλειον depends upon knowledge, knowledge gained by long experience of Christ, resulting both in firm conviction and maturity of thought and conduct. It has not so much our idea of "perfect", as of "having reached a certain point of completeness," as of one who has come to his full growth, leaving behind him the state of childhood (παιδεία). Cf. chap. i. 9-10. Lft. supposes a reminiscence of the technical term τέλειον, used in the Mysteries to denote the initiated, and imagines Paul to speak with a certain irony of people at Philippi who claimed to be in this fortunate position as regards the Christian faith. There is no need to assume here the language of the Mysteries (as Anrich shows, Das Antike Mysteriencwesen, Gött., 1894, p. 146, n. 1), or to find irony in Paul's words. Probably there were some (see on ver. 13 supr.) at Philippi who boasted of a spiritual superiority to their brethren and who may have called themselves τέλειοι. This may have been due to special equipment with the Spirit manifesting itself in speaking with tongues, etc. See 1 Cor. xii. passim. But Paul takes the word seriously and points out what it involves. [Wernle's attempt in Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paul., pp. 6-7, to show that this passage is no argument against Christian perfection which he believes Paul to hold, rests on the erroneous association of τέλειον with the Mysteries.]

Ver. 15. τέλειον. Let us show our humble conviction that we are still far from the goal which we desire to attain.—καὶ Τ. ἔστε τέλειον. If, in the case of any separate detail of character or knowledge, you imagine yourselves to be τέλειοι, to have reached the highest point, God will reveal the truth (the true standpoint of humility) on this matter also. The form of the conditional sentence suggests that Paul knew of persons at Philippi who had erroneous views on
III.

16. *πλην εἰς δ' ἐφθάσασμεν, τῷ ἄντωπον ἦτο 7 στοιχεῖα καὶ τὸ ἄντω φρονεῖν.¹

17. *Συμμαρτήτηροι μοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτως ἀνθρώπους.³

¹ So Ws., Alf. with ABD*EKL. Ti., Ws., W.H. σωμαίνει with BB*D*FG.
² So Ti., W.H. with ABD*FG. Trg., Alf., Ws. σώματες with DE*K*L, etc.
³ See Ws., T.K., p. 64, who thinks that οὐτῶς is connected with a similar reading at iv. 1. Both he attributes to the arbitrariness of the copyist.

this subject. But his hint of rebuke is very delicately put. εἰς τὸ κτ.Λ. It is far-fetched to take this (as Hpt. does) of their judgment on the Judaisers. Paul has forgotten, for the time, the special anxiety which weighs upon him, and has become absorbed in the glorious vista which unfolds itself to the Christian, καὶ τὸ θεονικόν κτ.Λ. A firm conviction of the Apostle's. See esp. i Cor. ii. 10 (and cf. Von Soden, Abhandlungen C. v. Weiss. gewidmet, p. 166).

Ver. 16. πλην. It is quite common as introducing a parenthesis. "Only one thing! So far as we have come, keep the path" (Weizs.). For the word cf. Schmid, Atticismus, i., p. 133, and Bonitz's Index to Aristotle. — εἰς δ' ἐφθάσασμεν. In later Greek (as in modern) δ' ἐφθάσασμεν has lost all idea of anticipation and simply means "come," "reach". Cf. 2 Cor. x. 14 (and see Hatz., Einl., p. 199; Sources of N.T. Greek, p. 156). "So far as we have come." In what? Ws. thinks in right φρονεῖν, connecting the words immediately with τούτω φρονεῖν. Kl. supposes the τὸ φρονεῖν βεβαιούμενης, referring to the earlier part of the chap. (esp. ver. 9). Does he not rather mean the point reached on the advance towards the goal (the κατὰ σκοπόν διάσωμεν), which is the subject directly before his mind? The very use of στοιχεῖα seems to justify this interpretation. — τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. It is, at first sight, natural to refer τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ immediately to δ' preceding. And this may be right. But there is much force in the interpretation of Lips., who renders "let us walk on the same path" (so also Hist.). The exhortation would then be directed against the difference of opinion and feeling which were certainly present in the Church at Philippi, and is suggested to Paul by the ἀνθρώπῳ φρον. of ver. 15. That this was an early interpretation is shown by the v.l. of TR. The words κανένας τούτω φρονεῖν (not found in the best MSS.) are evidently a gloss on the text. "Only, so far as we have come, let us keep to the same path." τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ is an instance of a dative common after verbs of "going" and "walking" in N.T. Cf. Button, Gram., p. 184.—στοιχεῖα. An imperative infinitive found in Hom., Aristoph., Inscr. (see Meisterhans, Gram. d. att. Inschr., § 88 A; Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 147). Probably this usage is closely connected with the origin of the infinitive, which was a dative, as is shown, e.g., by the infinitive in English, e.g., "to work." This might easily become an imperative, "to work!" Analogous is the use of χαίρειν and εὐχαίρειν in Letters. οὔτωσι is only found in late writers, although, from the frequency of στοιχεῖα, we may infer that it must have existed in earlier times. Literally it means "march in file". Moule well observes that στοιχεῖα more than περιστεραί (the common word) suggests the step, the detail.

Ver. 17-19. A SOLEMN WARNING AGAINST THE EARTHLY, SENSUAL MIND.

—Ver. 17. συμμαρτήτηρος. The compound is significant. Uno consensu et una mente (Calv.). This emphasis on their unity justifies the interpretation of τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ favoured above. Paul is compelled to make his own example a norm of the new life. It was not as in Judaism where the Law lay ready to hand as a fixed standard. There was, as yet, no tradition of the Christian life. —σκοπεῖται. A keen, close scrutiny. Cf. Rom. xvi. 17 (but there = "mark so as to avoid"). —οὔτωσι probably points back to πάντως. It seems more natural to give οὔτωσι its common argumentative force, "even as". —τὸν στάμπον = (1) "stamp" of a die, (2) "copy, figure," as the stamp bears a figure on.
the face of the die, (3) "mould, pattern," by transference from the effect to
the cause. Wetst. quotes Dios. Sic., Ex. (?), τὸν ἐντυπωμένον ἠκούσαντιν ἐν
τῇ ὑποβάθμῳ τιθέναι. See also Radford, Expositor, v., 6, p.
380 ff.

Ver. 18. ἡμᾶς. To whom does he refer? Plainly they were per-
sonts inside the Christian Church, although probably not at Philippi. This (against
Ws.) is borne out by the use of ἐμπνεόντων compared with ἐμπνεούσαν (ver. 17)
and σπείραν (ver. 10), by κλαίον which would have no meaning here if not
applied to professing Christians, and
further by ἐχθροφος which would be a
mere platitude if used of heathens or
Jews. Some (e.g., Schinz, Hort, Cone,
etc.) refer this passage to the same per-
sonts as he denounces at the beginning of
the chapter, the Judaising teachers. And
no doubt they might fitly be called ἐχθροφος
τοῦ σταυροῦ (cf. Gal. vi. 12-14). But the
rest of the description applies far more
aptly to professing Christians who allowed
their liberty to degenerate into licence
(Gal. vi. 13); who, from an altogether
superficial view of grace, thought lightly
of continuing in sin (Rom. vi. 1, 12-13,
15, 23); who, while bearing the name of
Christ, were concerned only with their
own self-indulgence (Rom. xvi. 18). If
there did exist at Philippian any section dis-
posed to look with favour on Judaising
tendencies, this might lead others to
exaggerate the opposite way of thinking
and to become a ready prey to Anti-
nomian reaction. Possibly passages like
the present and Rom. xvi. 18 point to the
earliest beginnings of that strange medley
of doctrines which afterwards developed
into Gnosticism. That this is the more
natural explanation seems also to follow
from the context. The Apostle has had
in view, from ver. 11 onwards, the advance
towards perfection, the point already
attained, the kind of course to be imi-
tated. It seems most fitting that he
should warn against those who pretended
to be on the straight path, but who were
really straying on devious by-ways of
their own.—οἵ τούτοις ἠκούσαν κ.τ.λ.
“Whom I often used to call,” etc. (so
also Grotius, Heinrichs, Hkm.). Cf.
Alexander, Eumen., 48, οὐκ οἷον γενάκια ἀλλὰ
Γοργάνας λέγω. Hatz. (Einl., p. 223)
remarks that in the Greek islands they
say μὴ λέγων λέγω με = "he names me". Paul speaks with a depth and
vehemence of feeling (ἐμπνεόντως . . . κλαίον) which suggest his
genuine interest in those disloyal Chris-
tians who had once seemed to receive his
message. If we imagine that the terms
he uses are too strong to apply to pro-
fessing Christians, we must remember
that he speaks in a most solemn mood
and from the highest point of view.—
τὰ ἐρευναὶ τοῦ στ. τ. Χ. If we are right in
taking λέγω = "call," "name," τοὺς
ἐχθροφοὺς will come in as the remoter accusa-
tive. Otherwise it must be regarded as
assimilated to the relative clause, as in
1 John ii. 25. The true Christian is the
man who is "crucified with Christ," who
has "crucified the flesh with its
affections and lusts". The Cross is the
central principle in his life. "If any man
will come after Me, let him deny himself
and take up his cross and follow Me." Those here described, by their unthinking
self-indulgence, run directly in the teeth
of this principle. The same thing holds
good of much that passes for Christianity
in modern life. "Who has not known
kindly, serviceable men hanging about
the Churches with a real predilection for
the suburban life of Zion . . . and yet
men whose life just seemed to omit the
Cross of Christ" (Rainy, op. cit., p. 286).
It is quite probable that Paul would feel
their conduct all the more keenly inas-
much as Judaisers might point to it as
the logical consequence of his liberal
principles.

Ver. 19. ἀνάλεια. Paul regards the
two issues of human life as σιωπής and
ἀνάλεια (1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15-16).
The latter is a common word for "destruc-
tion". There is much in the Epistles to
support the statement of Hitzig. (N.T.
Th., ii., p. 50): "To be dead and to re-
main dead eternally, that is to him (Paul)
the most dreadful of all thoughts". (Simi-
larly Kabisch, Eschatol. d. Paul., pp. 85,
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134.)—ἡ κοιλία. Most comm. compare Eupolis, Κολικαί. 4, κοιλιοθαλάμων, a "devotee of the belly". κ. is probably used as a general term to include all that belongs most essentially to the bodily, fleshly life of man and therefore inevitably perishes. Istorum ventur nitis: nostrum corpus atteritur: utrumque schema commutabitur (Beng.). Hort (Judaistic Christianity, p. 115 ff.) supposes that we have here the same development of Judaism which is attacked in Col. ii. 20-23. But this type of life was by no means confined to Jews.—ἡ 8. ἐν τ. αἰσχ.

"Who boast of what is really a disgrace to them." Wets aptly quotes Polyb., 15, 23, εφ’ οε ἀργὴν ἀλαχιστόν καὶ ἄντρεπθησθαι, ἓν τούτων ἐν καλισί συνεμονεῖν καὶ μεγαληχεῖν. Cf. Prov. xxvi. 11. ἐν τίνι ἀλεξίαν ἐκάγονα ἀμαρτίαν, καὶ στον ἀλεξίαν δόξα καὶ χάριν. (So also Sirach iv. 21.) This was apparently a current proverb. The limiting of αἰσχ. here to sensual sins is doubtful.—οὶ τ. ἄντρυ. φρον. It seems reasonable to explain the nominative as a resumption of the opening words of the sentence, summing up tersely the character in view. Cf. Mark xii. 38-40. τὸ ἄντρυ. έφερον, τῷ ἄντρῳ. έφερον, τῷ ἄντρῳ. έφερον, τῷ ἄντρῳ. έφερον. Curiously parallel is the Homeric phrase (Odysse., 21, 85), θεσπερύται ἐν ημιρία φρονίμωσιν. Vv. 20-21. Heavenly-mindedness and its prospect.—Ver. 20. τὸ πολιτεία. "Our commonwealth." (Tertull., municipatus. Cyp., Iren., conversatio.) The thought is certainly suggested by ἄντρυ. φρον. in ver. 19 (this is the force of γιν. This world has a characteristic spirit of its own. Worldliness is the common bond of citizenship in it. There is another commonwealth, not of the world (John xviii. 36), which inspires its members with a different tone of life. They "seek the things above where Christ sits at the right hand of God". Cf. 4 Esr., 8, 52: Vobis enim aperitus est paradisus . . . praeparata est habundantia, aedificata est civitas. The stability and security of the pax Romana (one of the most favourable influences for Christi-
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21. δε μετασχηματιστε το σωμα της ταπεινωσεως ημων, εις το σωμα της ανεργειας αυτοις, κατα την ενεργειαν του δυναμικου αυτον και υποταξιας εαυτου το παντα.

p Luke i. 48 (1 Sam. i. 11); Acts viii. 33 (Isa. liii. 8). q For constr. see note infra. Rom. viii. 29. Eph. iii. 7; Col. iii. 10 (only in P). Four exx. in Wisd.

1 So D & c, EKLP, Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Aug. ("an ancient supplement," Myr.). Edd. om. εις το σωμα αυτοις with ἸΑΒΔ*FG, d, e, f, g, m, vg. go. cop., many Fathers.

2 So Trg., Alf., Ws., W.H. with ABD<EKLP, etc. Ti. σωμα. with ἸΑΔ*FG.

3 So Ν≡ΕΠ, vg., Chr.,*M, Thdrt., Dam., Hil. Ti., Trg., Alf., Myr., Ws. αυτοις (W.H. αυτοις) with ἸΑΒΔ*FGKP, d, e, g, Eus., Epiph., Euth., Chr.

also Kl.), but strangely rare until the Pastoral Epistles. It corresponds to Paul's use of σωμα. — ἐνεργειας. The compound emphasises the intense yearning for the Parousia. It is no wonder that early Christian thought centred round that time. There was nothing to root their affections in the world (cf. Gal. i. 4). The dominant influence of this expectation in Paul's thinking and working is only beginning to be fully recognised. See some suggestive paragraphs in Wernle's Der Christ u.die Siinde bei Paul., pp. 122-123.— Κορ. i. X. This order is always found in the phrase.

Ver. 21. μετασχηματιστε. It is doubtful whether, in this passage, any special force can be given to μετασχηματιστε as distinguished from μετασχηματισμον, carrying out the difference between σωμα and μορφη. The doubt is borne out by its close connexion here with σωμα. Perhaps, however, the compound of σωμα has in view the fact that only the fashion or figure in which the personality is clothed will be transformed. We have here (as Gw. notes) the reverse of the process in chap. ii. 6-11. The locus classicus on the word is 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. It is found in Plato and Aristotle in its strict sense. Cf. also 4 Macc., ix., 22. It is Christ who effects the transformation in the case of His followers, because He is πνευμα λογοσυνων (1 Cor. xv. 45). Cf. Aposcal. of Bar., i. 3. "As for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law... their splendour will be glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die". — το σωμα τ. ταυτων. The expression must apply esp. to the unfitness of the present bodily nature to fulfil the claims of the spiritual life. It is pervaded by fleshly lusts; it is doomed to decay. ταυτων. is plainly suggested by δεια which follows. σωμα is "pure form which may have the most diverse content. Here, on earth, σωμα = σαρκα." (see an illuminating discussion by F. Köstlin, Jahrb. f. deutsche Th., 1877, p. 279 ff.). Holst. (Paulin. Th., p. 10) notes that for this conception of σωμα as "organised matter," the older Judaism had no word besides ταυτων. Later Hellenistic Judaism used the word σωμα in its Pauline sense (see Wisd. ix. 15).— εις το γ. a. is to be omitted with the best authorities. See crit. note supr.— μορφη is used proleptically as its position shows. Cf. 1 Thess. iii. 13, σωμαν τας καρδιας ενων ημων. Perhaps the compound of μορφη is used to remind them of the completeness of their future assimilation to Christ. Cf. Rom. viii. 29. The end of the enumeration in that passage is σωματικως. σωματικως is the climax here.— τ. σωμα τ. σωμα τας καρδιας ενων. With Paul δεια is always the outward expression of the spiritual life (πνευμα). It is, if one may so speak, the semblance of the Divine life in heaven. The Divine πνευμα will ultimately reveal itself in all who have received it as δεια. That is what the N.T. writers mean by the completed, perfected "likeness to Christ". This passage, combined with 1 Cor. xv. 35-50 and 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5, gives us the deepest insight we have into Paul's idea of the transition from the present life to the future. He only speaks in detail of that which awaits believers. Whether they die before the Parousia or survive till then, a change will take place in them. But this is not arbitrary. It is illustrated by the sowing of seed. The Divine πνευμα which they have received will work out for them a σωμα πνευματικως. Their renewed nature will be clothed with a corresponding body through the power of Christ who is Himself the source of their
spiritual life. The σῶμα σατανᾶς must perish: that is the fate of σάρξ. If there be no σάρξ, and thus no σῶμα σατανᾶς, the end is destruction. But the σῶμα σατανᾶς is precisely that in which Christ rose from the dead and in which He now lives. Its outward semblance is δόξα, a glory which shone forth upon Paul from the risen Christ on the Damascus road, which he could never forget. Hence all in whom Christ has operated as δόξα θεοτόκου will be "changed into the same likeness from glory to glory". Paul does not here reflect on the time when the transformation takes place. That is of little moment to him. The fact is his supreme consolation. On the whole discussion see esp. Hitz., N.T. Th., ii., pp. 80-81 and Heinrici on 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff.; for the future δόξα cf. Apocal. of Bar., xv. 8 (Ed. Charles).—εὐργ. ἀνέργ. ἀνέργεια is only used of superhuman power in N.T. Quia nihil mans incrtdibile, nee magis a stnsu carnis dtssentaneum quam resurrec- tiio: hoc de causa Paulus infinitum Dei potentiam nobis ponit ob oculos quae omnem dubitationem absorbat. Nam inde nascitur diffidentia quod rem ipsam metimur ingenii nostri angustis (Calvin).—τετελευταναί αὐτοῖς: "His efficiency which consists in His being able," etc. The beginnings of this use of the genitive of the infinitive without a preposition appear in classical Greek. But in N.T. it was extended like that of ἵνα. Cf., e.g., Acts xiv. 9, 2 Cor. viii. 11. See Blass, Gram., p. 220; Viteau, Le Verbe, p. 170.—ἰῶμαι. That is, according to the type which has been described in chap. iii. 17 ff.—ὐδείξε. Such a refusal to admit the rough breathing introduces language completely at variance with all Greek usage without the constraint of any direct evidence, and solely on the strength of partial analogies" (N.T., ii., Append., p. 144). On the other hand, Blass (Gram., p. 35, note 2) refuses to admit αὐτῶν. Winz, although preferring αὐτῶν, leaves the matter to the judgment of edd. Buttmann gives good reasons for usually reading αὐτῶν. (Gram., p. 111). Certainly αὐτῶν is quite common as a reflexive in Inscriptions of the Imperial age (see Meisterhans, Gram. d. Att. Inschr., § 59, 5). To sum up, it cannot be said that the aspirated form is impossible, but ordinarily it is safer to omit the aspirate. Cf. Simcox, Lang. of N.T., pp. 63-64. CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-3. COUNSELS TO INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.—Ver. 1. ὅταν. It seems better to regard this as drawing the conclusion from iii. 17-21 than to refer it to the whole of the discussion in chap. iii.—ὑπο. ὅ. Cf. the combination in 1 Thess. ii. 19, τετελευταναί αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν σώματος κακοποιομενος; the meaning is best seen from chap. ii. 16. He is thinking of the "day of Christ". His loyal Christian converts will then be his garland of victory, the clear proof that he has not run in vain. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 24-25, Sirach vi. 31. στεφάνου often means "to reward," see Darm., BS., p. 265.—ἐκεί. This direct reference to a difference of opinion between two women of prominence in the Philippian Church is probably the best comment we have on the slight dissensions which are here and there hinted at throughout the Epistle. For, as Schinz aptly puts it (op. cit., p. 37), "in such a pure Church, even slight bickerings would make a great impression". We find no trace of the cause. It may have turned on the question discussed in chap. iii.
15-16. It may have been accidental friction between two energetic Christian women. But from the whole tone of the Epistle it cannot have gone far. Six Christian bishops named Εὐδόκιος are mentioned in the *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.* The feminine name is also found in *Inscr.*—Συζύγος. The name occurs both in Greek and Latin *Inscr.*, as well as in the *Acta Sanctorum* (v., 225). Curiously enough, there is no masculine name precisely corresponding to be found except the form Σισθίκος (C.I.L., xi., no. 4703, from Narbo in Gaul. The *Inscr.* quoted by Lft. is spurious). On the correct accentuation see the elaborate note in W-Sch., p. 71. Lft. has collected valuable evidence to show the superior position occupied by women in Macedonia. See his *Philippians*, p. 56, notes 2, 3, where he quotes *Inscr.*, in some of which a metronymic takes the place of the patronymic, while others record monuments erected in honour of women by public bodies. We may add, from Heuzev., *Voyage Archiol.*, p. 423, an *Inscr.* of Larissa, where a woman’s name occurs among the winners in the horse-races (see *Introduction*). For the prominence of women generally in the Pauline Churches, cf. Rom. xvi. *passim*, i Cor. xiv. 34-35. The repetition of ἡμᾶς ἐγραφεῖν, ὑμᾶς ἐγραφεῖν, ὑμᾶς ἐγραφεῖν is common in N.T. = “beseech,” e.g., Luke xiv. 18. It is not so found in LXX, and this sense is very rare in late writers.—γυναῖκας is to be read with the great mass of authorities. We believe that W.H. are right in their marginal reading of Συζύγος as a proper name. This would harmonise with the other names mentioned. And the epithet γυναῖκα increases the probability. He requests Syzygus (lit. = “joiner together”) to help Euodia and Syn- tyche to make up their differences. “I beseech thee, who art a genuine Syzygus (in deed as well as in name) to help,” etc. (so also Myr., Kl., Weizs.). See esp. an excellent discussion by Laurent, *N.T. Studien*, pp. 134-137. The fact that this name has not been found in books, *Inscr.*, etc., is no argument against its existence. Ζύγος is found as a Jewish name (quoted by Zunz). Similar compounds such as Συμφίλον, Συμφίλονα occur. Perhaps all the above names were given to them after Baptism. Lft. and others refer συζύγος to Epaphroditus. Chr. thinks of the husband of one of the women addressed. Wieseler (Chronol., p. 458) actually refers it to Christ.—συζύγος. Paul’s friend is plainly a man of tact who can do much to bring the Christian women now at variance together again. Holst. thinks, and perhaps with some reason, that the use of συζύγος implies that Euodia and Syntyche were already trying to lay aside their differences.—ἐμακραίως. “Inasmuch as they laboured with me.” Their former services to the Gospel are a reason why they should receive every encouragement to a better state of mind. Cf. Acts xvi. 13.—μετὰ καὶ ΚΑ. An unusual position for καὶ although found in Pindar, Dionys.
Halicarn., Aelian, and, above all, in Josephus, who delights in this construction (see Schmidt, De Elocut. Jos., p. 16; Schmid, Atticismus, iii., p. 337). These words must be taken with  ἀνυπόκριτα. He wishes to remind his Christian friend at Philippi of the noble company to which the women had belonged, a company held in the highest esteem in the Philippian Church. οὔτως must have been some disciple at Philippi, unknown to Church history like the others mentioned here. It is nothing short of absurd (with Gw.) to make this Clement the celebrated bishop of Rome. See esp. Salmon, Dict. of Chr. Biog., i., p. 555. The same form in -τότε, ἔφθασε is seen in Κριστόν, Πολύτρον (a Tim. iv. 10, 21; τά ὁμ. τῇ βίβλῳ). Perhaps the phrase implies that they had passed away. The Apostle almost seems to foresee the obscurity which will hang over many a devoted fellow-labourer of his. But their names have a glory greater than that of historical renown. They are in the μέσα τῶν αἰώνων. The idea is common in O.T. Cf. Exod. xxxv. 32, Ps. lix. 29, Dan. xii. 1. See also Apocal. of Bar., xxiv., 1; Hemonch, xvi., 3; 4 Ezra xiv., 35; and, in N.T., Rev. iii. 5. Good discussions of the subject will be found in Weber, Lehren d. Talmud, pp. 233, 276; Schürer, ii., 2, p. 182.

Vv. 4-9. General exhortations on THE RIGHT SPIRIT AND THE RIGHT CONDUCT of life.—Ver. 4.  ἕξεσθε ἐν καρδίᾳ πάντως πάλιν ἐρωτεύεσθε. The idea is common in O.T. Cf. Exod. xxiii. 32, Ps. lix. 29, Dan. xii. 1. See also Apocal. of Bar., xxiv., 1; Hemonch, xvi., 3; 4 Ezra xiv., 35; and, in N.T., Rev. iii. 5. Good discussions of the subject will be found in Weber, Lehren d. Talmud, pp. 233, 276; Schürer, ii., 2, p. 182.

Ver. 5. π. ἐλαχιστά. "Reasonableness." Matthew Arnold finds in this a pre-eminent feature in the character of Jesus and designates it "sweet reasonableness" (see Literature and Dogma, pp. 66, 138). The trait could not be more vividly delineated than in the words of W. Pater (Marius the Epicurean, ii., p. 120), describing the spirit of the new Christian society as it appeared in a pagan. "As if by way of a due recognition of some immeasurable Divine condescension manifest in a certain historic fact, its influence was felt more especially at those points which demanded some sacrifice of one's self, for the weak, for the aged, for little children, and even for the dead. And then, for its constant outward token, its significant manner or index, it issued in a certain dehonain grace, and a certain mystic attractiveness, a courtesy, which made Marius doubt whether that famed Greek blitheness or gaiety or grace in the handling of life had been, after all, an unrivalled success." A definition is given by Aristotle, Eth. Nic., 5, 10, 3, τὸ ἐπίκεφαλεῖς καθισμὸν μὲν ἡκτόν, οὔτω τὸ κατὰ νόμον ἢ, ἀλλ' ἔκπαθράμπως νομίμου μικάλον, where the point is that it means a yielding up of certain real rights. This spirit, in the Christian life, is due to those higher claims of love which Christ has set in the forefront. Cf. 2 Cor. x. 1, Tit. iii. 2. Their joy (ver. 4) really depends on this "reasonableness" having as wide a scope as possible. It is he who shows forbearance and graciousness all round (γερομακαρία, ἀληθινὰ ἀληθῆ) who can preserve an undisturbed heart. In Ps. Sol. v. 14 God is called χρυσότερον εἰς ἐπίκεφαλεῖς—ἕτε ἐννήμων. Quite evidently Paul expects a speedy return of Christ. It was natural in the beginning of the Church's history, before men had a large enough perspective in which to discern the tardy processes of the Kingdom of God. Cf. chap. iii. 21. This solemn fact which governs the whole of Paul's thinking, and has especially moulded his ethical teaching, readily suggests "reasonableness." The Lord, the Judge, is at the door. Leave all wrath and retaliation (cf. Rom. xii. 19 f.). But further, in view of such a prospect, earthly bickerings and wranglings are utterly trivial. Cf. 1 John ii. 28, "Abide in Him, so that if He be manifested, we may have boldness and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." A close parallel is Jas. v. 8.

Ver. 6. μ. μέρι. "In nothing be anxious." μέρι is not common in earlier prose. It is used repeatedly in LXX of anxiety (a) approaching dread as Ps. xxvii. 19, (b) producing displeasure as Ezek. xvi. 42, (c) of a general kind as 1 Chron. xvii. 9. For the thought cf. 4 Ezra ii. 27: Νολί satagere, cum venerit enim dies pressuræ et angustiae... in autem hilaris et copiosa crisi. See the
note on chap. ii. 20 supr.—προσευχής κ. τ. δεήσεως. προσευχής emphasizes prayer as an act of worship or devotion; δεήσεως is the cry of personal need. See on chap. i. 4 supr. Curare et orare plus inter se paganum quam aqua et ignis (Beng.).—

μητροπετα. The word is rarely found in secular Greek (e.g., Hippocr., Polyb., Diod.; see Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 69), or LXX. Paul uses it twelve times, but only twice with the article. Does not this imply that he takes for granted that thanksgiving is the background, the predominant tone of the Christian life? To pray in any other spirit is to clip the wings of prayer.—

πρόσευχης is found three times in N. T. It emphasizes the object asked for (see an important discussion by Ezra Abbot in N. Amer. Review, 1872, p. 171 ff.).

"Prayer is a wish referred to God, and the possibility of such reference, save in matters of mere indifference, is the test of the purity of the wish" (Green, Two Sermons, p. 44).—προς τ. Θεόν. "In the presence of God." A delicate and suggestive way of hinting that God's presence is always there, that it is the atmosphere surrounding them. Anxious foreboding is out of place in a Father's presence. Requests are always in place with Him. With this phrase cf. Rom. xvi. 26.

Ver. 7. Hpt. would put no stop at the close of ver. 6. Whether there be a stop or not, this verse is manifestly a kind of apodosis to the preceding. "If you make your requests, etc., . . . then the peace . . . shall guard," etc. — η εἰρ. τ. Θ. Paul's favourite thought of that health and harmonious relation which prevail in the inner life as the result of reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ. Cf. Matt. xi. 28. It would be an undue restriction of his thought to imagine that he only refers to agreement between members of the Church, although, no doubt, that idea is here included. "This peace is like some magic mirror, by the dimness growing on which we may discern the breath of an unclean spirit that would work us ill" (Rendel Harris, Memoranda Sacra, p. 130; the quotation skilfully catches the spiritual conception before Paul's mind). To share anxiety with God is to destroy its corroding power and to be calmed by His peace. Peace is used as a name of God in the Talmud (see Taylor, Jewish Fathers, pp. 25-26).—η ὑπερβάλλουσα τῆς γνώσεως ἄνευ τοῦ Χ. Space forbids the enumeration of the many interpretations given. Wordsworth (Prelude, Bk. 14) defines this peace as "repose in moral judgments".—προσευχής . . . καρδίας . . . νοηματα. νους, very much what we call "reason," in Paul's view, belongs to the life of the ψυχή. It is the highest power in that life, and affords, as it were, the material on which the Divine ψυχή can work. It remains in those who possess the ψυχή as that part of the inner man which is exposed to earthly influences and relations. (See an admirable note in Ws.) καρδία is "a more undefined concept, side by side with νους" (so Lüdemann, Anthropol., p. 16 Lt.). It has to do not merely with feelings but with will. νοηματα are products of the νος, thoughts or purposes. Paul would probably regard them as being contained in the καρδία. The word is found five times in 2 Cor. and nowhere else in N. T.—φρονοῦσα. A close parallel is 1 Peter i. 5, τοὺς ἐν νομίμῳ Θεῷ φρονοῦμεν διὰ νοεῖν αὐτὸν καθως νόμον. Hicks (Class. Review, i., pp. 7-8) presses the figure of a garrison keeping ward over a town, and observes that one of the most important elements in the history of the Hellenistic period was the garrisoning of the cities both in Greece and Asia Minor by the successors of Alexander the Great.
Cf. Gal. iii. 23. The peace of God is the garrison of the soul in all the experiences of its life, defending it from the external assaults of temptation or anxiety, and disciplining all lawless desires and imaginations within, that war against its higher purposes.—Christ Jesus is the sure refuge and the atmosphere of security.

Ver. 8. The thought of this paragraph (vv. 8-9) is closely connected with that of the preceding by the resumption of the phrase άρετήν (ver. 7) in a new form (ver. 9). The peace of God will be the guardian of their thoughts and imaginations, only they must do their part in bending their minds to worthy objects. Lft. and Ws. have elaborate classifications of Paul's list of moral excellences. It is not probable, in the circumstances, that any such was before the Apostle's mind. — to Xoirdv is probably used to show that he is hastening to a close. See on chap. iii. 1 svpr. Beyschl. well remarks on the "inexhaustibility" of the Christian moral ideal which is here presented. It embraces practically all that was of value in ancient ethics.—aXijSjj and Σαίκαι express the very foundations of moral life. If truth and righteousness are lacking, there is nothing to hold moral qualities together. — ο-επφα. "Reverend." The due appreciation of such things produces what M. Arnold would call "a noble seriousness" (so also Vinc.). — πρωτοφαλή. Our "lovely" in its original force gives the exact meaning, "those things whose grace attracts." The idea seems to be esp. applied to personal bearing towards others. See Sirach iv. 7, πρωτοφαλή συνεργαζών σεαυτόν του; xx. 13, δ συνεργάζον τόν λόγον πρωτοφαλή συνεργαζόν. Cf. W. Pater's description of the Church in the second century: "She had set up for herself the ideal of spiritual development under the guidance of an instinct by which, in those serious moments, she was absolutely true to the peaceful soul of her Founder. 'Goodwill to men,' she said, 'in whom God Himself is well-pleased.' For a little while at least there was no forced opposition between the soul and the body, the world and the spirit, and the grace of graciousness itself was pre-eminently with the people of Christ." (Marius, ii., p. 132).—αιώνια. Exactly = our "high-toned". (So also Ell.) "Was einen guten Klang hat" (Lips.). It is an extremely rare word.—έπος, άρετήν, κ.τ.λ. "Whatever excellence there be or fit object of praise." The suggestion of Lft., "Whatever value may exist in (heathen) virtue," etc., goes slightly beyond the natural sense, from the reader's point of view. Cf. Sayings of Few. Fathers, chap. ii., 1, "Rabbi said, which is the right course that a man should choose for himself? Whatever excellency is in the earth, let him pursue it, and do it. Whatever excellency is in the heaven, let him copy it. Whatever excellency is in the man himself, let him also copy it" (Lips.).—ι. έμπρός, as Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 7) points out, corresponds exactly to άρετήν and implies it, including in itself the idea of moral approbation. He observes that it refers chiefly to "the inward disposition and sense and feeling of the inward life of the soul which is embraced in the whole valuable note.—κ. έσχάρα. "Make them the subject of careful reflection." Meditatio . . . praecedit: deinde sequitur opus (Calv.).

Ver. 9. It is hardly possible, with Ell., to refer to κ. τ.λ. immediately to the preceding, without forcing the construction.—εμπρός, άρετήν, plainly refer to the definite Christian teaching he had set himself to give them. παρελαμβάνειν is used regularly of "receiving" truth from a teacher.—έν καί, as Ell. in ἕν. This is the impression made upon them by his Christian character, apart from any conscious effort on his part. Cf. chap. iii. 17—έμπρός, κ. τ.λ. See on ver. 8 (ad init.). It is quite possible that he has partly in view the disregard of these ethical qualities as threatening the harmony of the Church, and as, so far, to blame for the divisions already existing...
Vv. 10-14. Delicate expression of thanks for their gift.—Ver. 10. "Vv. 10-14. Delicate expression of thanks for their gift.—Ver. 10. If marks the turning of Paul's thoughts to a different subject, or, as Lft. admirably expresses it, "arrests a subject which is in danger of escaping". He has not, up till now, expressly thanked them for their generous gift which was, in all likelihood, the occasion of this letter. The very fact of his accepting a present from them showed his confidence in their affection. This was indeed his right, but he seldom laid claim to it. No doubt the delicacy of his language here is due (so also Hilgenfeld, Z Wet., xx., 2, pp. 183-184) to the base slanders uttered against him at Corinth and in Macedonia (1 Thess. ii. 5), as making the Gospel a means of livelihood (see 1 Cor. ix. 3-18, 2 Cor. xi. 8-9, Gal. vi. 6, and Schurer, ii., 1, pp. 318-319).—ταῦτα ἄλλα. An expressive combination = "already once more" (precisely = schon wieder einmal, which has a force corresponding to that of the Greek, which cannot be reproduced in English, that of the unexpected nature of the gift. So Ws.).—ἀνέβαλεν. The verb is very rare in secular Greek, while occurring nine times in LXX. This older aorist form takes the place of the more regular one five times in LXX. It is only found in the Bible. (See W-Sch., p. 60; Lobeck, Paralipomena, p. 557.) The verb is used both transitively and intransitively. Here it is probably transitive, as in Ezek. xxvii. 24 and three other places in LXX (so De W., Ws., Lft., Holst., Lips., etc.). In that case τά ὅπλα ἄλλα φέρεται is the accusative governed by it. "You let your care for me blossom into activity again." Myr. thinks it inconsistent with the delicacy of Paul's tone in this passage to take it as transitive. But Paul expressly guards against hurting their feelings by correcting, as it were, his statement by the next clause in which he asserts, "You did truly care". This construction seems much more natural than to take τά φέρεται, etc., as an accusative of the inner object (so Myr., Gw., Hpt., Eadie). Moule, probably with justice, remarks that "the phrase is touched with a smile of gentle pleasantry" (Philippian Studies, p. 245).—ἀπεκοινώσει. The most various interpretations have been given. Some refer it to the whole phrase preceding. Some make ἀνέβαλεν the antecedent. Ell. renders, "with a view to which" (probably "my interests"; so also Gw., Beet); Lft. "in which" (taking it generally); Hfm. = ὅτι τούτων ἀπεκοινώσει. The simplest explanation is to regard ἂναστάσεις as antecedent (so also Calv., Vaughan). "About whom (lit. = in whose case) you certainly did care, were anxious, but you had no opportunity of showing your care in a practical fashion." ὅτι as contrasted with ἄλλα preceding would express a more indefinite relation to Paul. They were always, as he well knew, thoroughly interested in him. The definite relation is connected with the actual bestowing of the gift.—ἀμαρτίως. Lidd. and Scott quote one instance of the simple verb ἀμαρτίως. It is not certain whether he refers here to lack of means or the want of opportunity to send a gift. The imperfects show the habitual state of their feelings towards Paul.—Ver. 11. The form of v. 11-13, from εἰς ὄντα, is strophic. ἣν . . . εἴπατε gives the "theme". Ver. 13 marks the close. The thought is worked out between. See J. Weiss, Beit., p. 29.—οἱ ὅτι. See on chap. iii. 12. —οἷς ἄρα ἀντίτροπον. "As regards want." κατά has the same sense as in the phrase τά κατά οἷς.—ἐγὼ emphasizes his own position in a tone of calm independence of circumstances.—ἐν οἷς εἰπα. Taken by itself, the phrase might well mean, "in my present circumstances". But in view of the following verses it seems better to make it general = "in the circumstances in which I am placed at any moment". For exx. of the phrase see Kypke and Wetst. Ad loc.—ἐμοὶ must be translated into English as a perfect, "I have learned". But the Greek has a true aorist force: it sums up his experiences to the moment of writing and regards them as a whole.—ἀντίκρυς is admirably illustrated by Plat., Repub., 599 B, όπε ἀντίκρυς, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς ἑνδείκτα. "Dr. Johnson talked with approbation of one who had attained to the
state of the philosophical wise man, that is, to have no want of anything. 'Then, sir,' said I, 'the savage is a wise man.' 'Sir,' said he, 'I do not mean simply being without,—but not having a want.' (Boswell's Johnson, p. 351, Globe ed.).

Ver. 12. οἰδὰ κ.τ.λ. καὶ must be read with all good authorities. The one οἰδὰ must be correlative to the other, unless he intended to continue the sentence without the second οἰδὰ (see an excellent note on οἰδὰ in N.T. in Ell. ad loc. He defines somewhat too minutely). Examples of the infinitive after οἰδὰ are to be found in classical Greek.—ταῦτα. The best comment on this is 2 Cor. xi. 7. ταῦτα παντῶν ένα μαλακά ξύλον. There it means, "keeping myself low" (in respect of the needs of daily life). Moule aptly quotes Diod., i. 36 (speaking of the Nile), καὶ τόμον . . . ταυτάκεια = "runs low".—ἐν παρθ. κ. εν "A vague general phrase = "in all circumstances of life". It has no immediate connexion with μακάμα (cf. a similar expression ταυτά in Xen., Hell., 7, 5, 12, and τοῖς παρθ. κ. παρθ. in Thucyd., Soph., etc.).—μακάμα. The verb was originally used of one initiated into the Mysteries. It came (like our own "initiated") to lose its technical sense. But the word probably implies a difficult process to be gone through. Cf. Ps. xxv. 14: "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant" (Vaughan), and Wind. viii. 4, μάθης γερ σοὶ τοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ τον κόσμον. In later ecclesiastical usage δομικός = a baptised Christian (an instructive hint as to the growth of dogma).
μοῦ τῇ θλίψῃ. 15. οὖσαν δὲ καὶ ὑμῖν, Φιλιππήσιοι, διὰ τὸ ἄφθαρσιν τοῦ ἐναγγελίου, διὰ τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, ὁδηγεῖς, μοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐκοιμήσαντές εἰς ἱλαστήριον δόγμης καὶ λήψεως. 16. διὰ καὶ ἐν θεσσαλονίκη καὶ ἐκ τῆς εἰς τὴν μαρτύριον μοῦ ἐπέμειναν. 17. οὖχ ἃ οὖσαν τῳ δόμα, ἀλλ' ἐπιληφθὲν τῷ Σ. Ν. 

1. τ. ἑλ. μ. DEFG, O.L. vg.
2. ὁμ. ὁμ. Dig. Est. 37, 115 al., syr. arm. aesth., Chr., Thdrt.
3. ὁτι inserted before οὐδ. by D*E*F*G, d, c, g.
4. So BcDEKL. Edd. ληψ. with Ν*ΑΒ*D*FG.
5. ὁμ. οἰς AD*(E*) 39, 73, go. arm. aesth., Victorin. Lach. and Lft. bracket.

In classical usage (almost confined to Demosth.) this verb has the genitive of the thing in which a share is given. They had made common cause with his affliction (probably referring to his imprisonment). The bringing forward of μοῦ emphasises their personal relation to the Apostle, which was apt to be obscured by the form of expression used.

Vv. 15-19. Their earlier and later generosity and its Divine reward.—Ver. 15. δὲ marks the transition to his first experience of their generosity. “But this is no new thing, for you have always been generous. You know this as well as I do” (καὶ ὑμῖν).—Φιλιππήσιοι. (A Latin form, see Ramsay, Journal of Theol. Studies, 11, 1, p. 116.) He singles them out from all the other Churches.—ἐν ἀριθ. τ. ἐλαφ. It is difficult to see (in spite of Haupt’s objections) how this could mean anything else than “at the time when the Gospel was first preached to you”. That had been about ten years previously. Cf. 2 Clem. 47, ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταῦτα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ ἐν ἀριθ. τ. ἐλαφ. probably this is the gift referred to in 2 Cor. xi. 9 (cf. Acts xviii. 5). He refused to take any pecuniary aid at Corinth lest the Judaising teachers should make it a ground for false charges.—πρὸς . . . ἐκκλησίαν. This use (in N.T.) is apparently confined to the Epistles. A precise parallel (κοιν. with dative and εἰς) is found in Plat., Repub., v., 453 a.—ἐλαφ. λαγ. 8. κ. λ. Lit. = “No Church communicated with me so as to have an account of giving and receiving” (debit and credit). The whole of the context has a colouring of financial terms. Probably Paul uses them in a half-humorous manner. The combination of θ. and λ. is frequent. Cf. Sirach xii. 7, δόσει καὶ λήψῃ παρ' ὑμῖν γραφή, and in Latin authors, Cic., Lael., 16, ratio acceptorum et datorum. Numerous exx. are given by Weist. Paul had bestowed on them priceless spiritual gifts. It was only squaring the account that he should receive material blessings from them. Their mutual relations are expressed by the Apostle very delicately, as throughout this paragraph. His manner here gives a luminous view of his refined sensibility.

Ver. 16. δὲ κ. τ. λ. We are greatly inclined to take δὲ here, as in ver. 15, as dependent on οὖσαν. “Ye know . . . that at the beginning . . . that even in Thessalonica,” etc. Thessalonica was a city of far greater wealth and importance than Philippi, καί might, however, emphasise the fact that they began at once to support him.—ἀπεικόσια κ. θ. It is probably to be taken literally. Cf. Deut. ix. 13, λειλήψις πρὸς σοὶ ἔστω καὶ δίκη; 1 Macc. iii. 30, εἰλαβήθη μὴ σοὶ ἔστω δίκη καὶ δίκη. It is interpreted in a more general sense by Lft. and Wohl.—ἐλαφ. λαγ. εἰς should be read with most of the best authorities. It is probably used here in a semi-technical meaning often found in Papyri (see Dsm., BS., pp. 113-115; NBS., p. 23) and also in Paul, e.g., 1 Cor. xvi. 1, τὴν λαγάσα τῆς εἰς τούτος ἐλαφ. Rom. xv. 26, κοινωνίας τῷ ποιήσωσαι εἰς τούτος πτώσεως. It describes the object of gifts, collections, etc., or the various items in an account which have to be met. This interpretation accords with the financial colouring of the passage.

Ver. 17. τῷ δόμα. It is not the actual gift put into Paul’s hands which has
brought him joy, but the giving (δόνα, ver. 15) and the meaning of that giving. It is the truest index to the abiding reality of his work.—καρπὸν...πλούσιον...λόγον. We believe that Chr. is right in regarding these terms as belonging to the money-market. καρπον ἰδειτεν πλεόνεστα (Chr.). “Interest accumulating to your credit.” This is favoured by the language of vv. 15-16 supr. πλούωνεω is never used in a good sense in classical Greek, but always = “exceed,” “go beyond bounds.”

Ver. 18. ἄντέχω. The use of this word adds much force to the thought, when we bear in mind that it was the regular expression in the Papyri to denote the receipt of what was due, e.g., Faiyum Pap., Sept. 6, a.d. 57: ἄντέχω τῷ δόρῳ τοῦ θαλανθῶντος ἐν ἑτέρῳ μετὰ καὶ μισθώσεως. (Dem., NBS, p. 56.) Chr. evidently knew this sense, for he says, “ἰδεῖν δι' ὑπάρχη ἵνα τῷ πρᾶγμα τούτῳ γὰρ δότιν, ἄντέχω”. Thus the prevailing tone of the whole context is maintained. The word is almost = “I give you a receipt for what you owed me”. The genial strain of humour is in no discord with his more serious thoughts.—περασσέων. Cf. Sayings of Few. Fathers, p. 64: “Who is rich? He that is contented with his lot.”—περασάρη. Classical Greek would hardly use the word in this personal sense. The closing words of the verse have underlying them the idea of sacrifice. A gift to an Apostle or spiritual teacher seems to have been regarded in the Early Church, like the gifts brought in the Eucharist, as an offering to God. The recipient is looked upon as the representative of God (see Sohm, Kirchenrecht, pp. 74 ff., 81 n.).—δόμη, εὐδόμη. “A scent of sweet savour.”—ὑπάρχων βαστι. “A technical term according to Sirach xxxii. 9” (Hpt.).—ἐπλασθωσαν. Cf. Rom. xii. 1 ff., which bears closely upon the whole passage.

Ver. 19. ὅ δὲ θεὸς κ.τ.λ. God’s treatment of them corresponds to their treatment of Paul. They had ministered to his χρησι, so that he could say περασσέων. That was the side of the reckoning which stood to their credit. Here is the other side. “My God shall repay what has been done to me His servant for the Gospel’s sake. He, in turn, shall satisfy to the full (πλούσιον) every need of yours.”—τῷ πλοῦσι must be read. See crit. note supr. So also in 2 Cor. viii.2, Eph. ii.7, iii.8, 16, Col. i.27, ii.2. But ὁ πλοῦσι in Eph. i.18, and repeatedly both in nominative, genitive and accusative singular. Modern Greek uses πλοῦσι, βλοε, ὅρην sometimes with ὅ, sometimes with τῇ. LXX generally has ὅ = ἐν δόξῃ. The phrase is regarded by some (e.g., Beng., Ws., Eadie, etc.) as = “in a lavish, magnificent way”. This is to strain the sense. It is much more natural, comparing Rom. viii.21, Eph. i.18 (τῷ ὁ πλοῦσι τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας), to think of it as the future Messianic glory which Paul believed to be so near (so Lfd., Kl., etc.).

Ver. 20. Doxology. Doxologia fluent ex gaudio totius epistolae (Beng.). On the phrase τοῦ ἀλώνα τ. ἀλώνων see the excellent note in Grimm-Thayer ad loc.

Vv. 21-23. Greetings and benediction.—Ver. 21. Perhaps this last para-
21. *'Ασπάσωθεν πάντα δίκαιον εν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ἀσπάζονται τοι Ῥωμ. xvi. ὑμᾶς ό σὺν ὑμᾶς ἀδέλφοι· 22. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες ό δίκαιον, Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦ μέτα πάντων μετὰ πάντων. μέτα πάντων. μέτα πάντων.

Πρός Φιλιππησίους ἡγήσασθαι ἄνγλα ἀπὸ Ῥώμης δι᾽ Ἐπαφροδίτου.

1 E ato.

8 So Dkh-Ex-P, kscr., f, r, syrach, et p. cop. ath., Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Ambrost. Edd. om. ἡμᾶς with ΝΑΒΦΕ-GKL, d, e, g, arm., Euth.cot.

2 So also Myr. with ΝΕΚΛ, syr., Chr., Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. μετὰ τοῦ συνεργοῦ with ΝΕΦΑΕΔΓΦ 6, 17, 32, 47, d, e, f, g, r, v, g, cop. arm. ath., Euth.cot., Victorin., Ambrost.

4 So ΝΑΔΕΚΛΠ et al., d, e, r, vg. cop. syr. arm. ath., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrost. Ti., Ws., W.H. om. ἡμᾶς with ΒΦΓ 47, f, g, sah., Chr., Euth.cot., Vict.

5 So KL, syr., Thdrt., etc. Edd. ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπίας with ΝΑΒ 17, 135. The latter form is plainly the more ancient, the other being an expansion based on the contents of the Epistle.

The graph may have been written by the Apostle's own hand (so Von Soden and Laurent, cp. cit., p. 9). Cf. Gal. vi. xi. — ἐν Χ. Ι. These words are to be taken in close connexion with ἀσπάσωθεν. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19, ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ. — ἀδέλφοι. Perhaps these were Roman Christians who aided Paul in his labours (see M'Giffert, Ap. Agr., p. 397). At least they would be included.

Ver. 22. μέλισσα. If by this time, as is probable (see Introduction), Paul had been removed from his lodging to one of the state prisons near the palace, it is plain that Christians of the Imperial household would have special opportunities of close intercourse with him. — οἱ ἐν τῷ Κ. οἰκίας. See esp. SH., Romans, pp. 418-433, as supplementary to Lightfoot's important discussion; and also, Riggenbach, Neue Jahrb.f. deutsche Th., 1892, pp. 498-525, Mommsen, Handbuch d. röm. Alterth., ii., 2 (ed. 3), pp. 833-835. SH. point out that a number of the names mentioned for salutation in Rom. xvi. occur in the Corpus of Latin Inscriptions as members of the Imperial household, which seems to have been one of the chief centres of the Christian community at Rome. In the first century A.D. most of the Emperor's household servants came from the East. Under Claudius and Nero they were people of real importance. And we find, from history, that Christian slaves had great influence over their masters. See Friedländer, Sittengeschichte Roms, i., pp. 70 ff., 74, 110-112.

Ver. 23. Probably μετὰ τοῦ συνεργοῦ ought to be read with all the chief authorities instead of πάντων. Myr., however, supposes that these words have been inserted from Gal. vi. 18, to which he would also attribute ὑμῶν σὺν., which is probably spurious.
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

COLOSSIANS
INTRODUCTION.

SECTION I.—COLOSSÆ, LAODICEA, HIERAPOLIS.

COLOSSÆ was a city of Phrygia, situated on the southern bank of the Lycus, a tributary of the Maeander. The river passes here through a narrow gorge, by sheer and rocky sides. Its water is nauseous, and impregnated to a most unusual degree with carbonate of lime, which has formed very remarkable incrustations along its course. Rising steep from the glen in which the city lay was Mount Cadmos, towering to a height of 7,000 feet. The district is volcanic and subject to earthquakes, and a very disastrous one destroyed Laodicea, and probably Colossæ and Hierapolis, in the reign of Nero. The soil was very fertile; and its pastures reared a noted breed of sheep. Both Colossæ and Laodicea were very famous for their woollen manufactures. The former town was at one time of great importance, and is mentioned as such by Herodotus (vii., 30) and Xenophon (Anab., i., 2, 6). But the foundation of Laodicea, probably in the reign of Antiochus II. (261-246 B.C.), gave the death-blow to its supremacy. This city was only eleven miles distant, lying also on the south of the Lycus, but in a position far better fitted to secure commercial success. It was one of the richest cities in the province of Asia, and recovered from its destruction by the earthquake without receiving help from imperial funds. The third town mentioned in this Epistle, Hierapolis, lay to the north of the Lycus, six miles from Laodicea, opposite to which it stood, and thirteen from Colossæ. Its name indicates its character as a sacred city, and it "was the centre of native feeling and Phrygian nationality in the valley" (Ramsay). While it was influenced, especially as to its form, by Greece, "the religion continued to be Lydo-Phrygian". The population of Colossæ was probably for the most part Phrygian, with Greek admixture. In Laodicea the Jews were fairly numerous, though less so than at Apameia, and in this respect Colossæ probably resembled it. The Talmud says that the wines and baths of Phrygia had separated
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the Ten Tribes from Israel; and we have evidence that the Phrygian Jews compromised with heathenism to an extent possible only to those who held their ancestral faith most loosely. They probably accepted Christianity readily, and thus lost their racial identity.

We have no information as to the introduction of Christianity into these cities, in all of which Churches had been planted. They had not been founded by Paul, though some of their members were known to him. They seem to have owed their origin to Epaphras, who was probably one of Paul's converts, and since the Apostle gives emphatic approval to his teaching, they had been instructed in the Pauline type of doctrine. Apparently they consisted for the most part of Gentiles (this is suggested, though not proved, by i. 21, 27, ii. 13, iii. 7). We may conjecture from iv. 10 that Paul had written an earlier letter to them, to which they had sent a reply by Epaphras. Recently they had been assailed by a form of false teaching, and while they remained, so far, loyal to the doctrine they had been taught (i. 4, ii. 5), the danger was sufficiently serious to call forth this letter, which had perhaps been preceded by a letter addressed to Laodicea. It was sent by Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, whom Paul was sending back to his master, with a letter asking forgiveness for the culprit.

SECTION II.—ANGELOLOGY.

Since this subject has an important relation to the false teaching in the Colossian Church, to the authenticity of the Epistle and the exegesis of several passages, it is necessary to treat it in some detail so far as this is relevant here, and more convenient to devote a special section to it. The doctrine of angels has considerable prominence in the Old Testament, but received great development in later Judaism, both among the Rabbis and in the apocalyptic literature. The influence of these ideas on the New Testament writers is very marked. In this connexion the points to be specially noticed are the relation of the angels to nature and men, their ethical character, their ranks and their association with the Law.

In the O.T. the connexion of the angels with the forces of nature is not made prominent. The cherubim, it is true, appear in close connexion with natural phenomena, and probably were originally identical with the thunder-cloud. But we have no warrant for regarding them as angels. In Ps. civ. 4 God's messengers and ministers are said to be made of wind and fire. In later literature this
thought receives great extension. According to the older Jewish representation their work in nature was limited to extraordinary cases; but later this was not so, and the whole world was thought to be full of spirits and demons. In the Book of Jubilees the angels are brought into close relation with the elements. The author mentions angels of fire, wind, tempest, darkness, hail, hoar-frost, valleys, thunder, lightning, cold, heat, the seasons, dawn and evening, and all spirits of His works in heaven and earth. Similarly in Enoch ix. we read of spirits of sea, hoar-frost, hail, snow, mist, dew and rain. Again in the Slavonic Enoch xix. 4 we have “the angels who are over seasons and years, and the angels who are over rivers and the sea, and those who are over the fruits of the earth, and the angels over every herb, giving all kind of nourishment to every living thing.” In the N.T. this conception is also found, especially in the Apocalypse. Thus we read of an angel “that hath power over fire” (xiv. 18) and an “angel of the waters” (xvi. 5), cf. also vii. 1, viii. 5, 7-12. The interpolation in John v. 4 presents us with the same idea in the angel that troubled the waters. In Heb. i. 7 the language of Ps. civ. 4 is reversed, and God is said to make His angels winds and His ministers a flame of fire. A similar belief in the evanescent personality of the angels is expressed in the Rabbinical statements of the daily creation of angels, and their transformation now into this, now into that. While these thoughts are all but unknown to the O.T., it frequently connects the sons of God with the stars. In the Song of Deborah the stars fight against Sisera (Jud. v. 20); in Job xxxviii. 7 the morning stars are identified with the sons of God. In Neh. ix. 6 the host of heaven is actually said to worship God, and by this personal beings must be meant (cf. Is. xxiv. 21 with ver. 23). In Enoch we read of “a prison for the stars of heaven and the host of heaven” (xviii. 14), and of “the stars which have transgressed the commandment of God, and are bound here till ten thousand ages, the number of the days of their guilt, are consummated” (xxi. 6). A similar association is found in Rev. ix. 1 (cf. ver. 11). A closely related function of the angels is that of ruling and representing the nations. This is first found in Deut. iv. 19, xxxii. 8, LXX (cf. xxix. 26). According to these passages the nations are allotted to the host of heaven or the sons of God, while Yahweh chooses Israel for Himself (cf. Sirach xvii. 17). This undergoes a development in Daniel. In Deuteronomy the nations have their angels, while Israel has Yahweh. In Daniel Israel also has its own angel, Michael. In Is. xxiv. 21-23 we find the same thought, the host of the high ones on high being connected with the kings of the earth. In Rabbinical literature we have a
similar idea; the angels of the nations have a relation of solidarity with their peoples, and God punishes them before He punishes the nations themselves (Weber, System der pal. Theol., 1880, p. 165). In the N.T. the angels of the seven churches in the Apocalypse are to be interpreted in a similar way.

From the functions which the angels exercise it might be expected that ethical distinctions would not be made prominent. In the older Biblical literature there is no reference to evil spirits, in the modern sense of the term. The angels are instruments to effect Yahweh's will. They are good or evil not in virtue of intrinsic character, but of the mission on which they may be sent. The "angels of evil" who bring the plagues on Egypt (Ps. lxviii. 49), the "destroyer" who smites the first born (Ex. xii. 23), the evil spirit that troubles Saul, the angel that slays the Israelites (2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17), or Sennacherib's army with the pestilence, the lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets, the cynical Satan who smites Job in property, family and person to prove that he does not serve God for nought, all alike belong to the heavenly host and are God's servants, who live to do His will. They are evil so far as their mission is to inflict evil. Our distinction between good and evil angels is unknown; moral features, if present, are rudimentary. When they are called the "holy ones" no ethical reference is intended, but simply their consecration to the service of God. Immoral actions are attributed to them. Thus the sons of God have children by the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 1-4), and the host of the high ones on high have to be visited with punishment for the wrongs done by the kingdoms under their charge (Isa. xxiv. 21). In Ps. lxxvii. the Elohim are rebuked by God in the heavenly assembly for their unrighteous rule, and this is so also in Ps. lviii. In Job we have similar thoughts. Twice Eliphaz insists on the imperfection of the angels, once in his wonderful description of the spirit who said to him, "Behold He putteth no trust in His servants, and His angels He chargeth with folly" (iv. 18); and again, speaking for himself, "Behold He putteth no trust in His holy ones; yea the heavens are not clean in His sight" (xv. 15). (Similarly Job himself, xxi. 22, though Duhrm corrects the text.) Bildad also says that God "maketh peace in His high places," and that "the stars are not pure in His sight" (xxv. 2, 5). In later Jewish theology, when the distinction of angels and demons has become explicit, the angels are frequently represented as far from perfect. The proof of this may be seen in Weber. The following points may be selected for mention. The angels envied Israel the Law; "the angels of ministry coveted it, and it was concealed from them". On Sinai God gave Moses the
face of Abraham, the entertainer of angels, that the angels might do him no harm. They raise objections to God's decrees, and not in vain; they even prevent His wishes from being carried into execution. Gabriel was disobedient, and was punished on that account; but Dubbiel, who was set in his place, showed himself hostile to Israel, and was therefore replaced by Gabriel. Judgments are inflicted on the angel princes. Their sinlessness is only relative; sin is wanting only in so far as it is rooted in sensuality. A similar view is found in Enoch: the stars are punished for disobedience, and the "watchers" for their union with the daughters of men. It is also clear that where angels are thought of as elemental spirits the question of their morality can hardly arise. In the Apocalypse the angels of the Churches are praised or blamed for the spiritual condition of these Churches, which shows once more how unjustifiable is the sharp division of angels into the two classes of perfectly sinless and irretrievably evil. Angels are mentioned which are not evil spirits, and yet are not wholly good.

In the O.T. not much is said which would lead us to infer any gradation of rank among angels, though in Daniel an elementary system of division is present. In Rabbinical theology we have a developed hierarchy, in which ten orders are enumerated (Weber, p. 153). In Enoch we read: "And He will call on all the host of the heavens and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim and Ophanim, and all the angels of powers and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and the other powers on the earth, over the water, on that day" (lxii.10). Similarly we read in the Slavonic Enoch that in the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones and the watchfulness of many eyes. There were ten troops, a station of brightness" (xx.1, cf. 3). Ranks of angels are recognised also in the N.T.

In Deut. xxxiii.2 we have in our present text, which probably needs correction, a reference to the coming of God to His people from Sinai and from "holy myriads". The LXX reads "with the myriads of Kadesh," but has a reference to "angels with Him on His right hand" in the next clause. This passage was interpreted to mean that the Law had been given through angels. We find this in Rabbinical writings, also in the report of a speech of Herod the Great in Josephus, Ant., xv., 5, 3. In the Book of Jubilees we have detailed accounts of the giving of precepts by the angels. We find a reference to this function of the angels in the speech of Stephen (Acts vii. 53, cf. ver. 38) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 2).
Turning now to Paul, we find marked coincidences with the later Jewish view. For the connexion of the angels with nature, we have his phrase the "elements of the world" (Gal. iv. 3, cf. ver. 9), which should be interpreted as personal elemental spirits, to which the pre-Christian world was in subjection (see note on ii. 8). The connexion with the stars is probably present in the phrase "celestial bodies" (1 Cor. xv. 40), a term which suggests that they were animated by spirits. The moral imperfection of angels is also a Pauline conception. He speaks of angels, principalities and powers, which might be expected to separate us from the love of God (Rom. viii. 38), he supposes the case of an angel from heaven preaching another doctrine than what he taught (Gal. i. 8), women have to be veiled at the Christian assemblies because of the angels (1 Cor. xi. 10, a precept suggested by Gen. vi. 1-4), the principalities and powers have to be subjected to the Son (1 Cor. xv. 24), the rulers of this world, through ignorance of God's wisdom, crucified the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 6-8), Christians are to judge the angels (1 Cor. vi. 2). These passages, it is true, have been otherwise explained. But the exegesis has been unnaturally forced through the initial mistake of assuming that the angelic world is sharply divided into sinless and fallen spirits. Once this is surrendered the natural interpretation becomes possible. Again we find ranks of angels recognised by Paul. In Rom. viii. 38 we have "angels and principalities and powers," in Cor. xv. 24 we have "every principality and every authority and power," in Thess. iv. 16 the archangel is mentioned. He also shares the belief that the Law was given by the mediation of angels (Gal. iii. 19).

When we approach the Epistle to the Colossians and its companion Epistle by this line of investigation we find nothing that should cause us any surprise. A worship of angels, such as was inculcated by the false teachers, was quite a natural application of the Jewish doctrine. Gfröer says: "According to the testimonies cited, the entire activity of God in the world is mediated through angels. This belief was not without special dangers. One could easily fall into the error that the angels should be worshipped instead of God, since they help men more than the Eternal. That at the time of the Second Temple there really were men who taught this we see from the utterance of the Apostle Paul (Col. ii. 18)" (Jahrhundert des Heils, i., p. 376). A proof of the custom among the Jews is often quoted from the Preaching of Peter, in which the Jews are said to worship angels and archangels. Celsus brings a similar charge against the Jews, and numerous Talmudical prohibitions attest the prevalence of this cult. The opening section of the
Epistle to the Hebrews is thought by some to be directed against angel worship, but this is improbable. Twice in the Apocalypse the angel who shows the visions to the writer restrains him from an attempt to worship him. This seems to have a polemical reference to angel worship. There is a similar passage in the Ascension of Isaiah, vii. 21, cf. viii. 4, 5. In the Testament of Levi the seer asks the angel to tell him his name that he may call upon him in the day of trouble. So in the Testament of Dan, the patriarch bids his children "draw near to God and the angel". We have no ground in the angel worship for assuming a post-Pauline date, since already before Paul's time the conditions for it were present. That the angelic orders were created by the Son follows from the fact that the creation of all was ascribed by Paul to Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6), combined with the fact that, as we have seen, Paul recognised the existence of angelic orders. That he adds "thrones" and "lordships" to the list in Colossians is no proof of difference of authorship, for in the undisputed Epistles the lists, which he gives, vary. That they are included in the scope of the Son's work of reconciliation cannot be objected to on the ground that they did not need this, for the doctrine of angelic sinlessness is contrary to the teaching of Paul, as also to that of the O.T. and Jewish theology. A more plausible difficulty may be urged as to the method of Redemption. The death of Christ was a death in the body of flesh, and thus availed to destroy the sinful flesh in humanity. But it might be said, How can this have any effect on the angelic world? Should we not say: "Not of angels doth He take hold, but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham"? It is true that the N.T. writers, Paul included, think in the main of the effects of Christ's death on mankind. But in face of the false teaching it was natural for Paul to draw an inference already implicit in his doctrine. Wherever sin was present, there grace was present to meet it; and this grace found its expression in the Cross of Christ. No limit could be set to its saving power; for angels as for men it made complete atonement. And the relation to the angels which this involved is just what we should expect in Paul. The redemption of man was made possible by Christ's Headship of the race. That He was the Head of the angelic world was a natural thought to Paul, once he regarded Christ as its Creator, and realised its need for redemption. His connexion with it went back to its creation, and therefore His redeeming acts could avail for it, as for the race of men. It was also a natural thought for Paul, since the Cross abolished the Law, and the Law had been given by angels, that in the death of Christ God had despoiled and triumphed over
the angelic powers. That the angels of the Law had brought about the death of Christ is the probable sense of 1 Cor. ii. 6-8. That they did it in ignorance of God’s wisdom tallies with the statement that it is through the Church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known to the principalities and powers. It is not in virtue of any personal hostility to Christ that they crucified Him, but in virtue of their complete identity with the Law. The Law was against us, and Law and grace are incompatible. If so, the angels of the Law would necessarily, according to Jewish angelology, stand in opposition to Christ, till they were despoiled of the dominion they had exercised and placed in their true position. So far then from holding any position of authority, or exercising any mediatorial function, they are for the Christian as if they were not. He has died to the Law, and therefore to the angels of the Law, and all those elemental spirits, to which both Judaism and heathenism had been in subjection. All that he hoped to win through worship of them, and more than all, he has already in Christ. To serve them is to fall back into bondage to unmeaning ordinances, to miss the substance while clutching at the shadow. The angelology of the Epistle is thus in harmony with that of Paul, as gathered from the certainly genuine Epistles; and where it shows advance, the development is on thoroughly Pauline lines, and amply accounted for by the false teaching which it refutes. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle on the ground of its doctrine of angels. It is an interesting fact that the Council of Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, condemned angel worship; and the worship of Michael, which Theodoret, in the fifth century, speaks of as still carried on in the district, existed into the Middle Ages.

SECTION III.—The False Teaching and its Refutation.

The false teaching against which the Epistle is chiefly directed was of a Jewish type. This is clear alike from the characteristics mentioned and the nature of the polemic. It insisted on observance of regulations as to meats and drinks, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths. It drew on the tradition of men as its source. The reference to circumcision seems to show that the false teachers attached value to it; and the declaration that the Law has been abolished, which forms the basis for the definite attack, shows that they regarded it as still binding. Other characteristics are mentioned which are not so exclusively Jewish. It is spoken of as a philosophy and empty deceit, which was plausible and gave a reputation for
wisdom. It had the "elements of the world" and not Christ for its content; and was characterised by a humility which found expression in the worship of angels, but was not incompatible with fleshly conceit. It inculcated severity to the body, and imposed ordinances against certain foods. It is possible that the teachers asserted that they had visions of angels (ii. 18), but unfortunately the phrase from which this is inferred is exegetically uncertain and possibly corrupt. The false teachers were Christians, as is clear from the words, "not holding fast the Head"; but probably they did not assign to Christ His true place. It is possible that they thought of Christ as Paul did, and did not see that their peculiar views were incompatible with their doctrine of Christ; but this seems less likely.

It is not unnatural that many scholars should have seen in this teaching something which, while partially, was not wholly Jewish. And the most obvious solution, especially for those who dated the Epistle in the second century, was to regard the heresy as a form of Judaistic Gnosticism. In favour of this were alleged the use of the term "philosophy," the stress laid on "wisdom," the counter-presentation of Christianity as "full knowledge of the mystery," the asceticism which forbade drinks as well as meats, the angel worship which might rest on a doctrine of intermediaries between men and God, the emphasis on the universality of the Gospel in contrast to the exclusiveness of an intellectual aristocracy. It is certainly difficult to find full-blown Gnosticism mirrored in our Epistle. But it is also improbable that we have Gnosticism even in a rudimentary form. We are certain of the Jewish nature of the teaching, and if it can be explained from Judaism alone, we have no warrant for calling in other sources. "Philosophy" was a term used by Philo and Josephus for purely Jewish theology or sects; and in a Gentile community the common Greek term would naturally be employed, whatever the character of the system might be. Hort suggests that the term is used in a sense akin to the later use to denote the ascetic life, but this is uncertain. The stress on "wisdom" and "knowledge" may be paralleled from the Corinthian Church, where there was certainly no Gnosticism. Intellectual exclusiveness was no monopoly of the Gnostics; the Pharisees, with their contempt for the people of the land, accursed through their ignorance of the Law, were conspicuous examples of it; and it is a failing common enough in certain types of character. The angelolatry, as we have seen already, is perfectly explicable from the Judaism of Paul's time. The prohibition of drinks, while it goes beyond the Law, is an extension of it, for which we find a parallel
in Heb. ix. 10. Asceticism, it is true, is hardly a characteristic of Judaism. Yet fasting was considered to have a religious value, especially among the Pharisees, and Paul himself buffeted the body and brought it into bondage. Nor is it clear whether asceticism was regarded as an end in itself or a means to an end. It might be practised to induce visions. But, apart from this, it is a tendency so congenial to certain temperaments that all need for postulating a Gnostic origin, through a belief in the evil of matter, disappears. It has, with more plausibility, been suggested that we should seek for its origin in Essenism, or some form of teaching with Essene affinities. In favour of this it may be said that the Essenes were extremely rigid in keeping the Sabbath, they had some secret lore about the angels, they abstained from meat and wine, they eliminated marriage from their communal life. But there is no indication of any extreme Sabbatarianism at Colossae; what Paul attacks is the view that the Sabbath law should be regarded as still binding. The doctrine of angels has been already amply explained apart from Essenism, while we have no proof that the Essenes worshipped angels. Nor are we acquainted with the precise view of the false teachers as to eating and drinking, whether this involved abstinence from meat and wine. In any case the precepts of the Law as to food, with the extension they appear to have received in later Judaism (Heb. ix. 10), seem sufficient to account for this phase of the false teaching. And there is not a word in the Epistle to warrant us in assuming that there was any attack on marriage at Colossae. Further, there is no reference to some of the most important Essene practices. Such are their frequent washings, their alleged worship of the sun, their communal life, their “fearful oath” on initiation, their protracted and severe probation and their use of magic. And, lastly, we know nothing of Essenism at this time in Phrygia. For the most part the sect had its home by the Dead Sea, and before the destruction of Jerusalem it seems to have been unknown outside Palestine. Klöpper tries to turn the edge of these arguments by limiting this element to a dynamic influence of Essene principles on the Jews of the Dispersion, by urging that we should expect the larger movement of Essenes to Christianity after the destruction of Jerusalem to have been preceded by isolated instances, and by the reminder that we know the heresy only imperfectly. Lightfoot similarly is content to argue for Essene affinities in the false teaching. But in face of the absence from it of some of the most striking features of Essenism, and the possibility of accounting for it from contemporary Judaism, it seems much safer to set aside this theory.
as to its origin. In the modified form given to it by Klöpper it scarcely seems worth contending for at all.

It is noteworthy that Paul does not, as in Galatians, attack this teaching by arguments drawn from the O.T. This has been explained by the view that the errors were not doctrinal but practical. But this seems to be improbable, and it is more likely that Paul does not establish his positions by proof passages because this would have been unconvincing to his antagonists, who might perhaps have evaded their force by allegorical interpretation. His refutation consists partly in pointing the moral of their own experience, partly in a positive exposition of great Christian truths with which the false teaching was incompatible, partly in direct attack. In recalling them to their own experience of salvation, he is throughout suggesting that the Gospel which had thus proved its power in them stood in no need of being supplemented; all that was necessary was for them to hold firmly by the form in which they had learnt it, and strive continually to appropriate its meaning and power more completely. The teachers by failing to hold fast the Head were cutting themselves off from the source of life. He reminds his readers that they had passed into the kingdom of the Son from the realm of darkness, they had received deliverance, the forgiveness of sins, had been reconciled to God, and been qualified for the saints' inheritance in light. They must be loyal to the truth they had heard, walk in Christ, rooted and built up in Him. This truth was not proclaimed to and tested by them alone, it was proved by its rapid extension in the world. Doctrinally the false teaching was tacitly refuted by an exhibition of the true place and work of the Son. He is the image of God, Lord of the universe, in whom all things were created, including all ranks of angels. They were created through Him and even for Him, so that as to origin they were dependent on, and as to end subservient to Him. The whole fulness dwelt in Him, and therefore reconciliation of all things to God, again including the angels, could be made by Him. And thus not only is there no room for angelic mediators; they themselves needed to be reconciled to God. It is in Christ that all the fulness of the Godhead dwells; it is in Him that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden. His death abolished the Law and spoiled the principalities and powers; hence the precepts of the former held good no longer, and worship ought plainly not to be offered to the latter. Believers had died with Christ to these elemental spirits, and could no longer be subject to their restrictions. The direct attack may be thus summarised. This so-called "philosophy" is only an empty delusion.
resting on human tradition, with the elements of the world and not Christ for its content; in holding fast to antiquated ordinances it lets slip the substance to grasp the shadow; it is, in spite of its humility, a manifestation of fleshly conceit, but devoid of real wisdom; and the things from which it commands abstinence are so insignificant that they perish in the act of use.

Section IV.—The Authenticity of the Epistle.

The external evidence for the Pauline authorship of the Epistle is as strong perhaps as we have any right to expect. It is first referred to by name in the Muratorian Canon and by Irenæus. It was probably used by Justin Martyr and Theophilus; and it is not unlikely that there are echoes of it in Barnabas, Clement of Rome and Ignatius. But these are quite insufficient to prove acquaintance with the Epistle, still less the Pauline authorship. It is more important that Marcion included it in his canon, but this again is not at all conclusive proof of the genuineness. The question has to be settled by the evidence drawn from the Epistle itself. On the ground of internal evidence many critics have decided against its authenticity. Mayerhoff (1838) was the first to reject it. The Tübingen school, including Hilgenfeld, treated it as a second century work. Ewald thought that Timothy wrote it after consultation with Paul. Holtzmann (1872), following a view indicated by Hitzig, recognised a Pauline nucleus, but regarded more than half of the Epistle as non-Pauline. Von Soden (1885) reduced considerably the range of interpolation in a series of articles on Holtzmann's hypothesis, but has since recognised the whole Epistle as Pauline, with the exception of i. 16b, 17, which he thinks may be a gloss, since it disturbs the symmetry.

The authenticity has been impugned on various grounds: the language and style, the false teaching, the angelology, the Christology, the likeness to Ephesians. Enough has been said already of the false teaching and the angelology, so that it is needless to add anything here. The Epistle has a considerable number of words which are peculiar to itself, but on the whole not an exceptional number (34); and the contents of ch. ii. would have made even a larger proportion not at all strange. Greater difficulties are caused by the style. It is heavier and less impetuous than in Galatians Corinthians and Romans. Several of the logical particles most common in Paul are almost absent. There are also strange collocations of words (of which Haupt gives a good list), many being
combinations of two or three dependent genitives, accumulated synonyms, numerous compound words. But these features may be partially paralleled in the earlier letters; and where they cannot be we may rightly lay stress on the difference of Paul's circumstances and the problems with which he had to deal. Letters written in the heat of conflict with Judaisers and impugners of his authority, written too when he was in full career as a missionary and had pressing on him the care of all the Churches, must in the nature of the case be very different from a letter written, not to fight for the very existence of the Gospel, but to warn a still loyal Church against a pernicious error, and written in enforced retirement, with ample time for meditation.

The Christology, it is true, presents an advance on what we find in the earlier Epistles. Not in the position it assigns to the Son as Creator, for that is found in 1 Cor. viii. 6, but in that it speaks of Him also as the goal of the universe. Elsewhere it is God who is thus spoken of (1 Cor. viii. 6, Rom. xi. 36). But this is less cogent than it appears at first sight. Paul teaches that all things have to become subject to the Son, that He may deliver the Kingdom to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24-28). And it would be as warrantable to conclude that Romans and 1 Corinthians were by different authors, for in the passages already mentioned creation is said to have been effected, now through God (Rom. xi. 36), and now again through Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6). A doctrine of Christ quite as lofty is found in Philippians; and the conclusive refutation of the false teaching was just this setting of the Son in His true position. The doctrine of Christ's work is expressed in a thoroughly Pauline way, which bears all the marks of authenticity. It is not a slavish imitation, but a fresh and luminous presentation. And yet it is in such perfect harmony with Paul's own doctrine that it seems improbable that it can be due to another hand; and more than improbable when we remember that no other early Christian writer known to us, with the partial exception of the author of 1 Peter, has been able to reproduce the Pauline doctrine, any more than Penelope's wooers could bend Odysseus' bow. The only point under this head which raises suspicion is the extension of the reconciliation to God effected by Christ to the angelic powers. What has been already said on this need not be repeated here.

Lastly, its relation to Ephesians has aroused suspicion. The problem thus presented is unique in the N.T., and has elicited numerous solutions. It has been pressed against the authenticity of Ephesians more generally than of Colossians; though Mayerhoff
thought that Ephesians was genuine and Colossians the copy. If one Epistle is copied from the other, suspicion is aroused only against the copy; and since, if this is the relation, Colossians is more likely than Ephesians to be the original, we should find in this fact a proof of the genuineness of the former. For if a later writer wrote a letter purporting to come from Paul, and used in it a letter that bore Paul's name, there is a strong presumption that the latter would be of well-attested genuineness. But the problem is hardly so simple. Holtzmann, in a work described by Godet "as a masterpiece of exactness, patient labour and wisdom," reached the conclusion that the Epistles exhibit the phenomenon of mutual indebtedness. Sometimes Ephesians seems to be the original, sometimes Colossians. Accordingly he formulated the theory that Paul wrote an Epistle to the Colossians, on the basis of which a later writer composed Ephesians. He then returned to the original Epistle and expanded it by free extracts from his own writing, adding also a polemic against Gnosticism. This theory was examined by Von Soden, who tested very carefully Holtzmann's reconstruction of the original Epistle. He also pointed out that it was justifiable to eliminate only such passages as Paul could not have written. He rejected only i. 15-20, ii. 10, 15, 18\(a\). This was in 1885. A more exhaustive study of Paulinism has led him to accept the authenticity of the Epistle as a whole in his commentary (1891). Holtzmann's theory is examined by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Robertson in the articles "Colossians" and "Ephesians" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible (2nd ed.), and to these discussions the reader may refer for fuller details. J. Weiss in a review of Abbott's commentary has recently expressed himself in favour of a solution, not precisely in Holtzmann's form, but on his lines (Theol. Literaturzeitung, 29th Sept., 1900). It may be said here that it is hard to understand why a writer should give himself so much trouble. His purpose would have been served by one Epistle, a still larger "Ephesians," in which what he inserted in Colossians should have found its home. Very few have accepted the theory in its entirety. Yet if Holtzmann's observations are correct, only two theories seem to be tenable, one the theory he has himself proposed, the other that both Epistles are genuine. His own theory is far too complicated to be probable. The similarities occur often in different contexts, and express quite different ideas, yet each is natural in its place. This is difficult to account for in an imitator, who would be fettered by the document which he was using; but in a writer such as Paul, rich in ideas but unused to formal composition, such resemblance and yet such
difference in letters written together was quite to be expected. No trace of the process has been left in the textual evidence, and this is a cogent argument against the theory. The only alternative, then, to Holtzmann’s view seems to be that both letters were written by Paul; and thus his investigation becomes the firm basis for quite another result than the author contemplated. We cannot in that case speak of mutual indebtedness; the phenomena that suggested this explanation are amply accounted for by the unity of authorship. It is noteworthy that Jülicher, who has no leaning to traditional opinions, thinks that the best solution of the problem is to be found in the acceptance of the authenticity of both Epistles (Einl. i. d. N.T., 1894, p. 97, but compare the more dubious tone of his article in the Enc. Bibl., 1899). This view, it may be added, is confirmed by the close connexion of Colossians with Philemon, which, if genuine, all but guarantees the genuineness of Colossians; and that it is not authentic has been argued solely to dispose of its testimony to Colossians. We may therefore accept this Epistle with confidence as the work of Paul.

SECTION V.—PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION.

Since Paul was a prisoner when he wrote it, our only alternatives are Cæsarea and Rome. Meyer, Weiss, Haupt and others have argued for Cæsarea. What Weiss regards as decisive is that Paul speaks in Philemon of going to Colossæ on his release, whereas in Philippians, written from Rome, he says that he hopes to go into Macedonia. But this proves nothing, for Macedonia might have been taken on the way; and, besides, Paul’s plans might have changed in the interval. Haupt thinks that the genuineness of the letters can be maintained only on the assumption that they were written at Cæsarea, since letters so unlike Philippians cannot have been written so near to it as their composition at Rome would demand. He thinks their peculiar character is best explained by the fact that Paul in his confinement, unable to preach, was driven in upon himself, and thought out more fully than before the implication of his Gospel. The fruit of this we find in Colossians and Ephesians. This is of too speculative a character to bear any weight. On the other hand, it is certainly more probable that a runaway slave should have fled to Rome than to Cæsarea; for although Cæsarea was nearer for Onesimus than Rome, the latter was more accessible, and afforded a safer concealment. Paul’s expectations of release were more natural at Rome than at Cæsarea.
During the latter part of his imprisonment at Caesarea he knew that he was going to Rome. It would be necessary then to place the letter in the earlier part. But it does not well suit this, for Paul had for a long time been anxious to see Rome, and it is most unlikely that he should think of going to Colossae first. It would be very strange, further, if Paul wrote from Caesarea, that he should be silent about Philip, whose guest he had been shortly before, and should leave us with the impression that he was unsympathetic. The general situation presupposed in the Epistle suits Rome better than Caesarea.

This would be practically certain if these Epistles were written after Philippians, as Bleek, Lightfoot and several English scholars suppose. But the more usual view which makes Philippians the latest of the Imprisonment-Epistles seems to be preferable. The argument from theological affinities is most precarious; and Colossians, as well as Philippians, presents striking parallels with Romans. The theological system of Paul was formed before he wrote our earliest Epistle, yet how little Paulinism there is in Thessalonians, or even in 1 Corinthians. We have no right to expect the thoughts of Colossians to reappear in Philippians, a simple letter of thanks to a Church where the Colossian type of false doctrine had not appeared. Indeed, how much there is in Colossians that does not recur in Ephesians, and how much Ephesians adds to what we find in Colossians! Yet these were written practically together. Three years at least lay between Romans and the earliest time at which Philippians could have been written, and less than eighteen months between this time and the latest date that can be assigned to Colossians. Further, Paul seems in Philippians to express a more decided conviction as to the speedy settlement of his fate than in Philemon; and he looks forward to death as a not unlikely contingency. In Philippians Paul also speaks of sending away Timothy shortly, whereas he is with Paul in Colossians. If 2 Tim. iv. 19 dates, as some scholars think, from this imprisonment, this would agree best with the priority of Colossians, for in Philippians Paul speaks of sending him away, in 2 Timothy we find him gone. This, however, is not very cogent. It seems best to adhere to the usual view and to date the Epistle during the early part of Paul's Roman Imprisonment. The year to which we assign it depends on the general view we take as to the chronology of Paul's life. We may perhaps place it in A.D. 59. [The article on "Chronology of the New Testament" by C. H. Turner in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible may be consulted.]
Of patristic commentaries those of Chrysostom (*Homilies*), Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret may be mentioned. Of later commentaries earlier than the modern period Calvin and Bengel are perhaps the most important. The chief modern commentaries by foreign writers are those of De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, Hofmann, Klöpper, Franke (in Meyer), Oltramare, Von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*), Wohlenberg (Strack-Zoeckler) and Haupt (latest edition of Meyer). Among English commentaries those of Badie, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Findlay (in the *Pulpit Commentary*), Beet, Moule and Abbott (*International Critical Commentary*) may be mentioned. Klöpper is important for the discussion of theological questions, especially the angelology, but the style is very diffuse. Oltramare is very full and thorough, but at times eccentric. He is also quite ignorant of English work. Von Soden is valuable, and has frequently influenced Abbott. Much the best commentary on the Epistle is that of Haupt, which, though in Meyer, is an entirely new work. For close grappling with the thought of the Epistle it has no rival. It sometimes presses the argument from the connexion too far, and is perhaps sometimes too subtle; but these are very slight defects. We still need in English a commentary of this kind, to unravel the thought of this most difficult Epistle. Our most important works, those of Ellicott, Lightfoot and Abbott, are of special value from the philological standpoint. Lightfoot is very full on points of history, and contributes a valuable excursus on the Essenes. His discussions of special words are also full and luminous. He is less strong in exegesis and Biblical theology. Abbott is "mainly philological," and as such most thankworthy, especially for the frequent testing of Lightfoot's results. Findlay is also excellent and deserves to be much better known. Moule rests for the most part on Lightfoot, but is very scholarly and at times independent. Maclaren in the *Expositor's Bible* exhibits the insight and felicity of exposition which characterise all his work. Moule's *Colossian Studies* should also be mentioned.

For critical discussions the New Testament Introductions may be consulted, and especially Sanday's very valuable article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.). The most thorough critical discussion is Holtzmann's *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe* (1872), on which Von Soden wrote a series of elaborate articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* for 1885. For the theology of the Epistle the
works on New Testament Theology and on Paulinism may be consulted. Everling's *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie* is the best work on a subject of great importance for the correct understanding of the Epistle. Lueken's *Michael* (1898) may also be mentioned. H. St. John Thackeray's *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, published since this commentary went to press, contains a useful chapter on angelology. G. C. Martin's commentary in the *Century Bible* appeared too late to be used in any way.

**Note.**—The text of the Epistle here printed is a critically revised text, and that on which the commentary is based. The abbreviations in the notes need no explanation. The commentary was finished in September, 1898; references to later literature have been sparingly introduced in proof. The author may be permitted to add that his chief concern has been to expound the thought, since it was desirable, in view of the limits assigned, to concentrate attention mainly on one side of exegesis, and in the English commentaries on the Epistle the philological side is already amply represented. It has therefore been necessary to assume much in the way of philological results in order to gain space for the elucidation of the thought.
Chapter I.—Vv. 1, 2. Salutation of Paul and Timothy to the Christians of Colossi.—Ver. 1. ἀπόστολος... διὰ διαθήκης θεοῦ... Paul's apostleship is not due to any attack on his apostolic authority or teaching, as in the case of the Epistles to the Galatians or Corinthians, but, as in the Epistle to the Romans, to the fact that he was unknown to those to whom he was writing. Similarly, reference is made to it in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the letter being sent to Churches, to some of which, probably, Paul was unknown. In writing to the Macedonian Churches it is not mentioned, for they had been founded by him and remained loyal.—τιμὸθεος: included in the salutations in Thess., 2 Cor., Phil. and Phlm. He would be known by name to the Colossians as Paul's companion, but probably not personally. Ramsay's conjecture (also put forward by Valroger) that he may have founded the Church is unsupported and improbable (see ver. 7), while Ewald's view that he wrote the bulk of the Epistle, after consultation with Paul, has nothing to recommend it, and is open to serious objections. ἀδελφὸς is added to balance ἀπόστολος, and has no reference, as Chrysostom thought, to Timothy's official position.

Ver. 2. Paul does not address the Church as a Church. This has been explained by the fact that he stood in no official relation to the community, and therefore addressed individuals. But he does not mention the Church in Philippians, though he had founded it. The omission may be accidental; but he seems to have changed his custom in his later Epistles, since it occurs in all his letters to Churches from Romans downwards.—ἀγίοι may be an adjective (so Kl., Weiss and others), but more probably a substantive (so Mey., EH., Lightf., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), since Paul seems not to use it in the plural in an adjectival sense, except in Eph. iii. 5, and in the salutations of 2 Cor., Eph. and Phil. it is certainly a substantive. Like ἄδελφοις it may be joined with ἐν Χ., but should more probably be taken by itself. The saints are those who are set apart for God, as belonging to His holy people, the Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16); the privileges of the chosen nation under the Old Covenant being transferred to Christians under the New.—πιστοί: not to be taken
1 So W.H., R.V. with BC*, possibly by assimilation to θεόν (ver. 2). καὶ πατρὶ: T., Tr. with ΝΑΓΔΚΛΠ, probably to avoid unusual expression. τὸ πατρὶ: Ln., Ws. with D*FG, Chrys. inserted for similar reason.

2 So Ws. with B. ισεῦν Χρυσίου: Ln., T., Tr. [W.H.], Lt. R.V. with other MSS.

3 So T., W.H., Lft. with ΝΑΓΔΚΛΠ. τιμῇ: Ln., Tr., W.H. mg., Ws. with BD*FG 17, probably from ver. 9.

4 ἐπὶ: Ln., T., Tr. [W.H.] with ΝΑΓΔΚΛΠ, 17, possibly conformed to Philm. 5. τῷ: Ws. with DeKL, perhaps by assimilation to Eph. i. 15; B omits, perhaps rightly.

5. The tidings he has received of the spiritual welfare of the Colossians.

According to his usual custom (so in Thess., 1 Cor., Rom., Phil., Phlm.), Paul begins his letter with an expression of his thankfulness to God for the Christian graces of his readers. There is, however, a certain conventional element in these greetings, as may be seen from a comparison of similar formulae in letters found among recently discovered papyri (see articles by Prof. Rendel Harris in The Expositor for Sept. and Dec., 1898). Eph. i. 15-17 is parallel to vv. 3, 4 and 9.— Ver. 3. τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ: "to God, the Father of our Lord Jesus". Even if θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ were read, we should probably not make Χρυσίου de pendent on θεῷ as well as πατρὶ, since this is not Paul's usual language, though it is found in Eph. i. 17 (δὲ θεῷ τῷ Κυρῷ ἡμῖν. I.).— πατρὶ is connected by several commentators (Beng., Alf., Ell., Findl., R.V.) with προσεύχω. In favour of this is ὁ πατήρ μου ὑμῖν προσεύχω (ver. 9). But more probably it should be taken with εὐχαριστῶ (Mey., Lightf., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), as this is the usual collocation in Paul. But πατὴρ belongs to προσεύχω, not (as Lightf., Ol.) to εὐχαριστῶ. "We always give thanks when we pray for you."

Ver. 4. Paul now introduces the grounds of his thankfulness, the good report he has heard as to the faith and love of the Colossians. He refers to it again (ver. 9).— ἐν Χριστῷ: This is equivalent to εἰς, but probably indicates "the sphere in which their faith moves rather than the object to which it is directed" (Lightf.). This faith rests upon Christ. τῷ ἐν Χριστῷ as used by Ewald to mean "fidelity"—πιστῶσε, i.e., all Christians throughout the world, whose unity in the universal Church was a thought much in Paul's mind at this time.

Ver. 5. Πρὸς τὴν ἐλπίδα. This is connected by Bengel, followed by several recent commentators (Hofm., Kl., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), with εὐχαριστοῦμαι. Having heard of their faith and love, Paul gives thanks for the hope laid up for them in heaven. Lightfoot and Soden urge that in this way the triad of Christian
graces, faith, hope and love, is broken up. But "hope" is objective here, not the grace of hope, but the object of that hope. It is true that Paul glides from the subjective to the objective use of ἀπετεθήκας in Rom. viii. 24, but if this combination had been intended here he would probably have simply co-ordinated the three terms. A more serious objection is that εὐχαριστεῖν is so far away, though Haupt urges that ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀρτῷ could not have come in earlier. Further, Paul never uses this constr. εὐχαριστεῖν. ξέλα. It is also his custom, at the beginning of his Epistles, to give thanks for the Christian character of his readers (which he hardly does in ver. 4), not for the heavenly reward that awaits them. Others (De W., Lightf., Sod.) connect it with τῇ ἁγίᾳ . . . καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ. This gives a good sense, their faith and love have their ground in their hope of reward. But we should have expected the article before a clause thus added to substantives. It is simplest to refer it to τῷ ἄγιῳ. ἐν εὐγένειᾳ (Chrys., Mey., Ell., Alf., Franke), and interpret it of the love which is due to the hope of a heavenly reward. It is urged that a love of this calculating kind is foreign to Paul, but cf. 2 Cor. ix. 6, Gal. vi. 9.—Τῷ πόσῳ. Cf. the reward or treasure in heaven (Matt. v. 12, vi. 20, xix. 21), the citizenship in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), the inheritance reserved in heaven (1 Pet. i. 20), the inheritance in Christ (so Lightf., Ol., Abb.), perhaps in tacit contrast to the false teaching they had recently heard. Haupt, it is true, denies that there is any reference to the false teachers in vv. 2-8: but though none can be proved, it is surely probable that the turn of several expressions should be determined by the subject which was uppermost in the Apostle's mind, and that he should thus prepare his readers for the direct attack.—Λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγέλου. Cf. Eph. i. 13, according to which τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ should be taken as in apposition to λόγῳ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγέλου. "the word of truth, even the Gospel," though it is often explained as the word of truth announced in the Gospel. It is not clear what λόγῳ τῇ Ἀλήθειᾳ means. Several give the genitive an adjectival force, "the true word," but more probably it expresses the content, the word which contains the truth. Perhaps here also there is a side-thrust at the false teachers.

Ver. 6. This word of the truth has been defined as the Gospel, but Paul now proceeds to indicate more precisely what he means by this term. It is that Gospel which they have already received, not the local perversion of it that has recently been urged on their notice, but that which is spreading in the whole world, its truth authenticated by its ever-widening area and deepening influence on its adherents, and which manifests the same inherent energy among the Colossians themselves, in the form in which they learnt it from their teacher Epaphras.—καθὼς καὶ ἐν πάντι . . . ἐν ὑμῖν. According to the TR. καὶ ἐστιν, two statements are made—that the Gospel is present with the Colossians as it is present in all the world, and that it is bearing fruit and increasing as it is among the Colossians. The omission of καὶ before ἔστιν καρπ. creates a little awkwardness, since καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν seems then superfluous. Lightfoot takes ἐστιν καρπ. together as a periphrasis for καρποφορήσει, but this construction is very rare in Paul. The symmetry of clauses is much better preserved if, with Soden and Haupt, we write ἔστιν καρπ. We thus get the same double comparison as with the TR., Paul passing from the special to the general, and from the general back to the special. For the hyperbole τῷ πόσῳ, cf. 1 Thess. i. 8, Rom. i. 8, x. 18. As Gess points out (Christi Person und Werk, ii., 1, p. 228), Paul wishes here and in ver. 23 to widen the outlook of the Colossians, since the more isolated the community the greater the danger from seducers. For the similar feeling that local idiosyncrasies are to be controlled by the general custom of the Church, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36 (cf. 33).—καρποφοροῦμαι καὶ αὐξάνωμαι. The former of these participles expresses...
the inward energy of the Gospel (dynamic middle) in its adherents, the latter its extension in the world by gathering in new converts.— ἐπηκόομεν. This expresses the further fact that the progress of the Gospel has been continuous from the first in the Colossian Church.— ἐπηκόομεν. It is uncertain whether χάριν is governed by both verbs (so Lightf., K.I., OI., Sod., Abb.) or by the latter only (so Mey., Ell., Haupt). In the former case χάριν will mean "were instructed in ". But it is simpler to translate "ye heard it [i.e., the Gospel] and knew the grace of God ". ἐπηκόομεν should strictly imply full knowledge, but as the reference is to the time of their conversion it seems doubtful whether this shade of meaning should be pressed. ἐπηκόομεν is in his mind. The word occurs twice in the context. The grace of God is probably mentioned in opposition to the false teachers' doctrine of ordinances and rigorous asceticism.— ἐπηκόομεν: not to be taken as if an adjective with χάριν, "the true grace of God," for there is no false grace of God, but with θυγατρία, in the sense that they knew the Gospel as it truly is, in its genuine reality, in opposition to the travesty of it recently introduced.

Ver. 7. καθὼς, i.e., in the manner in which. Paul thus sets the seal of his approval on the form of the Gospel which they had learnt from their teacher, and also on the teacher himself.— ἐπαφρᾶς. Epaphras was apparently the founder of the Colossian Church, ἐπηκόομεν referring to the same time as ἐπηκόομεν. He had remained in connexion with it (iv. 12), and seems to have come to Paul to inform him of the teaching that was threatening its welfare. He is not to be identified with Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25 sq., iv. 18), who was connected with Philippi. The name was common.— ὑπὲρ ήμῶν. This is probably the correct reading; Epaphras is a minister to the Colossians on Paul's behalf, since he has accomplished a task which belonged to Paul's sphere as the Apostle of the Gentiles. The reading οὔτε ήμῶν may be taken in two ways, either (preferably) that he ministered for the sake of the Colossians, in which case we should probably have had ήμῶν or in ήμῶν or simply ήμῶν; or that he ministered to Paul as the representative of the Colossians, for which we should have expected "my minister" instead of "minister of Christ ".

Ver. 8. οὔτε ήμῶν ἐπηκόομεν may be taken in the general sense of ver. 4, though many think it is their love to Paul that is meant; and this is favoured by δια, and perhaps by σὺν τέκνοις ver. 9. οὔτε ήμῶν is added to show that this love is in the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 9-14. Paul's unceasing prayer for that moral discernment which will enable them to please God in all their conduct, that strength which will give them endurance in face of all provocation and trial, and that thankfulness to God which befits the great deliverance He has achieved for them through His Son.

— Ver. 9. οὔτε ήμῶν ἐπηκόομεν also," i.e., as the Colossians had prayed for Paul, so he had made unceasing prayer for them. Similar assurances are common in the letters of the period, but their conventional character must not in the case of one of so intense a nature as Paul's lead us to degrade them into polite commonplaces.— προσευχήσατε καὶ αὐτούμενοι. The former verb is general, the latter special, referring to
only here in N.T.; in Philo of pleasing
God; in bad sense, Theoph.
Char., 5; Arist.

Eth. End., ii., 3; Pol., vi., 2, etc.; Diod., xiii., 53.
q only here. Heb. xi. 34 and (?) Eph. vi. 10
in N.T. or Gk. vss. of O.T. Elsewhere in Paul, εὐθὺς.

1 So edd. with ΝΑΒΣΔΕFGP 17. εἰς τὴν ἐπιγνώσει: D-ΚΛ, probably to simplify
the constr., perhaps assisted by τὴν ἐπιγνώσει (ver. 9).

the definite request. Soden thinks the middle (αὐτοῦμεν) is chosen to express
Paul's personal interest, but there seems to have been no distinction between the
middle and active of this verb in later
Greek.—η μετανασθήσῃ τὴν ἐπιγνώσει. After verbs of praying, etc., η is used
in a weakened sense to express the content
of the prayer. μετανοή with the accusative is not precisely the same as
with the genitive or dative. So here
"filled with respect to." ἐπιγνώσις is
stronger than γνώσις. Meyer defines it
as the knowledge which grasps and pene-
trates into the object.—τὸ δέλματος
ἀυτοῦ. This does not mean God's coun-
sel of redemption (Chrys., Beng., De W.,
Κλ.), nor "the whole counsel of God as
made known to us in Christ" (Findl.),
but, as the context indicates (ver. 10),
the moral aspect of God's will, "His
will for the conduct of our lives" (Mey.,
Sod., Haupt, Abb.).—ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ
συνέσει πνευματική: to be taken with
the preceding, not (as by Hofm.) with
the infinitive. Συνέσεις special. σοφία embraces
the whole range of mental faculties; συνέσεις
is the special faculty of intelligence or
insight which discriminates between the
false and the true, and grasps the rela-
tions in which things stand to each other.
The acquisition of both is necessary
if they are to proceed from the inspiration
of the Holy Spirit. They thus stand in
opposition to fleshly wisdom (2 Cor. i.
12), and especially, it would seem, though
Haupt denies this, to the false wisdom,
by which the Colossians were in danger of
being ensnared (cf. τὰ τούτα τῆς
σακχάρας αὐτοῦ, ii. 18). The repetition of
πᾶς in this context should be noticed.
The early part of the Epistle is strongly
marked by repetition of particular words
and phrases.

Ver. 10. περιπατήσημεν ἡμῖν τοῦ
Κυρίου (cf. Eph. iv. 1). This lofty
wisdom and insight is not an end in
itself. It must issue in right practice.

Doctrine and ethics are for Paul insepara-
able. Right conduct must be founded
on right thinking, but right thinking must
also lead to right conduct. The infinitive
expresses result "so as to walk." τὸ
Κυρίον, i.e., of Christ, not of God
(Hofm., Ol.). In 1 Thess. ii. 12 τοῦ Θεοῦ
is used, but ὅ Κύριον in Paul means Christ.—ἀρετ-
κειαν in classical Greek used generally
in a bad sense, of obsequiousness. But
it often occurs in Philo in a good sense;
see the note on the word in Deissmann's
Bible Studies, p. 224. καρποφορούμενοι
καὶ αὐξάνομενοι. For the collocation
cf. ver. 6. The participles should prob-
cably be connected with περιπατήσημεν,
not (as by Beng., Hofm., Weiss) with
περιπατήσαται, which is too far away.
The continuation of an infinitive by a nomi-
native participle instead of the accusa-
tive is frequent in classical Greek, and occurs
several times in Paul (ii. 2, iii. 16, Eph.
iv. 2, 3). They should not be separated.
The whole clause should be translated
"bearing fruit and increasing in every
good work by the knowledge of God".
Fruit bearing is one of Paul's favourite
metaphors.—εἰς τὴν ἐπιγνώσει: not as R.V.
and Moule "in the knowledge," for Paul
has already spoken of this in ver. 9, but
"by the knowledge," the knowledge of
God being the means of their spiritual
growth. Meyer, against the overwhelm-
ing weight of evidence, reads εἰς τὴν
ἐπιγνώσει, "as regards the knowledge".
This would make knowledge the goal
of conduct (cf. John vii. 17), whereas
previously the relation is reversed.

Ver. 11. εἰς τὸν δύναμα: "with all
power," εἰς being instrumental, κατὰ τὸ
κράτος τῆς δύνας αὐτοῦ. The equip-
ment with power is proportioned not
simply to the recipient's need, but to
the Divine supply. God's glory is His
manifested nature, here as manifested in
might.—εἰς τὸν δύναμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.
This equipment with Divine
power is not, as we might have expected,
said to be given with a view to deeds
of great spiritual heroism, but for the practice of passive virtues, since this often puts the greater strain on the Christian's strength. Endurance in face of trials, temptations and persecutions; μακρόθυμος is forbearance, the patience of spirit which will not retaliate. The one is opposed to cowardice or despondency, the other to wrath or revenge (Lightf.).

Ver. 12. εὐθαρσίας: “who qualified you.” The reference is to status rather than character.—εἰς τὴν μερίδα... ψυχής. Lightfoot thinks τὸ μερός τ. θαλ. is the portion which consists in the lot, κλῆρον being a genitive of apposition (so Sod., Abb.). But probably θαλ. is the general inheritance in which each individual has his μέρος. The lot is the blessedness awaiting the saints. More controverted is the connexion of ἐν τῇ φωτὶ. Meyer connects it with ἰδαίωσε, and takes τῇ as instrumental “by the light.” This is harsh, and φωτὶ in contrast to σκότους (ver. 13) cannot mean the Gospel. Others connect it with ἀγγέλου, either in the sense of angels (so Kl., Franke and Lueken) or saints (so Ol. and others). But the angels are never in the N.T. called οἱ ἄγγελοι, though this term is used for them in the O.T. and Jewish Apocalyptic. Further, the contrast with the “darkness” of ver. 13 loses its force unless the “holy ones” are Christians as opposed to non-Christians. And if Paul had meant this he would have expressed himself more plainly. Nor is any such reference probable in an Epistle directed especially against over-valuation of the angels. If saints are meant, unless (with Ol.) we give ἰδαίως merely an ethical sense, they must be saints in heaven, for which we should have expected πάντα... ἰδαίως, as the object of the addition would be to distinguish them from saints on earth. έν φωτὶ should therefore be connected either with ἰδαίως (Beng.), μετὰ τ. κλῆρον (Alf., Lightf.), or κλῆρον (De W., Ell., Sod., Haupt). The difference is slight, and it seems simplest to connect with κλῆρον, “the lot of the saints [situated] in the light”; ἐν being probably local, and not expressing, as in Acts viii. 21, the idea of a share in the light. The precise sense of φωτὶ is disputed. Oltramare takes it of the state of holiness in which Chris-
tians live, so that the distinction between saints on earth and in heaven does not arise. But the immediate impression of the phrase is that the heavenly kingdom, where God dwells in light, is referred to.

Ver. 13. Paul now explains how God has qualified them for their share in the heavenly inheritance. On this passage Acts xxvi. 18 should be compared; the parallels extend to ver. 12, 14 also.—προφητεύω. The aorist refers to the time of conversion. The metaphor implies the miserable state of those delivered and the struggle necessary to deliver them.—ἐξωτικός: "ubi τῷ βασιλείᾳ oppromptetur, est tyrannis" (Wetstein, so also Chrys., Lightf., Kl.). This would heighten the contrast between the power of darkness and the "kingdom of the son of His love". But Abbott argues forcibly against this view, especially with relation to the N.T. usage. He quotes Rev. xii. 10, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ τῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξωτικός τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, where the contrast obviously cannot be maintained. Grimm takes the term as a collective expression for the demoniacal powers; and Klöpper says that in Paul is, is not a mere abstract term, but signifies the possessors of power. Here, however, he rightly sees that the contrast to is, makes this meaning inappropriate, and that for it should have been expected rather than ἐξωτικός. Accordingly he interprets it as the dominion possessed by the (personified) darkness.—τοῦ σκότους: taken by Hofmann as a genitive of apposition, but the obvious interpretation is to take it as a subjective genitive, the dominion which darkness exercises. We should have expected simply "out of darkness" to correspond to "in light," but Paul changes the form, partly to insist that the darkness is not a mere state but exercises an active authority, partly to secure a parallel with the kingdom of God's Son. But we are not justified (with Mey., Kl.) in personifying σκότους, for the primary contrast is with φως not ὑλή.—μετατύπωσιν. Wetstein quotes Jos., Ant., x. 6, v. 1 (Tiglath-Pileser's deportation of N.E. Israel), and Lightfoot thinks that this use of the word suggested the choice of it here, and this is made more probable by the addition of αὐτῷ. Meyer, however, quotes a striking parallel from Plato, where no such reference is present: ἐκ τε φωτὸς ὑπὲρ σκότους μετατύπωσιν καὶ ἐκ σκότους εἰς φως (Rep., p. 518 A).—βασιλείαν. Meyer insists that this is the Messianic kingdom, and as the realisation of this lay in the future to Paul the clause must have a proleptic reference, citizenship in the kingdom being guaranteed by their conversion. But the argument rests on a false premise, for in 1 Cor. iv. 20, Rom. xiv. 17, the sense is not eschatological. Nor, indeed, can it be so here, for the translation into the kingdom must have taken place at the same time as the deliverance.—τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. Augustine, followed by Olshausen and Lightfoot, takes ἀγάπης as a genitive of origin, and interprets, the Son begotten of the essence of the Father, which is love. This has no parallel in the N.T., and rests, as Meyer points out, on a confusion of the metaphysical with the ethical essence of God. The phrase is practically equivalent to His beloved Son, but is chosen for the sake of emphasis to indicate His greatness and the excellence of His kingdom. There is, perhaps, the further thought that the love which rests on the Son must rest also on those who are one with Him.

Ver. 14. This verse is parallel to Eph. i. 7. ἐν φίλοις not by whom, but in whom; if we possess Christ, we possess in Him our deliverance.—ἐξέπεσα: (present) we have as an abiding possession.—ἐλευθερωτησιν: "deliverance". The word is generally interpreted as ransom by payment of a price, for which Mark x. 45, δοθήσεται τῷ φυλάκι ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ πολλῶν, may be compared. But it is not certain that the word ever has this meaning. It is very rare in Greek writers (see reft.). The passage from Plutarch refers to pirates holding cities to ransom. But obviously the word here does not mean that we procure release by paying a ransom. The word is often used simply...
in the sense of “deliverance,” the idea of ransom having disappeared. (So in Rom. viii. 23, Eph. iv. 30, Luke xxi. 28.) It is best therefore to translate “deliverance” here, especially as this suits better the definition in the following words. The remission of sins is itself our deliverance, whereas it stands to the payment of the ransom as effect to cause. The elaborate discussion in Oltramare may be referred to for fuller details, with the criticism in Sanday and Headlam’s note on Rom. iii. 24; also Abbott on Eph. i. 7; Westcott on Heb., pp. 295, 296; Kitchil, Recht. und Versöhn. ii., 122 124; την ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ ἐξαπολύτητος. The similar definition of ἀφαίρεσις in Eph. i. 7 tells against Lightfoot’s view that it is added here against erroneous definitions by the false teachers, who very probably did not employ the term. The precise phrase does not occur elsewhere in Paul. την ἀφαίρεσιν not, as Hofmann thinks, on it and την ἀφαίρεσιν, for the latter is not used with the object from which deliverance is effected.

Vv. 15-21. This Son in whom we have our deliverance is the manifestation of God, the Lord of the universe, the Creator of all things in heaven and earth, including the angelic powers, and He is the goal for which they have been created. And as He is the first in the universe, so also He is Head of the Church, who has passed to His dominion from the realm of the dead, that He might become first in all things. For the Father willed that in Him all the fulness of Divine grace should dwell, and thus that He should reconcile to Him through His blood all things not on earth only but also in the heavens, in which reconciliation the Colossians have their part.—Ver. 15. With this verse the great Christological passage of the Epistle begins. Its aim is to refute the false doctrine, according to which angelic mediators usurped the place and functions of the Son in nature and grace. He, and He alone, is the Creator, Redeemer and Sovereign of all beings in the universe, including these angelic powers. The passage does not deal with the eternal relations of the Son to the Father, but with the Son’s relations to the universe and the Church. It is not of the pre-existent Son that Paul begins to speak, but of the Son who now possesses the kingdom, and in whom we have our deliverance (ἐσεὶ refers back to τ. ὑπὸ ὑμῖν ἐκεῖνος τ. ἀποκάλυφθαι). The work of the Son in His pre-existent state is referred to, that the true position of the exalted Christ may be rightly understood. As in other great theological passages in the Pauline Epistles, the metaphysical element is introduced for the sake of the practical. But it would be absurd to infer from this that it had little importance for the Apostle himself. He assumes the pre-existence of the Son as common ground, and is thus applying a fundamental Christian truth, which would form part of the elementary instruction in His Churches, to a new form of false teaching.—ἐσεὶ ἐστώ. It is the exalted Christ of whom Paul is speaking, as is suggested, though not necessarily implied by the present, but more forcibly by the previous relative clause. We could not feel confident in arguing back from the function of the exalted Son to that of the pre-incarnate Son, but what would be a plausible inference from this passage is asserted in Phil. ii. 5.—ἐκαίνι ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἀποστόλου. As image of God the Son possesses such likeness to God as fits Him to be the manifestation of God to us. God is invisible, which does not merely mean that He cannot be seen by our bodily eye, but that He is unknowable. In the exalted Christ the unknowable God becomes known. We behold “with unveiled face the glory of the Lord,” and so “are changed into the same image” (2 Cor. iii. 18). God has “shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge
of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ (iv. 6), and it is the unbelieving on whom "the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God," does not shine (iv. 4). These passages illustrate Paul's language here, and show that it is not, as Oltramare argues, of physical visibility or invisibility that he is speaking. Christ is the image of God for Christians. This, it is true, is only part of His wider functions. The Son is the Mediator between God and the universe. His work in grace has its basis in His place and work in nature. But it is the aspect of His work of which Paul is here speaking. The view of some of the Fathers that the Son, as image of the invisible God, must be Himself invisible is precisely the opposite of that intended by Paul. — πάντως τοῦτο σάν σάν κτίσεως. πρωτότοκος in its primary sense expresses temporal priority, and then, on account of the privileges of the firstborn, it gains the further sense of dominion. Many commentators think both ideas are present here. Soden and Abbott, on the other hand, deny that the word expresses anything more than priority to and distinction from all creation, while Haupt again thinks that all the stress is on the idea of dominion, the Son is ruler of all creation (similarly Ol. and Weiss, who says that no temporal prīs lies in the expression). It is undeniable that the word in the O.T. had in some cases lost its temporal significance, e.g., Exod. iv. 22, Ps. lxxxix. 28. Schoettgen instances the fact that R. Bechai spoke of God as "the firstborn of the world," though, probably, as Bleek says in his note on Heb. i. 6, this is to be regarded "nur als eine Singularität". The course of the argument seems to require that the stress should lie on the lordship of the Son rather than on His priority to creation. For what Paul is concerned to prove is the superiority of Christ to the angels, and for this the idea of priority is not relevant, but that of dominion is. Whether the word retains anything of its original meaning here is doubtful. If so, it might seem most natural to argue with the Arians that the Son is regarded as a creature. Grammatically it is possible to make τέργυς κτισεως a partitive genitive. But this is excluded by the context, which sharply distinguishes between the Son and το τέργυς, and for this idea Paul would probably have used πρωτότητος. The genitive is therefore commonly explained as a genitive of comparison. Oltramare says that such a genitive after a substantive is a pure invention, but it is explained to be after the πρωτότοκος κτισεως in πρωτότοκος, and for this idea Paul would probably have used πρωτότητος. This, as Lightfoot says, "unduly strains the grammar," and on this account it seems best to exclude the temporal element altogether. The pre-existence is sufficiently asserted in what follows. There seems to be no real affinity with Philo's doctrine of the Logos as πρωτόγονος. — τάσις κτισεως may be taken either as a collective, "all creation" (Lightf., R.V.), or distributively, "every creature" (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Abb.). Lightfoot urges in favour of the former that πρωτότοκος in its primary sense expresses temporal priority, and then, on account of the privileges of the firstborn, it gains the further sense of dominion. Whether the word retains anything of its original meaning here is doubtful. If so, it might seem most natural to argue with the Arians that the Son is regarded as a creature. Grammatically it is possible to make τέργυς κτισεως a partitive genitive. But this is excluded by the context, which sharply distinguishes between the Son and το τέργυς, and for this idea Paul would probably have used πρωτότητος. The genitive is therefore commonly explained as a genitive of comparison. Oltramare says that such a genitive after a substantive is a pure invention, but it is
is exhausted by the "all things" which were so created in Him ("omnem excludit creaturam," Bengel).— ἐκτίσσει: this does not mean "by Him". The sense is disputed. The schoolmen, followed by some modern theologians, explain that the Son is the archetype of the universe, the κόσμος νοητός, the eternal pattern after which the physical universe has been created. So Philo held that the Logos was the home wherein the eternal ideas resided. But it is by no means clear that Alexandrian influence can be traced in the Epistle. Further, the notion of creation is not suitable to the origin of the ideal universe in the Son. If the Son was from eternity the archetype of the universe, then εἰς αὐτόν ought not to have been used, both because the aorist points to a definite time and the idea of creation is itself inapplicable. But that the ideal universe was at some time created in the Son is an highly improbable, if it is even an intelligible, idea. Again, the sense of εἰς τὸν κόσμον is controlled by that of εἰς τὸν κόσμον, which does not refer to the ideal universe. It must therefore refer to the actual creation of the universe. If Paul had intended to speak of the realisation in creation of the ideal universe which had in the Son its eternal home he would have said εἰς αὐτόν. Others (Mey., Ell., Moule) take ἐν αὐτῷ to mean simply that the act of creation depended causally on the Son. This is perhaps the safest explanation, for Haupt's interpretation that apart from His Person there would have been no creation, but with His Person creation was a necessity—in other words, that creation was "given" in Christ—seems with the aorist and the choice of the word ἐκτίσσει to be inconsistent with the eternal existence of the Son.—τὰ πάντα, i.e., the universe in its widest sense regarded as a collective whole.— ὡς θεραύνεις δ. τ. Μαρτυρίας is a "classification by locality," while τὰ δρατά κ. τ. δόροι is a "classification by essence". The two do not precisely correspond, for the divisions cross each other to some extent, though some confuse the things in heaven to the world of spirits, and the things on earth to the world of men, in which case they would correspond to things invisible and things visible. Against this see above on τὸ νῦν. The ἐν αὐτῷ is to ἐν τῷ θεῷ: taken by some to be the angels of the Son, that is angels who, like the cherubim, bear the throne of God. But it is more probable that they are those seated on thrones (cf. Rev. iv. 4). On these orders, cf. the Slavonic Enoch,
In the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers and lordships and principalities and powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones and the watchfulness of many eyes". Also Enoch, lxii, 10, "and all the angels of powers and all the angels of principalities". Test., xii., Patr. Levi., 3. In τῇ μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰς θρόνου, ἡδοναλία, ἐν ὧν ἦγεν ἐν τῇ θεῷ προσφοράντα. Κυρίστησις: apparently inferior to θρόνοι. Δραχμαί... δόγματα usually occur together and in this order.—τὰ ἄρα... συνότητα: thrown in as a parenthesis.—δι' αὐτοῦ. The Son is the Agent in creation (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6); this definitely states the pre-existence of the Son and assumes the supremacy of the Father, whereas Agent the Son is.—ἐγείρεται. That the Son is the goal of creation is an advance on Paul's previous teaching, which had been that the goal of the universe is God (Rom. xi. 36; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 6, ἡσυχία ὑπὸ αὐτῶν). It is urged by Holtzmann and others as decisive against the authenticity of the Epistle as it stands. But in 1 Cor. xv. 25 sq. all things have to become subject to the Son before He hands over the kingdom to the Father. We find the same thought in Matt. xxviii. 18 and Heb. ii. 8. And, as Oltramare and others point out, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, ἐν οἷς τὰ πάντα is said of Christ, but of God in Rom. xi. 36. Yet this difference is not quoted to show that Romans and Corinthians cannot be by the same hand, and it is equally illegitimate to press εἰς αὐτός for αὐτός. The Son stands as Agent of worship. —ἐπιφανεία. The perfect, as distinct from the aorist, expresses the abiding result as distinct from the act at a definite point of time (cf. John i. 3, ἐγένετο followed by γένετο).

The interpretation of vv. 15-17 given by Oltramare should not be passed over. He eliminates the idea of pre-existence from the passage, and says that the reference is throughout to Christ as Redeemer. God had in creation to provide a plan of Redemption for the entrance of evil into the universe, and only on that condition could it take place. So since Christ is the Redeemer, creation is based upon Him, He is the means to it, and the end which it contemplates. He objects to the common view that there are the following grounds: (1) Elsewhere Paul speaks of God, not Christ, as the Creator and goal of the universe; (2) Paul starts from the Christ in whom we have redemption as πρῶτος, ὁ πατριός, and in ver. 18, which refers to the same Person as ver. 17, He is spoken of as the Head of the Church, therefore the context is against any reference to a pre-incarnate Christ; (3) He carefully avoids saying that the Son has created all things, though he has to change the subject of the sentence. In reply to (1) it may be said that the Son acts as Agent of the Father, and so creation may be referred to either, and that while Paul contemplates the final surrender by the Son of the kingdom to the Father, he also contemplates a prior subjection of everything to the Son. Oltramare himself, for another purpose, points to apparent inconsistency in John (John i. 2 compared with Rev. iii. 14, iv. 11, x. 6) and the author of Hebrews...
1 So Ln., T., Tr., Lft., Ws. with nearly all ancient authorities. ἡ ἀρχή: [W.H.] with B 47, under influence of εἰς τὸν Κ.  

(i. 2 compared with ii. 10, xi. 3). If these writers did not find the two views incompatible, why should Paul have done so? In reply to (2) it may be urged that Paul's hold on the personal identity of the Son in the states through which He passed was strong enough to enable Him to glide from one to the other without any sense of incongruity. As to (3), the change in the form of sentence is probably to prepare for διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. There is a similar change at ver. 19, where διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου corresponds to διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ver. 16). His own view is open to fatal objections. It is not clear that the creation of the angels who did not fall would be conditional on provision being made for Redemption, nor yet how this would prove the superiority of the Redeemer to these angels. The insuperable difficulty, however, is that the thought is so far-fetched and not naturally suggested by the words. διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου can hardly be consistent with the creation of the universe long before the Son came into existence. Nor can διὰ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου mean merely that the Son was an indispensable condition for the creation of the universe, it implies active agency. Nor is any sufficient explanation given. For ἡ τύχη, cf. ii. 19, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15, 16, v. 23. For Christ as Head simply, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 3. For the Church as the body of Christ, ver. 24, Eph. iv. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 27, Rom. xii. 5. For Christians as the members of Christ's body, Eph. v. 30, 1 Cor. xii. 37. For Christians as "severally members one of another," Rom. xii. 5. By this metaphor of "the head of the body" is meant that Christ is the Lord and Ruler of His Church, its directing brain, probably also that its life depends on continued union with Him. The Church is a body in the sense that it is a living organism, composed of members vitally united to each other, each member with his own place and function, each essential to the body's perfect health, each dependent on the rest of the body for its life and well-being, while the whole organism and all the individual members derive all their life from the Head and act under His guidance. And as the body needs the Head, to be the source of its life and the controller of its activities, so the Head needs the body to be His instrument in carrying out His designs. It is only in Colossians and Ephesians that Christ appears as Head of the Church, but the emphasis in Colossians is on the Headship, in Ephesians on the Church.—ἡ κοιναί ἡ τ. σώματος (cf. ii. 19, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15, 16). For Christ as Head simply, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 3. For the Church as the body of Christ, ver. 24, Eph. iv. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 27, Rom. xii. 5. For Christians as the members of Christ's body, Eph. v. 30, 1 Cor. xii. 37. For Christians as "severally members one of another," Rom. xii. 5. By this metaphor of "the head of the body" is meant that Christ is the Lord and Ruler of His Church, its directing brain, probably also that its life depends on continued union with Him. The Church is a body in the sense that it is a living organism, composed of members vitally united to each other, each member with his own place and function, each dependent on the rest of the body for its life and well-being, while the whole organism and all the individual members derive all their life from the Head and act under His guidance. And as the body needs the Head, to be the source of its life and the controller of its activities, so the Head needs the body to be His instrument in carrying out His designs. It is only in Colossians and Ephesians that Christ appears as Head of the Church, but the emphasis in Colossians is on the Headship, in Ephesians on the Church.—ἡ κοιναί ἡ τ. σώματος: often taken in apposition to σώματος. For this we should have expected τ. σώματος, τ. Κ. (cf. ver. 24). It may also be taken as expository of σώματος (so Weiss and Haupt, who quotes 1 Cor. v. 8, 2 Cor. v. 5, Rom. iv. 11, viii. 21, xv. 16.)
19. δι’ εν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πάντι τὸ πλήρεμα κατοικῆσαι, 20. καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλάβας τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτὸν, εἰρημυσθήσασι διὰ τοῦ αἰὼν. 1 Prov. x. 10; Hermes in Stob.; only here in N.T. as parallels, all of which, however, are not clear. ἐκκλ. is here the universal Church.—δι’ εστὶν: inasmuch as He is. Paul is giving a reason for the position of the Son as ἡ καθ. τ. σωμάτων.—ἀρχή is not to be taken in the sense of ἀρχήν, nor is it certain that it has, as Lightfoot and others think, the sense of originating power. It is defined by πρωτότοκος ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ, and this seems to throw the stress rather on the idea of supremacy than that of priority. There is perhaps a tacit reference to ἀρχαὶ (ver. 16).—πρωτότοκος ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ: "firstborn from among the dead". In Rev. i. 5 we have ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, which expresses a different idea. If the temporal reference in ἀρχαί is the more prominent, the meaning will be that He is the first to pass out of the dominion of death. But if sovereignty is the leading idea, the meaning is that from among the dead He has passed to His throne, where He reigns as the living Lord, who has overcome death, and who, before He surrenders the kingdom to the Father, will abolish it.—ἴνα... πρωτότοκος: the purpose for which He is ἀρχὴν πρωτότοκος ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ. He is supreme in the universe. He has to become supreme in relation to the Church. ἀρχὴ is emphatic; it is not masculine, on account of the context.

Ver. 19. This verse with ver. 20 shows how the Son was able to hold the position assigned to Him in ver. 18. Further, this verse leads up to ver. 20. The thought is then: All the fulness dwelt in the Son, thereforereconciliation could be accomplished through the blood of His cross, and so He became the Head of the body.—εἰσέκβησεν. Three views are taken as to the subject of the verb. (1) Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot, Oltramare, Haupt and the great majority of commentators supply ὁ θεός as the subject. (2) Ewald, Ellicott, Weiss, Soden and Abbott make πλήρωμα the subject. (3) Conybeare, Hofmann and Findlay supply ὁ θεός or ἡ Χριστοῦ. In favour of (3) the unique emphasis on the sovereignty of Christ in this passage is urged, also that it prepares the way for the reference of ἀποκαταλάβας and εἰρημυσθήσας to Christ, in accordance with Eph. ii. 14-16, v. 27. It is also true that the subject from ver. 15 is, for the most part, the Son. But the usage of Paul leads us to think of the Father, not of the Son, as the One who forms the eternal purpose (Eph. i. 9, 2 Cor. v. 19). Nor does ver. 20 run on naturally. If the Son is the subject of " was well pleased," the obvious interpretation of δι’ αὐτοῦ ἀρχὴν is to reconcile through the fulness, which is highly improbable. We should accordingly have to give to δι’ αὐτοῦ a reflexive sense, and translate " through Himself," which is grammatically possible, but not natural. There is the further objection which it shares with (1) that a change of subjects to the infinitives is required. πλήρωμα being the subject of ἱστορεῖ, while that to ἀρχηγόν is Θεός or θεός. But it is less awkward in (1) than in (3), for the former does not make the Son at once the originator and the Agent of the plan of reconciliation. Against (1), besides the objection just mentioned, it may be said that the construction with ἐστὶν is unusual, for its subject is elsewhere in the N.T. the subject of the following infinitive (this tells against (3) also), and that in a passage of such importance the subject could not have been omitted. But for the omission of the subject Lightfoot compares Jas. i. 12, iv. 6. What, however, is really decisive in its favour is the difficulty of accepting (2). The expression " all the fulness was well pleased" is very strange in itself. But what is much stranger is that the fulness was not only pleased to dwell in Him, but through Him to reconcile all things unto Him. And the only natural course is to refer ἐστὶν to the subject of ἐστὶν, but the masculine makes it difficult to regard πλήρωμα as that subject. We should therefore translate " God" (or " the Father") " was well pleased"—πάντα τὰ πλήρημα. On πλήρωμα the detached note in Lightfoot, pp. 255-271, should be consulted, with the criticism of it in an article on " The Church as the Fulfillment of the Christ," by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson (Expositor, April, 1898), also Oltramare's note. Lightfoot urges in opposition to Fritzsch that πλήρωμα has always a genuinely passive sense, not the pseudo-passive sense " id quo res impetur" which Fritzsch gave
Several times in LXX; only here and Eph. ii. 12, iv. 18 in N.T.

1 So T. [W.H.], Lft., R.V., Ws. with ΝΑCD GloEKP. δι' αὐτοῦ: omitted by Lm., Tr. with BD*FGL, by homoeoteleuton.

it, and which is really the active "id quod implet," but that which is completed. The basis of the decision is that substantives in -μα, since they are derived from the perfect passive, must have a passive sense. But, as Prof. Robinson points out, these substantives have their stem not in -μα but in -ματ-, and therefore are not to be connected with the perfect passive. He reaches the conclusion that if a general signification is to be sought for, we may say that these nouns represent "the result of the agency of the corresponding verb". If the verb is intransitive the substantive will be so; if it is transitive and the substantive corresponds to its object the noun is passive, but if the substantive is followed by the object of the verb in the genitive it is active. According to the double use of πληρώματος " fill" and to "fulfil", πληρώματα may mean that which fills or that which fulfils, the fulness, fulfilment or complement. Oltramare comes to the conclusion that the word means perfection, and interprets this passage to mean that ideal perfection dwelt in Christ. Accordingly he escapes the question what genitive should be supplied after it. It does not seem, however, that the word meant moral perfection. Many think that 6κομοτο, should be supplied after πληρώματα, as is actually done in ii. 9. Serious difficulties beset this view. If we think of the eternal indwelling, we make it dependent on the Father's will, an Arian view, which Paul surely did not hold. Alford's reply to this (endorsed by Abbott) that all that is the Son's right "is His Father's pleasure, and is ever referred to that pleasure by Himself," is anything but cogent, for εὐδοκησαν refers to a definite decree of the Father, and the obvious meaning of the words is that it lay within the Father's choice whether the πληρώματα should dwell in the Son or not. It might refer to the exaltation of Christ, in which the Son resumed that of which He had emptied Himself in the Incarnation. This would follow the reference to the resurrection in ver. 18. But the order does not indicate the true logical or chronological sequence. Vv. 19, 20 give the ground (δι' αὐτοῦ) on which the Son's universal pre-eminence rests, and ver. 20 is quite incompatible with this reference to the exalted state, co-ordinated as αὐτοῦκαί καὶ αὐτοίκριτωσίμουν καί.
the context. More possible is the view that it means the universe = τὰ ἀνώνυμα, ver. 16 (Hofm., Cremer, Godet, who compares "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness of it"). In that case the genitive supplied would be τῶν ἀνώνυμων from ver. 16. But if the reference in this be to the summing up of all things in Christ (Eph. i. 10), it is excluded by the fact that the indwelling of the fulness is contemporaneous with the incarnate state. A more plausible interpretation would be to regard τὰ ἀνώνυμα as dwelling in Christ before His death, and by sharing that death, attaining reconciliation with God. This would be an extension of the Pauline thought that all men died when Christ died (2 Cor. v. 14). But it would be an extension precisely corresponding to that of the scope of redemption in ver. 20, for which, indeed, it would admirably prepare the way, the universe dwelling in the Son that His death might be universal in its effects. That the Son is not only Head of the race, but Head also of the universe, is a familiar thought in these Epistles, and as His acts are valid for one so also for the other. Nothing more is implied for the relation of the universe to Christ than of the race, and if the main stress be thrown on angels and men, there is nothing incongruous in the idea. Whether Paul would have used it in this sense without fuller explanation is uncertain; but in any case a genitive has to be supplied. A further question must be briefly referred to, that of the origin of the term. Several scholars think it was already in use as a technical term of the false teachers at the time when the letter was written. This is possible, and in its favour is its absolute use here; but, if so, it is strange that Paul should use it with such different applications. It is more probable that its origin is due to him.—κατοικεῖ. The word expresses permanent abode as opposed to a temporary sojourn. Bengel says aptly "Haec habitatio est fundamentum reconciliationis".

Ver. 20. To this verse Eph. i. 10, ii. 16, are partially parallel. It supplies the basis for the Son's pre-eminence (ver. 18) in His reconciling death. — ἐν οὐρανοῖς through the Son. — ἐν οὐρανοῖς τὰ πάντα ἐλα ἀπόνων. The choice of ἐν οὐρανοῖς instead of the more usual σταυρῷ, is for the sake of strengthening the idea, and by insisting on the completeness of the reconciliation accomplished to exclude all thought that reconciliation by angels is needed to supplement that made by Christ. The reconciliation implies previous estrangement. It is the universal sweep of this passage that makes it at once fascinating and mysterious. Numerous expedients have been devised by exegetes to avoid the plain meaning of the words. The natural sense is that this reconciliation embraces the whole universe, and affects both things in heaven and things on the earth, and that peace is made between them and God (or Christ). The point which creates difficulty is the assertion that angels were thus reconciled. Some have evaded this by interpreting τὰ πάντα of the things in heaven below the angels and those on earth below man. It might be possible to parallel the latter reconciliation with Paul's prophecy of the deliverance of animate and inanimate nature (excluding man) from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 21-23). But the two are not identical, for one is and the other is not eschatological, and reconciliation is not deliverance from the bondage of corruption. And this helps us little to explain what the reconciliation of all things in heaven is. Nor is any such limitation legitimate; on the contrary, it is precisely in the opposite direction that any limitation would have to be made; for in its full sense reconciliation can only be of beings endowed with moral and spiritual nature. In vv. 16, 17 angelic powers are explicitly included in τὰ πάντα. It is plain that εἷς ἀπόνων excludes the view that a reconciliation of angels and men is intended. This is so even if with Chrysostom and others (including apparently Abbott) we make τὰ ἐν τ. γῆς and τὰ ἐν τ. οὐρανῶν depend on ἐν οὐρανοῖς. For this still leaves unexplained τὰ πάντα εἷς ἀπόνων, which makes the reference to angels undeniable. Bengel's note, "Certum est angelos, Dei amicos, fuisse inimicos hominum Deo infensorum," may be perfectly true. But it is irrelevant here, for only by forcing the words can ἐν οὐρανοῖς be regarded as other than epexegetical of the preceding clause, and in particular τ. ἐν τ. γῆς and τὰ ἐν τ. οὐρανῶν as a resolution of τ. πάντα. Abbott's suggestion that τὰ ἐν τ. οὐρανῶν may be inhabitants of other worlds may be true, though for Paul the thought is far-fetched, but does nothing towards excluding the angels. He urges that ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is not necessarily equivalent to "in heaven". But not only did Jewish angelology place the angels in the heavens, but Paul did so too, and has done so only just before in this passage, defining τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανῶν, as the various orders of angels (ver. 16).
Further, not only is this exclusion of the angels from the scope of reconciliation inconsistent with the terms of the passage, it omits a very important point in Paul's polemic. To the angels the false teachers probably ascribed the function of procuring the reconciliation of men with God. (Cf. Enoch xv.2, "And go, say to the watchers of heaven, who have sent thee to intercede for them: you should intercede for men, and not men for you ")

How effective is Paul's reply that these angels needed reconciliation themselves! Assuming, then, that angels are included among those reconciled, and that this is also referred to in the words "having made peace through the blood of His cross," the question arises, What did Paul mean by this? Meyer says that in consequence of the fall of the evil angels the angelic order as a whole was affected by the hostile relation of God to them, and the original relation will be fully restored when the evil angels are finally cast into hell. But apart from the speculative nature of this explanation, and the injustice it imputes to God, the reference is certainly not eschatological. Godet lays stress on εἰς αὐτῶν, and suggests that the reconciliation is not to God but with reference to God. He thinks that the passing over of sins by God (Rom. iii. 25) might cause the angels, who had been mediators in the giving of the law, difficulties as to the Divine righteousness. This was met and removed by the cross, which revealed God's attitude to sin and reconciled them to His government. We do not know that the angels needed this vindication, which, of course, it was a function of Christ's death to give, though it is possible (Eph. iii. 10, 1 Pet. i. 18). But this interpretation seems to be excluded by the explanation of reconciliation as making peace. And εἰς αὐτῶν was probably chosen instead of αὐτῷ on account of εἰς αὐτῶν (ver. 16), and because it was stronger and expressed the thought of God or Christ as the goal. The explanation that the angels were confirmed, and thus made unable to fall, is altogether inadequate. Harless, Oltramare and others admit a reconciliation of men and angels to God, but without asserting that το θε το ὑπ. needed reconciliation. Wherever it was needed Christ effected it. But Paul's division of το θε into two categories marked by το τι shows that the statement has reference not simply to these classes taken together as a whole, but to each taken singly. Alford, in his suggestive note, after saying that such a reconciliation as that between man and God is not to be thought of, since Christ did not take on Him the seed of angels or pay any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature, gives as his interpretation "all creation subsists in Christ: all creation therefore is affected by His act of propitiation: sinful creation is, in the strictest sense, reconciled from being at enmity: sinless creation, ever at a distance from His unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of Him, and is thus reconciled, though not in the strictest, yet in a very intelligible and allowable sense". Unfortunately this cannot be accepted, for the strict is the only allowable sense. But it is on the right lines, and indicates the direction in which a solution must be sought. This, as several recent scholars have urged (Kl., Gess, Everling and others), is through taking account of the Biblical and Jewish doctrine of angels. That the angels are divided into the sharply separated classes of sinless and demoniacal is a view on which this passage remains inexplicable. Nor is it the Old Testament or the Jewish doctrine, or it may be added, the doctrine of Paul. Perhaps we need not, with Gess, think of an intermediate class, or, with Ritschl,
of the angels of the Law. To Jewish
thought angels stood in the closest rela-
tions with men, and were regarded as
sharing a moral responsibility for their
acts. The angelic princes of earthly
kingdoms in Daniel, and the angels of
the Churches in the Apocalypse, are
Biblical examples of this. A large num-
er of Pauline passages harmonise with
the view that the angelic world needed a
reconciliation. The detailed proof of
this cannot be given here; it belongs to
the discussion of the angelology of the
Epistle. (See Introd., section ii.) But
if the angels needed it, how could it be
effectively through the blood of the cross?
It is not enough to answer with Haupt
that the reconciliation of men affected
the angels who were closely united with
them. A direct effect seems to be in-
tended, and the difficulty is that stated
by Holtzmann, that with the flesh all
capacity is absent from the angels of
Paul, to share in the saving effects of
the death of God's Son, which was made
possible through the assumption of the
flesh, and in which sin in the flesh is con-
demned. In answer to it these considera-
tions may be urged. The Son is Head
of the angels, as He is Head of humanity;
therefore His acts had an effect on them
independently of their effect on men.
His death must not be narrowly con-
ceived as physical only, as the destruc-
tion of the material flesh. It was the
destruction of the sinful principle; and
therefore is independent in its effects
of the possession of material bodies by those
whom it saves. And this cannot be set
aside by the fact that Paul uses such a
physical term as blood of the cross, for the
death of Christ was surely more to him
than a mere physical incident. So far,
then, as the angel world was affected by
sin, it needed reconciliation, and received
it in the atoning and sin-destroying death
of Christ its Head. That in this reconci-
liaiton vision in the angelic world, as for
the death of Christ was surely more to him
than a mere physical incident. So far,
then, as the angel world was affected by
sin, it needed reconciliation, and received
it in the atoning and sin-destroying death
of Christ its Head. That in this reconci-
liaiton vision in the angelic world, as for
the death of Christ was surely more to him
than a mere physical incident. So far,
then, as the angel world was affected by
sin, it needed reconciliation, and received
it in the atoning and sin-destroying death
of Christ its Head. That in this reconci-
liaiton vision in the angelic world, as for
the death of Christ was surely more to him
than a mere physical incident. So far,
then, as the angel world was affected by
sin, it needed reconciliation, and received
it in the atoning and sin-destroying death
of Christ its Head. That in this reconci-

continued in ver. 22, where the thought is of the Christian standing of the Colossians before God. It is therefore unlikely that \( \text{παρεσεῖον} \) should depend on \( \text{οὐδός} \). Accordingly, with Haupt and Weiss, a comma should be placed at the end of ver. 20, and a full stop at the end of ver. 21. \( \text{ὅμως} \) in ver. 21 will then depend on \( \text{ἀνοκέας} \). It might seem an anti-climax after the wide sweep of ver. 20 to narrow down the reference to the Colossians. But we have a similar case in ver. 5, and the personal application of a universal truth is anti-climax only to a rhetorician. The danger of the Colossians makes it peculiarly appropriate here. 

---

\( \text{ἐστραγγάλεως} \) : "estranged," i.e., from God, probably not to be taken as counted as aliens by God, but as expressing their attitude to God, but as expressing their attitude to God. 

---

\( \text{ἐν τῇ καιρῷ τῆς πεποιθώσεως} \) : "at the present time" or "at the present moment," but "in the present state of things," thus, as Lightfoot points out, admitting an aorist, referring to an action lying in the past. \( \text{ἀνοκύκλωσα} \) : "ye were reconciled," but scarcely to be re-
24. Nων χαίρω εν τοῖς παρθέναις υπὲρ ὅμων, καὶ ἀντανακλήρω τὰ ὀστερήματα τῶν ἀθλήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ οὐδὲν.

1 So edd. with non-Western authorities, perhaps by homoeoteleuton. os: inserted before vv by Haupt with DEFG, perhaps by dittography. See note.

do with a change of feeling in God or man, but of the relation of God to men. It is synonymous with justification. This παρθένον is a continuous process dependent on continuance in faith and love. He urges that Paul regards the judgment as depending on moral conditions, not on the holding fast of faith and love. But a distinction of this kind should not be pressed in the case of Paul; for him faith was the root of morality, and love the fulfillment of the Law. Generally this is taken to be before God. But since Paul elsewhere teaches that we must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, it seems best (with Meyer) to take αἰὼν in the same way. ἁγίασμα καὶ ἀνάμικτον καὶ ἀναγέληντον. Soden and Haupt insist that these are not ethical but religious terms. This is probably correct; since the reference is to the judgment, they have a forensic sense. ἁγίασμα probably means blameless rather than undefiled, and this is supported by the addition of ἀναγέλη.

Ver. 23. Εὐαγγελία with the indicative expresses the Apostle's confidence that the condition will be fulfilled. ἐν ἑαυτῷ This abiding in faith is the only, as it is the sure way, to this presentation of themselves κατ. αὑτόν. This is directed against the false teachers' assurance that the gospel must needs be supplemented if they wished to attain salvation. It needs no supplementing, and it is at the peril of salvation that they lose hold of it. τήμερονεἴρητον refers to the firm foundation, ἱδραύλῳ to the stability of the building. The perfect particiiple here gives way to the present, expressing a continuous process. It may be passive or middle, probably the former. ἀντὶ τ. ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: to be taken with μετακιν. alone, not, assuming a zeugma, with the three co-ordinate expressions (Sod.), for it is not at all clear that the last of these deeps up the metaphor of a building. The hope of the Gospel is the hope given by or proclaimed in the Gospel. ὁ μάρτυς Paul again sets his seal on the form of the Gospel which they had received, and again insists on the universality of its proclamation, its catholicity as guaranteeing its truth (see on vv. 5-7). ἐν παρθένῃ κτίσεω: "in presence of every creature"; π. κτ., as in ver. 15, with the limitation τ. τ. ὁμόρρωπον. ὁ δικαιὸς Παύλος Πάντων: cf. Eph. iii. 7. This phrase contains a certain stately self-assertion; the Apostle urges the fact that he is a minister of this Gospel as a reason why they should remain faithful to it. His apostolic authority, so far from being impugned by the false teachers, was more probably invoked; so Paul throws it in the balance against them. It is also true that the Gentile mission was so bound up in his own mind with his apostleship that a reference to the one naturally suggested a reference to the other. By this clause Paul effects the transition to ver. 24.

Vv. 24-29. Paul rejoices that his sufferings are for the benefit of the Church, in whose service he fulfills his divinely appointed task, of fully preaching the long hidden but now revealed mystery of the Gospel, which is universal in its scope, a task in which he uses all the mighty strength with which God has endowed him. — Ver. 24. It is usually assumed that οὐδὲν read by the Western text is due to dittography; but it may quite as easily have fallen out through homeoteleuton as have been inserted. It is, however, omitted by such an overwhelming combination of MSS. that it would not perhaps be justifiable to place it in the text. On grounds of internal evidence a strong case can be made out for the insertion. Lightfoot omits, and thinks the abruptness characteristic of Paul. He quotes as parallels 2 Cor. vii. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12. But the connexion in the former case is uncertain; Westcott and Hort do not begin a new sentence with τῶν χαίρει: if correctly, it is not a true parallel. But if otherwise there is not the abrupt change of subject we find here, for Paul has been speaking of his previous regret, and τῶν χαίρει follows naturally on this. In the latter case, apart from the dubious authenticity of the Epistle, ver. 12 naturally continues ver. 11. On the other hand, it is very characteristic of our Epistle for transitions to be effected by the relative. Without it we have no preparation for
ver. 24, for υἱὸν is not transitional. And with it the appeal to their loyalty in οὗ ἐγεν. ήπόν ρήμα, is greatly strengthened.

—νῦν χαίρω: "I now rejoice," not "now, in contrast to times of repining," or "now as I contemplate the greatness of redemption," but simply "in my present condition as a prisoner." Joy in suffering is a familiar Pauline idea.

Tois ἀνθρώποι: not, as Meyer and Haupt, "over my sufferings," for which ἑαυτῷ would have been expected (though cf. Phil. i. 18, Luke x. 20), but "in my sufferings," denoting the sphere in which, not (as Ell.) both sphere in and subject over which.—ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὲμε: i.e., for your benefit. Oltramare compares Phil. i. 29, Eph. iii. 13, i Pet. iii. 18, and interprets "for love of you"—a fine thought; but probably that is not in Paul's mind.—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν: i.e., for love of you. The meaning of this verb is much disputed. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is "to fill up." ὑπέρ in composition has, according to Grimm, the following senses: opposite, over against; the mutual efficiency of two; requital; hostile opposition; official substitution; but some of these do not occur with verbs. He explains it in this way: "What is wanting of the affliction of Christ to be borne by me, that I supply in order to repay the benefits which Christ conferred on me by filling up the measure of the afflictions laid upon Him". ὑπέρ- on this view means "in return for." The following interpretations are the chief views that have been taken: (1) Many Romanist commentators explain the sufferings of Christ to be His mediatorial sufferings, left incomplete by Him and completed by His saints, Paul taking his share in this. (2) Lightfoot, Oltramare, Findlay, Haupt and others agree with (1) in taking τ. Χ. τ. Χ. as the sufferings which Christ endured on earth. But they deny that these are mediatorial sufferings; they had "a ministerial utility." Christ suffered for the kingdom of God, and His followers must continue this. Hofmann's view is a special form of this. Christ was sent only to Israel, and endured sufferings in His ministry to it. Paul fills up what is left of these sufferings, as Apostle to the Gentiles. (3) Meyer, followed by Abbott, thinks the afflictions are Paul's own, and are called the afflictions of Christ because they are of the same essential character. Since his sufferings are still incomplete, he speaks of filling up the measure of them. (4) The sufferings are those of the Church, which are still incomplete. They are called the afflictions of Christ because they are those of His body. Thus Bengel: "Fixa est mensura passionum. quas tota exantlare debet ecdesia. Quo plus igitur Paulus exhausit, eo minus et ipsi postea relinquitur. Hoc factum communio sanctorum." Cremer similarly says that the defect is not in what Christ suffered, but in the communion of the Church in His sufferings. Paul concentrates on himself the hate of the world against Christ and His Church. (5) The sufferings are the sufferings of...
Christ, not however, those which He endured on earth, but those which He endures in Paul through their mystical union. The defect is not (as in 4) in the sufferings of the Church, but in Christ's sufferings in Paul. (2) must be set aside on the ground that ἄλλως is not used of Christ's atoning sufferings, for which Paul employs ἐπι, θέταντος, σταυρών. (3) must be rejected because the afflictions of Christ can hardly mean afflictions like those of Christ. (4) is to be rejected on similar grounds, the defect is in Christ's own suffering, not in that of the Church. Besides there would be an un-Pauline arrogance in the claim that he was filling up the yet incomplete sufferings of the Church. We are thus left with (2) and (5), each of which takes "the afflictions of Christ" in the strict sense of afflictions endured by Christ Himself. We cannot, with Lightfoot, decide against (5) on the ground that ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ excludes an identification between the sufferings of Paul and Christ. Hofmann's view is very attractive on account of the context, in which Paul is speaking of his Apostleship to the Gentiles. It is perhaps the best form of (2), and may be right. It, however, labours, with (2) generally, under the objection that it implies defect in Christ's earthly sufferings, for ἄλλως means defect, and actually compels us to fill up the defect left by Christ is strangely arrogant. It is therefore best to accept (5). It is urged that there is no N.T. parallel to the idea that Christ suffered in His members, but apart from Acts ix. 4, Paul's doctrine of union with Christ is such that we should almost be compelled to infer that Christ suffered in His members, even if Paul had not here affirmed it. And there is no arrogance here. For Paul does not claim to fill up the defects in Christ's earthly sufferings or in the sufferings of the Church, but in the sufferings which He has to endure in his flesh, which are Christ's sufferings, because he and Christ are one. We should accordingly take τ. θ. τ. Χ., with ἄν τῇ σταυρῷ μου as a single idea, "Christ's sufferings in my flesh".—ἄν τῇ σταυρῷ μου. There is a delicate contrast between the flesh of Paul and the body of Christ. If these words were connected with ἀπεστάλη, they would probably have immediately followed.—τῶν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ: "on behalf of His body". This may simply mean that the sufferings of Paul advanced the interests of the Church (cf. Phil. i. 12-14). But, taking into account Paul's strong feeling of the solidarity of the Church, he probably means that apart from any furthering of the Church's interests which his imprisonment may bring about, the suffering of one of the members must benefit the whole body; just as in a higher and fuller sense the suffering of the Head had procured salvation for the Church. Paul rejoices, not, as Abbott says the view taken of τ. θ. τ. Χ. would involve, "because they went to increase the afflictions of Christ," but because his afflictions, which were those of Christ also in the necessity of the case, were a blessing to Christ's body.—5 ἐν τούτῳ ἐξακολουθεῖ: "that is, the Church," perhaps added because σφέ and σφίμμα occur together here, and the readers might be confused as to the precise meaning of σφίμμα.

Ver. 25. ἐὰν ἔχεις μὴν ὑπὲρ διδασκαλίας. With these words Paul returns to ver. 23, speaking of himself here, however, as a minister of the Church, there of the Gospel. Because he is a minister of the Church, it is a joy to suffer for its welfare. He proceeds to explain what his peculiar (ἐν ὑπερβολῇ) ministry is.—κατὰ τὴν ἐλεονενίαν: cf. Eph. iii. 2. εἰκ. is "stewardship" rather than "dispensation" (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 17). τ. θεοῦ indicates that this office is held in the house of God, or that it has been entrusted to him by God.—ἐς τοὺς: to be taken with ἐς, as in Eph. iii. 2, not with ἐπί (as by Chrys. and Hofm.). It means towards you Gentiles, that is for your benefit. The context shows that the Gentiles are uppermost in his thought.—ἐπικεφαλήσας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ: "to fulfil the word of God". χαί. is taken by some of the completion by this letter of the teaching already given to the Colossians. But Paul is speaking of the function specially entrusted to him. Generally this is explained of the geographical extension of the Gospel. Haupt thinks the geographical point of view is not present here. An essential characteristic of the Gospel is its universality. Paul's special mission is to bring this to realisa-
tion. This he does by proclaiming the Gospel to the Gentiles, thus making clear the true nature of the Gospel. This suits the context better, for Paul proceeds to define the mystery entrusted to him as the universality of salvation, not the wide extension of the Gospel. Other interpretations may be seen in Meyer or Eadie.

Ver. 26. Partially parallel to Eph. iii. 9. How great the honour conferred on Paul is, appears from the fact that he is entrusted with the duty of declaring the long concealed secret which is the distinguishing mark of his Gospel.— to αἵρευσιν. Lightfoot thinks that the term is borrowed by Paul from the Greek mysteries, and that it is intentionally chosen to point the contrast between those secret mysteries and the Gospel which is offered to all. But for the mysteries the plural was employed. And there would be more justification for this interpretation in Meyer or Eadie.

Ver. 27. Cf. for a partial parallel Eph. i. 18. — οὐ τῶν αἰώνων τῶν αἰωνίων. It has been so taken here, not by Klopper, who suggests it as possible, but does not accept it, but by Franke. He thinks both are terms for angels, and in itself such a reference is not improbable, for it is through the Church that the principalities and powers come to learn the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 9, where just before the mystery is said to have been concealed αἵρευσιν). But we have no evidence that γενεαῖς was ever used in this way, and no parallel for this use of αἵρευσιν in N.T. Without identifying the terms with personal existences, we may with Haupt (cf. also Soden) take αἵρευσιν of the generations of human history. This will be practically the same as saying that the mystery was concealed from angels and men. This is probably the meaning of Bengel's note: "Æones referuntur ad angelos; generationes, ad homines." Theodoret, followed by Klopper, thinks that there is a polemical reference here to the antiquity of the Gospel and its consequent superiority to the Law. Abbott thinks the point of the reference to the long concealment and recent disclosure is that the acceptance of the false teaching is thus explained. But the non-polemical character of parallel passages makes these suggestions very uncertain.

— τῶν δὲ ἀγίων τῶν αἰώνων. The construction here changes, and the perfect participle is continued by the aorist indicative (Winer-Moulton, p. 717). The anacoluthon is caused by Paul's intense joy that the long silence has been broken; he is content with nothing short of a definite statement of the glorious fact. τῶν δὲ ἀγίων τῶν αἰώνων is equally appropriate whether it is temporal or not, for the antithesis of past and present lies in the nature of the case.— τῶν δὲ ἀγίων τῶν αἰώνων. The words must be taken in their obvious sense.

Ver. 27. Cf. for a partial parallel Eph. i. 18. — οὐτοί ἡδές τῷ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. "Inasmuch as to them God willed"; οὖν is chosen to express the idea that the revelation had its source solely in God's will.— τῇ τῶν αἰώνων τῶν δόξαν. — ἀναφέρεται τῇ τῶν αἰώνων τῶν δόξαν. Cf. Rom. ix. 23, Phil. iv. 19, Eph. i. 18, iii. 16. The expression does not mean the glorious riches, but rather how rich is the glory. The use of "glory" immediately after
in the sense of the Messianic kingdom favours the adoption of that meaning here. But as it is an attribute of the mystery it probably expresses its glorious character.—αὐτῷ δὲ αὐτοῖς is generally taken with τί τὸ ἐπὶ. κ.τ.λ., and this gives an excellent sense, for it was as manifested in the Gentile mission that the glory of the Gospel was especially displayed. There is a little awkwardness, since the definition Χριστὸς ἐστιν οὗτος seems to make ἐν τῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ unnecessary. The glory of the mystery was itself X. ἐν θαλάσσῃ, if we take ἐν ὐἱσάκει to mean among you Gentiles. This hardly justifies us in connecting the words with γνωστέον (Haupt), for it already has the recipients of knowledge attached to it (οὐ).—δὲ δὲ αὐτὸς answers τί τὸ ἐπὶ. κ.τ.λ. The riches of the glory of the mystery consist in X. ἐν θαλάσσῃ ἐν ὑμῖν. Usually ὑμῖν is taken to refer to ὑμῖν ὑμῖν. Perhaps the practical difference is not great.—Χριστὸς ἐν ὡς ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης. Haupt thinks no comma should be placed after ὡς, and that the meaning is that Christ among them is the hope of glory. But the usual view which makes not the fact that Christ among them guarantees their future blessedness, but the presence of Christ itself, the great glory of the mystery seems much finer. X. ἐν θαλάσσῃ, and not what X. ἐν θαλάσσῃ is, constitutes the riches of the glory. The context shows that ὡς must mean "you Gentiles". It does not necessarily follow from this that ἐν must be translated "among," though this is favoured by ἐν τῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. It may refer to the indwelling of Christ in the heart, and this is rendered probable by the addition of ἑλπίς τῆς δόξης. The indwelling Christ constitutes in Himself a pledge of future glory. For this combination of the indwelling Christ with the Christian hope, cf. Rom. viii. 10.

Ver. 28. ἐν: i.e., Χριστὸν ἐν ὡς—ἡμεῖς: (emphatic) we in contrast to the false teachers. But the reference seems to be simply to Paul, not to Timothy and Epaphras as well. For throughout the section he is speaking of his own special mission.—νουθετούντες. Meyer points out that admonishing and teaching correspond to the two main elements of the evangelic preaching, repent and believe. Haupt thinks on the ground of the order that Paul is not referring to elementary Christian teaching, but has this epistle in his mind. The order might, however, suggest warning to non-Christians followed by teaching of new converts. But the addition of ἐν τῷ τῷ σοφίᾳ and τὰς εἰθον support the view that it is warning against error, and advanced teaching that he has in view.—ἐν τῷ τῷ άνθρώπῳ: emphatically repeated here. The Gospel is for all men, in opposition to any exclusiveness, and for each individual man in particular. And the ideal is only attained when each individual has reached completeness. The exclusiveness might be, as with the Judaisers, of a sectarian type, or, as with the Gnostics, and possibly here, of an intellectual, aristocratic type. Since such is the Apostle's task, he addresses a Church the members of which are unknown to him.—ἐν τῷ τῷ σοφίᾳ is taken by some to express the content of the teaching, everyone may be fully instructed in the whole of Christian wisdom. This forms a good contrast to the probable practice of the false teachers of reserving their higher teaching for an inner circle. But for this we should have expected the accusative. Probably the words express the manner of teaching. If the phrase is taken with both participles the content of the teaching is excluded.—ταχείᾳ: probably to present at the judgment.—τὰς εἰθον. Here also allusion to the mysteries is discovered by Lightfoot. The term is said to have been employed to distinguish the fully initiated from novices. But, even if this be correct, the word is used in Matt. v. 48, xix. 21, where such a reference is out of the question. Probably Paul is contrasting the completeness he strives to secure with that promised by the false teachers.

Ver. 29. εἰς δὲ: to achieve which end. —κατ' ὑμῖν expresses toil carried to the point of weariness.—ἀγωνίζομαι: a metaphor from the arena. Meyer takes the reference to be to inward striving against difficulties and hostile forces.
Perhaps both inward and outward struggle are referred to (De W.). — κατά. The struggle is carried on in proportion not to his natural powers, but to the mightily working energy of Christ within him. — ἔσχατων: a dynamic middle (cf. ver. 6).

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-3. Paul's deep concern for the Colossians and other Christians unknown to him, that they may be united in love, and attain full knowledge of Christ, in whom reside all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.—καθὼς γὰρ ὅμως εἶδόν: for the formula cf. 1 Cor. xi. 3, and for a similar formula Phil. i. 12. More frequently the negative is used, ἐπάθον ἀρετάς, which introduces the proof of what he has just said, by the illustration from the case of his readers, and thus prepares the way for the warning that follows in ver. 4.— ἐγώνα: the inward struggle of Paul will embrace his prayers, his anxiety and his earnest meditation on the implications of the false teaching and the best manner of refuting it. Added to this are the difficulties caused by his imprisonment and the fact that the Colossians were personally unknown to him.—Λαοδικίᾳ. The members of this Church were probably exposed to the same dangers as their neighbours.—καὶ άλλωσεν κ.τ.λ. So far as the words themselves go, they may mean that the Colossians and Laodiceans did belong to the number of those who had not seen him or that they did not. But the latter alternative is very improbable, for Paul would not have joined a general reference to Churches unknown to him to a special mention of two Churches that were known to him. Further, Paul continues with αὐτῶν, which refers to καὶ δοσιν, but must include the Colossians, since in ver. 4 he says, "This I say that no one may delude you". This also corresponds to the use of καὶ δοσιν after an enumeration. The narrative in Acts favours this view, as does the absence of any hint in the Epistle that Paul had visited Colosse. We may therefore safely assume with almost all commentators that the Apostle was personally unknown to both of these Churches.— αὐτῶν: to be taken with τὸ εἰρ. ἐν αὐτῷ, not with ἑαυτῷ.

Ver. 2. παρακαλέσθως. It is disputed whether "may be comforted" should be attached to this. Meyer, Ellicott and others translate "may be comforted". This seems to be the more probable sense in Paul, and is supported by the addition "may be comforted" (De W., Alf., Kl., Ol., Sod.), for this was more needed than consolation in face of heresy. Oltramare quotes Rom. i. 12 (where, however, συνετῶς is used), 1 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 17, where this verb is joined to συνετῶς to show that the sense is Pauline, and in the latter we may have παρακαλέσθως ἕνας τοῖς καρδίαις καὶ συνετῶς. Haupt, following Luther, thinks it means "may be warned", but this does not suit καρδίαι, especially in iv. 8.—αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν. We might have expected ὑπὲρ, but ἐπί, while not excluding the Colossians, includes other Churches as well. καρδία implies more than our word "heart," it embraces also the intellect and the will.—συνήποντος agrees with αὐτῶ, understood as the equivalent of εἰς κ. αὐτῶν. In the LXX the word means "to instruct" (so in 1 Cor. ii. 16, which is a quotation from Isa. xl. 14). But joined to εἰς αὐτός it must have its usual sense, "knit together," as in ver. 19 and Eph. iv. 16. There may be a reference to the divisive tendencies of the false teaching.—καὶ εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνετῶς: "and unto all riches of the fulness of understanding". καὶ εἰς is to be taken with συνῆπον, "knit together in order to attain". συνῆπον is a verb implying motion, and therefore is followed here by εἰς. It is usual to take πληροφορία as "full assurance", but the expression "all the riches of full assurance of understanding" has a strange redundancy, which seems scarcely to be met, as Klopper thinks, by de Wette's remark that πληροφορία is a quantitative but πληρός a qualitative expression. Accordingly it seems better, with Grimm and Haupt, to translate "fulness," a sense which is possible everywhere in N.T.
For σοφίας see on i. 9. Insight into Christian truth is meant here.—εἰς ἐνεργείαν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ. Probably this is in apposition to the previous clause, εἰς τὸν κ.κ., and further explains it; all the rich fulness of insight, which he trusts may be the fruit of their union in love, is nothing else than full knowledge of the Divine mystery, even Christ. The false teachers bid them seek knowledge in other sources than Christ, Paul insists on the contrary that full knowledge of the mystery of God is all the wealth of fulness of understanding, and is to be found in the knowledge of Christ alone. This makes it probable that the correct interpretation of the true reading is to take Χριστοῦ as in apposition to Θεοῦ (so Ell., Lightf., Findl., Hofm., Holtzmann, Haupt). It is true that this is curt and harsh, and that we should have expected Θεοῦ, but it suits the context better than the translation "the mystery of the God of Christ" (Mey., Gess, Kl., Sod., Weiss and apparently Abb.). It is true that Paul uses a similar expression in Eph. i. 17. But here it would emphasise the subordination of Christ, which is precisely what is out of place in a passage setting forth His all-sufficiency, and against a doctrine the special peril of which lay in its tendency to under-estimate both the Person and the Work of Christ. The grammatically possible apposition of Χριστοῦ (Hilary) is out of the question. Horst’s conjecture that the original reading was τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς Χριστοῦ does not find sufficient support in the textual or exegetical difficulties of the clause. Ver. 3. ἐν may refer to μυστηρίου (Beng., Mey., Alfr., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) or to Χριστοῦ (Ell., Hofm., Lightf., Holtzmann, Findl., Moule). The former is defended on the ground that εἰς ἀνάκριψιν corresponds to μυστήριον. It is also urged that μυστήριον is the leading idea. On the other hand, if Christ is rightly identified with the mystery, there is no practical difference between the two views, and it is simpler to refer εἰς to Χριστοῦ as the nearer noun.—εἰς ἐνεργείαν Θεοῦ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀνάκριψις. Bengel, Meyer and Alford take ἀνάκριψις as an ordinary adjective with Θεοῦ, “in whom are all the hidden treasures”. For this we should have expected Θεοῦ, and there is no stress on the fact that the hidden treasures are in Christ, yet the position of the word at the end of the sentence is explained as due to emphasis. Generally Chrysostom has been followed in taking it as the predicate to Θεοῦ, “in whom are hidden all the treasures”. But this is excluded by its distance from the verb. Accordingly it should be taken as a secondary predicate, and thus equivalent to an adverb, “in whom are all the treasures... hidden”, i.e., in whom all the treasures are, and are in a hidden manner (Hofm., Ell., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). The force of the passage then is this: all, and not merely some of, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are contained in Christ, therefore the search for them outside of Him is doomed to failure. But not only are they in Christ, but they are contained in a hidden way. Therefore they do not lie on the surface, but must be sought for earnestly, as men seek for hidden treasure. They are not matters of external observances, such as the false teachers enjoined, but to be apprehended by deep and serious meditation. If Lightfoot is right in thinking that ἀνάκριψις is borrowed from the terminology of the false teachers, there is the added thought that the wisdom they fancied they found in their secret books was really to be found in Christ alone. But it is hardly likely that there is any such reference here. Even if the allusion to literature were more plausible than it is, there is no evidence that the word was used in this sense so early. Besides it occurs twice with Θεοῦ in the LXX. The distinction between σοφίας and γνώσεως is not easy to make here; the former is general, the latter special. Lightfoot says: “While γνώσεως applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, σοφία super-
adds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations". Moule thinks it is God's wisdom and knowledge that are here attributed to Christ, but this seems uncertain.

Vv. 4-15. Paul urges his readers not to be beguiled by plausible words, but to hold Christ fast as the principle of moral conduct. They must let no one take them captive by deceitful philosophy and human tradition, with the elements of the world and not Christ for its content. In Him alone dwells the whole fulness of the Godhead, and their completeness is in Him. They have died, been buried and raised with Him, God has quickened them with Him, while they were dead in sins, has cancelled the hostile law on the cross, and spoiled and led in triumph the principalities and powers.—Ver. 4. τούτο λέγω. Haupt thinks the reference is only to ver. 3, but this verse looks back as far as 2b, and ver. 5 to ver. 1. Generally the reference of τούτο is thought to be w. 1-3, though Soden thinks it is to i.24-ii.3. —irapaXoyI£ir)Ta means to deceive by false reckoning, then, as here, by false reasoning. —πτυχαλογια: "persuasive speech". The word has no bad sense in itself, and what bad sense it has here it gets from παραλογια. Classical writers use it with the meaning of probable argument as opposed to strict demonstration.

Ver. 5. γάρ is difficult. Meyer thinks that the fact of his spiritual presence is mentioned, in contrast to his bodily absence, as a reason why they should not let themselves be deceived. Ellicott (after Chrysostom) thinks that he is explaining why he can advise them, it is because he thus knows their need. Lightfoot, Soden, Findlay and Haupt think he explains his warning by his personal interest in them. —καλ goes closely with τη σωρεία. The dative is one of reference, and τη σωρεία is equivalent to "in the body". There is not the least ground for the inference that Paul had ever been to Colosse.—το τετράγωνο: not "by the Holy Spirit," but "in spirit". Paul's own spirit is meant as in 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.—σον ὅπως επάθε: not simply among you, but "united with you through the warmest community of interest" (Sod.).—χαίρω καὶ βλέπων. Many take this as if it were equivalent to "rejoicing with you and beholding". Meyer thinks χαίρω means rejoicing to be thus present with you in spirit. It is very difficult to decide as to the meaning, possibly Ellicott's view is best.—τῷ ταῖς καὶ τῷ στρατεύματι. A military sense is often found in both of these nouns, though sometimes (as by Ol.) it is restricted to the latter. Meyer and Abbott deny the military reference altogether. Both words are used in a military sense, but this is suggested by the context, and it is said that "here the context suggests nothing of the kind" (Abb.). Haupt decides for it on the ground of the connexion. If the terms had been general, Paul would not have placed his joy over their order before his mention of their faith. But in representing them as a well-ordered army, and then expressing the same idea under the image of a bulwark which consists in their faith, the order is correct. It is, however, very questionable if an argument from order of this kind is to be pressed. Lightfoot translates στρατεύμα "solid front". It may have simply the sense of firm foundation. Whatever the precise force of the words, it is clear that the Church as a whole remained true to the doctrine it had been taught.—πλείστως: cf. Acts xvi. 5, 1 Pet. v. 9.

Ver. 6. ὡς σον παραλαβέτε. Oltramare translates "since," and interprets, "since ye have received Christ... it is in Him you must walk". But probably the usual interpretation "as" is right, meaning the form in which they had...
pisteus oμων. 6. ὡς οὖν παρελθέται τὸν Χριστόν ἠγοςον τὸν Κύριον,
en αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε. 7. ἐρρίζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ
καὶ βεβαιώμενοι τὴν πίστιν καθὼς ἐδιδάχθησε, περιστεροῦτες ἐν
ἐκχαριστίᾳ. 8. βλέπετε μὴ τις ὁμᾶς ἐσται, ὅ τοις συλαγωγοῖς διὰ τῆς

2 So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ΒΚΛP. ἐσται μιᾶς: L., W.H. mg. with ΝΑDE. to connect more closely with συλαγωγοῖς.

received (= καδὸς ἔμαθεν, i. 7). The sense is, in that case, live in accordance
with what you received, and the em-
phasis is on περιστεροῦτες, not on ἐν αὐτῷ.
—παρελθέται is practically equivalent
to ἔμαθεν, received by instruction,
rather than received into the heart.
—τον Χριστὸν ἠγοςον τὸν Κύριον. This is
frequently translated "the Christ, even
Jesus the Lord" (Hofm., Lightf., Sod.,
Haupt, Abb.). In favour of this is the
fact that ὁ Χ. ἐ, is not a Pauline ex-
pression, but neither is ὁ Κύριος. A
further argument in its favour is that ὁ Χριστός is very frequent in this Epistle,
and especially prominent in this section
of it. If this is so we must suppose that
Paul has chosen the form of words to
meet some false view at Colossae.
A reference to a Judaistic conception of the
Messiah, held by the false teachers, which
failed to rise to the Christian conception
of His Person as Lord, is supposed by
Haupt to be intended. This is possible,
but the other possible view "ye received
Christ Jesus as Lord" is no more in
consistent with Pauline usage, and em-
phasises still more the Lordship of Christ,
which was the chief aim of the Apostle
to press home. There seems to be no hint that
the Messiahship of Jesus was challenged;
at most there was the question what
Messiahship involved. More probably
there is no reference to the Messiahship
at all.

Ver. 7. ἐρρίζωμεν καὶ ἐποικοδομοῦ-
μενον: "rooted and built up."
The metaphor changes from περιστεροῦτες,
and again from ἐρρίζωμεν, though Lightfoot points out
that the term "to root" is not infre-
quently applied to buildings. More im-
portant is the change in tense, the perfect
participle expressing an abiding result,
the present a continuous process. ἐν αὐτῷ probably belongs to both. We
should not (with Schenkel, Hofm.) place
a full stop at περιστεροῦτες, and take the
participle with ἐποικοδομοῦμεν, which would be
intolerably awkward. —βεβαιώμενοι τῇ
πίστει: "established in faith," also the
present of continuous process. Meyer
and Lightfoot take the dative as instrumen-
tal, but it seems best with most recent
commentators to take it as a
ative of reference (cf. ver. 5).—καθὼς
ἐδιδάχθησε: cf. καθὼς ἔμαθεν, i. 7. The
words define τῇ πίστει. —περιστεροῦτες ἐν
ἐκχαριστίᾳ. Oltramare notes that
"thankfulness is a preservative against
the new doctrines," since they remove
Christ from His true place. The em-
phasis on thankfulness is very marked
in this Epistle.

Ver. 8. Paul once more (previously
in ver. 4) begins to attack the false
teachers, but turns aside in ver. 9 from
the direct attack to lay the basis for the
decisive attack in vv. 16-23.—τοι. It is
not clear that we can infer from the
singular that only one false teacher had
appeared in the Colossian Church.—κατά
is placed in an emphatic position, and
its force is "you whose Christian course
has been so fair, and who have received
such exhortations to remain steadfast".—
ἐσται: the future indicative after μᾶς
implies a more serious estimate of the
danger than the subjunctive. For the
construction, τοι followed by a participle
9.—σταγνῶν. The sense is disputed.
Several of the Fathers and some modern
writers think it means "to rob". It is
used in this sense with εἰκὸν (Aristaen.,
2, 22), and Field (Notes on the Translation
of the N.T., p. 195) says "there can be
no better rendering than 'lest any man rob
you'". But, as Soden points out, that of
which they were robbed should have been
expressed. It is better to take it with most
commentators in the more obvious sense
"lead you away as prey". The verb is
so used in Helioid., Εὐθ., x. 35 (with
οἶκον), Nicet., Hist., i. 5, 96 (with
παρθένον), and it may be chosen with
the special sense of seduction in mind.—
καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κατὰ τὴς ἐπάτης.
The second noun is explanatory of the
first, as is shown by the absence of the
article and preposition before it and the
lack of any indication that Paul had two evils to attack. The meaning is “his philosophy, which is vain deceit.” The word has, of course, no reference to Greek philosophy, and probably none to the allegorical method of Scripture exegesis that the false teachers may have employed. Philo uses it of the law of Judaism, and Josephus of the three Jewish sects. Here, no doubt, it means just the false teaching that threatened to undermine the faith of the Church. There is no condemnation of philosophy in itself, but simply of the empty, but plausible, sham that went by that name at Colossae. Hort thinks that the sense is akin to the later usage of the word to denote the ascetic life.—

"according to human tradition" as opposed to Divine revelation. Meyer, Ellicott and Findlay connect with υπάλληλος. It is more usual to connect with αὐτός or τὸ φύλ. καὶ τὴν αὐτῷ. The last is perhaps best. It indicates the source from which their teaching was drawn.—κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. [On this phrase the following authorities may be referred to: Hilgenfeld, Galatabrief, pp. 66 sq.; Lipsius, Paul. Rechf., p. 83; Ritshl, Rechf. u. Vers., ii., 252; Klopper, ad loc.; Spitta, 2 Pet. u. Ἰδ., 263 sq.; Everett, Paul. Angel. u. Däm., pp. 65 sq.; Haupt, ad loc.; Abbott, ad loc. The best and fullest account in English is Massie’s article “Elements” in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible. To these may now be added St. John Thackeray, Planting and Training, i., 465, 466, cf. 323 (Bohn’s ed.).] He pointed out that if στ., meant first principles we should have had a genitive of the object, as in Heb. v. 12, στ. τ. ἀρχῆς τ. λογίων. Such an omission of the leading idea is inadmissible. Further, Paul regarded the heathen as enslaved under στ. τ. κόσμου and their falling away to Jewish rites as a return to this slavery. Therefore the expression must apply to something both had in common, and something condemned by Paul, which cannot be the first principles of religion (to which also ἄριστος would be inappropriate), but the ceremonial observances, which were so called as earthly and material. It has been further pointed out by Klopper that following κατὰ τ. παράδοσιν τῶν ἀρχῶν this term introduced by κατὰ and not connected by κατὰ must express the content of the teaching, which is not suitable if “religious rudiments” is the meaning. Nor is it true that the false teachers gave elementary instruction. If this view be set aside, as suiting neither the expression in itself nor the context in which it occurs, the question arises whether we should return to the interpretation of several Fathers, that the heavenly bodies are referred to. These were called στοιχεῖα (examples are given in Valesius on Eus. H. E., v., 24, Hilg. l.c.). This is favoured by the reference to “days, and months, and seasons, and years” in Gal. iv. 11, immediately following the mention of στ. in ver. 10, for these were regulated by the heavenly bodies. But it is unsatisfactory, for the context in which the expression occurs, especially in Galatians, points to personal beings. In this passage the contrast of στ. τ. κόσμου with ἄριστος is fully satisfied only if the former are personal. In Gal. iv. 3 Paul applies the illustration of the heir under “guardians and stewards” to the pre-Christian world under the στ. τ. κόσμου, and here again a personal reference is forcibly suggested. Still more is this the case with Gal. iv. 8, 9. In ver. 8 Paul says ἵσσαμένατε τάς φύτες μὴ ὁμοίως θεοὶ. In the next verse he asks “how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly στ., to which you wish to be in bondage (συνεκομισθήσατε) over again?” This clearly identifies τ. στ., with τ. φύλ. καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα, and therefore proves their personality, which is suggested also by κατὰ τ. στ. accordingly they cannot be the heavenly bodies or the physical elements of the world. Hilgenfeld, followed
by Lipsius, Holsten and Klopper, regards them as the astral spirits, the angels of the heavenly bodies. That the latter were regarded as animated by angels is certain, for we find this belief in Philo and Enoch (cf. Job xxxviii. 7, Jas. i. 17). But it is strange that the spirits of the stars should be called or. τ. κόσμου. And while they determine the seasons and festivals, they have nothing to do with many ceremonial observances, such as abstinence from meats and drinks. Spitta (followed by Everling, Sod., Haupt, and apparently Abb.) has the merit of giving the true interpretation. According to the later Jewish theology, not only the stars but all things had their special angels. The proof of this belongs to a discussion of angelology, and must be assumed here. or. τ. κόσμου are therefore the elemental spirits which animate all material things. They are so called from the elements which they animate, and are identical with the angel κ. ἑλέουσας, who receive this name from their sphere of authority. Thus all the abstinence from material things, submission to material ordinances and so forth, involve a return to their service. We need not, with Ritschl, limit the reference to the angels of the law, though they are included. Thus interpreted the passage gains its full relevance to the context, and to the angel worship of the false teachers which Paul is attacking. The chief objection to this explanation is that we have no parallel for this usage of the word, except in the Test. Sol., ἡμεῖς ἐσθιμά τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτεις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. But this is late. The term is used in this sense in modern Greek. In spite of this the exegetical proof that personal beings are meant is too strong to be set aside. So we must explain, "philosophy having for its subject-matter the elemental spirits"—καὶ οἱ κατὰ Χριστὸν must be taken similarly, not having Christ for its subject-matter. Χ. means the person of Christ, not teaching about Christ, and is opposed simply to or. τ. κ. οὗτος. The false teachers put these angels in the place of Christ.

Ver. 9. or. is emphatic, in Him and in Him alone. or. τ. θεότης: "all the fulness of the Godhead". or. is emphatic, the whole fulness dwells in Christ, therefore it is vain to seek it wholly or partially outside of Him. or. τ. θ. is not to be taken (as by Ol.) to mean the perfection of Divinity, i.e., ideal holiness. Nor can it mean the Church, for which Eph. i. 23 gives no support, nor yet the universe, either of which must have been very differently expressed. The addition of θεοτόκος defines or. as the fulness of Deity. The word is to be distinguished from θεότης as Deity, the being God, from Divinity, the being Divine or God-like. The passage thus asserts the real Deity of Christ,—σωματικές. This word is very variously interpreted. The reference is usually taken to be the glorified body of Christ, or (as by Lightf.) to the Incarnation, and the word is translated "in bodily fashion". Apart from the question whether the word naturally expresses this, there is the difficulty caused by the contrast implied in its emphatic position. This contrast is sometimes thought to be to the pre-incarnate state, but this has no relevance here. A contrast to the angels might be in point, but they were closely connected with bodies, so the contrast in this respect did not exist. But neither is Soden's view that while the angels have bodies what is expressed in them is only θεότης (Rom. i. 20) not or. τ. θεότης, a tenable explanation, since this is just read into the words, not elicited from them; nor could such a distinction have occurred to the readers. This interpretation of σωματικές is expressed in the indwelling of the fulness in a body, although said by Abbott to be "the only one tenable," is encumbered with grave difficulties, and has been rejected by several commentators. Many have taken it to mean "really" (recently Bleek, Kl., Everling, Cremer). This is supported by the contrast of σωματικές with συμφ. in ver. 17, the indwelling is real and not shadowy or typical. But σωματικότης could hardly express this shade of meaning unless the antithesis was expressed. Oltramare translates "personally, in His person". But he quotes no instances of the adverb, but only of σωματικότης. And Haupt's criticism is just, that this sense might suggest that in God Himself it dwelt impersonally. After an elaborate examination of the
various views, Haupt puts forward the explanation that *σωματικός* relates to τ. πληρωμά, and is to be translated "in the form of a body". The meaning he takes to be that the fulness exists in Christ as a body, that is as a complete and organic whole. This suits the context and the general argument better than the reference to Christ's own body. In contrast to the distribution of the fulness among the angels, or to the view that it dwelt only partially in Him, Paul insists that all the fulness dwells in Him, and not fragmentarily but as an organic whole. This view, like Oltramare's, is supported only by references to the use of *σωματικός*. This is not a fatal objection, and it harmonizes with the context makes it the most probable interpretation.

Ver. 10. "καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένον". This still depends on ὑπάρχον, and is obviously not an imperative. We should, perhaps, reject the view of Ellcott and Lightfoot that there are two predicates. The thoughts thus obtained that they are in Him, and that they are made full, are true in themselves. But, as Abbott points out, the context requires the emphasis to be thrown on the ἐν αὐτῷ, so that the sense is "and it is in Him that ye are made full". *πεπληρωμένον* is chosen on account of the *πεπληρωμένον* in ver. 9, but we cannot explain it as filled with the Godhead, because such an equalising of Christians with their Lord would have been impossible to Paul, and would have required καὶ ψυχή to express it. This meets Oltramare's objection to the translation adopted. He says that if *πεπληρωμένον* means filled, they must be filled with something, but since the most obvious explanation that they are filled with the fulness of the Godhead is so largely rejected, it is clear that the translation breaks down. He translates "in Him you are perfect," and urges that this also overthrows the usual interpretation of *πληρώμα* τ. θεόν. But apart from the fact that *πληρώμα* does not mean moral perfection, *τὸν θεόν* cannot be supplied. What Paul means is that in Christ they find the satisfaction of every spiritual want. It therefore follows of itself that they do not need the angelic powers.— *δὲ ἐστίν ἡ κεφαλὴ πᾶσιν ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας* : cf. i. 18. That Christ is the Head of every principality and power is a further reason why they should not seek to them. All they need they have in Christ. Paul does not mention here the thrones or lordships as in i. 16. But it is a questionable inference that they, unlike the principalities and powers, had no place in the false teaching. The latter are probably adduced only as examples.

Ver. 11. The reference to circumcision seems to come in abruptly. But probably it stands in close connexion with what has gone before. For the return to the principalities and powers in ver. 15 shows that Paul is not passing here to a new section of his subject. Judaism, of which circumcision was the most characteristic feature, was regarded as under angelic powers, and the removal of them meant its abolition. It seems probable that the false teachers set a high value on circumcision, and urged it on the Colossians, not as indispensable to salvation, in which case Paul would have definitely attacked them on this point, but as conferring a higher sanctity. There seems to be no suggestion that it was regarded as a charm against evil spirits. The Apostle does not merely leave them with the statement that they have been made full in Christ, which rendered circumcision unnecessary, but adds that they have already received circumcision, not material but spiritual, not the removal of a fragment of the body, but the complete putting off of the body of flesh.——

Iv u Kal Τρεπόμενη. A definite historical fact is referred to, as is shown by the aorist. This was their conversion, the inward circumcision of the heart, by which they entered on the blessings of the New Covenant. The outward sign of this is baptism, with which Paul connect it in the next verse. But it cannot be identified with it, for it is not made with hands. The circumcision of the heart is a prophetic idea (Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, Jer. iv. 4, ix. 25, Ezek. xlv. 7, 9). In Paul it occurs Rom. ii. 28, 29, Phil. iii. 3.——περιτομή ἄχερσονήτως: "with a
circumcision not wrought by hands," i.e., spiritual, ethical (cf. Eph. ii. 11, of... by hands, and such a reference would be most unfortunate for the polemic against ceremonies and altogether un-Pauline.

Usually it is explained as the circumcision of our hearts which comes from Christ. But this has no parallel in the N.T.; further, it practically repeats in kai. 
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and so or εκ is not necessary to express it. — ἐνέργεια expresses the positive side of the experience. That death with Christ, which is the putting off of the body of flesh, has for its counterpart the putting on of Christ (Gal. iii. 27), which is followed by a walk with Him in newness of life. It is true that our complete redemption is attained only in the resurrection of the body (Rom. viii. 23, 2 Cor. v. 2-4). But there is clearly no reference here to the bodily resurrection at the last day, as some have thought; for that is altogether excluded by the whole tenor of the passage, which refers to an experience already complete. Nor can we, with Meyer, think of the bodily resurrection as already ideally accomplished in baptism. For the preceding contexts speak only of a spiritual experience, and it is impossible to pass thus violently to one that is physical. Haupt agrees with this, but thinks the reference is not ethical, but religious, that is forensic. The rest of the passage, he argues, shows that it is not moral transformation, but justification, that Paul has in mind. But however true this may be of ἁρματέων . . . σταυρός, it is at least questionable whether it is applicable here. And since the union covers both ethical renewal and justification, it is natural to find both mentioned in connexion with it, and to hold fast the former here as the more natural interpretation of the words. — εἰς τὴν ἐνέργειαν: "through faith in the working". Klöpper (following Luth., Beng., De W. and others) makes τὴν ἐνέργειαν genitive of cause, "faith produced by the working". He argues that it is strange that in the experience already referred to the faith which proves itself in baptism must be thought of as directed towards the Person of Christ, and so cannot now be spoken of as faith in the working of God; and further, that the whole context has referred to a passive experience, and so this is fitly continued by the assertion that even the faith, which appropriates the death and resurrection of Christ, is the creation of God. But these arguments are insufficient to overthrow the force of Pauline usage, according to which unless it refers to the person who believes, expresses the object of faith. The view of Hofmann that τ. ἐνέργεια is a genitive of apposition, and that what is meant is "faith, that is the working of God," is quite out of the question. For faith directed towards the working of God who raised Christ from the dead, cf. Rom. iv. 24. God is so characterised, since the working by which He raised Christ will also be effective in our own spiritual experience. Our baptism is therefore not a sign of nothing, but of a real spiritual burial and resurrection with Christ.

Ver. 13. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 1, 5.—καὶ ὑμᾶς: "and you". Frequently this is taken to mean "you also," i.e., you Gentiles. But since Paul has been using the second person before, he can hardly be introducing a contrast. We should therefore take ταλιτάς simply as nominative. It means "you as well as Christ," as is shown also by the verbal parallel between διὰ τ. πεπραγμένου and μετατέθησατος.

—πέπραγμα. Here Paul varies the sense of death. In the preceding verses it is death to the old life, here the old life itself is described as a condition of spiritual death. It is not of liability to eternal death (Mey.), or to physical death as the certain consequence of sin that he is speaking, but of a state of actual death, which can only be spiritual (cf. "sin revived and I died," Rom. vii. 9). —τοῖς παρεστάθησιν: "by your trespasses". The dative is probably one of cause, but it could be translated by
"in". τερατώτητας, are individual acts of transgression, of which ἁμρῆμα is the principle. — τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ τῆς σφαλῆς ἰδέας: "by the uncircumcision of your flesh". This is often supposed to refer to literal uncircumcision, i.e., to the fact that they were Gentiles. But we have already seen that there is no emphasis on this fact. And the implied contrast that Jews were not, while Gentiles were, spiritually dead, is impossible in Paul. He cannot have said that they were dead by reason of uncircumcision, and, if the dative is taken otherwise, yet the coupling of τῇ ἀσεβείᾳ with τῇ τερατώτητα shows that physical uncircumcision is not referred to, but an ethical state. And this would not have been necessary, be unintelligible to Gentile readers, for he had already explained the metaphor in ver. 11. τῆς σφαλῆς is accordingly to be taken as an epexegetical genitive, "the uncircumcision which consisted in your flesh". — συνεζωονθήνατον: to be taken in the same sense as συνεζωονθήνατο, not in any of the senses wrongly attributed to that word, which are introduced here. Chrysostom (followed by Ew., Ell.) makes Christ the subject. This is defended by Ellicott on the ground of the prominence of Christ through the passage, of the difficulty of supplying ὄνομα from Θεοῦ, and of referring the acts in vv. 14, 15 to the Father. But this last difficulty, urged also by Lightfoot, rests on a probably wrong interpretation of ver. 15. Neither of the others is of any weight against the argument from Pauline usage, which always refers such actions to God. This view would also involve the awkwardness of making Christ raise Himself and us with Him, whereas in ver. 12 His resurrection is referred to God. It is therefore best to regard Θεοῦ as the subject, as in the parallel Eph. ii. 4, 5. — χαρισμάτων: "forgiving". Forgiveness is contemporary with quickening. — ἰδίως: the change from the second person may be due to Paul's wish gratefully to acknowledge his own participation in this blessing. It must not (with Hofm.) be referred to Jewish Christians. — Ver. 14. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 15. Apparently Paul now passes to the historic fact which supplied the ground for the forgiveness. χαρισματον. therefore refers to the subjective appropriation of the objective blotting out of the bond in the death of Christ. — ἐξαλλάτθη: "having blotted out," i.e., having cancelled. — τῇ καθ' ἰδίως χαρισμάτων τοῖς δύσμασιν. The original sense of χαρισμός, is handwriting, but it had come to mean a bond or note of hand. It is generally agreed that the reference here is to the Law (cf. Eph. ii. 15, τῶν ἴδιων τῶν ἑπτάδιων ἐν δύσμασιν). That those under the Law did not write the Law has been pressed against this. It is true that χαρισμός means strictly a bond given by the debtor in writing. It is not necessary, with Chrysostom and many others, to meet the objection by reference to the promise of the people in Exod. xxiv. 3. There is no need to press rigidly this detail of the metaphor. It is disputed in what sense we are to take the reference to the Law. Some (including Lightf., Ol., Sod., Abb.) think it embraces the Mosaic Law and the law written in the hearts of Gentiles. It is quite possible, however, that καθ' ἰδίως means simply against us Jews. But, apart from this, the addition of τοῖς δύσμασιν points to formulated commandment. This is confirmed by Eph. ii. 15, where the similar expression is used, not of what Jews and Gentiles had in common, but that which created the separation between them, νῦν, the Jewish Law. Whether, with Calvin, Clöpper and Haupt, we should still further narrow the reference to the ceremonial Law is very questionable. It is true that circumcision and laws of meat and drink and sacred seasons are the chief forms that the "bond" takes. And it might make the interpretation of ver. 15 a little easier to regard the ceremonial as that part of the Law specially given by angels. But this distinction between the moral and ceremonial Law has no meaning in Paul. The Law is a unity and is done away as a whole. And for Paul the hostile character of the Law is peculiarly associated with the moral side of it. The law which slew him is illustrated by the tenth commandment, and the ministry of death was engraved on tablets of stone. It was the moral elements in the Law that made it the strength of sin. It is not certain how to ὑποτιθήματι should be taken. Frequently it is interpreted "consisting in decrees". For this we ought
to have had τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ δήγ. Ellicott says this construction "seems distinctly ungrammatical". Others (including Mey., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) connect closely with χειρόγ., in such a way that the dative is governed by γεγραμμένον implied in χειρόγ. This is questionable in point of grammar. Winer says: "Meyer's explanation, that which was written with the commandments (the dative being used as in the phrase written with letters), is the more harsh, as χειρόγ. has so completely established itself in usage as an independent word that it is hardly capable of governing (like γεγραμμένον) such a dative as this". (Winer-Moulton, p. 275; cf. also Ellicott ad loc.) It seems best then (with De W., Ell., Kl., Ol.) to translate "the handwriting which was against us by its ordinances". For this we should have expected τ. καθ' ἡμ. τ. δήγ. χειρόγ. or τ. τοῖς δήγ. καθ' ἡμ. χειρόγ.; but this seems to be the best way of taking the text as it stands, and perhaps the position of τ. δήγ. is for emphasis. The Greek commentators, followed by Bengel, explained the passage to mean having blotted out the Law by the doctrines of the Gospel. But δήγ. is a most un-Pauline, because legalistic, expression for the Gospel, and by itself could not mean Christian doctrines. Not in the sense it gives Pauline, for it was not by the teaching of the Gospel, but by the death of Christ, that the Law was done away. Erasmus' view (followed by Hofm.) that τ. δήγ. should be connected with what follows is very improbable.—δὴ ἡ ἀναφοράντων: stronger than καθ' ἡμῶν, asserting not merely that the bond had a claim against us, but that it was hostile to us, the suggestion being that we could not meet its claim. No idea of secret hostility is present.—καὶ αὐτὸ ἥραν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου. "And it He hath taken out of the midst," The change from aerist to perfect is significant, as expressing the abiding character of the abolition. Lightfoot thinks that a change of subject takes place here, from God to Christ. His reason is that Christ must be the subject of ἀναφοράντων, since "no grammatical meaning can be assigned to ἀναφοράντων, by which it could be understood of God the Father". Since, however, no change of subject is hinted at in the passage, and would involve great difficulty, it is more reasonable to conclude that an interpretation which requires Christ to be the subject of ἀναφοράντων is self-condemned.—προσηλώσως αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ: "having nailed it to the cross". When Christ was crucified, God nailed the Law to His cross. "Thus it, like the flesh, was abrogated, sharing His death. The bond therefore no longer exists for us. To explain the words by reference to a custom of driving a nail through documents to cancel them, is not only to call in a questionable fact (see Field, Notes on Transl. of the N.T., p. 196), but to dilute in the most tasteless way one of Paul's most striking and suggestive phrases. Quite on a level with it is Field's own suggestion as to "this seemingly superfluous addition" (!) that the reference is to the custom of hanging up spoils of war in temples. Zahn (Einl. in das N.T., i., 335) draws a distinction between what was written on the bond and was blotted out by God, and the bond itself which was nailed to the cross and taken out of the way. We thus have two thoughts expressed: the removal of guilt incurred by transgression of the Law, and the abolition of the Law itself. It is questionable if this distinction is justified. The object is the same, αὐτῷ simply repeats χειρόγραφον.

Ver. 15. In this difficult verse the meaning of almost every word is disputed. It is therefore imperative to control the exegesis by strict regard to the context. The main question relates to the character of the principalities and powers. Subordinate questions are raised as to the subject of the sentence and the meaning of ἀναφοράντων. The context before and after (ἐν, ver. 16) requires us to bring the interpretation into close connexion with the main thought, the abolition of the Law.—ἀνεκδοτάμενος τὰς ἁρκάς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας. Till recently the
principalities and powers have been explained as hostile demicidal spirits, and this view is held by Meyer, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Oltramare and Weiss. In its favour is the impression made by the verse that a victory over the powers is spoken of. How far this is so can be determined only by an examination of the terms employed. Against this view the following objections seem decisive.  

In Eph. vi. 12 the reference to evil spirits is definitely and repeatedly fixed by the context. This is not so here. Further, the connexion with the context is difficult to trace. Bengel says: "Qui angelos bonos colebant, iodem malos timebant: neutrum jure". Weiss expresses a somewhat similar idea: "It seems that the Colossian theosophists threatened the readersthat they would again fall under the power of evil spirits if they did not submit to theirdiscipline". But not only have we no evidence for this, but this interpretation cuts the nerve of the passage, which is the abolition of the Law by the cross. Meyer's view is more relevant: the Law is done away in Christ, and since it is the strength of sin, sin's power is thus broken, and so is the devil's power, which is exercised only through sin. Gess interpretsthat the Law through its curse created separation between men and God, and thus gave a point of support for the dominion of evil spirits. "Of this handwriting have they boasted. Our guilt was their strength. He who sees the handwriting nailed to the cross can mock these foes." But these views are read into the passage, and do not lead up to ver. 16. And where the Jewish Law was absent, as in the heathen world, sin was rampant. Ellicott and Lightfoot do not attempt to trace a connexion with the context, nor on their view of the passage, is one possible. All this strongly suggests that we should give another sense to  

The translation " Having put off His body " may be safely set aside, for Paul must have said this if he had meant it. The Greek commentators, followed by Ellicott and Lightfoot, interpret " having put off from Himself". The word is used in this sense in iii. 9. They explain that Christ divested Himself of the powers of evil that gathered about Him, since He assumed our humanity with all its temptations. But (apart from the change of subject) the change of metaphor is very awkward from stripping off adversaries, like clothes, to exhibiting and triumphing over them. More cogent is the objection caused by the strangeness of the idea. Christ wore our human nature with its liability to temptation. But that He wore evil spirits is a different and indeed most objectionable idea. The same translation is adopted by some who take the other view of the passage, and the explanation given is that God in the death of Christ divested Himself of angelic mediators. This is free from the impropriety of the other view, but shares its incongruity of metaphor. The more usual translation is "spoiled". The word is "stripped for Himself," and this again suits either view of the passage. If evil spirits, they are stripped of their dominion; but if angels of the Law, they are despoiled of the dominion they exercise. This view, though stigmatised by Zahn as "an inexcusable caprice," is probably best. They are fallen potentates. There is no need to worship them, or to fear their vengeance, if their commands are disobeyed. With the true interpretation of this passage, every reason disappears for assuming that Christ is the subject. "He made a show of them openly." No exhibition in disgrace is necessarily implied. The principalities and powers are exhibited in their true position of inferiority, as mediators of an abolished Law and rulers of elements to which Christians have died. The word is not to be translated "boldly," for courage is not needed to exhibit those who are spoiled. The word is contrasted with "reserve," and indicates the frank, open exhibition of the angels in their true position when the bond was cancelled and
Christ was manifested as the final revelation of God. — \( \phi \rho i m a \beta e i o s \). This seems to express most definitely that the \( \alpha p \) \( \kappa \). \( \delta \) are hostile powers. Alford, referring to 2 Cor. ii. 14, says the true victory is our defeat by Him. Findlay thinks the reference in the verb (which is not earlier than Paul) is not to the Roman military triumph, but to the festal procession \( (\phi \lambda u m b o s) \) of the worshippers of Dionysus. In this case God is represented as leading the angels in procession in His honour; in other words, bringing them to acknowledge His greatness and the revelation of Himself in Christ. It is perhaps safest to translate "triumphing over". This is favoured by other passages in Paul, which imply that the \( \alpha p \). \( \delta \) needed an experience of this kind.— \( \varepsilon \nu \ \alpha ^{\circ} \nu t \) may refer to \( \chi r i s t \). or \( \sigma t a x t \). or \( \chi e r p o y \). The second is best, for there has been no reference to Christ since ver. 13, and it is the cancelling of the bond, not the bond itself, that is the cause of the triumph. It is in the death of Christ that this triumph takes place. Zahn explains the passage to mean that God has stripped away the principalities and powers which concealed Him, not from the Jews, to whom He had revealed Himself, but from the heathen world. Thus He has revealed Himself and these apparent deities in their true character. He has triumphed over them in Christ, and led them vanquished in His train. But this was not accomplished on the cross, but through the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles, accompanied with such signs and wonders as in the story of the maid with the spirit of divination and the exorcists at Ephesus. But this is not what is required by the argument, which has the Jewish Law in view. Vv. 16-23. Since the Law has been cancelled and the angels despoiled, ritual or ascetic ordinances have no longer any meaning for those who in Christ possess the substance, of which these are but the shadow. They must not be intimidated by angel worshippers, who are puffed up by fleshly conceit, and only loosely hold the Head, from whom the body draws all its supply. Since they have died to the elemental spirits, they must not submit to the precepts of asceticism, whatever reputation for wisdom they may confer.—Ver. 16. The connexion with the preceding argument is this: Since the bond written in ordinances has been abolished, and the angelic powers spoiled and led in triumph, allow no one to criticise your action on the ground that it is not in harmony with the precepts of the Law, or cuts you off from communion with the angels. You have nothing to do with Law or angels. At best they were but the shadow, and in Christ you possess the substance.—\( \kappa r i s t \) \( \varepsilon \nu \) : "judge you in," \( \varepsilon \nu \) meaning on the basis of. Whether a man eats or drinks or not his conduct in this respect supplies no fit ground for a judgment of him. \( \kappa p . \) is not to "condemn," though the context shows that unfavourable judgment is in Paul's mind. —\( \beta r o s e i \) \( \kappa a l \) \( \varepsilon \nu \ \tau o s a i : \) "eating and in drinking," not food and drink, for which Paul would have used \( \beta r o m a \) and \( \tau o f a \). The question is not altogether between lawful and unlawful food, but between eating and drinking or abstinence. Asceticism rather than ritual cleanliness is in his mind. The Law is not ascetic in its character, its prohibitions of meats rest on the view that they are unclean, and drinks are not forbidden, save in exceptional cases, and then not for ascetic reasons. But these injunctions stand along with ordinances of the Law itself, partly, because they may have been regarded as extensions of its principles, partly, we may suppose, because, like the Law, they were attributed to the angels by the false teachers. In Heb. ix. 10 regulations as to drinks seem to be referred to as part of the Jewish Law. That the false teachers were ascetics is clear from \( \alpha m a t i s \) \( \sigma h m a t o s \) in ver. 23. —\( \varepsilon \nu \ \mu e r e i : \) "in the matter of," \( \mu i r \).
expresing the category. Chrysostom and some others have taken it strangely
to mean "in the partial observance of." —
ἤπειρα γὰρ ἡ μνήμη ὁ συμβαθής: the
Jewish sacred seasons enumerated as they
occur yearly, monthly and weekly. The
Sabbath is placed on the same footing as
the others, and Paul therefore commits
himself to the principle that a Christian
is not to be censured for its non-observ-
ance. συμβ., though plural in form,
means a single Sabbath day.

Ver. 17. This verse contains a hint of
the fundamental argument of the Epistle
to the Hebrews (cf. esp. Heb. viii.5,
X. l). — τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
Whether δὲ or ὡς be read, the reference is
to the whole of the ceremonial ordinances
just mentioned. σῶμα is "shadow," not
"sketch" (as Calvin and others). It is
cast by the body, and therefore implies
that there is a body, and while it re-
sembles the body it is itself insubstantial.
τ. μελλ. means the Christian dispensa-
tion, not (as Mey.) the still future Mes-
sianic kingdom, for, if so, the substance
would still lie in the future, and the
shadow would not be out of date. It is
future from the point of view of Judaism.
— τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ: "but the body
belongs to Christ". σῶμα is that which
casts the shadow, therefore it existed
corresponding to its manifestation,
and, of course, according to the
Jewish view, in heaven. It practically
means what we should call "the sub-
stance," and is chosen as the counterpart
to σκία, and with no reference to the
Church or the glorified body of Christ.
Since the substance belonged to Christ,
it was foolish for Christians to hanker
after the shadow. All that the most
sanguine hoped to attain by asceticism
and ceremonialism was possessed im-
mEDIATELY in the possession of Christ.

Ver. 18. This verse gives us our only
definite information, apart from which it
would have been a highly probable in-
ference, that the false teachers practised
angel-worship. — ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύτω.
This is commonly translated "rob you
of your prize". The judge at the games
was called βραβεύς or βραβευνός, and
the prize βραβευνόν. But the verb βραβευνόν
apparently lost all reference to the prize,
and meant simply "to decide". In the
two cases in which καταβραβεύω occurs
it means to decide against or condemn.
It is best therefore to take it so here,
"let no one give judgment against you";
it is thus parallel to, though stronger than,
κρίνειν (ver. 16). (Field, Notes on
Transl. of the N.T., pp. 196, 197, dis-
cusses the word; cf. also Ol. and Abb.
ad loc.)—θίλουν ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ.
This phrase is very variously interpreted.
Some assume a Hebraism, and translate
"taking pleasure in humility" (Winer,
Lightf., Findl., Haupt). The LXX uses
this not infrequently (but usually with
persons, though otherwise in Ps. cxi. 1,
cxvi. 10); but there is no N.T. parallel
for it, and Paul does not employ Hebra-
sisms. For this idea he uses εὐθείᾳ.
Moreover it yields no relevant sense here.
Others translate "wishing to do so in
(or by) humility" (Mey., Ell., Sod.,
Weiss). But for this τοῦτο θυμεῖν should
have been added, and on this interpreta-
tion θε'ραυ has really little point. The
rendering of Alford, Moule and others is
not very different from this in sense, but
more forcible. It connects μελλ. with
καταβραβ., and translates "wilfully,"
"of set purpose." 2 Pet. iii. 5 is re-
ferred to for the construction. Olt-
ramare's view is similar, but he translates
"spontaneously," so apparently the R.V.
mg. and Abbott. The unsatisfactoriness
of these interpretations suggests that the
text may be corrupt. Hort thinks that for
θίλουν ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ we should read
ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ. This word is
used by Basil, and a similar compound
occurs in ver. 23. It is, of course, as
Haupt says, difficult to understand how
the copyists should have altered it into
the very strange expression in the text.
But this is not a fatal objection, and
the conjecture is very possibly correct. It
would mean "gratuitous humility," a
humility that went beyond what was

1 So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with N*ABD* 17, 28, 67**. μη: inserted after α
by [Ln.]} with CKLP. οὐκ: FG.

2 Only here and Acts xxvi.5; Jas.i.26,27 in N.T. y Only here and 1 Cor. (six
times) in class. or Bib. Gk.
required. *tutunofrosoyn* is frequently explained as ironical. By a display of humility they beguiled their dupes. But the connexion with the following words makes this improbable. Their humility found an expression in angel worship. It is therefore that lowliness which causes a man to think himself unworthy to come into fellowship with God, and therefore prompts to worship of the angels. Such humility was perverted, but not therefore unreal. It was compatible with vanity towards others.—καὶ ἡσυχασία τῶν ἄγγeliων: "and worship of angels".

The genitive is objective, though some have taken it as subjective. This has been done most recently and elaborately by Zahn. He takes τ. ἄγγ. with ταφεύν. as well as with ἡσυχασία. The former noun is used, he argues, in a non-Pauline sense, therefore it needs a definition, and that τ. ἄγγ. is intended to define it is made probable by the fact that it is not repeated before θεοκρατ. What is meant is a mortification and devotion suitable for angels, but not for men who live in bodies, an attempt to assimilate themselves to angels, who do not eat or drink. The chief ground urged for this view is that Judaism was too strenuously monotheistic to admit of angel worship, and Paul could only have regarded it as idolatry. Against this what is said in the Introduction, section ii., may be referred to. The angels worshipped by the false teachers are the ἰσραηλίτα τ. ἡσυχασιας: "and worship of angels". Meyer translates "entering upon what he has beheld," and explains that, instead of holding fast to Christ, he enters the region of visions. Several translate "investigating" (Beng., Grimm, Findl., Ol., Haupt). This is probably the best translation of the words as they stand, for the translation "parading his visions" (Sod. and Abb.) seems not to be well established. The harshness of the combination, and uncertainty of the exegesis, give much probability to the view that the text has not been correctly transmitted. After it had been conjectured that we should read & εἶπα κενεμβατεύων, Lightfoot independently suggested the latter word, but for & εἶπα suggested ισραή or αἰωρ. [Sod. incorrectly quotes the emendation as ισραή; and in Abb. by a misprint we have αἰωρ. Ellicott not only misrepresents Lightfoot’s emendation, but does not even mention Taylor’s.] εἰπα is used sometimes of that which suspends a thing, sometimes of the act of suspension. "In this last sense," Lightfoot says, "it describes the poising of a bird, the floating of a boat on the waters, the balancing on a rope, and the like. Hence its expressiveness when used as a metaphor," κενεμβατεύων does not actually occur, but the cognate verb κενεμβατεύειν is not uncommon. A much better emendation, however, is that of Dr. C. Taylor (Journal of Philology, vii., p. 130), έπα κενεμβατεύων, "treading the void of air". In his Pirke Aboth, p. 161, he says that the Rabbinic expression
20. Largely parallel to Eph. iv. 15, 16. Paul proceeds to point out that so far from securing spiritual growth of a higher order, the false teaching, by loosening the hold on Christ, prevented any growth at all, since it obstructed or severed the very channel of spiritual life.

Ver. 19. The latter is the sense in Gal. iii. 4, iv. I, i Cor. xv. 2, Rom. xiii. 4, but, since it does not suit φώς, the former is to be preferred here.—φυσιοφόρον: cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1 ἡ γνώσις φυσιοφόρι, xiii. 4. They were puffed up by a sense of spiritual and intellectual superiority.—viro τοῦ φώς τῆς σαρᾶν ἀυτῶς: "by the mind of his flesh." The mind in this case is regarded as dominated by the flesh. Soden, followed by Abbott, says that the φώς as a natural faculty is ethically indifferent in itself, and so may stand just as well under the influence of σάρξ as of σώμα. But in the most important passage, Rom. vii. 22-25, it is the higher nature in the unregenerate which wages unsuccessful conflict with the σάρξ. At the same time we see from Eph. iv. 17 that it could become vain and aimless and even (Rom. i. 28) reprobate. The choice of the phrase here is probably dictated by Paul's wish to drive home the fact that their asceticism and angel worship, so far from securing as they imagined the destruction of the flesh, proved that it was by the flesh that they were altogether controlled, even to the mind itself, which stood farthest from it.

Ver. 20. May have suggested the phrase to Paul. This emendation is accepted by Westcott and Hort, and regarded as the most probable by Zahn, who says that the text as it stands yields no sense. It involves the omission of a single letter, and although the province of conjectural emendation in the New Testament is very restricted, yet such a slip as is suggested may very easily have been made by Paul's amanuensis or a very early copyist. Field urges as a fatal objection that "κενnobατικῶν is a vox nulla, the inviolable laws regulating this class of composite verbs stamping κενnobατικάς as the only legitimate, as it is the only existing, form" (loc. cit., p. 198). Lightfoot, on the contrary, asserts that it is unobjectionable in itself. Even if Field's criticism be admitted, it would be better to read ὅμως κενnobατικάς than to retain the text. If the emendation is correct, Paul is asserting the baseless character of the false teaching; and all reference to visions disappears. —οὕτω should probably, in accordance with Pauline usage, be connected with the following rather than the preceding words. It may mean "groundlessly" (Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.) or "without result" (Sod. and others). The latter is the sense in Gal. iii. 4, iv. ii, i Cor. xv. 2, Rom. xiii. 4, but, since it does not suit φώς, the former is to be preferred here.—φυσιοφόρον: cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1 ἡ γνώσις φυσιοφόρι, xiii. 4. They were puffed up by a sense of spiritual and intellectual superiority.—viro τοῦ φώς τῆς σαρᾶν ἀυτῶς: "by the mind of his flesh." The mind in this case is regarded as dominated by the flesh. Soden, followed by Abbott, says that the φώς as a natural faculty is ethically indifferent in itself, and so may stand just as well under the influence of σάρξ as of σώμα. But in the most important passage, Rom. vii. 22-25, it is the higher nature in the unregenerate which wages unsuccessful conflict with the σάρξ. At the same time we see from Eph. iv. 17 that it could become vain and aimless and even (Rom. i. 28) reprobate. The choice of the phrase here is probably dictated by Paul's wish to drive home the fact that their asceticism and angel worship, so far from securing as they imagined the destruction of the flesh, proved that it was by the flesh that
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II. PROS KOLOSSEAIOS

a Only here 21. Μή δέψι μηδὲ γεωγα μηδὲ θήψης, 22. (ς έστιν πάστα εἰς θοραν τῇ
and Heb. xi. ii. b δόξαρχεσε, κατὰ τὰ 'εστιαματα καὶ διδακασίας τῶν άνθρωπων;
so (quot.) in N.T.
b Only here in Bib. Gk. c Not class., only here and Matt. xv. 9 = Mark vii. 7 (quot. also with
add.) in N.T.

"being supplied and united". Often the supply is thought to be of nourishment, but perhaps we should interpret more
generally of life. ἄφις κ. σων. are thus the media through which life is com-
municated and the unity of the organism secured.—ἀνεξεῖ τὴν άνθρωπον τοῦ ὄσιν: "increaseth with the increase of God."
Generally ἄφις. τ. Θ. is explained to mean the growth which God gives (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6). Against this is the fact that Christ
is referred to as the source of growth. (I. 7.)
We may better take it "a growth such as God requires" (Ol., Haupt).
Ver. 20. The Apostle, recalling them to the time of their conversion, points out
how inconsistent with a death to the elemental spirits any submission to ordi-
nances belonging to their sphere would be. The death of the believer with Christ
is a death to his old relations, to sin, law, guilt, the world. It is a death which
Christ has Himself undergone (Rom. vii. 10). Here it is specially their death to
the angels, who had ruled their old life, and under whose charge the Law and its
ceremonies especially stood. They had died with Christ to legalism, how absurd
then for ordinances to be imposed upon them.—εἰ ἄπεκδέκτης σὺν Χριστῷ: "if, as
is the case, you died in union with Christ". The aorist points to the defi-
nite fact, which took place once for all. It was in union with Christ, for thus they
were able to repeat Christ's own experi-
ence.—ἀνέκτων στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου. The use of ἀνέκτων with ἀνέκτημα expresses
more strongly than the dative (as in
Rom. vi. 2) the completeness of the sever-
ance, and adds the idea of escape from the
dominion of the personal powers. On
στ. τ. κ. see note on ver. 8.—οὐ δεξιοῦς ἐν κόσμῳ. For the death of the Christian
with Christ includes his crucifixion to the
world (Gal. vi. 14). The world is ruled by these angels; but Christians belong
to the world to come (cf. τ. μελλόντων,
ver. 17), which, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, has not
been made subject to the angels. Since
they were still living in the physical world
σώφρος. has evidently an ethical sense.—
δοξαρχεσσει may be middle, "subject yourself to ordinances," or passive.
Since Paul nowhere says that the readers had accepted the false teaching, the latter
is better: "Why are ye prescribed to?" (Mey., Winer, Hofm., Findl., Haupt.)
Alford also takes it as a passive, but
thinks it implies a keener rebuke than the
middle. The middle asserts rather that
they had submitted, the passive need
only imply, not their submission, but that
their resistance might have been more
energetic. If there is blame it seems to
be slighter. The verb δοξαρχεσσε is chosen with reference to τοῖς δόξαρχοις in ver. 14.
Ver. 21. The precepts here quoted are
those of the fake use teachers, and are, of
course, quoted to be condemned, though
their meaning is frequently misunder-
stood. It is not said what things are
thus prohibited, but the context supports
the reference to meats and drinks, and is
confirmed by τ. χρηστοῦ. There is no
reason whatever to suppose that there is
any reference to a prohibition of sexual
relations.—μή δέψι μηδὲ γεωγα μηδὲ θήψης. "Handle not, nor taste, nor even
touch." There is perhaps a gradation in
the order from coarser to more refined
contact.
Ver. 22. σώλιν πάντα εἰς θοράν τῇ
ἀνθρωπον. Augustine and Calvin took
δέψει as meaning the ordinances referred to
in ver. 20, and explained the words as
Paul's refutation, "all which ordinances
lead in their use to spiritual destruction ".
But ἀνέκτημα means much more than use,
it means abuse or using up; and δέψει refers
more naturally to the prohibited things
than to the prohibitions; while the sense
would be complete if τ. χρηστοῦ. were
omitted. A much more attractive inter-
pretation is that of De Wette (followed
by Grimm, Ol. and others). He regards
the words as a continuation of the injunc-
tions of the false teachers, "all which
things tend to spiritual destruction in the
abuse". The sense will then be that
certain meats and drinks are forbidden,
because the abuse of them leads to spiri-
tual destruction. Lightfoot says "this
interpretation, however, has nothing to
recommend it". This is perhaps too
strong, for on the usual view σώλιν . . .
ἀνέκτημα comes in awkwardly, as its
place is at the end of the prohibitions.
But it must be rejected. The translation
is a little strained, and it would have
been much simpler to say "the use of
these things is destructive". It is there-
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fore best to adhere to the common view, and translate "all which things are to perish with the using". The meaning is, then, that with consumption the forbidden meats and drinks were destined to perish. This interpretation has the advantage of being forcible, for it throws one side of Paul's refutation into a terse parenthesis. His argument is, these meats and drinks, on which the false teachers lay such stress, are of no such importance, for in the nature of things they perish in their very use. If we can annihilate them they cannot rule us. The words should be included in brackets. — Kara to 

This states the other side of Paul's refutation. The precepts are not only concerned with things destined to perish, they have their source in human commandments. Light-foot aptly points out the striking parallel between these words of Paul and those of Christ on defilement (Mark vii.). Both argue from the perishableness of meats, both treat these things as indifferent in themselves, and both quote Isaiah. Even though these precepts are partially found in the O.T., they are rightly called precepts of men, partly because they went beyond what it enjoined, partly because their object is different.

Ver. 23. ἀνώνια: i.e., which commandments and teachings. — λόγον σοφίας. This may be taken in the sense of "a word of wisdom," but with no inner truth. Others translate "appearance of wisdom" (Beng., De W. and others). But this seems not to be a meaning of λόγος. Klöpper's translation, "reason" or "ground," yields no very good sense. It is best, with most recent commentators, to translate "a reputation for wisdom." μέν is not followed by δέ, but this is not uncommon (see Winer-Moulton, pp. 719-721). — ἐν θεολογησκεῖα καὶ ταταίκο-

If, however, it is omitted their sense may be affected. It is possible to take ἄφις then, as an instrumental dative with λόγον ἔχοντα. But it is also possible to take it, with Haupt, as an explanatory apposition to the earlier datives. In this case ἀδικεῖσθαι and ταπεινοφορῶν have both an ascetic meaning. Against this, however, is the fact that the words cannot be separated from the parallel expressions in ver. 18. This seems to fix the sense of ἀδικεῖσθαι as a worship of angels, which was not required of them, and ταπεινοφορῶν will mean what it meant in ver. 18. ἀποκλίνω occurs nowhere else, and was probably coined by Paul. Similar compounds were not unusual, and generally, though not invariably, had a bad sense. This is commonly supposed to attach to this word, but in any case it gets a bad sense from its context. ἀφίς σώματι is the clearest assertion we have of the ascetic character of the false teachings. — ὅποι ἐν τιμῇ τίνι, πρὸς πληρωμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς. These words, which constitute this verse one of the most difficult in the New Testament, have received very various explanations. It is disputed whether ὅποι in τιμῇ τίνι should be connected with the preceding or following words, and also with what τρεις. Ταπεινοφορῶν should be connected. Sumner, followed by Conybeare and Evans on 1 Cor. vii. 2, interpreted τρεις as meaning "to check," and translated "not in any value to check the indulgence of the flesh," connecting ὅποι in τιμῇ τίνι with the following words. This view was adopted by Lightfoot, and has been accepted by Moule and now by Ellicott. It has been inserted, with altogether insufficient warning, in R.V. It is a new explanation, and since propounded has found comparatively little favour. Lightfoot quotes numerous examples to prove that πρὸς after words denoting value, utility, sufficiency, etc., is used in the sense "to check" or "to prevent." But in these cases the meaning does not lie in πρὸς, but in πρὸς after some word which imposes this sense upon it (e.g., φάρμακα), and there is nothing of the kind here. Abbott, in his valuable criticism of this interpretation, points out that πρὸς means
with a view to," and if the object is a word signifying action or the production of an effect it will mean with a view to (producing). Hence it seems to follow that unless πλησματική be taken in the sense of 'a state of repletion,' which would be unsuitable, πρὸς πλησματική could only mean to produce πλ. A further question relates to the use of τῷ. Our word "value" is ambiguous, and τῷ may mean "value" in the sense of "price." But in this interpretation it is used in the sense of "efficacy," and this sense needs to be established. It seems necessary to reject this explanation on linguistic grounds. But the sense it yields is less good than appears at first sight. For what would be said would be that these things had a reputation for wisdom in "will-worship," etc., but they had not a reputation for wisdom in any value against the indulgence of the flesh. But obviously this cannot be the meaning. The sense imposed "but have not any value" can only be got out of the words by straining them. Another view, which keeps the same connexion of words, is that the translation should be "not in any honour to it [i.e., the body] to satisfy the [reasonable] wants of the flesh." This must be rejected because πλ. is not used in this good sense, and σωμάτως cannot be used as equivalent to σωματικός in a context where σώματος has been used just before, for the terms must stand in emphatic contrast. Soden and Abbott translate "not in any honour for the full satisfaction of the flesh." This means that there is no real honour, but what there is, is such as to satisfy the carnal nature. So Meyer, not in any honour, but serving to satiate the flesh. The objection to this view is that διάλεια at least is required before πρὸς πλ. τ. σωματικός. Alford connects οὐκ ἐν τ. τ. with the preceding words, but πρὸς πλ. τ. σ. with δημιουργικὴ. This gives a fairly good sense, and requires no necessary words to be supplied, but the parenthesis is incredibly long. A less lengthy parenthesis is involved in the interpretation of Bahr, Eadie and Weiss: "Which things, having indeed a reputation of wisdom in will-worship and humility and severity to the body, not in any honour, are for the indulgence of the flesh." If the contrast is between severity to the body and honour to it, we should have expected αὐτῷ after τῷ. It is also strange that ἐν should be placed before τῷ and not before ἄπειρον. And the meaning is not probable, for it is implied that Paul thought that a reputation for wisdom ought to rest on honour to the body, which is absurd. Findlay's view, "not in any honour, against surfeiting of the flesh," not only yields a thought most obscurely expressed, but must be rejected because of its translation of πρὸς. All these interpretations are open to serious if not fatal objections. It is therefore not unlikely that Hort is right in the suspicion, shared also by Haupt, that we have to do here with a primitive corruption, for which no probable emendation has been suggested. He thinks that the text of the Epistle, and especially of the second chapter, was badly preserved in ancient times.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-17. Resurrection with Christ must be completed by participation in His heavenly life, which though at present concealed, will not always remain so. This life with Christ in heaven demands the death of the members on the earth, the heathen vices of impurity and covetousness, which bring down the wrath of God. All sins of malice, anger and abuse and all lying must be given up, for these belong to the old nature, and are incompatible with the new, with its ever-growing conformity to the Divine image, and the cancelling of all those distinctions which make men aliens to each other.—With iii. 1 Paul passes to the hortatory portion of the Epistle, the attack on the false teachers ending with ii. 23, and there is no break between vv. 1-4 and ver. 5. The ethical exhortation has its basis in the dogmatic exposition already given, and is therefore connected with it by οὐ... Ver. 1. εἰ οὖν συνεγράφθη τῷ Χριστῷ: "if then [as is the case] you were raised together with Christ." It is not their resurrection when Christ rose of which he speaks, but their personal resurrection with Him at the time of their conversion and baptism. "This is the counterpart to death with Him, and as that breaks off the old relations, so this initiates them into the new. They must now work out to its consequences that which they then received in union with Christ. Alford denies that there is any ethical element
in this resurrection, on the ground that if there were there would be no need to exhort to ethical realisation. But this is to misunderstand Paul's idealistic language. Resurrection implies that the death has already taken place, and the death is ethical.—

Ver. 2. to ovw tijrtiTe. The reference is not, as Meyer characteristically makes it, eschatological. It is present fellowship with the exalted Lord, a life in heaven, of which he speaks. The true explanation is suggested by Eph. ii.6, oirr|twr|... iv Tif Ocw. This risen life is not which they now enjoy through union with Christ is concealed with Him in God. By the fact that it is hidden is not meant that it is secure (Kl.), for the contrast to edx. is phw. (ver. 4), but that it belongs to the invisible and eternal, to which Christ belongs; perhaps not precisely "shrouded in the depths of inward experiences and the mystery of its union with the life of Christ" (Ell.).

Ver. 3. oir«6ar<TC yap: "for ye died," that is to their old life, at the time of their conversion. It gives the reason for ver. 2. The exhortation is justified because they have died with Christ.—kal h ζωή... iv τῷ Θεῷ. This risen life (ζωή not βίωσι) which they now enjoy through union with Christ is concealed with Him in God. By the fact that it is hidden is

1 So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BDcKL. ζωή: T., Tr., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ΜCDFGP, by assimilation to η ζωή ζωή (ver. 3).
2 So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with Ν*BC* 17, 71. ζωή inserted after μεθ by Ln. with Μ*AC*DEFGHKLP.

Ver. 4. This life is not always to remain hidden, it will be manifested at the second coming. And that not merely in union with Christ, for it is Christ Himself who is our Life. This is not to be toned down to mean that Christ is the possessor and giver of eternal life. Paul means quite literally what he says, that Christ is Himself the essence of the Christian life (cf. Phil. i.21, ζωή τῷ Θεῷ, also Gal. ii.20). His manifestation therefore includes that of those who are one with Him. And this can only be a manifestation in glory (cf. Rom. viii.17).

Ver. 5. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 3-5.—νεκρώσατε οὖν. "Put to death, therefore" (cf. Rom. viii.13). The aorist implies a single decisive act. Perhaps νεκ. is chosen as a weaker word than βασάνω (Cremer, Haupt), implying the cessation of functions during life. οὖν is interesting. It seems strange that the assertions in the previous verses, of their death and resurrection with Christ and hidden life with Him in God, should be followed by the exhortation to put their members to death. Clearly these assertions are idealistic. The death and resurrection potentially theirs are to be realised in the putting to death of their members, —τα μέλη τα έπι της γης. The mem-

b Only here and † Thes. iv. 5; Rom. i. 36 in N.T.
bers are referred to in so far as they are
the instruments of the σάρξ, and are in-
cluded in the "things on the earth," with which the Christian has no more
concern (ver. 2). Lightfoot places a stop
at γῆς, and regards πορεύεσθαι κ.τ.λ. as
governed by ἀνάθεσθαι (ver. 8). He
thinks Paul intended to make these accu-
satives directly dependent on ἀνόης, but,
owing to the intervening clauses, changed
the form of the sentence. It is true that
the apposition of μιμησία and the list of sins
that follows is strange, but not so strange
as to make this very forced construction
preferable. We should have expected
Air. at the beginning of the sentence.—
cαι τὴν πλεονεξίαν: "and covetousness," not "impurity." It comes fittingly here, for
gold provided the means for indulging
these lustful passions. For the noun with
the article at the end of a series without
it, see Winer-Moulton, p. 145. — Ἰρρίν,
τις, refers simply to Ἰρρίν., not to the whole series of vices enumer-
ated, nor to μιμησία, by attraction for Ἰρρίνα.
The lust for wealth sets riches in the

Ver. 6. Parallel to Eph. v. 6, from
which τις τῶν νείας τῆς ἀδικίας has
been added in most MSS. The sentence
is abrupt without them, and ver. 7 is
more easily explained if they are retained
(as by Mey., Kl., Ol.), yet their omission in B, combined with their presence in the
parallel Eph. v. 6, is too strong to admit of
their retention. The verse may refer to a
general principle which acts in human life,
or the reference may be
exchatological. The latter seems to be
more in accordance with Paul's usage.

Ver. 7. ἐν οἷς: in which vices. If τ. νοστὶς τ. ἄνω be retained, the probable translation is "in whom". Lightfoot
thinks in any case the reference to the vices to be preferred, the chief reason
being that Paul could not blame his
readers for living among the Gentiles. But, as Meyer points out, περιπατεῖτε implies
participation in conduct.—καί ἰματία: you
as well as those who still practise these
vices. — περιπατεῖται: a Hebraistic
metaphor expressing moral conduct.—
ἐξητε ἐν τοῖς: "ye were living in them," i.e., in these vices. The reference is
to their pre-Christian state, in which
sin was the atmosphere of their lives.
The change of tense should be noticed.

Ver. 8. Vv. 8-10 are largely parallel
to Eph. iv. 22-24, 25, 31.—ὑμεῖς: "but
now," emphatic contrast to ὁτι, now
that you have passed from that life of
sinful conduct, see that you strip your-
selves of these vices. — ἀνάθεοται καὶ
ἀμεία τὰ πάντα: "do ye also put away all
of them."—κ. ὁμώς: obviously not you as
well as the Ephesians (Holtzm.), but you
as well as other Christians. It is not
clear whether ἔτεκε refers exclusively to
the preceding sins, to which then ἐργ. k.τ.λ. forms a loose apposition, or whether
it includes the latter also. It seems less
harsh to give the injunction a forward as
well as a backward reference.—ἐργήν,
θυμὸν: usually the former is regarded as
the settled anger, of which the latter is the
sudden and passionate outburst. Cremer,
however, followed by Haupt, regards ἐργ. as the inner emotion, of which ὁμῆρ. is the
external expression. ὁμῆρ. is certainly used
of the external manifestation of wrath in
ver. 6.—καθιστ.: "malignity," the feeling
which prompts a man to injure his neigh-
bour.—βλασφημία: as the other sins are
against men, so this, "slander," is not
"blasphemy".—ἀλογρολογίαν. The
word may mean "filthy speech" or
"abusive speech". Here the context
decides for the latter. Lightfoot, com-
bining both senses, translates "foul-
mouthed abuse," but such combinations
are generally to be distrusted.—ἐκ τῶν
στόματος ἰματία: probably this should be
connected both with πλ. and αἰσχρός.
Whether it is dependent on ἰματία, "ban-
ish from your mouth" (Mey., Ol., Abb.),
is more doubtful, since the interpolation
of sins which are not sins of speech makes such a connection awkward. Prob-
9. μὴ φεύγεσθε εἰς ἄλλας, ἀπεκδευσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν καὶ ἀνθρωπὸν σὺν ταῖς πράξεισιν αὐτοῦ. 10. καὶ ἀπεκδευσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἑπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτιστοῦ αὐτῶν.

Ver. 9. μὴ φεύγεσθε εἰς ἄλλας: “lie not to one another”. The imperative changes its tense from aorist to present, the exhortation to the decisive act being followed by a rule for their daily life. εἰς expresses the direction of the utterance. It should not be translated “against” (Kl., Fr.).— ἀπεκδευσάμενοι . . . ἐνθυμοῦμεν. These participles may be translated as part of the exhortation, “lie not one to another putting off . . . and putting on,” in other words, “put off . . . and put on . . . and lie not”. Or they may give a reason for the exhortation, “lie not, seeing ye have put off . . . and put on”. In favour of the former is the addition σὺν τ. πρ. αὐτ., for if the practices had been put off at conversion the warning might seem superfluous. ἀνακαιν. (pres.) also points to a continuous process. Either view harmonises with Paul's theology, for he speaks of death to the old and life to the new either as ideally complete in the moment of conversion or as realised gradually in actual experience. But the latter, which is taken by most commentators, is preferable; for the reference is much wider than in the foregoing words. They refer only to the discarding of vices. Paul now emphasises the positive side also, the putting on the new as well as casting off the old.— τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρωπὸν: i.e., the old non-Christian self (cf. Rom. vi. 6, Eph. iv. 22).— ἀπεκδευσάμενοι: “practices,” such as those already enumerated.

Ver. 10. τὸν νέον. In Eph. iv. 24 we have καταν. “fresh” (as opposed to “worn out”); νέος is new as opposed to old. The idea contained in καταν. is here expressed by ἀνακαινισθήναι. Some (including Sod.) regard “the new man” as Christ, according to which “the old man” will be Adam. But this is negatived by the next verse, for if the new man is Christ, ἡ χρυστῶς would be a strange tautology. καταν. is also against it, though we have μορφῆς Χρ., Gal. iv. 19. It is the regenerate self, regenerate, of course, because united with Christ.— ἀνακαινούμενον: “being renewed,” the present expressing the continuous process of renewal (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16). There is no reference to a restoration to a former state.— ἐξ ἑπίγνωσις: not to be connected (as by Mey. and Hofm.) with καταν. εἰκόνα, which would give a strange and obscure thought, but to be taken as the object of the renewal. The knowledge is ethical rather than theoretical in this connexion. — καταν. εἰκόνα: to be taken with ἀνακαινισθήναι. There is a clear allusion to Gen. i. 26-28, the new self grows to be more and more the image of God. There may perhaps be a side reference to “ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil” in ἐξ ἑπίγνωσις. — τὸν κτίστον: i.e., God, not (as Chrys. and others) Christ. Some take κτίστον to mean “according to Christ”. It is true that Christ is the image of God, but the parallel καταν. Θεόν, in Eph. iv. 24, makes this improbable, and we should have expected the article before ἔστιν.

Ver. 11. Cf. Gal. iii. 28. He has been speaking of sins inconsistent with brotherly love, anger and falsehood. Such sins are incompatible with Christianity, which has abolished even those deep distinctions that divided mankind into hostile camps. In the splendid sweep of the great principle, which has cancelled the most radical differences of nationality, ceremonial status, culture and social position, all minor causes of strife are necessarily included. The solvent of national, racial and even religious hate cannot be powerless before the petty strifes of a Christian church. — ἐντελῶς. ἐν τ. ἐστιν: “where there cannot be”. ἅπαξ. seems to refer to “the new man,” not to “knowledge” or “the image”. In the new man created by God all these dis-
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12. ἐνδόσασθε οὖν ὑμεῖς ἕλεκτοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄγιοι καὶ Ἰεραπετήμονες, σπλάγχνα ἑκτίμων, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνη, πραΰτητα, μακροθυμίαν, 13. ἀνεχόμενοι ἐξάλλως καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχῃ μομφήν: καθός καὶ ὁ Κύριος. ἔχαριστατο ὡμῖν οὕτως καὶ ὅρμεις. 14. εἰτί πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην

1 So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ABD*FG. Χριστὸς: T., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with Ν=CD=EKL. Θεός: Ν*.

tinctions vanish. ὲν seems not to be for ἔνσις, as used to be said, but, as Buttmann maintains, a form of ἄν. Winer-Schmiedel says "ἐν is the older form of ἄν, and has the significance of ἔνσις". —Εὐλογεῖν κ.τ.λ. The first two pairs contain opposites, in race and then in religion. For the third pair Paul cannot employ an antithesis, since "Εὐλογεῖν, the contrast to Βάργος, has already been used in the sense of Gentile. He therefore adds to barbarian the Scythian as the extreme example—Scythe barbari barbarores (Beng.)—but reverts to the method of opposition in the last pair. The order Εὐλογεῖν κ. τ.λ. is unusual, and perhaps due to the fact that he is writing to Gentiles, but in Gal. iii. 28 he is writing to Gentiles too. The usual order is resumed in περὶ κ. ἀκρ. In δοῦλον ἄνευ, he may have a reference to Philemon and Onesimus, but the terms occur also in the Galatian list.—πάντα καὶ ἐν πάσιν Χριστῷ. This expresses the thought that Christ is all, and that He is in all the relations of life; πάντα νεuter, and Χ. is placed at the end for emphasis. Since He is all, and all things are one in Him, He is the principle of unity, through whom all the distinctions that mar the oneness of mankind are done away.

Ver. 12. This verse and ver. 13 are parallel to Eph. iv. 2, 32. The ethical consequences of having put on the new man are now drawn out in detail.—ἐνδόσασθε οὖν: not since Christ has become all and in all to you (Lightf.), but since you have put on the new man.—ἐστὶ ἕλεκτοι τοῦ Θεοῦ: i.e., as conformity to your position as God's elect demands. The election is God's choice of them in Christ before creation (Eph. i. 4).—ἀγιοι καὶ Ἰεραπετήμονες qualify ἔλεος, and are not vocatives. ἄγιος, means, as elsewhere in N.T., beloved of God; he is speaking of their position as Christians.—σπλάγχνα ὑμών: a heart of compassion, the σπλ. being regarded as the seat of emotion.—χρηστότητα: almost "sweetness of disposition". It is opposed to "severity" (of God) in Rom. xi. 22.—ταπεινοφροσύνη, πραΰτητα: both virtues towards fellow-men, and quite different from ταχεύς, the practical difference is very slight. The thought that Christians are members one of another may underlie the choice of expression (cf. 1 Pet. iv. 8). It may be chosen to correspond to ὑμᾶς. —μομφὴν may have reference to the case of Philemon and Onesimus.—ὁ Κύριος: whether this or ὁ Χριστὸς be read the reference is to Christ. In the parallel Eph. iv. 32 we have "God in Christ," which is Paul's usual way of putting it. But that is no reason for referring Κύριος to God, for Jesus when on earth forgave sins. The forgiveness they have received is used to enforce the duty of forgiving others. The best illustration is the parable in Matt. xviii. 23-25.

Ver. 14. ἐνί τὰ πάντα τῆς ἀγάπης: probably "over all these," carrying on the metaphor of clothing, not "in addition to all". These virtues are manifestations of love, but may be conceivably exhibited where love is absent, so that the mention of it is not superfluous.—ἐνίσχυσθαι τ. ἄγ. for love itself is the ἐνίσχυσθαι τ. ἄγ. Generally ἐνίσχυσθαι is explained as that which binds together all the virtues. The genitive is variously interpreted. It has been taken as genitive of the object, but the objection (Luther, Ol., Haupt) that the bond binds the virtues into a unity but does not bind together the unity itself is forcible. It has also been taken as a genitive of quality, "the perfect bond," which Paul would have said if he had meant it. Ellicott regards it as a subjec-
12—16.

πη, δ ἐστιν σύνθεσις τῆς τελείωτητος. 15. καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβραβεύτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἑν καὶ ἐκλήσθη ἐν ἑνί σώματι· καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία γίνεται.

16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν σώματι πλούτου, ἐν δόγμα σοφίας διδάσκοντες καὶ νοειρίτες ἐκατοντάς ψυχαῖς, ὁμοίως ψυχαίς πνευματικαῖς, ἐν τῇ.

1 So edd. with Ν-ΒΚ-DEFGL. τον Θεοῦ: R.V. mg. with AC* 17. τον Κυρίου: W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with Ν* cop.

2 So L., T., Tr., Lft., W.H. mg., Ws. with Ν-ΒΔ-Ε*FG 67**. τη: omitted by W.H. with ΝΑΚΛ.

Vv. 16, 17. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 19, 20.—Ver. 16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: probably, as usually explained, "the Gospel," so called because it proclaims it and speaks it through His messengers. Lightfoot interprets it as "the presence of Christ in the heart as an inward monitor." The phrase occurs only here, but cf. i. Thess. i. 8, 2 Thess. iii. i. —ἐν σώματι: according to Pauline usage must mean within you, and probably not collectively (Mey., Alf., Abb.) "in you as a Church," but individually. —ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ: to be taken with the following words (Beng., Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.), since ἐν σοφίᾳ is sufficiently qualified by πλούτους, and σοφ. suits διδασκάλους much better than ἐν σοφίᾳ. The balance is better preserved, as ἐν σοφίᾳ is then parallel to ἐν χήρᾳ. Lightfoot meets the last point by taking ἐν χήρᾳ with διδασκάλους, but even if this were probable the other arguments are decisive for the connexion with the following words. —διδασκάλους καὶ νοειρίτες: cf. i. 28. Lightfoot regards the participles as used for imperatives, which Ellicott thinks impossible. There is a slight, but quite intelligible, anacoluthon here.—ἐκατοντάς, as in ver. 13.—ψυχαῖς, ὁμοίως, ψυχαίς πνευματικαίς: to be connected with διδασκάλους, not with διδασκάλους (Hofm., KL, Weiss), with which the accusative should have been used. The precise distinctions intended are not certain, and perhaps they should not be sharply drawn. The meaning is, whatever kind of song it may be, let it be made the vehicle of religious instruction and admonition. ψαλ. may be restricted to the Old Testament Psalms, but this is improbable. ἐν σοφίᾳ are songs of praise to God. ἐν χήρᾳ has a wider sense, and was used of any class of song. Hence ἐν is added to it, and not to the others, for ψαλ. is used exclusively and ἐν σοφίᾳ usually in a religious sense. The word of Christ is to dwell in them so richly that it finds spontaneous expression in religious song.
in the Christian assemblies or the home.

— πόντον καρδίας. Not with sweetness or acceptableness (iv. 6), which does not suit the emphatic position. It may be "by the help of Divine grace," but more probably the meaning is "with thankfulness" (De W., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), on account of the reference to thankfulness in vv. 15 and 17. Thankfulness finds expression in song.— τοῖς καρδιαῖς. The reference is to the inner song of praise, which is to be the counter-part of the audible singing. What is meant is probably not singing from the heart, though cf. Matt. xxv.37.

Ver. 17. τῶν ... δραμά: a nominative absolute.— πάντα is governed by τουτέστατα (not ποιοῦτεστα, as Sod.), supplied from τοιαύτα.

τοῖς καρδιαῖς, τοῖς παρθένοις. This is not something additional to actions done in the name of Christ; but these actions are themselves expressions of thankfulness.

Ver. 18-19. Enforcement of the reciprocal duties of wives and husbands, children and parents, slaves and masters, with frequent reference to these duties as involved in their duty to Christ.— In this section the reference to the subject precedes that to the ruling parties, and the duty of obedience is emphasised to prevent false inferences from the doctrine that natural distinctions are done away in Christ. Holtzmann, Oltramare and Weiss think these precepts are added in protest against the false teachers' asceticism. The fact that we have similar, and fuller, injunctions in Ephesians tells against this. Eph. v. 22 sq. and 1 Pet. iii. 6 may be compared.—Ver. 18. καρδία has been taken as a perfect in sense of present (Luther, Bleek, Ol.), a view said by Winer to be "as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible" (Winer-Moulton, p. 338). Usually it is taken as an imperfect, "as was fitting," and is thought (but this is very dubious) to imply a reproach. Probably ἐν Κυρίῳ is to be joined to it, not to ὑπὸν. (cf. ver. 20).

Ver. 19. μὴ πικραίνεσθε: i.e., do not be harsh or irritable. Bengel defines πικρία as "odium amori mixtum," which is acute, but "odium" is too strong.

Ver. 20. κατὰ πάντα is omitted in Eph. vi. 1.

Ver. 21. ἐπεθύμητε: i.e., irritate by exacting commands and perpetual fault-finding and interference for interference' sake. The consequence of such foolish exercise of authority is that the child becomes discouraged; in other words, his spirit is broken, and since what he does leads to constant blame, he loses hope of ever being able to please. "Fractus animus pestis juventutis" (Beng.).

Ver. 22. The case of slaves is treated at greater length than that of the other family relations, probably on account of Onesimus. But Paul was much possessed with the need for keeping Christianity free from the suspicion it naturally created of undermining the constitution of society. So while δουλεῖα, εξερεύνοντες is a distinction which has vanished for Christianity, in the interests of Christianity as a spiritual power social freedom had to be cheerfully foregone till the new religion was able to assert its principle with success. An instructive parallel is the exhortation to submission to constituted authority in Rom. xiii. In Paul's time slaves probably made up the larger part of the population of the empire.— τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις: opposed to their spiritual Lord. οἰκοδομεῖται: acts of eye-service (singular in Eph. vi. 6), i.e., service which is most zealous when the eye of the master or overseer is upon them. The word was perhaps coined by Paul.— ἑπτάπολις: It is the Christian's first duty to please the Lord, and this he can do only by conscientious performance of his tasks quite apart from the recognition he receives from men. If the principle of his conduct is the pleasure of men, he will neglect his duty where this motive cannot operate.— ἀνελήφθη καρδίας: "singleness of heart," opposed to the
double-dealing of eye-service. — τῶν Κύριων: in significant contrast to the masters according to the flesh.

Ver. 23. Not only must the slave's work be done in the fear of the Lord, but done as if it were actually for the Lord that he was doing it, and not for a mere human master. And this principle is to govern every detail of his varied service. — ἐκ φιλίας: heartily and with good will. — οὐκ ἄνθρωπως: their service, Paul would say, is not to be rendered at all (οὐκ not μὴ) to their earthly master, but exclusively to Christ.

Ver. 24. However their earthly master may reward their service, there is a Master who will give them a just recompense; although they cannot receive an earthly, He will give them a heavenly inheritance. — ἄνδρα Κυρίου: in Eph. vi. 8 παρὰ Κ. The absence of the article is noteworthy. It emphasises the position rather than identifies the Person of Him who gives the reward (cf. the anarthrous ἐν θ., Heb. i. 1). Haupt thinks that there is no significance to be attached to its omission; but, as Lightfoot says, "it is studiously inserted in the context". — ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας: the "just recompense consisting in the inheritance". — αὕτη a genitive of apposition. — Σουλέιτε. This may be taken as an indicative (Lightf., Findl., Moule, Haupt) or as an imperative (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb.). The indicative is defended on the ground that it is needed to explain who is meant by ἄνδρα Κυρίου (but this was surely obvious), and that the imperative seems to require ἐάν τῷ Κ. But Lightfoot himself quotes Rom. xii. 11, where ἐάν is absent. On the other hand the indicative gives a somewhat flat sense, and the imperative seems to yield a better connexion with ver. 25. It is best then to take it as an imperative.

Ver. 25. This verse provides the reason (γὰρ) or Σουλέιτε. It is disputed whether ὅ ἄν. means the master who treats his slave unjustly, or the slave who by his idleness wrongs his master. To include both (Lightf., Findl., Ol.) is highly questionable, not only because a double reference is on principle to be avoided in exegesis, but because the connexion with Σουλ. implies that one side of the relation only is being dealt with. It is commonly thought that the verse is an encouragement to the slave, based on the assurance that the master who ill treats him will receive his recompense in due course. In favour of this οὐκ ἐστὶν προσωπ. is urged, since it implies that they are in a social position which might influence earthly courts, but cannot mitigate the judgment of God. But while a Christian writer could dissuade from vengeance by the thought that vengeance belonged to God alone, it is not credible that Paul should console the slave or encourage him in his duty by the thought that for every wrong he received his master would have to suffer. And, as Haupt says, we should have expected ἐάν after ἄνθρωπως and ἐάν instead of γὰρ. There is also a presumption in favour of an exhortation to the slave here. If it referred to the masters it would have come more naturally after iv. 1. Nor does προσωπ. necessarily imply that the wrongdoer is socially more highly placed. It equally well applies to favouritism that might be expected from God on the ground of religious position. So we should interpret the verse (with Weiss and Haupt) as a warning to the Christian slave not to presume on his Christianity, so as to think that God will overlook his misdeeds or idleness.

Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. ἐσότερα. The literal meaning is "equality," and Meyer takes it so here (so Ol., Haupt), explaining not of equality conferred by emancipation, but of the treatment of the slave by his master as a brother in Christ. It may,
IV. 

1. The prooemium, the introductory address, in Greek, is a request for prayer. IV. 1-5. The prayer is addressed to the Romans, not as a.mere petition, but with the expectation of God's hearing and response. The prayer is offered for the furtherance of the apostolic work, for the wisdom required for the Gentile Converts, and for the ability to speak with effectiveness.

2. The prayer is a call to prayer, especially for the furtherance of the apostle's work. It is a call to wisdom in speech. The prayer is partially parallel to Eph. vi. 18-20. Ver. 2. Steadfastness in prayer is opposed to fainting in it. The illustration is the importunate widow and the importunate friend. Ver. 3. The prayer is also a call to watchfulness against confusion in thought. The idea is clear in the form of prayer. The prayer is a thanksgiving for God's gifts, and therefore watchful against losing them.

3. The prayer includes all his fellow-workers, probably not Paul alone, on account of the singular (πάντες). It is a removal of whatever obstructs progress, possibly liberation from prison, to which he was looking forward (Phil. 2). The prayer is also a call to speak with wisdom in speech. The prayer is a call to speak with wisdom in speech, for the Gentile Converts.

4. The prayer is not connected with οὐκ εὐθανάστῃ, a reference to the singular (πάντες). The prayer is a call to speak with wisdom in speech, for the Gentile Converts.

5. The prayer is a call to speak with wisdom in speech, for the Gentile Converts.

in spite of Oltramare's denial, mean “equity,” and the combination with οὐκετισσαίον suggests this meaning here. The master should regulate his treatment of his slave not by caprice, but by equity.—παρέχεται: “supply on your part,” a dynamic middle. Ver. 3. The prayer is a call to speak with wisdom in speech, for the Gentile Converts. The prayer is a call to speak with wisdom in speech, for the Gentile Converts.

The usual way is best which connects it with οὐκετισσαίον. This is better than going back to προστρέψατε, while the connexion with λαλεῖ is strained. It may be taken (as Beng., Hofm., Sod.) with δεδέμεναι, “bound in order that I may manifest,” but if so why should Paul have desired liberty? Soden gives a peculiar turn to the thought. He thinks Paul is bound in order that he may manifest to his judges how he can do no other (ὅτι) than preach. This seems to be met by Haupt's criticism that for this we must have had παρέχεται ὅτι διὰ με λαλεῖσαι αὐτῷ. Ver. 4. Θαυμάζων Soden urges in favour of his interpretation that λαλεῖσαι is never used of Paul's preaching, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be. It is a stronger word than καλλικοτέρως, he wants to “make it clear.”—δεδέμεναι Soden urges in favour of his interpretation that παρέχεται is never used of Paul's preaching, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be. It is a stronger word than καλλικοτέρως, he wants to “make it clear.”
Ver. 6. ἐν χάριτι: probably "gracious," "pleasant" is the meaning; by the swiessness and courtesy of their conversation they are to impress favourably the heathen. Some (most recently Haupt) think Divine grace is meant, but this does not suit ἅπαν so well.— ἅπαν ὑμνόν. In classical writers "salt" expressed the wit with which conversation was flavoured. Here wisdom is probably meant on account of εἷδον. There may be the secondary meaning of wholesome, derived from the function of salt to preserve from corruption.— εἷδον: "so as to know".—ἐνεχθῆς: they must strive to cultivate the gift of pleasant and wise conversation, so that they may be able to speak appropriately to each individual (with his peculiar needs) with whom they come in contact.

Vv. 7-18. Commendation of the BEARERS OF THE LETTER, WITH SALUTATIONS FROM HIS FELLOW-WORKERS AND HIMSELF.—Vv. 7, 8 parallel to Eph. vi. 21, 22.—Ver. 7. Τυχίκος is mentioned in Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, Tit. iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 12. He belonged to the province of Asia, and was sent at this time not only with this letter but with the Epistle to the Ephesians.— ἄδελφος is usually taken to express his relation to the members of the Church, though Haupt thinks it means Paul's brother.—εὐλαβεῖς διδάσκαλος: "faithful minister," probably to Paul, not to Christ. τισ. goes also with συνεπόμενος, and since this expresses a relation to Paul it is probable that διάκ. does so too.—ἐν Κυρίῳ: to be taken with all three nouns on account of the single article.

Ver. 8. Ἐπιφανία: "I am sending" (epistolary aorist).—γνώστε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν.

This is not only the better attested reading but yields the better sense, because both before (ver. 7) and after (ver. 9) Paul says that Tychicus will acquaint them with matters at Rome. He wishes to relieve the anxiety of the Colossians as to his welfare.—παρακαλῶν; see on ii. 2. This function is not ascribed to Onesimus, who was not a σύνδεως.

Ver. 9. Ὑπότιμος. Philemon's runaway slave, who was rescued by Paul and converted to Christianity. Paul sent him back to his master, with the exquisite Epistle to Philemon despatched at the same time as this letter. He speaks of him in the most affectionate terms, to secure a welcome for him at Colossae. He seems from this passage to have belonged to Colossae, and we may infer that this was the home of Philemon. It the author of Colossians learnt his name from the Epistle to Philemon, it is strange that he should have contented himself with this bald reference, and made no allusion to his desertion, conversion and return to his master. Such omission is characteristic of Paul's delicacy.—τὰ δέ is wider than τὰ κατ' ἐμι (ver. 7). It means all that is happening to the Church in Rome.

Ver. 10. Ἀριστοφάρος: a native of Thessalonica, mentioned in Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2, Philm. 24. In Philm. Epaphras is mentioned as Paul's fellow-prisoner. Fritzsche suggested that his friends took turns in voluntarily sharing his captivity, and explained the difference between the two Epistles in this way. The divergence between the two Epistles testifies to authenticity, for an imitator would not have created a difficulty of
**IV.**

11. καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰωάννης, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἐκ περιστομῆς οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οῖνοι ἔγνησθήσαντι μοι 4 παραγγείλω. 12. διατέθηκεν ὦμας Ἐπαφρᾶς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, πάντοτε ἄγων ἱδρυμένος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν

*Only here in this prose wortificas, in order to indicate 1. the change and translation of the verbs, and of the name*.

11. Ἰησοῦς: otherwise unknown to us. Zahn has well pointed out that the mention of this name, in addition to Philemon, creates difficulties for the impugners of the authenticity. If Philemon was authentic, why should an imitator venture to add an unknown person, and especially to give him the name Jesus, that so soon became sacred among Christians? If not authentic, why should he not have copied himself?—οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἐκ περιστομῆς: to be taken with the following words, in spite of the awkwardness of the construction. What is meant is that these are the only ones of the circumcision who have been a help to him. If a stop is placed at ἔγνησθη, we get the sense that these who have just been mentioned are his only fellow-workers, which is not true. Aristarchus is probably not included, for he went as one of the deputation sent by the Gentile Christians with the collection or the Church at Jerusalem.—οἵτινες μόνοι: for the attitude of Jewish Christians in Rome towards Paul cf. Phil. i. 15-17, ii. 19-24. This is more natural in a letter from Rome than from Caesarea.—βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The phrase is intentionally chosen; the Jews were devoted to the kingdom: Paul should have found in the Jewish Christians his best helpers. —ἐγνήσθησαν: the aorist seems to point to some special incident.

12. Ἐπαφρᾶς: see on i. 7. He was either a native of Colossae or had settled there.—δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Paul uses this term often of himself, but of no one else except here and Phil. i. 1, where he calls himself and Timothy δοῦλοι Χ.’ Meyer and Alford connect with 6 ἐκ., but it is better to place a comma after ὑμῶν.—συνεργοῖς: see on ii. 2. Usually it is translated here "fully assured". Haupt thinks that after τολμᾷ this is unsuitable. But if we translate "complete" or "filled," this is tautological, and it is not clear that τολμᾷ covers full assurance.—ἐν πάντι θελήματι Θεοῦ: "in everything that God wills". Meyer and Alford connect with συνεργοῖς (or as they read συνεργοῖς), but it is better to connect with the two participles.

13. The anxiety of Epaphras for these Churches was probably due to his connexion with them, either as founder or teacher.

14. Luke the physician, the beloved:—"Luke the physician, the beloved," no doubt to be identified with the evangelist Luke. His writings have been shown to exhibit a considerable use of medical terms. The name was originally Lucas. He was clearly not one "of the circumcision" (ver. 11), and this, as often pointed out, seems to exclude the possibility that he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.—Δημᾶς: mentioned last and without commendation. This is commonly explained as due to a foreboding of Paul that he would turn out badly, suggested by the reference to him in 2 Tim. iv. 10 as having left him. But in Philm. 24 he is placed before Luke and numbered among Paul's fellow-workers.
Possibly he wrote the Epistle, and is thus mentioned last and without praise.

Ver. 15. Νυμφον may be masculine (Νυμφὸν) or feminine (Νύμφαν). The Doric form, Νύμφαν, is improbable; on the other hand the contracted form, Νυμφάν, is rare. If αὐτὸν is read, either is possible. Otherwise the decision is made by the choice between αὐτός and αὐτὴς. It seems probable that αὐτὸν was due to change by a scribe who included ἀδελφός in the reference. And a scribe might alter the feminine, assuming that a woman could not have been mentioned in this way. The attestation of αὐτὴς is very strong, though numerically slight. The Church in her house was a Laodicean Church, distinct apparently from the chief Church of the town.

Ver. 16. τὴν ἐκ Λαοδίκιας: clearly a letter sent by Paul to Laodicea, which the Colossians are instructed to procure and read. It may be a lost letter, or it may be our so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, to which Marcion refers as the Epistle to the Laodiceans, and which was probably a circular letter. Weiss argues that it cannot be the Epistle to the Ephesians, for that was sent at the same time as this, and therefore Paul could not have sent salutations to Laodicea in this letter. But this is really natural, if Ephesians was a circular letter (and the absence of salutations is difficult to explain otherwise), and if this letter was to be passed on to Laodicea.

Ver. 17. Archippus may have been at Laodicea, but more probably not, for we should have expected the reference to him in ver. 15. The Church is entrusted with the duty of exhorting one of its ministers. There is no need to infer any slackness on his part.—ἐν Κυρίῳ is added to emphasise its importance, and the need that it should be zealously fulfilled.

Ver. 18. τῇ χαρᾷ μεθ’ οὕτων: the rest of the letter would be written by an amanuensis. As he writes, his chain, fastened on his left hand, would impress itself on his notice. Hence the touching request “Remember my bonds,” which may bear the special sense “remember in your prayers”.—ἡ χάρις μεθ’ οὕτων: so without any defining addition in Eph. and 1 and 2 Tim. It is not so in the earlier letters, but neither is it so in Phil. (or Titus).
In order that others may use this book, please return it as soon as possible, but not later than the date due.