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EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

CHAP. X.

The Apostle proceeds, in this Chapter, to detail the causes why such a multitude of Jews should be now excluded from the Messiah's kingdom: and he again lays down the following, as the primary one: "That the Jews, priding themselves on their zeal for the law, as if that were a high merit, refused to repose their hope and trust for salvation in the grace of God through Christ, obtained for them by the Lord Jesus. (Rosenm.)

In this Chapter is especially considered the difference between the justification that is by the law, and that which is by faith in Christ. And here (Mackn. observes) the Apostle answers to two chief objections, whereby the Jews justified their opposition to the Gospel. The first objection was, that by teaching the justification of the Jews by faith without the works of law, the expiations of the law of Moses were rendered of no use in their justification. The second was, that by admitting the Gentiles into the Church and covenant of God without circumcision, the covenant with Abraham was made void." Koppe well remarks on the mildness of the Apostle, with which (though he was going to declare the Jews as the authors of their own ruin), yet, as far as was possible, he excuses their unbelief (ver. 2.), and professes his love towards them, and his ardent desire that they should be saved."

1. ἀδελφοὶ. Grotius and Koppe rightly think this
is especially meant for the Jewish Christians, who would doubtless grieve at the fate of their countrymen.

1. ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδιᾶς, scil. ἐστι, "it is the anxious wish of my heart." The expression is explained by Theophyl.: σφόδρα ἐπιθυμία. It properly signifies will, or wish: so that the intensive force rests in the καρδιᾶς. In the Sept. it answers to the Hebrew בַּיִם.

Crellas and Paræus remark on the use of μὲν without a δὲ, which they think indicates the omission of a sentence, such as: "yet speak the truth I must." But I cannot agree with them on the words omitted. The μὲν is sometimes used alone, especially after the personal pronouns; in which case it usually may be expressed by "part." So ἦν μὲν, "for my part," καὶ μὲν, of which see examples in Matth. Gr. Gr., who has, however, not discerned the full force of the idiom. The same sense is sometimes found, even when the personal pronoun is omitted; as in the passage of Plato cited by Matthiæ. But as the μὲν is so used with personal pronouns, so there is no wonder that it should be used with possessive pronouns, which include the personal ones. The sense, then, is: "For my part, the wish of my heart is," &c. It is true that in these cases there is always a sentence omitted: but it is one which must exactly correspond to that which is expressed. In the present case it will be as follows: "whatever others may wish, or impute to me." Theophyl. supplies: "How can I be ill affected to you?" which is approaching very near to the truth.

1. καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν. Here there seems a climax, q. d. "nay it is also the subject of my prayers to God," i. e. I offer up prayers to God. Ἐπέρ, for them, on their behalf.

1. εἰς σωτηρίαν. One should have expected the article. The sense, however, must be the same, viz. "for their salvation, that they may be saved." The Commentators dispute whether this designates tem-
poral (as Hammond and Whitby suppose), or eternal welfare. Grotius and Doddridge understand both. Most Commentators, however, take it to mean "that they may be converted to Christianity." But this is only indirectly adverted to. The force of the word, especially in this connexion and context, suggests the idea only of preservation from the wrath of God, and acceptance with him. Now this the Jews sought and expected by the law. Thus far the Apostle means to say, that he prays they may attain the object of all religious observances; though he knows this can in no other way be done but by the justification that is in Christ Jesus. This σωτηρία, then, included temporal welfare, and preservation from the impending ruin which awaited their obstinate rejection of the Messiah.

2. μαρτύρω γὰρ αὐτῶι ἐς ζηλον Θεοῦ ἐξωσιν, "I bear them witness," i. e. in their favour. For μαρτύρω, with a dative, signifies to bear witness for a person, i. e. in favour of him. See the examples in Schleus. Lex. Wets. renders ἐξωσι, "they think they have." But there is no need to resort to any such stretching of the sense.

2. ζῆλον Θεοῦ. I am surprised that some of our best Commentators should take the words to mean a great zeal. (See Wolf's Curæ and Schleus.) For though this Hebraism of Θεὸς, to denote greatness, has place elsewhere, yet here it is unnecessary, nay inadmissible. For (as Koppe observes) it takes away the object of the zeal mentioned, which cannot well be supposed to be left understood. The old Commentators discuss the force of the genitive, which has been most distinctly seen by Grotius. "All nouns of this kind (says he) have a genitive sometimes of subject, sometimes of object; as here." And he might have given as an example, ἡ οὖν ἡ ἔχει ἐξωσιαν τοῦ πτηλοῦ, supra 9, 21., where see the note. Moreover, the expression is taken from Ps. 69, 9. (cited in Joh. 2, 17.), and we may here compare Acts 21, 20. 22, 3. 2 Cor. 12, 2. The sense, then, is: "they have a
zeal, the object of which is God and his approbation, and consequently the Mosaic law, his revelation: and this zeal was enkindled by a supposed neglect of it on the part of the Jews." But this, the Apostle adds, is οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν, which Koppe renders "non sapienter et intelligenter." And so Casaubon, inscīdē. Which, however, does not express the force of the phrase. Doddridge explains: "not directed into a right channel." But this is wandering too far. Ἐπίγνωσις is supposed by Grotius to be here synonymous with γνῶσις, and like the Heb. γνωρίζειν. But it seems a stronger expression, and means well founded knowledge, accurate judgment, at least not knowledge in general, as Erasm. and Menoch. take it.* Now the zeal of the Jews was not under such a sure guidance, but (as Koppe observes) proceeded upon ignorance of the nature and intent of the law, and of the real value to be set upon those good works on which they so prided themselves. The words are thus paraphrased by Theophyl.: οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν ἐστὶν ὁ ξῆλος αὐτῶν, μὴ βουλομένως γνῶ-

ναι, ὅτι ὁ νόμος οὗτος πέπαιναι καὶ κατηργηται.

To this tenaciousness of the Jews with respect to the law (Carpzov observes), the works of Josephus bear frequent testimony. And the learned Commentator illustrates this from several passages of Philo.†

* An interpretation also adopted by Ammon, who hence deduces the philosophical notion, that our religious faith must rest on just conceptions, and knowledge of truth. It is needless for me to point out the erroneousness of the opinion, and it is my duty to caution the student against the writings of this heterodox, though erudite, Theologian, who, however (as I learn), is now singing the παλαιώδη.

† Ex. gr. 1008 c (ἔθνος) εἰσθάνεσθαι ἤλθαντως ἐπερ ἄλαναλαν, ὑπὲρ τούτων μὴν τῶν παρισίων περιδεῖν ἄναρμε

νοι, εἰ καὶ βραγύτατον εἰπ’ & 1032 D & F. Ἀπαντεῖ γαρ ἀνθρωποὶ

φυλακτικοὶ τῶν ιδίων ἐθνῶν εἰσίν, διαισθήτως δὲ τὸ Ἱουδαίου ἔθνος. —Τούτῳ γὰρ ἢδη καθαίρεται, ἢ καθαρίζεται, ὡς παραμορφωθῇ ἄνεξ(t)ηλεται, καὶ περίκεισθαι μὲν ἐκαστὸν τῶν διηγομένων αὐτῶς, ὡς ἀκαθάρτη ἡν παρ’ ἀνθρωποῖς εἰτε εὐτυχίας, εἰτε εὐθανασίαν χρῆ

καλεῖν, μηδέντων ἄν ὑπὲρ παραβάσεως καὶ τοῦ νυκτὸς ἀν ὑπαλλά-

λαθαιαὶ περιττοτέρα δὲ καὶ ἐκαθαρτοῖς ἐστὶν ἀπαθεῖν ἡ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν

σπουδή.
3. ἀγνοοῦντες γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην. This clause seems meant as an illustration of the preceding words ὦ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν. The δικαιοσύνη must signify "the mode by which God is pleased that justification and salvation should be attained." Being ignorant, then, or not sufficiently acquainted with, and not caring to know this δικαιοσύνη. (for the term seems to include all these notions), they sought, it is said, στήσας τὴν ἴδιαν δικαιοσύνην, i.e. (says Wets.) "to the exclusion of the other nations." This, however, is not agreeable to the scope of the Apostle. By ἴδιαν δικαιοσύνη is meant a justification of their own, resting on the works of the law. And the Apostle so terms it, because, being a law of works, it made every one's salvation depend upon his own merits; and thus such a law might, in a certain sense, be called a justification of his own. So Theophyl.: τὴν ἐκ ἔργων ἴδιαν καὶ πάνω καταρθυμένην. And in the same manner the ἴδιαν is understood by Hardy, who renders it: "ut ipsis excogitatum;" and also by Rosenm., who observes that ἴδ. δικ. (by the force of the antithesis) denotes that mode of obtaining the Divine favour, which the Jews held to be alone the true one, and pleasing to God." So also Carpzov. "Externa quippe obedientia est; sunt opera bona, ex propriis naturæ viribus Legi præstanda, per quæ justos se reddi posse existimabant."

Στήσας. Koppe explains it as the opposite to καταρ-γεῖν, or ἀναρεῖν, i.e. "not to suffer it (viz. the Mosaic Law) to be taken from them." In this, however, there seems something too formal and harsh. The force of the στήσας is well illustrated by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) as follows: ἢτις καὶ πέπακε καὶ οὐ δύναται στήσαι. The idea, then, intended seems to be, the propelling and buttressing up of a weak structure.* It is

* So Doddridge. "The Pharisees certainly inculcated the external duties of morality, how much soever they might themselves fail in observing them, or rest merely in outward acts; but they trusted in legal expiations to procure the pardon of those evils which might happen; and the composition of these, if I may be
rightly remarked by Grotius: "Judei plerique pro causâ salutis æternæ constitueare volebant justitiam illam externam quæ per frequentes actiones paratur, et in societate humanâ aliquid valet."

3. τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ἑπτάγησαν. Grotius has rightly noticed that the passive has here (as often) a reciprocal force (as Niphal for Hithpael). It is not, however, a mere Hebraism, but is often found in the Classical writers. The sense is: "they have not submitted, accommodated themselves to, yielded obedience to, and accepted, the mode of justification held out by God, namely, in the Gospel." Koppe observes that the aorist is for the present. But to this principle it is unnecessary here to resort. We may render, "they have not submitted, and do not submit themselves."

It is shrewdly remarked by Grotius (I think from Diog. Laert.) that many would have attained unto wisdom, if they had not thought they had already attained it. And, in conjunction with Carpzov, he compares a similar sentiment of Philo 912 δ. Εἰςὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ δόξαντες ἐπιμελεῖσθαι (scil. σπερμάτων ἐλπίδος), φιλανθίαν πρὸ εὐσεβείας ἀσκασάμενοι, τὰ αἰτία τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀνέθηκαν ἑαυτοῖς. "Παίτιοι δὲ πάντες οὕτως. Μόνος δὲ ἀποδοχῆς ἀξίος, δ ἀναθέλει τὴν ἐλπίδα Θεοῦ.

4. τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός. Here is more plainly declared the mode by which God is pleased that men should be brought to salvation by Christ.

The sense of this passage is not very easy to determine; owing to the brevity with which the Apostle expresses himself, and the extensiveness of the term τέλος, which admits of two or three senses equally applicable in a general way. The most favourite opinion, at present, is that of Cyprian, Crelius, and Koppe, who regard τέλος νόμου Χ. as a popular expression for τέλος ἐφερε τῷ νόμῳ, "Christ has put an end to the law." And Koppe takes εἰς δικαιοσ. τιστ. for εἰς τὸ συμβαίνειν δικαιοσύνην τῷ πισ-
tewonti. He then lays down the sense of the passage as follows: kataqeyntos gar vnomou dia Xristou, diakouvexa pantes ek pisteas. And in the same view Ammon renders: "Desinit lex in Christum, ut salus nunc offeratur credenti." But this mode of interpretation, though it yields a sense by no means inapposite, is not agreeable to the context.

Other interpretations may be seen in Pole and Wolf. The most simple and satisfactory one seems to be that of Chrysost. Theophyl., Ecumen., Pho- tius, and Theodoret (also adopted by Carpzov). "The words (say they) are meant for the Jews, and Jewish Christians, to assure them that nothing is lost by abandoning the Law. The Apostle shews that there is only one justification, and that what the Law attempted, the Gospel fulfils; and therefore he who chooses the one by faith, fulfils the other; whereas he who aims at the other, must miss of this; q. d. 'The intent and end of the law, namely, justification, is fulfilled and perfected in Christ.' For what the law would have effecte, but could not, this Christ perfected, namely, to justify men."*

5—11. Koppe would closely connect together these verses; and he lays down the sense as follows. "While the authority of the Mosaic Law lasted, it was by a careful observance of it that men obtained salvation; but now, since the abrogation of that law by Christ, the sole condition of salvation is this, to believe in the Messiahship of Jesus, and in his resurrection from the dead." Koppe then pro-

* Chrysost. offers the following popular illustration, and able exposition of the sense; Kal gar telos iatremi' ogeia' osper onn o dunameos agi' pioein, kai mu ton iatremi' ech, to pan ech, o de mu eidos therapeuein, kai meti' exi tivn techen, tov pantos expe- sen' otiw kal evi ton vnomon kal tis pisteus' o meg taun echwv, kal to ekeinoi telos ech' o de taun echwv, amfoteron estin allotrios; ti gar evbuleo o vnomos; diakion poiiai ton anbropoton' al' ouk iakhisen' oudeis gar auton expl SIZE' tovto otiw telos huv ton vnomon, kal ei ton pantet bllake, kai dia ton pantu egveno, kai ai orrhai, kai ai entolai, kai ai thesia, kai ti locta pantai, iama dikaiwthi o anbrowv' alla touto to telos ynuv en ho Xristos mei
dovos dia tis pisteus.
ceeds to illustrate the design of the Apostle. But his whole reasoning appears to be sophistical and unsound. Indeed it is at variance with that design, which is, to show that justification never was, and never could be attained by the law, since the law never could be thoroughly observed. And it is rightly remarked by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) "that the words of ver. 5. are meant to confirm what was just before said; namely, that what the law did not accomplish, this Christ completed. For Moses, indeed, says a man is justified by the works of the law. But these works no one was found able to fulfil. So that it is not possible to be so justified." The above is, I think, a just view of the sense; and it must be remembered, that by law is meant the moral as well as the ceremonial.

Now the ἁγίασμα (Wets. says) is explained by the Jewish interpreters of life eternal. And he subjoins several references to the Rabbinical writers; as does also Carpzov. Yet some of our best modern Commentators and Theologians, as Warburton, Whitby, and Macknight, and, of the antient ones, Origen, confine the sense of the expression solely to the present existance, so as to denote a prosperous and happy life in the land of Canaan. "And if (adds Whitby) eternal life was obscurely hinted at as the reward of their obedience to the law of Moses, it related not to their obedience to the ceremonial but to the moral law, of which our Saviour speaks in Matt. 19, 8. 'If thou wilt enter into life (i.e. life eternal, as in ver. 16.) keep the commandments. And Macknight observes, that though this is generally thought to be a promise of eternal life to those who obeyed the law of Moses perfectly, yet any one who reads the chapter of Levit. 18, 5. from whence these words are taken, will be sensible, that though the doing of these things means a perfect obedience to the whole law, and more especially to the statutes and judgments written in that chapter, the life promised to the Israelites. as a reward of that general
obedience, is only their living long and happily as a nation in Canaan." (See Dr. Hammond.) As to Whitby's distinction respecting the moral and ceremonial law, it seems to be void of foundation.

I must not omit to observe that in ἔγραψε δικαιοσὺνῃ there is a popular ellipsis, in which two clauses have coalesced into one; q.d. "Moses, treating of the justification to be had from the law, thus writes or speaks of it."

The αὐτὰ, Koppe says, refers to the προστάγματα before recited in that chapter. And so Blackwall, who observes, that it must be taken from the context. But such a subaudition is precarious, and here (I think) unnecessary. The common ellipsis is περὶμάτα, which, however, must be accommodated to the case in hand, and must here mean commandments. Moreover, ταῦτα, I think, plainly includes καὶ τοιαῦτα, namely such as had been commanded in the foregoing part of the law.

6. ἦ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνης οὐτω λέγει, &c. These words, indeed, have a mystical air, and seem very obscure; yet when the Oriental phraseology, and Jewish modes of expression, are taken into the account, they become sufficiently clear.

The expression ἦ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνης οὕτω λέγει involves a prosopopeia familiar to our own language, as when we speak of the law directing, ordering, &c.

'Ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη is put, by metonymy, for "the religion which offers them justification by faith, viz. the Gospel." Οὕτως, "to this effect." But in order to understand the force of the following words, we must bear in mind the scope of the Apostle. Now the antient Commentators, and some modern ones, as Carpzov, have rightly seen, that justification by faith forms the subject of this and the three following verses, in reference to which the Apostle inculcates this requisition, "Believe, do not doubt." And the fruits of this are detailed in ver. 9, 10, & 11.

Here two things are contained: “Do not doubt,
but believe." * This the Apostle expresses in words borrowed from Deut. 30, 11—14., which are there used to denote a great difficulty, and meant to inculcate, that the commandments of God were by no means hard of fulfilment. Now there is reason to think that the expression of ascending to heaven, and descending to hell, was a proverbial mode of denoting great difficulty, nay impossibility. † The words, then, are accommodated by Paul to his present purpose, and applied to the Gospel, by means of the phrases τῶτε καταγαγεῖν and τὸῦτ ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.

The admonition not to doubt is couched in the words μὴ εἰσηγεῖται καρδία σου, which aptly express that sort of self-conference in which unbelief usually originates. So Theophyl. Μη εἰσηγήσεται καρδία σου τάδε καὶ τάδε, τῶτε καὶ τῶτε, μὴ έννοήσῃς διὰ σαμφισθολίας τι νόημα. The scope of the passage is well illustrated by Mr. Turner, as follows: "Moses means to tell the Israelites, that it is neither impracticable, nor indeed hard, to attain a knowledge of God's laws, and to obey them: St. Paul applies a part of what he says (altering it so as to make it suit his antithesis) to the subject before him, the facility of exercising faith, and consequently of obtaining justification. As if he had said, "The system of the Gospel demands faith, which is comparatively easy of acquisition; it does not require from you any thing of vast difficulty, as if the heaven were to be

* So Schöttt, "Vera hic indoles fideli verbis Mosis describitur, quae in eo consistit, ut non de ratione et modo rei proxime quæramus, sed Deo eiusque verbis credamus."

sailed to bring down Christ, or the abyss to be fathomed to bring him up; but it asks only what is within the reach of every one, what cannot be withheld without obstinate prejudice, that is, a belief in its divinity."

One thing is omitted by almost all modern Commentators, though it is noticed by the antient ones, namely, that the words τις ἀναβῆσαι—ἀναγείν are not only a formula expressive of great difficulty, but were meant to advert to the points at which the faith of the unbeliever chiefly staggered. So Theophylact: "Do not doubt, nor say in thine heart, how did Christ descend from heaven and become flesh? or, how after death did he rise from the grave: for God raised him: only believe that he descended incarnate, and again, after being buried, rose and ascended up to heaven: for God raised him. So that from the dignity of the raiser thou mayest without difficulty believe."*

Surely nothing can be clearer than that this involves the prior existence of Christ before his incarnation.

* The words are thus paraphrased by Schoettg. "Quis consilia Dei perscrutabitur? aut novam revelationem habebit. Omnia vobis revelata habebis, quae ad salutem vestram necessaria sunt." And by Carpzov, thus: 1. "Who can be certain whether Christ appeared in the flesh, as God-man? And whether God be entirely reconciled? No one can ascend to heaven, no one can account for the thing, or comprehend the manner of it.—2. Who can be certain whether Christ really rose again? whether he has really obtained the victory over his enemies, death, the Devil, and sin? No one can descend into the abyss, and find it out, or trace out the manner of it." (See more in his note.) This view of the sense (which is confirmed by Theophyl. just cited) is also taken by every Commentator of note, and amongst the rest by Macknight, who rightly observes, "that by the ἀβυσσον is meant Hades, the place of departed souls, so called because it was supposed by the Jews to be as far below the surface of earth as heaven was thought to be above it. See Ps. 139, 8. Ammon, however, contends that the Mosaic העיון does not denote regions far separated from each other, but the velarα ψελπαρα γαίης καὶ παρων of Hom. II. 8, 944., and thus designates the vicinity of the Orcus, from the notions of the early ages. And he refers to Ps. 9, 10. Job 11, 17. Od. 10, 508. Joseph. B. 9, 8, 11. But such speculations merit little attention from the Christian Theologian.
8. ἔγγὺς σοι τὸ ῥημαὶ ἐστίν — σοι. The sentiment (expressed, as before, in the words of Moses) is this: "So certain and indubitable is the doctrine of Jesus, the true Messiah, that faith must necessarily be due to him." (Koppe.) The words and the sense are diligently compared by Koppe with those of Deut. 3, 14. (see Surenhus. p. 476. and Horne's Introd.): but the meaning is so clear as to require no laboured explanation. One may render: "The word (i.e. the doctrine of faith) is familiar, easy to be understood, believed, and expressed."

On the easiness of the religious observances enjoined, Philo (cited by Grot. and Carpzov) says, 853 Αἰτεῖται γὰρ, Ἰ διάνοια, πάρα σοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ὕδειν βαρύ καὶ ποικιλον ἡ δύσεργον, ἀλλὰ ἀπλοῦν πάλιν καὶ ῥαδίον. Ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶν, ἀγαπᾶν αὐτῶν ὡς εἰνεχέτην. On which Carpzov truly remarks, that theological faith is not contained in moral and philosophical love, still less consummated in it.

9. οὗτ ὦ ὁμολογήσεις ἐν τῷ στόματι, &c. Koppe has here much subtle discussion on the parallelism which subsists in this passage. Taken out of the rhetorical form, the words would run thus: "If thou confess with thy mouth, and believe with thy heart, that Jesus is the Lord, and that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth, and with the mouth confesseth, unto justification and salvation."

Similar sentiments are found in Mark 16, 16. 1 Joh. 4, 15. compared with 5, 1.

Parsæus and Koppe think that confession with the mouth is mentioned first, since it so occurs in the passage of Moses. Other reasons, indeed, may easily be imagined. The confession with the mouth is of more consequence, as regards men, and the be-

* It is a strange notion of Grotius, that the mouth and breast are put, by synecdoche, for all the members of the body. It would be truer to say that belief in the resurrection is so put, as being that article of belief which is of the most importance, since it includes the rest. See Tolet., Menoch., and Parsæus ap. Pole.
lief with the heart as respects *God.* It is observed by Theophyl. ἡ μὲν κατὰ διανοιὰν πίστις δικαιοὶ ἡ δὲ παντελῆς σωτηρία ἐν τῇ ὁμολίθῃ κεῖται. And in the same Mr. Turner paraphrases: "Justifying faith must be sincere, and saving confession must be open." The same view is also taken by Mackn. But this seems a too refined distinction, and is, I think, unfounded in Scripture. For though the *eis δικαιοσύνην* and the *eis σωτηρίαν* are placed separately by the Apostle, yet it is for the sake of the parallelism, not that they are separated in *rerum naturā*; and yet neither are they properly *synonymous*, as Koppe calls them.

Here it is well remarked by Grotius: "Facta non aestimat Deus ut ea in æternum remuneretur, nisi quæ ex corde mundato profisciscuntur. Munda-tur autem cor per fidem, et eam maxime quœ creditur Jesus a Deo resuscitatus; in hoc scilicet ut et prœcepta ejus noscamus esse divina, et promissa certa, tum propter auctoritatem ei datam, tum propter vitæ reddite conspicuum exemplum." By this belief it is plain we are not to understand a mere historical and dead faith, but a living and active one, such as shall carry with it a practical obedience to the precepts of Christ.

Jaspis rightly remarks on the great weight there is in the word *Κύριος*; adding, "Ita enim, ut constat, Christus dicitur, quod divina est ejus natura et legis-latio, et quod imperium exercet, nominatim in eccle-siam Christianam."

11. λέγει γὰρ, &c. See the passage explained supra, 9, 17 & 33.
12. οὖ γὰρ ἐστι διαστολὴ. Compare 8, 22. Τε καὶ

* To which purpose the following passage of Origen, Exhort. ad Mart. sub init. (cited by Bulkle, ) is very apposite: "Εστὶ γε εἰπεῖν, διὰ μᾶλλον ἔστι τοῖς χείλεσι τιμῶν τὴν καρδίαν πόρρω ἔχοντα ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ἢ περὶ τῆς καρδίας χειλῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ στόματος μὴ ὁμολογοῦτος. "We may better talk of honouring God with our lips, while the heart is far from him, than of honouring him with the heart, while the mouth does not confess him to salvation."
is here employed in a manner different from the usage of the Classical writers, by which the τε has place only in conjunctive, not disjunctive sentences. Hence in the MSS. D. and E. we read Ἰουδαῖος καὶ Ἑλλην. But that is evidently ex emendatione.

12. ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς Κύριος πάντων. Carpzov contends that here ὁ αὐτὸς, like the Hebr. נְקֵן, denotes the great Ηζ, Jehovah, which was one among the other cognomina of God; as indeed he has proved in his Obss. Philon. on Hebr. 1, 12. But I cannot think it applicable here, nor perhaps in the passage of Hebr. Nay, the article seems adverse to this interpretation; while it exceedingly confirms the common one. Koppe takes ὁ αὐτὸς, &c. for εἰς ὁ Κύριος. But, without resorting to this principle, the sense will be: "the same person, one and the same person, is Lord of all (both Jews and Gentiles)." It is rightly remarked by Grot., that Κύριος must here mean Θεὸς, Jehovah.

12. πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλομένους αὐτῶν. The antient Commentators strangely understand this, as if God considered those that invoke his aid as his riches and treasures; which is very harsh and far-fetched. The sense plainly is, that He is rich, i. e. abundant, εἰς, in respect to some quality which those that invoke him need, i. e. (as Grotius rightly understands) χάρις, or χρηστότης: which is confirmed by Eph. 1, 7. πλοῦτος χάρις and Rom. 2, 4. πλοῦτος χρηστότης, benignity. The same expression, too, occurs in Philostr. V. Ap. 4, 8. s. f. εἰς τοὺς κοινῶν πλουτεῖν. Koppe urges the harshness of supplying χάρις, and would take πλουτῶν for δυνάτος ὁ, or ὅν δύναμις ἔχων. But this can only be done by supplying δυνάμει, which would be a harsher subaudition than χάρις; since it is evident, from the preceding words ω ἐστι διατολή, that not power, but benignity, is here considered. Ammon would take πλουτῶν in an active sense, to denote imparting his wealth. But however this signification may have place in πλουτίζω, yet in πλουτέω it is no where found; and as χάρις
must then be understood, a very harsh subaudition would be thus occasioned.

Ἐπικαλέσθαι may here be understood, not of invocation properly so called, but every kind of precatory address to God.*

13. τὰς γὰρ, ὅσ ἂν ἐπικαλέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, εἰσῄεσθαι. The words are taken from Joel 3, 5. By τὰς is meant every one, whether Jew, or Gentile. It has been doubted whether Κύριος here refers to Christ, or to Jehovah. Most recent Commentators suppose the latter; while the antient Commentators, more rightly, I think, understand the former. Even Koppe, however, admits that it is doubtful. The word is treated at large by Whitby in the following masterly annotation. "The original for this is Jehovah, whence it is certain that the prophet speaks these words of the true and only God, and yet it is as certain that the Apostle here ascribes them to our Lord Jesus Christ, both from the following words, How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? For the Apostle in this whole chapter discourseth of faith in Christ, and from the words foregoing, of which these are a proof, and to which they are connected with the particle γὰρ, for those words, whosoever believeth in him shall not be ashamed, are spoken by the Prophet Isaiah of Jesus Christ the Cornerstone, Isaiah, 28, 16. And so they are interpreted by St. Peter, 1 Peter, 2. 6, 7. And in the Prophet Joel these words follow, εἰςγενειστῇ τοι ὁ ὄνομα Κύριος προσκεκληται, and the evangelised, whom the Lord shall call shall be saved. Here then we have two arguments for the Divinity of Christ.—1. That what is spoken of Jehovah is ascribed to him.—

2. That he is made the object of our religious invocation."

This opinion, too, is also ably supported by Bishop Pearson on the Creed, p. 149, who there argues at large, that if Christ be not here called Jehovah, the Apostle's argument is quite inconclusive."

14. On the construction and scope of this and several following verses Commentators are at issue. Grotius and Hammond suppose ver. 14 and 15 to contain an objection on the part of the Jews, that they have not had sufficient opportunities of knowing the truth, and that to this the Apostle replies in ver. 16 and 17. But to this it has been justly objected by Koppe and Wells, that the answer would not be adapted to the doubt proposed; and moreover the same objection is proposed in ver. 18. by the Apostle himself, and then more suitably and fully refuted." Locke, however, and Taylor (after Crellius) suppose that ver. 16. contains the Jewish objection, namely, that a Divine mission would have been attended with success. Which interpretation has been adopted by Koppe and most Interpreters since his time, and is supported by the authority of the antient Commentators. The sense will be most clearly ascertained on examining the verses in detail. In the meantime the following general view of it by Mr. Slade may be acceptable: "The Apostle is shewing, that the rejection of the Jews, and admission of the Gentiles, are consonant to Scripture, and adduces this verse as a proof, "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved." How then, continues the Apostle, shall they call on him without having believed? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard, &c.? On this the Jew remarks, "But they have not all (see on ver. 16.) obeyed the Gospel, for Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" (From this very quotation then, says the Apostle, it appears that) faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. Yet why should the Jew conclude, that the Gentiles have
not the privilege of hearing, for I say, have they not already heard, are not the words of the Psalmist, concerning the heavenly bodies, applicable to them? Psalm 19. And have not the people of Israel been made acquainted with this admission of the Gentiles, and their own rejection, by the words both of Moses and Isaiah? ver. 19 to the end."

14, 15. "Since, therefore, the worship of God cannot be thought of apart from faith in God, but to the production and confirmation of this faith there is need of teaching and instruction; there is surely no reason why the Jews should pursue me with hatred, when I teach that even the Gentiles have this faith, especially since it was long ago predicted by Isaiah (52, 7.) that this would happen." A sentiment expressed by an elegant sortes, proceeding from effects to causes, by the aid of four questions, to be explained negatively. These are as follows: 1. No one will call upon Christ, nor acknowledge him to be his Saviour and Lord, if he does not believe in him. 2. No one will believe in Christ, if he has not heard of him. 3. No one will hear of Christ, unless there be some one to preach Christ. (Luke 24, 47.) 4. No one will preach Christ (cum ἱκανότητι et ἐνεργεία, (2 Cor. 3, 5,) except he be regularly called and sent. (Carpzov.) The Apostle, after saying whosoever shall call upon the Lord Jesus shall be saved, now reprehends the Jews because they have not called upon him; but wherefore have they not called upon him? because they believed not. Wherefore have they not believed? was it because they have heard not? but they have heard. Then comes the objection. How could they hear without a preacher? To this is subjoined the solution: and yet many preached and were sent to them. Now hence is it clear that they are the sent? Then the Apostle finally brings in the prophet's saying: "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" For the Apostles went about announcing good

The δὲ is here for ἀλλὰ. (See Schl. Lex.) Οὐ is for ἄν, by a common Greek idiom. Οὐκ ἢκουσαν is an idiomatic expression for αὐτὸν περὶ οὐ οὐδὲν ἢκουσαν, “how shall they believe in him of whom they have heard and known nothing.” For here, and just after, in ἀκούσω: knowing is supposed to accompany the hearing.

15. οἷς εἰραίοιν, &c. Taken from Is. 52, 7. The passage is by many recent Interpreters supposed to have no reference to the times of the Messiah, but (as Rosenm. thinks) treats of those Jews who, after the decree of Cyrus in favour of the restoration, returned first to Judea, and announced the liberation of their countrymen, to those who had continued in the land.” And Bp. Lowth thinks it a poetical description of the messengers who first brought the good news of Cyrus’s decree for the people’s return home. But from the Rabbinical citations in Wets.* there is no reason to doubt but that the Jews understood it as referring to the times of the Messiah; and therefore it may justly be supposed that the Prophet here, as in innumerable other passages, couches under the primary and exoteric a secondary and exoteric, or mystical, sense.

It is singular that the words of the Apostle here differ considerably from the Sept., but are agreeable to the Hebrew; except that the υἱὸς θεοῦ and μετὰ καταβολῆς are omitted. The other Greek versions, however, and the Vulg., render in nearly the same manner. Aquila, τι σειρηνήσων; Symmachus, τι εἰρετείς; Theodoret, ὡς εἰρετείς: and Vulg. quam pulchri super montes. Whence Koppe, with much ingenuity, con-

jectures that in the Sept. was formerly read, not ὡς σάρξ—ὡς, but ὡς ἐρυθής—ὁι.*

At the expression ὡς σάρξωι, &c. some tasteless Commentators have unnecessarily stumbled. There is surely nothing but what may very well be understood, and tolerated. By beautiful is, I think, here meant grateful, pleasant, acceptable; and by the feet is meant, not (as Doddr. supposes) the footsteps, but the approach; and this is especially mentioned, since at their approach such messengers of good news are especially acceptable. Crellius, with his accustomed good taste, was, I believe, the first who saw the true ratio metaphoræ, which has, after him, been treated on by Bos,† and is especially illustrated from Soph. Elect. 1358., cited by Wets. (which I had also myself noted down), ὁ διήλατα μὲν χείρες, ἡμιστοὺς δὲ ἔχουν ποδῶν ὑπηρέτημα: where the Schol. on the words ποδῶν ὑπηρέτημα well remarks: διὰ γὰρ τούτων τὰ πρὸς σαρκίαν ἡμῖν ὑπηρέτησας. Πόθεν, in the sense of approach is an Oriental metaphor. So Acts 5, 9. “Behold the feet of those who” &c., where see the note, in which is cited a similar passage of Eurip. Or. 1217. παρθένου δέχου τῶν, where the Schol. explains: τὴν ἔλεον καὶ παρωσίαν τῆς παρθένου. Finally, this passage of the Apostle is beautifully alluded to by Zonaras in his Hist. 8, 6, 23. τῶν τάγας ὡς οἱ αἵρεσιν πόθεν Χριστοῦ, ὡς εἰρήνην εὐαγγελισμένως, διαδεινασάτω.

The words εἰρήνης and τὰ ἀγαθὰ are, by the parallelism, synonymous.

* I cannot but suspect that the letters were eaten away by a worm, or had faded away, in some very ancient archetype. Indeed I remember to have met with many instances of these lacunæ in the Classical writers, and especially in those of which we have few MSS., as Hesych., Dio Cass. &c. Some of these have scarcely been perceived, others, filled up, more or less successfully, by the Critics.

† “The hands and feet (says he) of those who come upon a kind errand are represented as beautiful to those who received benefit by their arrival.” So Wetstein: “The feet of those who bring a joyful message, even though dirty, yet seem beautiful.” This, however, seems too fanciful.
16. ἀλλ' οὖ τάντας ὑπεξουσαν. This may be either an objection of a Jew, or the writer's acknowledgment. If the former, the answer is to be considered as implied in the words of Isaiah immediately following, which are applied to meet the objection, although relating principally to Jewish unbelief. See 53, 1. If the latter, the quotation illustrates its propriety. (Turner.) See the note supra ver. 14. The sense is thus laid down by Koppe. "But the reason why many are not saved is solely to be ascribed to the neglect of the doctrine declared to them; which very thing the prophets of old, especially Isaiah, had predicted.

The scope of the verse is thus illustrated by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) After having said that the preachers had testimony borne to them by the prophets as being from God, lest any one should say: "And yet, if they were from God, ἐδει πάντας αὐτῶν ὑπακούσαι (I emend partly from the margin ἐδει πάντας πάντας α. ὑ.), the Apostle replies that, in fact, all did not hearken to the Gospel; but the truth is not at all injured from that; for this very thing was also spoken of by Isaiah, many years before: "Who hath believed," &c. This confirms the mode of interpretation adopted by Locke and Taylor.

To me it seems that the words ἀλλ' οὖ—εὐαγγελίῳ are a supposed objection of a Jew; q. d. "But not all, nay, very few have hearkened to this good news from God; which is strange." Thus the following words will be the Apostle's answer, in which something from the preceding clause must be repeated; q. d. True, very few have hearkened to the Gospel; insomuch that we may say, in the words of Isaiah, "who hath believed," &c.

Ἀκοή, report, or any thing heard, προφορία, preaching, doctrine. Koppe compares a passage of Philo 131 c. ὡδὲ γαρ ἀλήγος ἐστὶν ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐξ ἄκοης καὶ υφηγήσεως μαθημάτων.

17. ἄρα η ἀντὶς ἐξ ἄκοης, &c. Most ancient and modern Interpreters regard the ἄρα as conclusive.
Koppe renders it *atqui igitur*. It is seldom by the Classical writers placed, as here, at the beginning of a sentence.

This passage is regarded by Koppe and Rosenm. as similar to that of ver. 14 & 15., and meant to inculcate the necessity of the Apostolical or Evangelical office, and to vindicate the divine authority of the Christian doctrine against the Jews. It is very well paraphrased by Mr. Locke as follows: "That which we may learn from thence is, that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing from the word of God." I assent to Mr. Turner, that this observation is made to intimate the necessity that the Gentiles should hear the Gospel in order to believe it; and that there is a reference to ἀκοῇ in the former verse.

The above seems to be the most probable interpretation of the whole passage, in ascertaining the true sense of which Dr. Macknight perplexes himself and his readers to no purpose. It is plain that some verb is left to be understood. Many supply ἐστι: others γίνεται, which seems preferable. The authors of our Common Version supply ἔχεται; which is supported by a similar passage of Max. Tyr. Diss. 31, 4. δε ἄγγελον ἠ ἱστορία ἔχεται. On the Theological doctrine contained in these words see Carpzov.

Here it is remarked by Wetstein: "Ut sol omnibus lucet, et coelum omnes tegit: ita Evangelium omnibus debet annunciari."

18. ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μὴ οὐκ ἔκοψαν; On the scope of these words Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Hammond, Koppe, and Rosenm., refer them to the Jews exclusively. Others, as Vatapl., Grot., and Whitby, to the Gentiles. And Locke to both Jews and Gentiles. Chrysostom and the Greek Commentators support the first of these opinions. It is thought by Chrysost. that the Apostle is supposing an objection; q. d. "But what say you, if preachers were sent to them, and yet they heard not at all." The reply to which is: "What say you: have they not heard? Why the very farthest parts
of the earth have been evangelized; and have not you, among whom the preachers so long remained, heard of the Gospel."*

18. ἀλλὰ λέγω is a formula dubitantis novaque objicientis. *Mevouye* repels the doubt, and may be rendered *nay but*. The passage which follows is from Ps. 19, 5.:† and most Commentators are agreed that the primary intent of that sublime composition is the illustration of God's glory from the works of the creation; but that it is here accommodated by the Apostle to the illustration of God's glory by the dissemination of the Gospel. And this is also the opinion of the learned and orthodox Schoettg., whose words are these: "Negari non potest, verba hæc Psalmi XIX. propriè agere de sermone creatorarum naturali, ex quo omnes homines, quacunque lingua utantur, majestatem Numinis supremi agnoscent. Apostulus autem ea sic adducit, ut a pari argumentetur: Si sermo Dei naturalis tam latè se extendit, ut omnes homines illum intelligere, Deumque ex operibus sui glorificare queant, quanto magis Deo, ejusque in genus humanum propensione dignum est, ut verbum Evangelii per omnem terram audiatur." He adds that almost the very same sense is ascribed to the words in Sohar Genes. fol. 9. Et in omnem terram exivit linea eorum: מִלְיָרְעָכָר

* The Apostle had shown in a general way, that because faith cometh of hearing and obeying (ἄκοι) the divine word, it was necessary for the Gospel to be preached to all. (ver. 14—17.) Now he shows specially, that the heavenly truths had been preached both to all the Gentiles (ver. 18.), and also the Jews (ver. 19.): but with unequal success. For many Gentiles believed in the Gospel. (ver, 20.) But the Jews, for the most part, remained obdurate. (ver. 21.)

† The words of this quotation (Koppe observes) agree with the Sept., and are not at variance with the Hebrew; since ἤρ (which it has been conjectured that Paul read) is never by the Sept. rendered φθογγὸς, but φωνή: whereas שׁענ (the present reading) may very well signify φθογγὸς φωνή, since הֶר comes from הָר, to stretch, and signifies, 1st, a chord in full tension; 2d, the sound emitted from it when thinned. Nay, in Arabic (as Schoettgen says) הָר signifies to sound, call, &c.
It is probable that the Psalm was meant by its author to carry a primary or popular, and a secondary or mystical, sense. The phrase πᾶσα γῆ and πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης are not to be too much pressed; merely denoting the habitable world.* But I cannot agree with Koppe, that no more can be elicited from the words than this sense; "that the Jews and Gentiles who then rejected the Gospel, might have known it if they would." Carpzov here compares a passage from Philo 654., where the Mosaic law is thus eulogized: Τοὺν νόμον ὑπὸ κλέος οὗς ἀπολέσσεν διὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης περιπτηκόν, ἄχρι καὶ τῶν γῆς τερμάτων ἔφθασαν.

It is evident that the sense of αὐτῶν will vary, according as the natural or mystical acceptance be adopted. In the former case it will refer to the hearers: in the latter to the preachers, or the things preached.

19. μη ὁμ. ἔγνω Ἰσραήλ; Here again we have a sentence which, from its extreme brevity, is susceptible of more than one meaning. Certain it is that it cannot be taken declaratively; as some have supposed;† but must be taken interrogatively. The question, however, is, what is meant by ἔγνω? Chrysost., and the Greek Commentators, as also Beza, interpret it understand, comprehend; q. d. "But suppose these did preach, and these did not comprehend, are they not excusable for their ignorance." This, however, requires too much to be supplied, and is not agreeable to what follows. Grot. understands by ἔγνω "hear of it;" q. d. "It was impossible but they must have heard of it; and therefore with them rested the blame." But this sense cannot

* In Aristid. 1, 415 c, we have the very rare form ἀπάσα ἡ πλούτος, i.e. the suitable world, and in 1, 433 D. ἐν μέσῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης τέκαλ θαλάσσης.
† So Dr. Macknight, who treats μη ὁμ. as a double negation. A strange ignorance this of the Greek idiom.
be elicited from the words; for (as Koppe remarks) ὁκ ἔγνω is not synonymous with ὁκ ἥκωσαν; nor could the passages of Moses and the Prophets above cited, be of any avail to the removal of that doubt. The truth is (I conceive) that after ἔγνω must be understood τοῦτο, which is to be referred to what went before; namely (as is suggested by Locke, Doddr., Koppe, Rosenm., Piscat., Paræus, Solet, Menochius, and Hardy), the promulgation of the Gospel not only to the Jews, but to all nations. Thus the words following will be very apt. For the Apostle meets this objection by showing that something similar had been declared by the Prophets.

19. πρῶτος Μασωὴς λέγει. It is not very clear what is the exact sense of πρῶτος. Grot. takes it to mean first in time; q. d. “who preceded the other Prophets in time:” and he thinks it has reference especially to Daniel and Isaiah, from whom quotations are brought forward supra and infra. Semler, however, thinks it has reference to the Apostles; q. d. “prior nobis Apostolis.” But this seems harsh; though the Apostles may be included. Wetstein and Storr join the πρῶτος with Ἰσραήλ; q. d. “before the nations were called, nay, before they knew they were to be called, this was predicted to the Jews.” But (as Koppe observes) though the sense is apposite, yet the construction is too harsh to be admitted. It is plain that πρῶτος is for πρῶτερος. The interpretation, then, of Grot., &c. seems to deserve the preference.

The words here quoted are from Deut. 32, 21., and agree with both the Hebrew and Sept., except that ύμᾶς is put for αὐτῶς; which, in the accommodation of the passage to the present purpose, was convenient. Grot. and Koppe remark on the Oxymoron in ἐν τούτῳ ἔδει: and the latter compares Eurip. Orest. 902. Ἀργείων οὐκ Ἀργείων. Plut. 2, 1811. Χρυσός ἐκ μὴ χρυσοῦ, λίθος ἐκ μὴ λίθου. Drusius, too, compares other Classical Oxymorons; as ἀδώρα δώρα, ἀγάμος γάμος. Cic. inspulta sepultura. Ovid. injusta justa. Catull. funera non funera. But these
are not quite all of the same kind. By *not a people* is meant not peculiarly so by any covenant or revelation.

19. ἕνει ἀσωτερ. Grotius observes that ἀσωτερ. does not simply mean *foolish*, but infected with the folly of idolatry, and therefore *impious*; since the knowledge of God is alone true wisdom. The *nation* meant by Moses is that of the *Philistines*; but in the application must be understood the Greeks, or Gentiles in general. So Theophyl. 105. Τί γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ἀσωτετάτερον, ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις προσκεκλητάς; It is observed, too, by Wetstein, that the Jews themselves (as Salomo, Bechai, and Abarbanel) understand by *foolish nation*, the Christians, whom they call *Idumæans* or Romans, as we learn from Altingius in Schilo p. 344."

The words παραβιλασω and παρορματω, which occur in the two members of the parallelism, are synonymous; and the sense is, "excite your envy by conferring on them benefits which you thought belonged exclusively to you." The ἐνι signifies *respecting*. The sense of the passage, both in its natural and accommodated sense, is sufficiently clear.

Rosenm. observes, that St. Paul does not cite the above passage as a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, but merely to show, that it had been long ago predicted that the Israelites were not the chosen people of God, in such a sense as to exclude other nations also from receiving his benefits. Mr. Turner, however, thinks it probable, from the severity of the punishment immediately afterwards denounced, that the prophecy has in view the rejection of the Israelites, and the admission of the Gentiles to be God's covenant people.

20. Ἡσαῖας δὲ ἀποτολμᾶτε. Koppe would render the *de similiter seriore tempore*. But this is too arbitrary an interpretation. It merely signifies *immo vero*. Ἀποτολμᾶ, "is very bold;" for the ἀτρεβις has an intensive force. The word is also used by the Classical writers, as Lysias, Æschines, Plut., and Philo, from whom examples are adduced by Wets. and others. Ἀποτολμᾶ καὶ λέγει is put, by hendia-
dis, for ἀποτολμῶς λέγει. The ἀνά refers to the anger of the Jews, which such a speech would be sure to excite.

The words are from Is. 65, 1 & 2. (with this alteration, that the two members of the sentence are taken in inverse order), and treat of the rejection of the Jews, into whose place the other nations should pass.

The aorists εἰσῆλθεν and ἐγενόμην Koppe takes for presents used by the Prophet in a future sense. But this is an exceedingly harsh mode of interpretation. It is sufficient to suppose that the Prophet, *more prophetico*, pronounces what was in futurity as if it were already done.

The sense of the two parts of the parallelism will become plainer by mutual comparison. For, as Koppe and Rosenm. observe, (from the antient Commentators,) God is said εἰσίνεσθαι and ἐμφανί γένεσθαι, when he by his benefits excites men to worship and obey him: and the terms ἐπηράω and ἐπερατῶ, like the Hebrew ἔραω and ἔραω, are synonyms used to denote devout worship of God. In illustration of the force of ἐπερατῶ, Crellius observes, that they who seek anything are accustomed to make inquiries after it.

21. πρὸς δὲ τῶν Ἰσραήλ, &c. The connection is thus pointed out by Theophylact: "That the Jews might not have to say, Thou wert found by the Heathen, but with us thou didst not choose to have intercourse, there follows, All day long I have stretched forth," &c.

The Commentators are not agreed whether πρὸς should be taken in the sense of de, or adversus. The former interpretation seems to have been adopted by the Greek Commentators, and is preferred by many modern ones, as Grotius, Estius, Doddridge, &c.: but the latter is supported by Beza, Erasmus, Piscator, Koppe, and others. Either, indeed, may have place; but the former seems to deserve the preference. Certainly that of the Vulg. and our Common Version (ad, to) cannot be admitted.
The words (except with a slight transposition) agree with those of the Sept.: but the words ἀνείθοντα and ἀντιλέγοντα have only one term corresponding to them in the Hebrew, namely ἥραν. Hence some critics suspect that they represent a double interpretation. But it is more probable that the Translators used two words, to more accurately represent the force of the Hebrew term; though ἀντιλέγειν does, in the Scriptures, often denote rebellion as well as contradiction. It is observed by Grotius, that the words refer, in their primary sense, to those Jews who followed the party of Antiochus; adding: “Si nunc tales esse potuere in Judæis, quid mirum sit et nunc inveniantur.”

"Ολην τὴν ἡμέραν Theophyl. rightly explains by πάντα τὸν χρόνον, perpetually. On the ἐξεκέτασα τὰς χεῖρας, Paræus well remarks: “Metaphora a ma-tribus, quæ petulantes pueros passis ulnis ad se revocant, venientes complecti parata.”* There is another example of the metaphor in Prov. 1, 24. to which I add Plut. Dionys. 29. ὄργαν τὰς χεῖρας τοῖς Συρακοσίοις. Theophyl. and Vatabl. supply, “and yet it refuses to come to me.” But such a subaudition is not necessary; since that sense is included in the words ἀπειθοῦντα and ἀντιλέγοντα. Theophyl., however, seems justified in supplying the following: "Ωστε ἔγνωσαν οἱ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἐθέλησαν δὲ ὑπάκουσαί.

Koppe concludes his commentary on this Chapter with the following judicious observations, which are highly deserving of attention.

Et hic quidem locus, imprimis inde a versu 18., si diligenter attenditur, non appareat profecto, quid

amplius postulari aut expectari possit, ut ab omni cupiditatis culpâ Deus vindicetur, causâ vero incredulitatis humanæ, cum eaque conjunctæ miseriae in solâ hominum ipsorum pravâ voluntate quæretur. Unde ad Capitis 9. ni loca aliquanto obscuriora rite interpretanda, et ab omni absoluti cujusdam decreti divini, quod firmari iisdem dicunt, criminé vindicanda, hunc imprimis locum diligenter conferendum esse censeo.

CHAP. XI.

Having shewn why the Jews in general were excluded from the kingdom of the Messiah, St. Paul now proceeds to console those of his nation who had embraced the faith of Christ, under the affliction which a consideration of the lamentable state of their countrymen must have produced, and to discourage, in the Gentile converts, any disposition to inordinate self-complacency, and any tendency to treat the Jews with contempt. He states that, in fact, many Jews had become converts to Christianity, that the unbelief of those who remained obstinately prejudiced against the truth, was only made illustrative of God's wisdom and kindness to the Gentiles; and lastly, that the time should come, when the Jewish nation would acknowledge Jesus as the true Messiah, and receive his Gospel. (Turner, from Koppe.)

In this Chapter the Apostle studiously inculcates that the Jews are not all, wholly, or perpetually to be excluded from the favour and mercy of God, if, excited by the example of the Gentiles, they took unto themselves the same confidence, as consisting in faith in Christ. It is, moreover, carefully to be borne in mind, that in the whole of this Chapter the Apostle does not simply say that the Jews shall, at some future time, have faith in Christ, but with the adjunct, if they shall repose faith in Christ; as is plain from ver. 11, 28, 26, 31. (Carpzov.)

1. μὲ ἀπώσατο δ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; Locke takes
this to be a question on the part of the Jew who made the objections to the former Chapter. It may, however, be regarded as an anticipation of an objection founded on a misunderstanding of the Apostle's words; q. d. "understand me not as intending to assert that God has rejected his people."

The term ἀπώσατο is a very strong one; and, literally, means to reject with abhorrence as a nauseous potion, and, from the adjunct, to push away, cast off. But it is often metaphorically employed by the Classical writers with more or less of emphasis, according to the subject and purpose of application. Several examples are adduced by Wetstein. Here it must have great force, and imply absolute and perpetual rejection and abandonment. Koppe aptly compares ἀποδοκυμάζειν in Ps. 94, 14., and Hesych. ἀπώσατο, μακράν ἐφρίψεν. The lexicographer, doubtless, has reference to the present passage. The sense, then, is: "Hath God cast off Israel from being his people: μὴ γένοιτο, by no means."

1. καὶ γὰρ Ἰσραήλ ἦν. "The Apostle (observes Koppe) refutes the objection, 1st, by experience; since many of the Jews, and, among the rest, Paul himself, were followers of Christ (ver. 1.): 2dly, by a familiar example taken from the Old Testament, and accommodated to the present purpose (ver. 2—4.)."

Grotius and others have seen that between the μὴ γένοιτο and εγὼ γὰρ, &c. there is a sentence left to be supplied; viz. "For how, then, would it fare with myself? For otherwise I should pronounce reprobation on myself, since I am an Israelite." Now this ellipsis is indicated by the γὰρ, which carries with it an άλλας.

The words εκ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ are equivalent to "with all the privileges of a descendant of Abraham." I assent to Grotius that in φυλῆς Βενζαμιν there is no particular emphasis to be sought, but that the words are solely to be referred to a certain custom among the Jews, which is, when speaking of their origin, to
derive it not only from the nation generally, but the tribe in particular; as in Phil. 3, 5. Σπέρματος is for γένους.

2. οίκ ἀπεώσατο δ' Ἐθές τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ δ. π. The Apostle solemnly repeats his affirmation. Here Jaspis explains: "omni occasione et spe veræ felicitatis adipiscendae Deum Jüdaeos privasse non dici potest." Koppe takes the aorist for the present. But the common interpretation "hath not rejected," comes to the same thing. The sentiment (he observes) is frequent in the Old Testament; as 1 Sam. 12, 22. Judg. 6, 13.

2. ὑν πρεσβευ, Rosenm. renders: "quem ab æterno cognitum habuit:" Locke and Jaspis: "amavit, favit. Wetstein thus: "Quem ad Christum convetendum esse per Prophetas praedixit." This cannot (as Dr. Mackn. observes) relate to God's fore-knowing his people to be heirs of eternal life; for, in that case, the supposition of his casting them off could not possibly be made: but it is God's fore-knowledge of the Jews to be his visible church and people on earth." Thus Koppe very well renders: "Quem quidem semel æterno sapientique consilio populum suum constituerat." The sense must necessarily follow out of the parallel passage supra 8, 29., where see the note.

2. ἐν ὁδατε ἐν Ἡλία τι λέγει ἡ γραφή; The Critics and Commentators are divided in opinion, whether ἐν signifies of Elijah, or in Elijah, or in the book of Elijah, that part of the book of Kings which treats of the actions of Elijah. The earlier Commentators adopt the former mode of interpretation; the more modern ones the latter, which is supported by the examples of the idiom occurring in the Classical writers. Thus Koppe instances Sueton. in Nerone. And (I must add) the ancient Critics refer to various parts of Homer in a similar manner; as the κατάλογος, the Ταφὸς Πατρόκλου, the Νεκρομαντεία. Nay, even Thucydides himself, L. 1, 8., refers to Homer ἐν τοῦ σκηντρο τῇ παραδόσει. And
of this we have an example in Mark 12, 26. ἐν ἐν διὸς 
βασιλείᾳ, where see the note. This, then, is proof suf-
ficient to establish the interpretation: nor can we 
reasonably require (as is done by Ammon) a positive 
example of the idiom as applied to some portion of 
the book of Kings. Besides, the jest of the argu-
ment does not turn upon any thing that happened to 
Elijah, but upon what was spoken by the Almighty; 
whether to Elijah or not, were of little moment.

2. ὁς ἐνυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ 'I. The verb 
ἐνυγχάνει is here used in an uncommon manner. 
It properly signifies, with the dative of the person, 
to meet any one, have an interview with, hold con-
ference, and converse with any one; as in Acts 25, 
24. Now as this is a sort of action usually done on 
the part of, or in behalf of another, so the verb often 
takes an ὑπὲρ with a genitive; as in Rom. 8, 27 &
34. Heb. 7, 25. 5, 4., &c. But it is also applied to 
a representation made against any one; as here and 
in 1 Macc. 8, 32. ἐντ. κατὰ σοῦ. 1 Macc. 10, 61 & 63.
11, 25., and without the κατὰ in 1 Macc. 10, 64. In 
all such cases it denotes to complain against, crimi-
nate, accuse.

2, 3. λέγων, i.e. in 1 Kings 19, 10. The words of 
the Apostle differ from those of the Sept. only in 
construction. (See Surenhus, or Mr. Horne's Introd.
vol. 2.) Kopppe remarks that κατασκάπτειν is here 
used for καταβάλλειν. It is certainly a more exact 
as well as elegant term than καθάλειν of the Sept.; 
though I cannot assent to Mr. Slade's assertion that 
it is a more apposite one, "the altars being built of 
earth:" for the word is applied, both in the Scrip-
tures and the Classical writers, to the destruction of 
edifices built of the most solid materials, nay whole 
cities. So Eurip. Phæn. 1170. βαζὶν Πήρ καὶ δικέλλας, 
ὡς κατασκάπτων πόλιν. Agam. 527. Τροίαν κατασκά-
ψαυτα τοῦ δικέλλου Δίος μακέλλη, τῇ κατείργασται 
τέθην. Choeph. 46. οἰκονομεῖν κατασκαψαλ ὅλων.

3. καθωκοτιμετέθην μόνος, "I alone of the Prophets
am left." Theodoret paraphrases: "ό προφήτης ἐν αὐτῷ μόνῳ τὰ λείψανα σεσώθαι τῆς εὐσεβείας τοῦ θεοῦ. νόμιζεν. I would compare a similar sentiment found in Arist. Plut. 1060. οὗ γὰρ εὐφήσεις ἐμοῦ ἐκτὸς ἄνδρα τοῦ τρόπου βελτίων. Μα τὸν Διὸ; οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλος, πλὴν ἑαυτῷ.

3. ἐξοδεῖ τὴν ψυχήν μου, i. e. "seek to take away my life." An Hebrew and identical phrase.

4. ἀλλά τι λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματίσμος; The word χρηματίσμος, like χρηματίζειν, is used (as Grot. observes) of every extraordinary method by which God makes his will known to men. But here it has especial reference to that still small oracular voice, called by the Hebrews the בֵּית הָעִם, as in 1 Kings 19, 12. (See Theophyl. and the Greek Lexicographers.) It is sometimes used in the Classical writers, and the Sept. of the authoritative decrees and edicts of kings and princes.

The passage is taken from 1 Kings 19, 18. Koppe observes that the words agree rather with the Hebrew than the Septuagint.

4. κατέλιστον ἐμαυτῷ ἐ. ἃ. Augustin and his disciples, our modern Calvinists, eagerly catch at this word, in order to borrow some support to their peculiar dogmas of election, and the perseverance of the saints; yet with little reason. It is very properly observed by Grot. and Koppe, that the verb is to have a future sense: which is confirmed by the Sept. But for what reason the Critics do not say. It is, I suppose, by the force of the vau conversive, on which see the writings of the late venerable Mr. Granville Sharpe. Grotius thinks that the Apostle writes κατέλιστον, either by a too literal version of the Hebrew, or on the authority of some Greek translator of his time. Be that, however, as it may, κατέλιστον may signify, "I have left to me," which is equivalent to "there are left to me seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal, and who shall be preserved." The historical circumstances which are
alluded to in these words may be best known by turning to the writings of the Old Testament, and consulting the best Commentators thereon.

Many Commentators, both ancient and modern, take this *seven thousand* as a certain for an uncertain number, though a considerable one. But it should rather, I think, be regarded as a *round number*.

4. οὐκ ἐκαμψαν γόνον τῇ Βααλ. The masculine form is generally found in the Old Testament; the *feminine* form rarely: yet it does occur in Hos. 2, 8. Jer. 2, 8. Soph. 1, 4., and Job. 1, 5. τῇ βααλ τῇ δινάμει, *the power of the goddess Baal*; or, according to the Vulg., τῇ Βααλ τῇ δαμάλει. Whence it appears that the idol was of *both sexes*. *What it represented is uncertain: but it is commonly supposed to designate the sun and moon. (Koppe.)* And this has been, I think, satisfactorily proved by our learned Selden de Diis Syris, who shows that לְעֵב, Baal, designates the Phœnician Apollo; and לִירָשׁ, Ashtoreth, the moon (Judg. 2, 13.), לְבֵב (he adds) was the contract form for לְעֵב; and therefore signified the same idol." Rosenm., too, remarks that the image was worshipped either under the form of a bull, or of a female calf, or cow; the former designating the sun, the latter the moon. According to the opinion of Abarbanel, the former was worshipped by the men, the latter by the women.*

Some Interpreters, the better to account for the feminine form, suppose an ellipsis of εἰκόν. But this is too arbitrary a subaudition to be admitted.

5. συνετε αὖν καλ—γέγονεν. The example of Elijah is now accommodated to the present case. (Koppe.) The *συνετε* may be rendered "thus, for example." Λείμμα is well explained by Theophylact *καταλείμμα* : as at 9, 27., where see the note. The reason why the Apostle used the word is (Koppe thinks) to be ascribed to the *ὑπελείπθην* which just preceded.

He, therefore, would not introduce any notion of paucity into this passage; though that it elsewhere has place is evident from Wetstein's citations: and the λείπων γέγονεν he considers as put for υπελειφθησαν τινες; and he renders the whole clause thus: "Sunt etiam nunc, quos pro sua benignitate Deus elegerit."

5. κατ’ ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, "by the gratuitous benignity of God."

The sense of the next clause εἰ δὲ χάριτι—ἐγένεται is too obvious to need explanation. There has, however, been much doubt raised as to its genuineness. It is omitted in four uncial MSS. and a few others, the Vulg., and some recent versions which follow it, as also in Chrysost., Theodoret, and some other Latin Commentators; and is rejected by Erasmus, Grot., Mill, Wets., Semler, and others. I cannot, however, assent to their opinion, and I would remark, that the number of MSS. is far too small to have any sufficient weight. As to the Versions, they are of little antiquity and authority: and as to Chrysost. and Theodoret, there is no proof that they did not read the clause. It is found in the text of both of them; and although they do not treat on that clause, that is no proof that they did not read it; since they, not unfrequently, pass by clauses, and especially Theodoret, on account of his brevity.* As to Chrysost., he often considers what is suitable to a Homily rather than to a Commentary. And certainly this clause does appear to be an excrescence arising out of and suggested by the word χάριτος. But of such there are frequent examples in the Epistles of St. Paul. The clause, however, ought to be included in a parenthesis. It is truly observed by Carpzov (see Doddr., who, with his usual good taste, sees the matter in this same light) that the Apostle seizes the occasion offered by the mention of this word, to repeat and press the doctrine of

* Thus in the fuller commentaries of Theophyl. and Cæcumen. it is found; as also in Photius.
grace, which he had especially and professedly treated on in the 9th Chapter; namely, that the election of God did not respect the merits and good works of men, but was purely the work of Divine grace. "And hence (continues he) it is apparent that the χάρις καὶ ἐκκλησία is not opposed, in this Epistle, to reprobation unto eternal perdition, but rather to the works of men, the merits of good works."

"The election here spoken of (says Dr. Macknight) is only to outward privileges, particularly the great privilege of being the visible church, and people of God.* The remnant according to an election by grace, are the Jews who believed the Gospel, and who, in the first age, were many thousands. This remnant is said to have been elected according to grace, because they were made the church and people of God along with the believing Gentiles, through mere grace or favour. Of this kind of election Peter speaks, 2 Ep. 1, 10. Brethren, endeavour to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things ye shall never fail. For how can the election of individuals to eternal life be made more sure than it is by the divine decree? But election to the privileges of God's visible church may be made sure by a right improvement of those privileges. For if God spared not the natural branches, neither, perhaps, will he spare thee, Rom. 11, 21."

Acknowledgments like the above (and many such have already appeared in this system of annotation) from the most learned and judicious Calvinists, are surely not a little important; and should make the great body of well-meaning, and truly pious, but

* So Jaspis: "Fundamentum totius loci de electione est Deut. 14, 1, 2. coll. 4, 20. 'Εκκλησία metem dicitur de libero Dei consilio benignissimo, quo ille sibi quaedam in peculium quasi asciact, vel populo suo adscribendum curat. Jan a sicuti eligere, electio, electi, sub vetere disciplinâ hoc sensu propria vocabula, ita sub initium nova transferuntur ad eas, qui ut beneficiis cultorum Christi perfrauntur, in societatem Christianorum recipiuntur. 1 Cor. 1, 27. Ephes. 1, 4. 1 Thess. 1, 4. 2 Pet. 1, 10. Cfr. Rom. 8, 30. in notâ subjectâ et Jacob 9, 5. in notâ huic loco additâ."
misjudging religionists, who espouse those opinions; consider on what slight foundations, and those in every age fast decaying away, their doctrines are founded.

On this occasion I will not advert to the opinion of Dr. Taylor; since the soundness of his theological principles on the most important articles of our holy faith diminishes his authority on the rest. But I may be permitted to adduce the judgment of a Prelate, on whose profound learning, great intellectual powers, and sound, yet enlightened orthodoxy, there is but one opinion. "If it be an act of justice, in consequence of man's works or uniform obedience, it is not an act of grace; and if it be an act of grace, it is not in consequence of his works. A claim from works, and grace through faith, are incompatible. A man cannot obtain justification upon both grounds, works and grace; in the one case he would have fulfilled the law, in the other case he would not have fulfilled it." (Bp. Tomline's Ref. Calv. p. 113. ed. 1812.) This view of the subject is perfectly accordant with that taken by Theohylact, who (following the most eminent Fathers) observes: "If we be acceptable to God from works, grace has no longer any place; since if grace have place, works are gone, and exist no longer. For where there is grace, work is not grace; and where there is work grace is not." *

* In the course of his exposition (formed, as usual, on the most judicious Greek Fathers) he compares the λείμμα to the wheat left, after the chaff has been separated from it. "Thus (says he) God takes to himself the good, rejecting the bad." "The καὶ εκλογὴν (continues he) has reference to the exertions and endeavours of men, from which they are διέκοιται επελεγμέναι. The term χάριος designates the gift of God. Hence those that were desirous of, and embraced the offers of salvation, were saved, who are also the people of God. God has therefore not rejected his people that is worthy of salvation."

7. τι αὐτῷ; This is not to be considered, with Koppe, as a mere formula transitionis. There is a subaudition of ἑρωμένων, or λεκτέων. Here, too, we must supply some sentence preceding. Grotius offers the following: "an eos qui olim amati fuerant a Deo, jam despectos? non sane;" Carpzov. "doces tu quidem, Paulle, Judæos non simpliciter, nec omni tempore segretagos esse a Dei justitiâ (ab ecclesiâ sanctâ); et manifestum est autem, ingentem eorum numerum excludi." Then comes the answer, in the interpretation of which Commentators vary. Most of them assign the following as the sense: "What the greater part of the Israelites seek, that it obtains not." By Ἰσραήλ is meant that far greater part of, and, in a manner, all Israel, which did not believe in Jesus Christ. Many Commentators make the sentence interrogative, and render thus: "Quid igitur! Israelitis non contigit id quod, tanto studio optabant atque affectabant? Imo vero, nonnullis eorum utique contigit." But there seems no reason to deviate from the common interpretation. By the τῶτος is meant justification, and acceptance with God. (See 9, 31.) Grot. observes that the cause why they did not obtain it is to be sought for from 9, 32. 10, 8. Theophyl. lays down the connexion and sense thus: "Having shown what is grace, namely, that it is the gift of God, and is separate from works, the Apostle proceeds to say that the Israelites, though they sought to be justified, have not obtained it, because they sought it in the wrong way, and from works, in which it is impossible to find it."

For τῶτος, many MSS. and Editions read τῶτο, which is preferred by most Critics. The sense, indeed, will remain the same; but the construction is not established on any good authority. For the poetic syntax in Hom. II. τη. 450. and ψ. 821. is not to be

Ibi de justitiae effectibus, hic de causis tractatur: ibi λογίζεται κατά χάριν. Ηικ λειμμα χάριτι γέγονε. Ίμο ετη σετενα ibi χάρισμα 6, 23. Ita accipimus χάριν αντι χάρισμα, Joh. 1, 16."
attended to. And as to the passage cited by Wets. from Eurip. Hec. 51. τούμπον μὲν οὖν, ἀνωτέρω ἄδελξιν τυχεῖν, ἔστι, there the construction is different. The other passages cited by Wets. are little to the purpose. On the other hand, the syntax of the genitive is supported by the authority of the best Greek writers, and occurs in Heb. 11, 38., and Prov. 9, 27. It is not improbable that the ὃ preceding occasioned the accusative to be adopted.

Carpozov has here cited the following passage of Philo 468. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ εἰσάγει μηδὲν μὴτε Ζητοῦντας, μῆτε εὑρίσκοντας, τοὺς δὲ ἐν ἐκατέρω καταρθοῦντας, ἐνίοις δὲ θάτερον περιστοιμένους ἔν τι οἱ μὲν Ζητοῦντες οὐχ εὑρίσκοντο, οἱ δὲ εὑρίσκοντο τοὺς Ζητῆσαντες. Οἱ μὲν οὖν μὴτε εὑρίσκειν μῆτε Ζητῆσας ἐφιέμενοι, τὸν λογισμὸν ἀπαιδευθαί και ἀμέλεσθαι χαλέσας ἤκοινεν, καὶ δυνάμενοι δὲ ἑαυτῷ ἐπερώθησαν.—Ὅς γὰρ ἄν ὁ λογισμὸς τοῦ διδάσκοντος ὑπὸ βαθύματα ἐμφάνισε τὸ ὅμοι τοῖς καὶ συνῆκοι, τὰ μὲν πρὸς καταλήπτης, δὲ ἀν φράσεν καὶ ἄκοινε, καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις δυνάμεσις ὑπὸ χρήσθαν—ἄψυχον και κωφὸν λίθον τρόπον σηληκεῖται. Οὐ γὰρ ἔσχον οἱ τοιοῦτοι τρόποι καρδίας συνιέναι, καὶ ἀφθαρσίων βλέπειν, καὶ δὲ ἄκοινε, ἄλλα τυφλὰν και κωφὸν και ἄνοικτον και πάντα πρὸς βλέπαν ἀβίωτον ἀναπόστημες ἐξερήσασαν, οὐδενὶ τῶν δεινῶν ἐφιέμενας.

7. ἡ ἐκλογὴ. Abstract for the concrete οἱ ἀκλεκτοὶ; as in 2, 25. 3, 30. 15, 8. ἡ περιτομὴ and ἡ ἀκροβυσσία. This has the same sense as the τὸ λέγειν κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος at ver. 5., namely, that very small, but select and choice portion of the Jews who had faith in Christ, and thus obtained justification and acceptance. For which purpose Grotius compares Dan. 11, 15. ἐκλογὰς αὐτῶν, their choice men. And he adds, that we are here to understand the ἐκλεκτοὶ, cum effectu, as καθόλου supra; namely, those who have received great benefits from God, and have not neglected to use them. Theophyl. remarks that the term ἐκλογὴ displays the greatness of the benefits, and shows that the whole results from the grace of God. “Thus we (adds he) familiarly say ὃ δεῖνα ἐπέτυχεν, “such an one has hit the mark, and has been lucky;” by which we mean ἀπόνως εὗρημα εὗρεν.

8. οἱ δὲ λαοῦτος ἐπωραίθησαν. The best Commentators, both of ancient and modern times, are agreed that this, like many other passive verbs, must have
a reciprocal sense; as in Joh. 12, 40. ἐτὶ πεπαραμένεις ἔχετε τὴν καρδιάν ύμῶν. So Grot. indurnerunt; "nempe prejudiciis suis," adds Rosenm. The verb παράσι, from πάρος, properly signifies callo obducere; and παρεπόσθαι is therefore applied to denote being fat, stupid, and also blind;* and since, in these cases, the natural sense is either lost or weakened, the word comes to denote being (as we say) callous to any sense of virtue, hardened in conscience, and consequently vicious in conduct.

8. ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως. The above sentiment is now confirmed from passages of the Old Testament, where the Prophets complain of similar hardness and impenitence. See 2 Cor. 3, 14 & 15.

The quotation is made up from Is. 29, 10. 6, 10, and Deut. 29, 3. From the former is taken the πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, and from the two latter the ὕφασμα—ἀκούειν. With respect to the πνεῦμα κατα-

νύξεως, it cannot here (notwithstanding what Chrysostom and the Greek Commentators may urge) denote compunction; as if from κατανύστα, but, by a use confined to the Sept., must be supposed to come from νύστα, whence νύξω, νύστος, νυστάζω, &c., and to denote nodding, νυσταγμὸς. (See Dan. 10, 4.) Hence the Sept. render מָמַל (to be dumb), and מְד (to be silent, dumb), by κατανύσθαι: and here Aquila for κατανύξις has καταφόρα. Πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, then, denotes a state of mind stupid, and destitute of all sense of good and evil. In employing the passage of Isaiah, the Apostle has changed the Greek version πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς into ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, &c.; which, from

* See the note on Mark 6, 52., where I have shown, that it sometimes denotes the scaly substance which grows over the eyes: and hence it is no wonder that the ancient lexicographers should have given the sense, "being blinded." Quite unnecessary, therefore, is the conjecture of Koppe, that in Hesych. for τυφώθησαν, τυ-

φλώθησαν we should read ἐτυφώθησαν. The present reading is de-

fended by the ordo litterarum, and confirmed by Suidas, and another passage of Hesych. τεπωρωμένοι, ἐκληρωμένοι, τετυφλωμένοι.
the genius of antient language, must mean, "God permitted them to become such." (Koppe.) On this sense of ἔσωκε the best Commentators, both antient and modern, are agreed. So Chrysost. οὐκ ἐνεργεῖαν δηλοῖ, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ συνεχόρησε. And Theophyl. 108. κατέλεξεν αὐτοὺς ἔχειν, συνεχόρησε, ἁφήκε.* And so Theodoret and OECumenius. Grotius and Hammond, too, have well illustrated the force of this κατανύξει, as it respects the Jews in the time of Christ and the Apostles.

* And he explains the κατανύξει by τὴν πρὸς κακὰ ἐκτίμησιν καὶ ἀμετάθετον έξίν τῆς ψυχῆς: adding, κατανύσασθαι γὰρ ἐστι τὸ ἐμπέχοντος παν, καὶ προσηλοῦσθαι. Which, indeed, deserves great attention, and is very applicable to the state of the unregenerate, who, though they have the os sublime given them, are, as it were, nailed down to the world and the flesh; just as, in the beautiful language of Cowper, (Task, 1. 5.)

"Brutes graze the mountain-top, with faces prone
And eyes intent upon the scanty herb
It yields them; or, recumbent on its brow,
Ruminate heedless of the scene outspread
Beneath, beyond, and stretching far away
From inland regions to the distant main."

This passage brings to my mind a parallel one of exquisite beauty in Plato de Repub. l. 9. p. 737 v. & 738 a. οἱ άρα, φρονήσεως καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀπερίτα, εὐχερεία δὲ καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις αἰτι ἐνότετε, κάνω, ὡς οὐκ, καὶ μερικὸ πάλιν πρὸς τὸ μεταξὺ φέρονται τε, καὶ ταύτη πλάνωται διὰ βίον ὑπερβαίνει τοῦ τούτου, πρὸς τὸ ἀλλιθές διὸν οὔτε ἀνεξελεύπαν, πώς τούτο οὔτε ἀνεκχεθαν, οὔτε τοῦ διὸν τῷ διὸν ἐπηρωθήσαν, οὔτε βεβαιον τε καὶ καθαρῶς ἡδονή ἐγείρεσθαι ἀλλὰ βοσκήματων δίκην κατ' αἰτι ἥλκεστε, καὶ κεκυρωθέντες, καὶ ἐκφυσεῖς εἰς γην καὶ εἰς τραπέζας, ἐκσυμφωνοντας καὶ καθαρῶς ἐγείρεσθαι, καὶ ἤκρα τοῦ τούτων. πλοενείας λατρευτες καὶ κυριούτες ἀλλήλους σημοίρεσι κέρασι τε καὶ ἐπλασίαν, ἀποκινυνάσαι δ' ἀπληστιαν.

On the whole of this subject the following beautiful lines of the above-mentioned Poet (1. 5.) are also very applicable:

"Propense his heart to idols, he is held
In sily dotage on created things,
Careless of his Creator. And that low
And sordid gravitation of his pow'rs
To a vile clod so draws him, with such force,
Resistless from the centre he should seek,
That he at last forgets it. All his hopes
Tend downwards; his ambition is to sink,
To reach a depth profounder still, and still
Profounder, in the fathomless abyss
Of folly, plunging in pursuit of death."
The words following, ὑδαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, are exegetical of the preceding, and are well explained by Theophyl. "having eyes to see the miracles, and ears to hear the instructions of the Lord and the Apostles, yet so as not to use either of them to the purpose intended." Thus Rosenm. correctly represents the sense as follows: "Neither their eyes nor ears will they use aright. The means of salvation are at hand, but they knowingly, and of their own will reject them." On this infatuation Grotius has admirably treated; and he illustrates the sentiment both from the Classical writers, from Josephus and Philo, and from the Fathers. Of his citations the following are the most important. "Ὅταν γὰρ ὅργαν διαιρόμεν πεπάτη τινά, οὕτω τῷ πρώτῳ ἐξαφαίρεται φρειὰν ὁν νοῶν τῶν ἐσθιόν, εἰς δὲ τὴν χείρα τρέπει γνώμην, ἣν εἰδή μηδὲν ἄν ἀμαρτάνει: imitated by Lycurg. Orat. contra Leocrat. Οἱ θεοὶ οὐδὲν πρὸτερον ποιοῦσιν ἡ τοῦ πτωτοῦ ἀνθρώπων τὴν διανοίαν παράγουσι: followed by Vellej. Paterculus, "Quippe ita se res habet, ut plerumque cui fortunam mutatur est Deus, consilia corruptam." Ammian. Marcellin. "Solent manum injectantibus fatis hebetari sensus hominin et obtundis." To which I add, Athen. 516 c. τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ ἀταίτευσιας κεκαυμένον τῶν αἰτῶν ἐξελκόνεια. So the well-known adage: "Quos perdere vult Jupiter prius dementat.

8. ἐν ἡ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας. It is truly remarked by Koppe, that these words were added by the Apostle to those of the Prophet, in order to accommodate them to his own times; (of which we have another example in 2 Cor. 8, 15.) q. d. "and thus their obduracy, stupidity, and impenitence, has continued even to the present day."

9. καὶ Δαβίδ λέγει: Γεννηθήτω τῇ τράπεζα, &c. In the Psalm to which the Apostle here refers (69, 28.) evils are denounced against those who had inflicted bitter injuries on the sacred writer; ex. gr. "when I would eat, they gave me gall for food; and when I was thirsty, they gave me vinegar to drink." Then
follows the sentiment: "Would that their own table may be made bitter by misery and misfortune." Which sentiment is accommodated by the Apostle to the present purpose. As David (he means to say) denounces evils against wicked men, so also will God award retribution to those Jews for their injurious and contumacious treatment of the Messiah. The expressions, however, need not be too much pressed. They may be understood to convey a notion of Divine punishments of every kind.

It is evident that by τράπεζα is meant, by metonymy, the food placed upon the table, the meat, also convictus.* (Rosenm. and Koppe.) There are many ways by which meals may become traps and snares, i.e. productive of evil and misery, both concealed and open. On these see Grotius and other Commentators.

The words εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτῶς ought not to be understood in the same sense with the preceding παγίδα, θήραν, and σκάνδαλον, but in the following sense: "and may such evils be a retribution to them for the injuries they have done me." So Schleus. renders: "ut ob mala facta puniantur:" and he compares Sirach 14, 6. καὶ τοῦτο ἀνταπόδομα τῆς κακίας αὐτῶς. And this mode of taking the words εἰς ἀνταπόδομα is, I find, confirmed by Theophyl. 109. Δεικνύους δὲ ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτήματαν ταῦτα πάσχουσιν, ἐκπε τὸ, εἰς ἀνταπόδομα.

10. ἐκποιοθήτωσαν—βλέπειν, i.e. may they fall, like blind persons, into the evils prepared for them." For this is an expression not unfrequently used of great miseries. Rosenm. and Grotius take the words to denote the darkening of men by affliction. See Lament. 5, 17.

10. καὶ τὰν νάτον αὐτῶν διαπαντῶς σύγκαμψον, i.e. "make them groan under heavy burthens, which bow down the back, and fatigue the body." A figure expressive of the miseries of bondage and slavery.

* In the same sense τράπεζα occurs in the passage of Plato de Rep. cited on ver. 8.
All this was fulfilled when they were subdued by the Romans.

There are other ways in which both these expressions may be taken. The kinds of punishment are thus ingeniously stated by Carpzov: 1. Afflictio corporis; dum cibus potusque, victus, quæstus, eorum exitio cedit. 2. Occæatio animæ et pernicies; dum Messiam et beneficæ ejus gratiosa non vident. 3. Damna rerum externarum; dum servitute perpetua, dorso jugitur incurvo, ab Assyriis, Romanis, aliis, premantur." He also proposes a more spiritual, but, I think, less solid mode of interpretation.

Mr. Turner thinks it is not to be inferred from the above quotations, that Isaiah and David had both in view the Jews who would reject the Messiah; but that St. Paul merely quotes the passage to show, that it was undeniable, from the Jewish Scriptures, that persons were thus subjected to God's judicial punishment; having just asserted in the words oi ἐστι λαος ἐκαίν., that such judgment was predictable of the unbelieving Jews. But I can by no means assent to this position. No one, I think, can tentatively read the 68th Psalm, and compare it with what happened to our Redeemer, without seeing that it was meant to be prophetic of his sufferings.

It has been observed by many enlightened Commentators (as Whitby) that the Hebrew words may be rendered in the future instead of the imperative mood. To this, however, objections have been made, (see Jenkinson ap. Slade) and I admit that they are not utterly unfounded; yet this mode of taking them as futures is confirmed by several ancient Interpreters, and amongst the rest Theophylact, who (chiefly from Chrysost.) thus ably paraphrases ver. 9 & 10. Ἀμεξαρδοὶ δότες ἐν τῇ κατι, τὰ ἔσχατα κολασθήσονται. Ἡ γὰρ τράπεζα αὐτῶν, τουτεστὶ, πάντα τὰ ἀγαθά, καὶ η ἐρμή, μεταβαθήσεται εἰς τοινάντιον, καὶ παγιδευθήσον καὶ εὐληθηθήσονται, τίχερσι ποίει γενόμενοι, καὶ αἰει σάρκαλα καὶ προσώπωσα ἐν τῇ  ἔσχατα αὐτῶν ἐξοικεῖτο. Ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἐθιμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκκαυθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νοητοὶ μὲν πάντως, καὶ οἱ αἰσθητοὶ δὲ, ἀπὸ τῶν συμφορῶν. Καὶ ὁ κόρος αὐτῶν ἐκκαυθήσεται δουλεύσαι γὰρ τοῖς Ρωμαίοις ἀντελέητοι δουλείαν τούτο γὰρ ἐστι τὸ, διακατανόειον δυνάμεως λύσει νησίμου ταύτης.

11. The Apostle at length concludes his whole disputation on the wisdom and greatness of God, in rejecting the Jews and receiving the Gentiles, with a passage of peculiar beauty, and calculated to excite our highest admiration of the Apostle. The sum of it is: That God had permitted the Jews, for a time, to reject the doctrine of the Messiah, not that he felt
any satisfaction at this their unbelief, and the misery consequent upon it, but in order that the doctrine itself might so much the more rapidly be transmitted to the Gentiles; especially since he foresaw that this very salvation which the Jews see bestowed on the Gentiles might excite them to imitate their faith: that therefore the Gentile Christians ought, indeed, to adore the goodness of God towards them, but by no means to boast over, or insult the Jews; since whatever blessings they themselves experienced they ought to ascribe solely to the Divine benignity, and not to their own merits; lastly, that the Jews themselves, if they return to a better mind, may finally experience the same Divine grace; and this will really sometime take place. (Koppe.) See also the plan laid down by Carpzov.

The general meaning of ver. 11 and 12 is thus detailed by Mr. Turner. "Although the Jews have, for a time, been permitted to refuse the Gospel, yet it is, by no means, to be supposed that this is intended to effect their irrevocable rejection and utter rule; it is, that the 'Gentiles may the more readily be induced to receive the Gospel;' or, 'their temporary rejection has been followed by this consequence;' and it is to excite the Jews (αὑρώσ) to emulate their example, by embracing the same faith. But, were this to be the result, how vast would be the benefit to mankind, since their incredulity proves so beneficial.' He then draws the conclusion: "If divine wisdom causes even the unbelief of the Jews to advance his plans, by extending Christianity, much rather will the same wisdom make their submission to the faith of the Gospel illustrate its truth, and promote the best interests of mankind."

11. μὴ ἐπταῦσαν, ἵνα πέσωσιν; "have they so stumbled, that they might fall," i.e. "has God suffered them to be unbelieving, in order that he might render them utterly miserable, without a hope of salvation?" Πταύω and πίπτω differ, as cause and effect. The former signifies to trip at, stumble, and
also, by a metaphor common to all the antient languages, to *err, delinquere;* the latter, to fall, and also metaphorically to come to ruin, *perish.* And that it must be understood of complete and irreparable misery is clear from the following words. (Koppe.) So Theophyl. ἵνα πέσωσι τελείαις, μηδὲ- ποτὲ ἀρισθήναι δυνάμενοι. Wets. here compares Ovid. t. 3, 4, 17. Quia cadit in plano (vix hoc tamen evenit ipsum) sic cadit, ut tactâ surgere possit humo: et miser Elpenor tecto delapsus ab alto occurrit regi debilis umbra suo.

It is well remarked by Carpzov, that as the impiety of the Gentiles was the cause of the Jews having formerly been put into possession of Palestine, so by the obstinacy of these, the holy inheritance came to fall unto the Gentiles.” Wets. here cites from an antient Glossator the following quaint, but apt illustration of the subject. “Quando bos currit et cadit, in ejus locum equus statuitur ad pressepe, quod non fuisset factum, nisi bos, qui carissimus erat, cecidisset. Illo autem senato grave est hero removere equum in gratiam bovis, postquam semel locum ejus occupavit. Ita Deus S. B. lapsis Judæis eorum dignitatem concessit gentibus, converso autem Israele ad Deum, grave est ei perdere gentes in gratiam Israeliatarum.”

Ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτών παραπτώματι, sub. ἐπὶ, “but (only) by their fall.” Παρεξ., Koppe observes, either signifies their *offence, namely unbelief;* or the misery arising from it, ἀπωλεία; (since πταίειν and πέσειν had preceded. Schleus. decidedly adopts the *latter interpretation, since the word,* he says *nihil aliud significare potest.* Yet I cannot be induced to abandon the former.

At σωτηρία must be supplied ἐγένετο, taken from γένοιτο.

The sentence is thus excellently explained by Grotius (as translated by Turner) “The unbelief of the Jews benefits the Gentiles in two ways: first, because it is thus made evident, that God does the Jews
no injustice, in calling the Gentiles to those benefits which they had rejected (comp. Matt. 24, 14); and secondly, because, if the greatest part of the Jews had believed in Christ, they would have opposed the admission of the Gentiles into the Church, unless they submitted to circumcision and the Mosaic law, as is plain from Acts 15, 1. 21, 20. But since they were much the smaller body, they were not able to give laws to the others. Thus has God, by a wisdom truly admirable, brought light out of darkness.”


11. εἰς τῷ παραθηλασαί αὐτῶν, “and this has been permitted, for the purpose of exciting them to emulation.” On the word παραθηλασαί see note on 10, 19.

12. εἰ δὲ τῷ παράστημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου, &c. Theophyl. remarks: Δυο ταύτα βούλεται καταρθώσαι, δι’ αὐτῶν γέγει νῦν τὸ, τὸ παραμεθηλασαί τοῖς Ιουδαίοις, καὶ τὸ καταστελλάι τὸ οὐρα αὐτῶν ἔθνων.

The general sense of this verse is sufficiently obvious: but to determine the exact force of certain expressions, and indicate the mutual dependence of the clauses, is not so easy. Koppe has here exerted his usual diligence, and not without success. The verse contains (he says) a sentiment expressed twice. There is moreover an antithesis between εἰ δὲ τὸ παράστημα—ἔθνων and πόσῳ—αὐτῶν: but the antithesis is irregular, by the former member being of two parts which form a parallelism: whereas the latter has but one. The deficient apodosis has been skilfully restored by Koppe, who lays down the construction as follows: εἰ δὲ τὸ παράστημα—κόσμου, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἦ
It is plain that πλήρωμα corresponds to ἡττημα. Kόσμος must be taken in its full sense, as denoting all the nations of the universe, without distinction of Jews or Gentiles, but especially the latter. Πλοῦτος must be taken for πλούσιον, the enriching; means of enriching, blessing, and saving. Koppe refers to Heb. 11, 26. Of ἡττημα it is not easy to fix the sense. The old commentators generally render it pau-citas: E. V. diminution: taking the opposite πλήρωμα to denote multitude; as ἡττος is opposed to πλεῖον. See Vorst. Parsæus, and Grot., who refer to Is. S1, 8. neanioskei ἐστωται εἰς ἡττημα. But I assent to Koppe that that passage is indecisive.

There seems reason to prefer the interpretation of Carpzov, Wets., Koppe, and Slade, who take ἡττημα in the sense of clades, conditio deterior, i. e. (as Mr. Slade explains) the deterioration or degradation of the Jews, with respect to their privileges as God’s people, in consequence of their unbelief.” Koppe refers to 1 Cor. 6, 7., and a similar use of τὸ ἡττω at 1 Cor. 11, 17., and ἡττωσθαι to be inferior at 2 Cor. 12, 18. 2 Pet. 2, 19 & 20. Then (he adds) πλήρωμα will mean, ex ratione oppositi, abundantia fortunae, prosperity; a synonyme of τοῦ πλούτου; and denote ἀνάληψis, restoration (ver. 15. ἀνακεφαλαίωσις. and Eph. 1, 10. ἀνακεφαλαίωσθαι), their full and complete conversion to Christianity; and thus ἡττημα will be synonymous with ἀπόβαλης at ver. 15.”

This last interpretation is undoubtedly the best founded; and it is moreover supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) p. 110. very well paraphrases the whole passage thus: Εἰ δὲ τρεῖς εγένετο τούτων σωτηρίας, καὶ εἰ τὸ τοῦτος ἀνακεφαλαίωσεν, ἐκεῖνοι προσελήφθησαν, καὶ τὸ σφάλμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐγένετο τῶν ἐδυνάμων πόσο μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν, τούτατι, ἢταν τάταις σαθῶσιν ἐκστρέφομεν; It is the opinion of the best Interpreters, ancient
and modern, that there is here no allusion to any future return of the Jews, in a visible or remarkable manner, to their own land, but only to their final admission into the Church of Christ, by faith and repentance. The common opinion, however, that there is an allusion to the future return of the Jews, &c. is ably maintained by Whitby and Doddridge, whom see.

13. ήμιν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς ἐκνευτικὶ ἐφ' ὅσον, &c. Elsner rightly observes that this verse and the next are parenthetical; and Carpzov (after De Brais) thinks that they may best be understood by being thus compounded into one, with the following sense. “Nolo enim vos, qui e gentilibus, i.e. extraneis vocati estis, ignorare, quia omnium ego gentium Apostolus sum, gloriosum erit meo muneri, si etiam gentiles, i.e. consanguineos meos, provocare possem, eorumque nonnullis ad salutem perduere.” The phrase δοθέασειν τὴν διακονίαν (he adds) signifies “carry off glory from my Apostolical office.”

The above interpretation is also adopted by Schl. and indeed yields an unexceptionable sense: but I see not how δοθέασειν can have the signification there ascribed to it.

Koppe paraphrases the sentence thus. “Scitote enim, vos e gentilibus Christiani: ex quo tempore missus sum inter gentes Apostolus, in hac muneri mei parte recte administranda omnem operam collocabo, eo imprimis consilio: ut, si fieri posset, populares meos ad Æmulandam Ethiscorum fidem excitem, sicque aliquam saltem eorum partem servem.” Thus δοθέοσω will here have the sense of ἔκτω δοθέασειν, for examples of which Koppe refers to Gal. 1, 10 & 13. And he renders: “I endeavour to acquire honour and praise to my office by the multitude of Heathen converts.” One thing, I conceive, is certain, that the introductory words ήμιν γὰρ λέγω are a formula requesting attention, which may be rendered: “Mind,” or “attend now, you Gentiles; for to you I (now) speak.”
13. ἐφ’ ἐκεῖν is rendered, by Koppe and others, quamdiu, sub. χρόνον: as in Matt. 9, 15. But to this the present tense eimi is not suitable: nor, indeed, does there seem any reason to desert the common interpretation quatenus, inasmuch as; which yields a sense equally applicable.

By the term ἐδώκω ἀπόστολος the Apostle merely means to designate himself as one to whom was chiefly committed the care of the Gentiles; not to the exclusion of the other Apostles, any more than to that of his Apostleship over the Jews.

Of this verse Mr. Slade offers the following translation. "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles; I proclaim the glorious nature and success of my ministry (not with a view of making you proud or contemptuous, but) that I may excite to emulation my brethren by birth, and save some of them," i.e. convert them to the true faith.

14. εἴπως παρασηλάσω μου τὴν σέρκα. Here we have an elliptical form in which some verb suitable to the context is to be supplied: q.d. "to try if by any means I may," &c. It may also, however, be considered, with Koppe, as equivalent to ἵνα εἰ δώσων, a phrase (as he says, nec desperantis, nec magnopere confidentis) which occurs in Acts 27, 12. Rom. 1, 10. Phil. 8, 11.

14. καὶ σῶσον τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν.* These words, Koppe observes, are added for the purpose of showing that while he was strongly interested for the Gentiles, (to whom he was especially sent) and the Jewish Christians, he was not forgetful of the rest of his countrymen); for that is the sense of σέρκα.† and to this

* I would compare Eurip. Andr. 54. εἰ τῶς—θεῷ παρατηρήσω

† The word may, by a Hebraism derived from ἤσω in Is. 58, 7., signify all who are united in consanguinity, and denote not only those of the same family, but of the same nation. It carries with it, too, (as is well observed by Theophyl.) an idea γνησίότητος καὶ φιλοστοργίας.
\( \text{qu\textae} \) is adapted, by the \( \pi\delta\varepsilon \tau\delta \sigma\eta\mu\alpha\nu\sigma\mu\epsilon\mu\nu\) Commentators are not quite agreed. I would render, "put into the way of salvation." And so Piscat. and Vorstius.

The \( \tau\nu\nu\alpha\nu\) (Theophyl. observes) is meant to hint his fear lest no more than some few should be converted.

15. \( \epsiloni\ \gamma\alpha\epsilon\ \eta\ \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\nu\)—\( \nu\varepsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\); Here we have a repetition of the sentiment at ver. 12. \( \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\lambda\nu\) signifies casting off (like \( \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\nu\nu\omega\)) rejection, at ver. 1, "by an image (says Ammon) derived from \( \text{shipwreck}.\)"

And he refers to Acts 27, 21. But such an \( \alpha\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\nu\) was made not only in shipwreck, but in a storm.

Here there is an ellipsis of the verb substantive, which, as Hardy observes (from Vorstius and Tole tus), by a metonymy of the containing for the contained, signifies "was the occasion for the Gospel being preached to the Gentiles, and consequently of their being reconciled to God." At \( \tau\nu\nu\) must be understood \( \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\), or \( \epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\). The \( \tau\nu\nu\) involves the notion of greatness, and has the sense of \( \text{qualis, quantus}.\)

15. \( \eta\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\lambda\nu\psi\iota\varsigma\), "their assumption, reception into Divine favour;" like the \( \pi\lambda\rho\alpha\varrho\alpha\mu\alpha\) just before. Koppe compares 1 Sam. 12, 2. \( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\alpha\lambda\beta\varsigma\varepsilon\tau\omicron\ \omega\mu\alpha\) \( \epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omega\ \epsiloni\ \lambda\alpha\nu\) and Ps. 65, 5. \( \mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma\ ) \( \nu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\alpha\lambda\beta\varepsilon\omega\) \( \kappa\alpha\) \( \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\alpha\lambda\beta\varepsilon\omicron\).

The \( \kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\) denotes the world at large, as compared to the Jews; namely, the Gentiles.

In the phrases \( \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\iota\) and \( \xi\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\nu\kappa\rho\alpha\nu\) (Koppe remarks) there is inherent a notion of felicity, each differing only in degree. Thus the latter corresponds to the former, and, agreeably to the popular forms of speech in every language, is equivalent to \( \text{bliss supreme and ineffable}.\) Wets. compares Terent. Hecyn. 5, 4. Egone, qui ab orco mortuum me reducem in lucem feceris, sinam sine munere a me abire. This interpretation is embraced by the best modern Commentators, and is, in some degree, supported by the authority of the ancient Commentators. So Theophyl. 110. s. f. \( \epsiloni\ \omicron\rho\gamma\eta\iota\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\), \( \phi\nu\sigma\omega\), \( \delta\ \Theta\epsilon\sigma\),
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tωμάτα ἐκμάθησατο ἑτέρους, καὶ τοὺς ἐξῆς δόλους ἐκποίη-
σευ ὅταν αὐτοῖς προσλάβθηται, τι οὐκ ἂν χαριέται; Ζανὴ
gὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν τότε ἐσται, τοιεύστω, ἀπειρά ἄγαβα. And
yet the same excellent Commentator admits that
something deeper (βαθύτερον) is concealed. So also
OEcumen., Photius, and Chrysostom. They do not,
however, appear to have successfully dived for this
pearl of truth, any more than Taylor and Mackn.,
who have unwarily followed them. The interpreta-
tion above detailed represents, I conceive, the prin-
cipal idea meant by the Apostle. There may, how-
ever, be included, by way of allusion, that which
some Commentators, as Vorstius and Carpzov, lay
down as the principal one, namely, the conversion
from vice to virtue, "a death unto sin, and a new
birth unto righteousness." (See Carpzov.) But there
seems no more than an indirect allusion. The con-
struction and sense of the whole verse is well laid
down by Ammon as follows: ei γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἀποβολῆς
αὐτῶν ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς ἐκφύσθη τῷ κόσμῳ, πόσῳ
μᾶλλον ἐν προσλήψει αὐτῶν βασποιηθοῦνται οἱ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις
νεκροὶ t. e. τὰ ἔθνη;

16. ei ὁ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα.

The Apostle here (I think) commences a new section, the purpose
of which is to admonish the Gentile Christians not to despise even
the unbelieving Jews. The reasons for this exhortation are founded
on the high dignity, by birth, which the Jews may, as the posterity
of Abraham, unquestionably claim. Now the sentiment is couched
under a double similitude: 1st, taken from the primitive fruits
whence the leaven offering of dough was made: 2dly, from a tree
with spreading branches: on which latter he especially dwells,
pointing out by it the respective condition of the Jews and the Gen-
tiles. (Koppe.)

The Apostle now returns to the principal thesis proposed at ver.
11., that God has not for ever rejected the Jewish people, and so as
never again to receive it into favour. (Crell.)

The above Commentators treat the ἐθ as transitive, in the sense
of furthermore. Koppe takes the ei in the sense of quam: but it
seems unnecessary to deviate from the common interpretation.
Then, as to the distinction between ἀπαρχὴν and φύραμα, there has
been some difference of opinion, which is well detailed as follows by
Mr. Turner. "Ἀπαρχὴ is the first fruits, which were required by
the law to be offered to God. It is applied to express the first of-
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first made into bread. See Num. 15, 17—21. Some, who have supposed the former to be here referred to, explain φυτον by the rest of the grain, which it was lawful to eat, after the first fruits had been presented. But this use of φυτον can hardly be justified. The word occurs only four times in the Old Testament, and five in the New, including the place under examination; and in every instance (except above 11, 21., where it is used for potter’s clay) it means either a kneading trough, or a mass of kneaded dough. See Exod. 8, 3. 12, 34. Num. 15, 20, 21. 1 Cor. 5, 6 & 7. Gal. 5, 9. It is preferable therefore to consider ἐπερ here, in its literal, or proper sense, as referring to the cake, which was made of the first mass of dough (see Num. as above) and offered to God as first fruits; and φυτον to the whole mass, out of which the cake was made; thus: “since the offered cake is holy, so is also the whole mass; meaning that God could, if he chose, have appropriated to himself any other portion of the productions of the ground, or the whole; there was no peculiar excellency in that which was required. In the tropical sense, some understand by ἐπερ. the pious ancestors of the Jews, considering it as synonymous with βίζα, and the two members of the verse as parallel in sentiment; thus: “if the Patriarchs were dedicated to God, so, in a certain sense, are all their posterity.” Others suppose it to mean the first converts (compare 8, 3, 16, 5. 1 Cor. 15, 20.) who were Jews. So Schoettg. and Ammon: and thus far this exposition is not improbable; but βίζα in the next member cannot mean, as they intimate, the same body, called, figuratively, the root whence Christians sprang; for some of its branches are afterwards spoken of as having been cut off, which can mean nothing else than the excision of a part of the Jews.”

The first mentioned interpretation was adopted by Grotius and Rosenmuller. But it seems untenable, for the reasons above given; and also (as Koppe observes) because, in that case, λοιπὸν πᾶν, or some such word, would have been added to the φύραμα.

Koppe renders ἀπαρχὴ primitiae frugum: and it is, he thinks, put for the fruits themselves: which is confirmed by Thucyd. 6, 20. Συμπήδους δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων τινῶν ἀπαρχὴ. And in the passage of Num. above cited occurs the very expression ἀπαρχὴ φυράματος. The φύραμα Koppe takes to denote the mass, or dough, i.e. the cake of the dough; and he lays down the following as the sense: “ex primitiis frugum non possunt panes vulgares, κοινοὶ, subigii; sed quae inde componitur massa est hec ipsa deo sacrata, quia primitiae sunt deo sacrata.† Similiter populus ex parentibus αὐτος stir-

* From which curious passage may be illustrated the force of ἀπαρχὴ, as anciently applied to denote first fruits, under which was comprehended, not only tithes, but royal tribute and taxes, &c.

† So Philo 727 ν. (cited by Carplzov) calls the Jewish people an ἀπαρχὴ of the Deity. Σύμπαν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ὀρφανῶν λόγων ἔχει, —Ἀλλὰ τῆς ὀρφανίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐρημίας ἔλεον καὶ οἶκον φρονοῦσιν αἰεὶ λαμβάνειν τὸν ἴμερόν τῶν διός φρονεῖν ἐπεκληρονταί, διότι τοῦ σύμπαντος ἀνθρώπων γένους ἰσχυρὰ ὁμοθέτησιν οὐ τί ἀπαρχὴ τῆς τοιαῦτα καὶ παρι. I assent to Koppe that φύραμα means the dough,
pem ducens ipse est ἀγιός." This interpretation of the passage has been adopted by most recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Jaspius, Schleus., Slade, and Turner. And, upon the whole, it seems to be true, as far as respects the primary import of ἀρχηγός and φῶραμα (and so far it has the support of the Greek Commentators), but, as respects the tropical sense, and the application (which was, I believe, first proposed by Crellius, and supported by Grotius), I must profess my hesitation to adopt it. Preferable is that of Schoettgen and Ammon, the objection made to which by Turner is not well founded. And this was also adopted by Carpzov, who paraphrases the passage thus. "If now a great part of the Jews, at the beginning of the New Covenant, have, like primitival offerings of good fruit, been received, on account of their faith, into the church of Christ, and made partakers of justification and sanctification (Acts 2, 41. 4, 4.) ; so neither has the remaining mass of the Jews been rejected without hope of salvation, but may likewise be received into the church of Christ, and obtain justification and sanctification (i.e. if the mass shall repose the same faith as the first-fruits."

These (as Ammon remarks) are those who at 8, 23. are called the οἱ τῆς ἀρχηγῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες (where see the note), who are the root and trunk of the church of Christ. For (as Koppe and Grotius observe) βίζα may signify both; as in Matt. 3, 10. 1 Macc. 1, 11., and infra ver. 18.; as the Heb. יִזָא is sometimes rendered by στέλεγον.

Καὶ εἰ ὁ βίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι, "if the trunk be holy, holy also are the branches." So also Carpzov: "Et, si radix jam sancta est, ergo etiam rami potuerunt sancti fieri." And he observes, that these words admit of the same interpretation as the former. The above sense of βίζα is confirmed by the following passage of Menander frag. p. 278. (cited by Wets.) ὁ μὴ τρέφων τεκόειν ἐκ τέκνης νέος, "Ἀκριβῶς ἐστίν οὐτὸς ἀπὸ βίζης κλάδου."

Here I cannot but subjoin the very judicious observations of Grotius on this passage. "Hac quae sequuntur, ed etiam pertinent ne ex Gentibus vocatos Judæos, ideo quod legis ritibus addicisti essent a se segregarent, nam sicut Ebionis spiritus inter Judæos, ita spiritus qui Marcionem from φυτᾶω, which signifies to mix up flour in bread-making, or by watering, kneading, &c. Hence the terms in various languages that denote this are taken from one or other of those operations. Dough is from δειμω, to water; paste from παστή, sprinkled, watered. Ῥοῦς. Masses of dough from Ῥυῖα, to agitate, work together, mix knead. Τὸ στραίς in Exod. 12, 34., signifies the flour when watered, mixed, kneaded, and brought into a consistency for making a loaf.

* The above is also adopted by Locke and Wells, who observe: "These allusions the Apostle makes use of here, to shew that the Patriarcha (the root of the Jewish nation) being accepted by God, and the Jewish converts which at first entered into the Christian Church, being accepted by God, are, as it were, first fruits or pledges, that God will, in due time, admit the whole nation of the Jews into his visible church, to be his peculiar people again. By holy is here meant that relative holiness, whereby any thing hath an appropriation to God."
postea agitavit, inter Christianos e Gentibus factos incipiebat se ostendere. Contra utrumque hoc hominum genus gravia suere Apostoli certamina. Adeo difficile est servare mediocritatem."

17, 18. οτι δὲ τινες των κλαδων ἐγκλαδοθησαν. On the latter of the above two similitudes the Apostle here enlarges. The connexion is thus skilfully traced by Crellius. "The Apostle pursues his purpose, namely, that of exhorting the Gentiles not to contemn the unbelieving Jews: and, in order thereto, he preoccupies an objection (such as, that branches, though from a good root, yet when broken off are valueless, and can derive no esteem from the virtue of the trunk), by answering which he paves the way for the admonition which follows."

"The Heathens (observes Koppe) are compared to the branches of a wild olive-tree, engrafted into a garden-olive; not, indeed, after the usual mode of grafting, which is not of the oleaster into the olea, but of the olea into the oleaster; yet after a manner which may be supposed. Indeed, the Apostle's intent does not extend to the fruit borne, but only to the engrafting, and the nutriment of the branches engrafted." So Origen, Casaubon, and Grotius, from whom, indeed, the above remarks were derived. Origen accounts for this by observing, that the Apostle changes the order of things, accommodating things to causes, rather than causes to things. And Grotius urges that the Apostle could not do otherwise; since it would have been absurd for the Jews, who are here represented as a root, and superior to the Gentiles, to be compared with a wild olive-tree, but the foreign nations, who are here represented as an engrafted branch, to be compared to a garden olive." "The Apostle, therefore (adds he), chose to borrow a simile from engrafting, not, indeed, such as was agreeable to the usual mode, yet was nevertheless possible. Nor need it be objected, that a wild olive engrafted on a garden olive would bear wild fruit: for the Apostle is not speaking of fruit, but of the grafting of trees, and the nutrition of the
branch engrafted. And so far the similitude squares, which must not be pushed any further than as it respects the case in question."

The above methods of accounting for this are, however, rendered nugatory by what Ammon tells us, namely, that it was usual to so engraft, in order to promote fecundity. And this he rests on the authority of two passages cited by Bredenkamp: viz. Columella de re rust. 5, 9. solent terebrari oleae laetae; in foramen talea viridis oleastri demittitur, et sic velut inita arbor saccundo semine fertilior exstat. Pallad. de inft. 14, 53. Fecundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas, et quae non novit munera ferre docet.

But, to proceed to the words in question, with this use of ἐκκλάω may be compared that of the Latin defringere. So Virg. Georg. 2, 30. (cited by Grot.) — aut summis defringi ex arbore plantas. Cic. pro Cæc. 926. Qui praeteruntes ramum defringentem arboris. Ἄγριελαυσ must here signify a wild olive shoot, or branch, by a subaudition of κλάδος. The term occurs in Theophr. and Dioscor., cited by Wetstein. To which I add Soph. Tr. 1199. ἀγριον ἑλαιον, and Theocr. Id. 7, 18. ῥοικῳ ὤ ἐχεν ἄγριελαιῳ κορώναν. Now a wild olive never bears fruit, and hence it became a proverbial term to denote sterility and unprofitableness. See Suid. and Diogen. Prov. cited by Schoettgen.

Ἐμεκεντρίσθης, "welt ingrafted." The word ἐμεκεντρίζω signifies literally to prick in, and is used with reference to the notch made in the stock, in order to admit the shoot to be engrafted (which, Grot. says, was called ἐνοφθαλμισμὸς). Wets. adduces two examples from Theophr. and Marc. Anton.; and Schoettg. refers to Florent. Geoponic. 1, 13, 2. Our word engraft has the very same force; since γράφω (from whence it is derived) properly signifies pungo.

Ἐν αὐτῶι is taken by Koppe for αὐτῶι. But the ἐν has rather the sense of amongst them, i.e. the branches, some of which are supposed to be yet remaining. Others, as Syr., Beza, Wells, Mackn.
and Schleus., assign to ἐν the sense of ἀντὶ, pro, loco, vice. But I assent to Mr. Slade, that, though there are Classical authorities for this signification (as in Polyb. Exc. Leg. 82. ἐν φιεργῇ, dotis loco. See Zeun. ad Viger. p. 592.), yet such a sense is not sanctioned by any passage of Scripture, neither is it necessary here.

17. συγκοινωνεῖ (σὺν τοῖς κλάδοις ἀρχαιοίς) πίξης. This is the construction adopted by Koppe, who seems not to approve of the Hendiadys supposed by the older Commentators. Πιότητος, i.e. "fatness and fertility," which is transferred from the root to the branches. A fit image of the felicity formerly promised to the Jews only. And the epithet is especially appropriate, since we have in Virg. Ecl. 5, 68. (cited by Wets.) pinguis olivi; and Hor. Epod. 2, 55. lecta de pinguisissimis oliva ramis arborum. Wets. also refers to a similar figure in Judg. 6, 9.

18. μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων, i.e. literally, "do not boast at, against, over, and consequently despise." The word occurs both in the Old and New Testament, and in some MSS. of Æschyl. Pers. 358; in almost all which cases the κατα is pleonastic: but here it has the same force as in καταγέλαω, to laugh out of countenance; occurring in Thucydides 3, 83. and elsewhere. By the κλάδων are meant the branches broken off.

In the clause εἰ δὲ κατακαυχάσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν πίξην βαστάζεις, there is a popular ellipsis, in which some verb must be supplied. Camerar. subauds, "you ought to think." Koppe: γυναῖ ὅτι. And he thus points out the application: "Know that the Jews owe nothing to you; but you, all to the Jews; since the hope of salvation was transferred from the Jews to the Gentiles, not vice versa." (See also Hammond.) Here Wets. aptly compares Anthol. 1, 20, 2. Ἡ πάρος ἐν δρύμωσι νόθης ζείδηρος ἄροινης Ἀχράς, θηροθότου πρέμυνον ἐφημοσύνης. Ὁθενεῖος ὄξισι μετέφυτως ἀμέρα δαλλα, οὐκ ἐμὴ ἡμετέρησι κλάσι φέρουσι βάρος. Πολλὴ σοι φυτάργροι πάνου χάρις, εἶνεκα σείω
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'Αχράς ἐν εὐκάρποις δενδρεσιν ἐγγράφωμι' and Martial 13, 43. Vilia maternis fueramus Persica ramis: nunc in adoptionis Persica cara sumus. Grotius, too, cites the following elegant Epigram. Πολλῆς σοι, φυτόεις, χάρις εἰνεκα σείο 'Αχράς ἐν εὐκάρποις δενδρεσιν ἐγγράφωμι.

19. ἐρείς οὖν, 'Εξεκλάδωσαν, &c. The connexion is thus traced by Koppe. "If you are inclined to insult the Jews on the ground that God has rejected them, and received you, think, I pray you, that the same which has befallen them, may much more easily happen to you; and therefore you should rather adore the benignity of God, and stand in awe of his displeasure."

The words ἐξεκλάδωσαν—ἐγκεκριμένῳ are supposed to come from a Gentile Christian; q. d. "God, by casting off the Jews, has made room for me." To this the answer is: καλῶς, which exactly corresponds to our well, and implies not only assent and approbation, but, as here, concession, accompanied by a reservation; i.e. well, but, &c. The Commentators compare a similar use of καλῶς in Mark 12, 32. Luke 20, 39. Joh. 4, 17.

20. τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, for ἐν ᾧ ἔστι, sub. εἰ, "by unbelief, because of."

20. σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἐστικας. The construction is not distinctly seen by the Commentators. There is, if I mistake not, an ellipsis of μόνον; and the σὺ seems emphatical. The sense, then, may be thus expressed. "But it is by faith (only) that thou standest," i.e. "It is by continuing in the Christian faith and religion, and not through any merit of thy own, that thou continuest in the Divine favour unto which thou hast been admitted: as the engrafted wild olive shoot continueth in the good olive." So Theophyl. explains: διὰ τὴν πίστιν ἐστικασ, ἐν τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐγκεκριμένῳ. Here Grotius compares a similar use of the Heb. נָאָ, to remain. Koppe notices a similar metaphor in 1 Cor. 10, 12., and thinks there is an ellipsis of διότι; as in Rom. 10, 9 & 10.
But this seems founded on a wrong view of the construction.

20. μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ. The Greek Commentators here, rightly recognize an ellipsis of τοίνυν. The force of μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει is thus excellently illustrated by Grotius. "Be not puffed up with pride, nor think this owing to thy own peculiar merits, lest thou be cut off," or lest the same happen to thee: for (as paraphrases Theophyl.) thou art not the graft of nature, but of faith." So Theodoret: "It was unbelief deprived them of the root, and faith united thee thereto, and made thee partaker of its fatness. Therefore there is cause for fear and trembling." And he refers to Philo 2, 12. It is well remarked by Chrysost. οὐκ ἐὰν ταπεινοὶ, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· η γὰρ ἀπονοία καταφρόνησεν ἐμποιεὶ καὶ ἰδιωμίαν. Here Wets. compares a similar sentiment in Senec. Troad. 259. Moderata durant, quoque fortuna altius Evexit ac levavit humanas opes. Hoc se magis deprimere felicem decet, Variosque casus tremere, metuentem Deos—Troja nos tumidos facit nimum ac feroces? Stamus hoc Danai loco, unde illa cecidit. I add Pind. Isthm. 3, 7. θείας δὲ μάσσαν Ὀλβος οἰσιομένων, where see Heyn. and the Schol.

21. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ οἰσιομάτω. The sense is very obvious. Οὐκ οἰσιομάτω is, by meiosis, for ἔξεδρας. At μῆπως—οἰσιομάτω there is an ellipsis of some verb, as φοβοῦ or οἰσιομάτω, or θλέπε. Ignorance or forgetfulness of this well known idiom of the Greek language, has caused many Interpreters to stumble at the phrase. To this I attribute the reading of very many MSS. οἰσιομάτω, which, however, would require μῆ: whereas μῆπως demands the future Indicative; of which syntax see examples in Wets. and Matth. Gr. Gr. Some MSS. read οἴη—οἰσιομάτω. But this destroys the delicacy of the Apostle's language: for, as Chrysost. well remarks, he avoids saying οἴην σοῦ οἰσιομάτω, from a regard to their feelings. Theophyl. paraphrases thus: φοβοῦ
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σοῦ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ εἰσποιητός, μήκως πταίσαντός σου οὗ φείστηκαί. Here Wets. aptly cites Dionys. Hal. 4, 46. Νομίζεις, οἷς ὃ τὼν συγγενεστάτων καὶ ἀναγκαιότατων μὴ φευσάμενος, τῶν ἄλλων φείστηκαί.

22. οἶδ' οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ. The force of the first clause of this verse the Commentators have failed to discern; owing, I think, to their not perceiving that it depends upon καλ, which is here emphatical, and put for τε καλ, not only—but. The Apostle, it must be observed, admonishes the Gentiles not so to rest upon the goodness of God to them as to grow proud and secure, and forget his severity. Thus the words following are exegetical, and show the objects and grounds for the display of each of those attributes. Χρηστ. comprises the Divine clemency in pardoning sin, and his beneficence in conferring benefits.

Chrysost. takes another and more refined, but far less popular view of the sense,* and therefore probably distant from the truth. Into this he seems to have been led by not perceiving the construction and true gist of the passage.


In ἀποτομία, severity, the Commentators and Lexicographers recognize a metaphor taken from surgery; † the operator being said ἀποτείμεν, to amputate an incurably diseased limb. Hence many Commentators remark on the aptness of the term to the present subject: and Grotius compares a similar use of the Heb. שֶׁרֶץ (from שָׁרֵץ, to cut off), which is rendered σκληρότης in Dan. 9, 2. Yet though this

* In considering which, he might have adverted to Ps. 130, 4. "For there is mercy with thee: therefore thou shalt be feared."

† Schoettg. and Schleus., however, think there is a metaphor taken from gardening. But of this we have no proof.
metaphorical use of the word is frequent in the Classical; it almost invariably signifies severity in words. The only decided example of the physical use is in Plut. 2, 199 b. (cited by Wets.) τον δήμον ἀποτόμους χρείαν ἔχειν ἱατρῷ. As respects severity in words, the term, I conceive, has reference to what we call cutting matters short; which, by an easy translation, may be applied to severity in general.

22. εἰς ἐπιμείνας τῇ χρηστότητι. This clause (which is inadvertently omitted in the text by Koppe) is variously interpreted, owing, perhaps, to the uncertainty produced by the ellipsis of a noun or pronoun united with χρηστότητι. The context, however, forbids us to apply it to the Gentile Christian; and, as certainly, confines it to God; nor, indeed, is any pronoun necessary, since the article here evidently sustains the place of it; and hence it is plain that it cannot be used (as Koppe seems inclined to think) in the sense of probity and goodness, as ascribed to the person himself.

In the interpretation of this and the following clause, the Calvinists are put to great straits, are reduced to miserable shifts, and compelled to resort to sophistical and metaphysical distinctions. Omitting to notice these, I shall now turn to what I conceive is the sound interpretation. Beza, Vorstius, and Grotius, render: "remain in that state in which thou hast been placed by the benignity of God, through faith in Christ, by which this benignity is retained:" the consequent being, by a Hebraism, put for the antecedent. So Grotius and Whitby: "if thou retainest God's goodness to thee, by continuing to be worthy of it, and improving this advantage." The above interpretation is also adopted by Crellius, and fully confirmed by the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) observes, that the word χρηστ. ascribes the whole to the grace of God. And he explains ἐπιμείνας by ἐποδάγγων ἐπιμείνας. He observes, too, that the Apostle does not say "if thou continue in faith,"
but ἐν τῇ χρηστότητι, i.e. if thou continuest to do things worthy of his goodness unto the end." Here it is well remarked by Crellius, that the Apostle tacitly shows that this divine goodness which is imparted to believers, is such as any one may be deprived of, namely, by his own fault, i.e. if he fall from that state in which he obtained it: since by the same means that this goodness was obtained, by the same is it retained."

A very similar passage occurs in Jud. 21. εαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.

22. ἔπει καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ. It is plain that there is here an ellipsis of ἄλλος, which often has place after ἐπει; as supra ver. 6. and 3, 6., where see the note. Ἐκκοπήσῃ is regarded by Grotius as a stronger term than ἐκκαλ. supra. But Koppe, with more judgment regards both as synonymous.

Hence Mr. Slade draws the well-founded conclusion, that the Christian converts were under no overruling necessity of persevering in their state of grace.

23. This verse is closely connected with the last sentiment at ver. 22. The sense is: "The Heathens may finally be deprived of the benefits now offered; and, on the contrary, the Jews be finally invested with them. (Koppe.)"

The καὶ may be rendered: "and (on the other hand)."

23. ἐγκεντρίσθησονται. Koppe, from Carpzov (who observes that the Apostle is speaking, not of what certainly shall be, but of what may be, by the τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ, by the supernatural efficacy of the divine Word, Rom. 1, 16., no longer perversely resisted by them), renders: "may be engrafted." And he adds, that what shall really happen is expressed at ver. 25. But I prefer the shall of our Common Version, which involves no difficulty, since it merely implies a promise.

23. δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστιν Θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτοῦ. Koppe remarks that δυνατὸς ἐστι is for δύναται. But
this usual sense of the word seems scarcely sufficient for the present purpose. Hence many eminent modern Commentators are of opinion that there is here an idiom, by which able (by a delicate suppression not unknown in our own language) carries with it the adjunct notion of willing. The ratio of the idiom has been acutely and profoundly discussed by Crellius: and it is observed by Hardy: "When God is said to be able to do a thing, there is often understood not solely the power of God, but also the Divine will to do that which He is able to do." And Grot. (evidently on the same principles as those suggested by Crellius) paraphrases: "Nothing but their own unbelief hinders their being again taken by God for his own, treated paternally by him, and thence brought by faith unto Christ." And he refers, for examples of this sentiment, to Rom. 4, 21. 14, 4. 2 Cor. 9, 8. 2 Tim. 1, 12. Heb. 11, 19. The above interpretation is also adopted by Whitby, Mackn., Rosenm., and Koppe.*

"Thus is removed (observes Crellius) the third objection, on the ground of the impossibility of the thing."

24. ei γὰρ φῶς ἐκ τῆς, &c., "quam tu, separatus ab illâ gente, Deorum cultui dedita, in quâ natus es, additus fueris populo Dei, non per natales, sed divino beneficio: quanto magis hi, qui nati sunt in illo populo, rursus in eum recipi, denuo huic sæculi, addi possunt?" (Rosenm.) That the Gentiles should be brought to the felicity of Christ's kingdom, was far more improbable than that the Jews should be brought to this happiness, which was originally destined for them. (Koppe.) Ἡ κατὰ φῶσι is for φῶςικν. The Gentile nations at large are compared to a wild olive tree, and each of them singly to its branches.

* And so Jaspis, who observes: "Cessante causâ cessat effectus. —Deus, qui potest omnis, potest hoc etiam, quantumvis improba-bile multis videatur."
24. παρὰ φύσιν. Mr. Slade paraphrases: "it is unnatural, i.e. contrary to the course which nature prescribes, to graft a wild, barren, useless tree into a good stock." But the sense rather seems to be: "not by nature, but by art; by artificial letting in."

24. καλλιέλαιον, "a good olive-tree," i.e. a cultivated one. This is supposed to be a word formed by the Apostle, in order to correspond to ἀγριελαιοῦ. The term used by the Classical writers to denote this is ἐλαιὰ κατα-κάρτες; as in Ps. 52, 10. and Herodot. 5, 82. ἕτοι ἡμέρης ἐλαίης.

24. τόσο μᾶλλον, "how much more (easily, readily)." Τῇ ἱδίᾳ ἐλαιᾷ, "their own olive-tree;" namely, that from which they were originally cut. On the sentiment see Macknight.

25. οὐ γὰρ θέλω—μυστήριον ταύτα. The Apostle now, by the authority of Him from whom he derived the knowledge, adds that this will really happen of which he had before asserted the possibility or probability. (Koppe.) Here I assent to the learned Commentator, that γὰρ is a particle of transition; since it is united with words and formulas to that effect; and moreover is introductory (as Koppe remarks) of something new, important, and unheard of, and therefore demanding attention to understand it. And this is further suggested by the term μυστήριον, on which I have before treated. See Campbell's Dissert. Here it is explained by Chrysost. τὸ ἁγιουστὶ μέλινον καὶ ἀπερρήτων λέγων, καὶ πολὺ μὲν τὸ θαύμα, πολὺ δὲ τὸ παράδειξαν ἐχου. By Theodoret thus: Μυστήριον ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ πάντι γνωρίσιν, ἀλλὰ μόνοις τοῖς θαρρομένοις. And by Schoettg. thus: "Μυστήριον h. l. Apostolus dicit doctrinam non ubivis obviam, et quæ non a quovis docetur, quamvis ejus vestigia in loco Prophetæ citando occurrunt." Dr. Macknight observes, that "the Apostle calls the rejection of the Jews for a time, and their restoration after the conversion of the Gentiles is completed, a mystery, because it was a matter of the greatest importance to mankind, and because it had hitherto been kept a secret, like the
doctrine of the mysteries which was discovered to none but the initiated.” We may suppose, too, with Schoettg., that the Apostle disclosed this doctrine to the Christians, with the view of checking in them a disposition to assume to themselves more than was proper, and despise the Jews.”

25. ἵνα μὴ ἦτε παρ’ ἐαυτοῖς φρονίμου. It is rightly remarked by Grotius, that “this expression is taken from Prov. 3, 7. μὴ ἵσθι φρονίμος παρὰ σεαυτῷ, i.e. (according to the Hebr.) wise in thine own eyes, in thy own opinion.” So also Is. 5, 21. οὐ αἱ συνεστὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. Compare 12, 10.* The general sense must, however, be here applied agreeably to the subject and the context. Hardy (from Grotius, Vorst., and others of the earlier Commentators,) paraphrases thus: “that you may not fancy you can of yourselves know beforehand what is to be; nor pride yourselves overmuch on the favour in which you at present stand, as if you were irrevocably chosen, but they entirely and for ever rejected.” Koppe, keeping more to generalities, paraphrases thus: “that you may not suppose your notions and opinions respecting the Jews are true, and agreeable to the Divine counsels.”

25. ὅτι πάροισι ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ Ἰσραήλ γέγονεν. In the interpretation of this clause, and the next, is involved some difficulty, occasioned by the elliptica character of the style. The words preceding, however, and the nature of the subject, enable us sufficiently well to determine the sense. I am suprised that Commentators should have so obscurely seen (what is chiefly to be attended to in laying down the construction) that at μέρους there is an ellipsis of μέ-

νον; and that ἀχρις oο here denotes continuation, dura-

tion, and perpetuity; as Rom. 5, 15. ἀχρὶ νόμου ἀμαρτία ἐν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. & 11, 8. ἐὼς τῆς σημείου ἡμε-

ρας. Other examples may be seen in Glass Phil. Sacr. Ἀπὸ μέρους is, by a Hebraism, for ἐκ μέρους.

* Here Wets. cites Cic. de Orat. 1, 39. M. Bucculeius, homo neque meo judicio stultus, et suo valde sapiens.
Paulósis signifies obdurate and obstinate unbelief, willful blindness. (See note on παρώνωθαι supra, ver. 7.) By Ἰσραήλ is meant the nation of Israel, the Israelites. It must be observed, too, that there is a popular hypallage (used to soften the harshness of the expression), by which “in part to Israel” is for “to some Israelites;” as opposed to all at ver. 20.* In vain it is objected by Estius, that there was no mystery in this; since, in fact, the mystery solely respects the following words, ἀχρις οὗ πληρώμα. This πληρώμα is, I think, best explained by Grot. Beza, Vorst. Tolet., Pisc., Koppe, and others, as equivalent to πλήθος τῶν ἔθνων (as opposed to ἕττυματι at v. 12), and signifying the great bulk of the Heathens, i.e. in a manner, all. Thus the sense will be: “until the whole body of the Gentiles be converted.” For (as Koppe observes) it is foretold by the Prophets that the whole of the nations will yield obedience to the Messiah, and embrace his religion. See Ps. 22, 28. Zach. 14, 9 & 16. Apoc. 15, 4. At the ἀχρι, before οὗ τῶν πληρώμα τῶν ἔθνων εἰσέλθη, must be supplied some such words as, “and which will continue to perpetuity, until the fulness of the Gentiles enter.” And at εἰσέλθη there is (as Beza, Piscat., Paræus, Grotius, and Koppe observe) to be supplied εἰς τῷ βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the kingdom of God, his Church, and people. Ecumenius supplies εἰς τὴν πίστιν; which comes to the same thing. Koppe explains εἰσέλθη by προσελθήση; and refers to the πρόσ-

* So a Commentator ap. Pole. “Cæcitas obtigit Israeli, non toti, sed ex parte, non tamen exigua, sed multè maxima; non omnibus omnino, sed aliquibus.” Grotius, too, observes that the ἀπὸ μέρους is used in the same way as the preceding τίνες τῶν κλάκων; and is a delicate mode of expressing plurimi.” And he remarks that ἀπὸ μέρους and ἐκ μέρους are frequently used by St. Paul to denote non omnes, or non omnia. By not attending to this, many of the earlier modern Commentators, as Tolet., Estius, and Paræus, vainly perplex themselves to find out to what word ἀπὸ μέρους refers. (See Pole.) But the mode of construction above detailed is the only true one, and was long ago adopted by the Fathers and antient Commentators, especially Chrysost., as also by Beza, Piscat., and so Grot., Rosenm., & Koppe,
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καὶ σωθήσεται; "and so all Israel shall be saved." "By this (Locke rightly observes) is not meant eternal happiness in Heaven, but the profession of the true Religion here on earth." So also Mackn., who observes, that "the future restoration of the Jews to their privileges as the people of God, in consequence of their embracing the Gospel, is expressed by their being saved; because, by their coming into the Christian church, they shall have the means of salvation bestowed on them." On the important term σωθήσεται. I have treated on Matt. 1, 21., and have shown that it often means, as, I think, it does here, put into the way of salvation.

I am surprised that Grotius and Hammond should account as a fulfilment of this prophecy the comparatively partial conversion of the Gentiles effected by St. Paul in his after journeys. Such a πλήρωμα as that here treated of never did happen even in the times of the Apostles, but (as both Brown and Mede, Diss. 35, observe,) is yet to happen. It is well remarked by Harris ap. Dodd., that as this Epistle was written about the year 57, that is, long after the most remarkable conversion of the Jews by the first preaching of the Apostles, and after Paul had been about 30 years engaged in his work, it appears that the prophecies relating to the calling of the Jews were not accomplished then, and consequently are not yet accomplished."

Dr. Whitby has here an excellent Dissertation on the conversion of the Jews, as referred to by the words καὶ πλήρωμα, &c., in which he ably supports the interpretation above adopted and detailed. Of this, as the subject is of no little importance, I shall now proceed to give a careful abridgment.

The learned Commentator, in the first place, asserts, and shows by examples from the Greek and Latin Fathers and Interpreters, that such has been the constant doctrine of the Church. So Chrysost. on ver. 11 & 25. Ócumen. on ver. 25, 31 & 26. Origen. contr. Cels. p. 331. Huet, tom. 1. p. 74 c. Orig. contr. Cels. p. 174. August. de Civ. D. l. 18, 23. Jerome in Comment. in loc., Cyril in loc., and Origen. in loc. "Moreover (says he) as this doctrine has
the suffrage of all the ancient Fathers, and Commentators thus generally agree in exposition of this Chapter, so it is easy to confirm it by showing the absurdity of other expositions, and the plain inconsistency of them both with truth, and with the words of the Apostle. For, 1st, the words of the Apostle cannot be expounded (as is done by Dr. Lightfoot and others) of the spiritual Israel, i.e. of all those persons, whether Jew or Gentile, which belong to God's election. The learned Commentator then proceeds to overturn this opinion, by four arguments, which it will not be necessary for me to insert, as the opinion is too improbable to deserve attention. In the next place, he refutes at large the opinion of Grotius and Hammond (above mentioned), that the words do not refer to any yet future return of the Jews in a visible and remarkable manner. This position the learned Commentator shews to be groundless; 1st, by a reference to the Jews as they are described by St. Paul himself; as Rom. 9, 12 & 3. ver. 22 & 37, 31. 10, 4, 10, 2 & 3. Acts 28, 23 & 28. 2dly, by showing the futility of several common opinions on this subject; as that many of the Jews were converted to Christianity when they saw Christ's prediction. (Matt. 24.) fulfilled, in the Roman army sitting down before that city, and went out of the city with the Christians, and so were delivered from the evils which followed. This (he shows) is said without any foundation, or testimony from the writers of those times.

"Moreover (continues he) this was the time when there happened a great apostasy of the Jewish converts, according to our Lord's prediction, Matt. 24, 12; and therefore the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that of St. James, are full of exhortations to constancy in the faith. See James 1, 6, 7 & 8. 1 Pet. 4, 12. James 1, 12. 5, 8, 10 & 11. 1 Pet. 3, 14. 4, 13 & 14. 5, 9 & 10. Heb. 3, 12 & 14. 4, 1 & 11. 6, 6, 10, 25. 12, 35 & 38. 12, 15. Luke 21, 22 & 23. And could the times of the apostasy, even of the converted Jews, be the times of the salvation of the unbelieving Jews? Was it to be expected that they should then, more than ever, see the things belonging to their peace, when they were hidden from their eyes? or could the times of wrath and vengeance upon that people, when the Avenger came out of Zion to punish the iniquity of Zion with the sorest judgments, be the very times when the Deliverer came out of Zion, to turn away iniquity from Jacob?"

He then proceeds to overturn another of these opinions; namely, that after the Temple and City was destroyed, and they brought into subscription by the Romans, then many were humbled, and turned Christians; and that after that, even in Justin Martyr's days, every day there were some who came in to be Christ's disciples. "In the first place (says he) I cannot find one word in Church history about this conversion, but much to the contrary." The learned Commentator then appeals to Epiphani., Just. cont. Tryph. p 335. Tertullian adv. Marcion. L. 3, 23., and Just. Mart. Apolog. 72 n., and cont. Tryph. 335 n., 266 b. p. 350. As to what Justin relates of some every day coming in to be Christ's disciples, that is (he answers) to be understood of Gentiles. (See 45 n., 256 p.) This he proceeds to show by appealing to the language of Justin Martyr.
"From this time (continues he) to the days of Constantine, the Fathers represent the Jews as a nation whose ears were shut, and their heart hardened, &c. See Iren. L. 3, 24. Orig. cont. Cels. L. 2. p. 62. L. 4. p. 183, and Tertull. adv. Marcion L. 3, 23. And this seems agreeable to our Lord's predictions. See Matt. 21, 41 & 43. Luke 14, 24. Matt. 8, 11 & 12. Luke 13, 26—30. Now if we consider that wrath was come upon this nation εἰς τέλος to the end, can we imagine either that this kingdom taken from them, this vineyard let out to other husbandmen, these children of the kingdom cast out into outer darkness, should suddenly receive again this kingdom, be restored to this vineyard, or admitted to the light of the Gospel, or that all Israel should be saved, or iniquity should be taken away from Jacob, whilst that nation lay under these dreadful judgments! or that when our Lord had so solemnly foretold there should be wrath upon this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Luke 21, 23, 24., this wrath should not continue on them whilst they were captives in all nations, and Jerusalem was trodden down?

The exposition in question is, moreover, contrary to fact; for when was there any such conversion made of the Jews at the times assigned by him, which can, in any probability of construction, answer to the phrases used by the Apostle, that by it all Israel should be saved; ungodliness should be turned away from Jacob; God should bless them by taking away their sins; they who now were blinded should have the veil taken away from before their eyes; they who now were diminished should have again their fulness; and they who were now cast off should be again received? This could not happen in the very times when this Epistle was first indited. For though it be true that St. James mentions many thousands or myriads of Jewish converts, all zealous of the law, Acts 21, 20., yet were they all converted at, or before, the time of writing this Epistle, and so belonged only to the remnant according to the election of grace here mentioned, not to the residue that were blinded, of whose conversion the Apostle here speaks from ver. 12. to ver. 32. Nor could their conversion and salvation be a mystery to be then revealed to the Gentiles. That no such conversion after the blindness mentioned in this Chapter happened to them, upon their seeing the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place, or soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, has been already shewed; and that Justin Martyr says nothing of any such remarkable conversion of them, has been also proved.

Wherefore there having been, as yet, so far as we can discern, no such remarkable conversion of the Jews since the inditing this Epistle, and no such happy emulation of the converted Gentiles, as provoked them to embrace the Christian faith, this could not be, as here Dr. Hammond suggests, a confirmation of the faith to the Gentiles, and much less a means to bring them all to receive it, or to convert the Gentiles over all the world. And what records or histories make the least mention of any such conversion of the Gentile world, on
account of the remarkable conversion of the Jews after the writing this Epistle? When came in such a fulness of the unbelieving Jews as was the riches of the world, v. 12., or such a reception of them to the Christian faith as was to them life from the dead, v. 15.; or how can these assertions be reconciled to the words of the Apostle; for if the coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles be their receiving faith in those times, then the partial blindness of the Jews must cease in those times also; for blindness, says the Apostle, hath happened to the Jews in part, and that blindness is to continue only till the fulness of the Gentiles is come in. If, then, the blindness of the Jews is not yet ceased, but they have generally continued, even from the time of writing this Epistle to this very moment, in as much blindness and obduracy as they then lay under, and as much branches broken off, as now they are, it follows that the fulness of the Gentiles, mentioned by the Apostle, is not yet come in, and that when the time for the fulness, i.e. for the conversion of the still Heathen Gentiles is come in, then shall the blindness of the Jews be removed, and so all Israel shall be saved, and then all nations shall flow in unto them, and their reception shall be to the Gentiles as life from the dead.

But to proceed to discuss the import of this phrase, there is a double fulness of the Gentiles mentioned in the Holy Scriptures: I. That which is spoken of, ver. 12., in these words, "If the diminution of them was the fulness of the Gentiles, and this consisted in the preaching of the Gospel to all nations, and the imparting the glad tidings of salvation to them, and was, in a great measure, to be accomplished before the destruction of Jerusalem, and the ruin of that Church and nation, according to our Lord's prediction in these words, the Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations, and then shall the time come, Matt. 24, 14. Mark 13, 10.—II. There is to be another fulness of the Gentiles by a more glorious conversion of them, and a coming in of those nations which have not hitherto embraced the Gospel, or have relapsed into Heathenism or Mahometanism, to be effected when this rejection of the Jews shall cease, and God shall send the Deliverer out of Zion to turn away iniquity from Jacob; and of this only can we understand those words of the Apostle, v. 12. If the fall of the Jews hath been (already) the riches of the (Gentile) world, and the diminution of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more shall their fulness, i.e. the time of their conversion, be the increase and fulness of the same Gentiles. And ver. 15. If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving them again be (to the same world) but even as life from the dead. And v. 25. Blindness in part hath happened to the Jews, till the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in. This blindness, therefore, still continuing upon them, as much as ever, another fulness of the Gentiles is to be expected, when it entirely shall be removed from them, and so all Israel shall be saved.—III. Jerusalem is yet trodden down of the nations, and the Jews are yet captives in all nations, whereas the captivity and the treading down of Jerusalem is to cease when the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled; according to those words of
Christ concerning the destruction of the Jews, They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be carried captives into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down, till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, Luke 21, 24. i. e. till the times when they shall have a plenary conversion by the coming in of the Jews, and shall no more lord it over them, as now they do, but serve them, and flow in unto them. And to this purpose let it be noted,—I. That if we consult Ancient Prophecies concerning the vast extent of our Saviour's kingdom over all nations, we shall find reason to believe that they have not yet had their full accomplishment upon them, for he has not yet had the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, Psal. 2, 9. God hath not yet made all people, nations, and languages to serve him, and all dominions to obey him, Dan. 7, 4. 27. He has not yet filled the whole earth, or broken in pieces, and consumed all other kingdoms, Dan. 2, 34, 35. That seems not yet fulfilled which was foretold by Macab, that the Lord should be king over all the earth, Mich. 5, 4. and by Zachariah, Zach. 14, 9. and by David, Psal. 72, 8. These, and sundry other such like prophecies there are, which yet were never accomplished according to the full import of them. For, as Breerwood observes, if we divide the known regions of the world into thirty equal parts, the Christians' part is (only) as five, the Mahometans as six, the Idolators as nineteen; whence we have reason to conclude, that there is yet a time to come, before the consummation of all things, in which our Saviour will yet once more display the victorious banner of his cross; and like a mighty man of war march on conquering, and to conquer, till he has confounded, or converted his enemies; and, finally, consummated his victories in a glorious triumph over all the powers of the earth, and made all nations, tongues, and languages to serve him.—II. That there is still to be a glorious conversion of the Jewish nation, as it seems evident from the words of the Apostle here, who speaks of a time when the partial blindness which then had happened to the Jews, and still continues upon them, should cease; when God would turn away ungodliness from Jacob, and take away (the punishment of) their sins, which he has not done; and when not a little remnant only, as at our Lord's first Advent, but all Israel should be saved; when that Israel, whose minds were then, and still are, blinded by the veil that is upon them, shall have that veil taken away by their turning to the Lord. But also from those prophecies of the Old Testament, which promise to that nation such kindness, favour, and salvation, as either has not been at all as yet, or but imperfectly fulfilled; as when he promises to bless her with such blessings as never should be taken from her, and to shew mercy to her, so as never to forsake her more. See Isa. 54, 9 & 10. 59, 50 & 21. 60, 15, 18, 19 & 20. 61, 7 & 8. 62, 4, 12. 65, 19. 66, 22. Jer. 32, 39 & 40. Ezek. 34, 28 & 25. 37, 25, 26 & 27. 39,28 & 29. Amos 9, 15.—Now it seems very evident, that scarcely any of these things can be applied to the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon. For since that time his kindness hath departed from them, and
his covenant of peace hath been removed for above 1600 years; Violence hath been heard in their land, wasting and destruction within their borders, and their land has been made desolate; the days of wrath, of mourning, and of weeping, have been long upon them; their Sun hath been, according to our Lord's prediction, darkened, and their moon hath not given her light; their Sanctuary and Tabernacle have been consumed, and they have been a prey to the Heathen; they have long since ceased to be his people, and he to be their God. Nor can we reasonably confine these promises to that little remnant which believed in the times of the Apostles; for they were never gathered out of all lands, nor did they inherit the Land for ever, but were banished thence, as well as the unbelieving Jews, by Hadrian; they can in no propriety of speech be styled the House of Israel, the whole House of Israel. Nothing, indeed, seems more unlikely than that the time of the casting them off, the breaking off the branches, the leaving them under a spiritual slumber, the taking the Kingdom from them, and casting them out into utter darkness, should be the time of the completion of these glorious promises; and that this sense cannot accord with the discourse of our Apostle here, has been already shown. Nor, thirdly, can we apply these promises to the believing Gentiles; for sure they could not be a prey to the Heathens, or, to bear their shame, be the people whom God hath led into captivity, and after gathered into their own land, and so planted there as never to be plucked up again; the promises could not be made to them that they should suck the breasts and eat the riches of the Gentiles.—III. I have already shewn from Scripture prophecies, that after this conversion the nations generally shall flow in to them, and walk in their light, and so their fulness (which signifies not their incorporation into another Church, but as the opposite words, their full, their diminution, their rejection, require, and as the Apostle doth himself interpret it, their reception to the Christian faith, and so into the favour of God) shall be the riches of the Gentiles, and as life from the dead to them; then the Gentiles shall come to their light, and kings to the brightness of their rising; and nations that have not known them shall run in unto them, because God hath glorified them. Then, saith God, I will gather all nations, and tongues, and they shall come and see my glory. Isa. 55, 5. 56, 8. 66, 18 & 22. Then all nations shall turn, and fear the Lord truly, saith Tobit, chap. 13. 10 & 11. And this I conceive to be that fulness of which the Apostle speaks." (Whitby.)

The above arguments seem conclusive: and therefore it is in vain that Wets. who adopts the interpretation of Hammond, urges: "Neque cum naturâ hominis, neque cum indole doctrinâ Christi consistit, ut malem mutationem speremus. Scimus, quid hactenus argumenta pro veritate doctrinâ Christi effecerint, nimium quosdam credidisse, quosdam
non credidisse. Nec nova sperare possimus." * This, indeed, is supposing a knowledge which we do not possess, and ought not to pretend to, of the the mode in which this πάροςις will be removed: a subject (to use the words of Koppe) scarcely less obscure to us, than was formerly to the Jewish Christians that of the conversion of the Heathens, (Acts 11, 18.), which is itself by Paul called a mystery (16, 25. Eph. 3, 4—6). There is, however, no reason to suppose, as is commonly done, that this will be effected by a simultaneous, sudden, and miraculous conversion. It seems reasonable to imagine that the conversion will not be instantaneous, and yet not tardy; since, probably, the prejudices of the Jews will have been, for some time, gradually wearing away. However, we are not to be "wise above what is written:" nor is it reasonable to expect, that what is mentioned as a mystery should now be completely understood. And thus, (to conclude in the words of Koppe,) "since the Apostle hath not himself thought proper to explain the thing, or the mode in which it will be brought about, very distinctly, it seems best for us to leave it wholly to the Divine will and good pleasure."†

26. καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἡξει ἐκ Σωτ ὁ ὑψίμενος — 'Ιακωβ. The words are from Is. 59, 20., and agree with the Sept., except that ἐνεκέρε is there used instead of ἐκ. And indeed Beza and Koppe suspect that this was originally read in the present passage; since 'EK, as a contraction of ἐνεκα, might easily be changed into 'EK. But I know not whether it can be proved that 'EK is a MS. abbreviation. At all

* On this, and the above hypothesis of Hammond, it is well remarked by Koppe: "Quicquid contra priniam (i. e. communem) totius loci interpretatorem a Theologis imprimis disputatam vidimus, ex ingenio magis, quod in consiliis divinis djudicandis plerumque falli ut quisque est sapientissimus, ita lubentissime confitetur, quam ex usu loquendi, systematiqué tum Pauli ipsius tum reliquorum scriptorum divinorum, ratione et consensu, repetitum videatur."

† So Jaspis; Totam illam rem potius divine providentiae verecundè, verecundè inquam, relinquamus."
events, it is improbable that the mistake should have crept into all the MSS., and even those very antient ones from which the early Versions, the Syr. and Vulg., were formed. The Arabic Translator seems to have read ἐν Σιων. But that can neither be received, nor will it serve to confirm the above conjecture; since it is undoubtedly an error for ἐκ.

Taylor thinks that the Apostle does not allude to any particular prophecy, but the current sense of the Prophets. This, however, is cutting the knot. I am rather inclined to adopt the conjecture of Vitringa (on the passage of Isaiah), that, together with this passage, St. Paul connected in his mind, Ps. 13. (Heb. and Eng. 14.) τις δῶσει ἐκ Σιων τὸ σωτῆριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; I am not, however, disinclined to agree with Mr. Turner, that the Apostle modifies the language of the Prophet to accommodate it to his purpose. "The sense (continues Turner) the Apostle does not change. The Hebrew Prophet speaks of the Redeemer as coming to Zion. This was perfectly natural, as Zion was the centre of national glory. The Christian Apostle, not denying that the Redeemer had come to Zion, speaks of his marching, as it were, triumphantly out of Zion, and subduing all opposition. Thus the passage, as applied in the epistle, will be understood figuratively, and be equivalent to Isa. 2, 3." With ἰδοὺμενος the Commentators compare the Hebrew ἀπαθεῖσας.

26. καὶ ἀπεστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. Here the Heb. and the Sept. slightly differ. The former has: "unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob." But there is no occasion, with Grotius and others, to suppose that the Sept. Translator had a different reading. He seems only to have rendered somewhat too freely the sense of the Hebrew. For when (as observes Vitringa in loc.) the prophecy declares that the Messiah would come to Zion (meaning for its benefit), and to them that turn away from transgression in Jacob, it expresses the object for which he would come, to convert the posterity of Jacob from
sin. So the Chaldee: "to convert rebels, the house of Jacob, to the law." And Kimchi adds, "because then all the Israelites shall be thoroughly converted." And it is certain (observes Dodd."") that the general tenor of God’s covenant with Israel gave no hope of deliverance after rejection and abandonment, but in a way of repentance and reformation." Most assuredly I cannot approve of the liberty taken by Bp. Lowth, of translating from the Sept., contrary to all the copies of the Hebrew text, confirmed as it is by Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion.

It is observed by Jaspis, that "almost the first word which issued from the mouth of our Saviour, on commencing his ministry was; μετανοεῖτε! repent! (Matt. 4, 14.)" And the same may be said of John the Baptist (Matt. 3, 2.); as also of Pet. Acts 2, 38."

καὶ αὐτῇ αὐτοῖς, &c. The Apostle goes on with the same passage of Is. 59, 21.; but, after the Jewish manner, does not transcribe the whole passage, but only its commencement; leaving the rest to be supplied by the reader. (Koppe.) On this custom see his Exerc. 1. ad Rom.

The other words διαν—αὐτοῖς are added from Is. 27, 9. The sentence may be thus rendered, with Koppe: "And these are the benefits which I promise them, after I shall have liberated them from the divine punishments (I will give my spirit to them)." Διαθήκη here signifies a promise; as in Acts 3, 25., Gal. 3, 17., and may be compared with the Heb. דְּתָא. (See Schleus. Lex. in voc. § 4.) It literally signifies a disposal of any property, or any thing advantageous, made in favour of a person; without any reference necessarily to inheritance after death. The passage is thus paraphrased by Jaspis: "Si se ad me convertirint Messiam rite accipientes, a peccatorum poenis eos liberabo, et æternæ bona illis certissimè exhibebo; sic fatur Deus."

κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐξθροὶ δὶ ύμᾶς—τοῦ πατέρας. These words are meant to meet a tacit objection; q. d. "It cannot be that all Israel will
be saved, and experience such grace from God; since they are God's enemies, and God is theirs.” To which the reply is: “They are indeed enemies; but are nevertheless beloved, though in another respect. The hatred is, by right reason, mingled with love, and tempered with charity; especially as respects the nation at large. (Crellius.)

The μὲν and δὲ do not form a simple apodosis, but (as Koppe observes) are equivalent to εἰσερχομένων—καὶ δύνασθαι. Κατὰ τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον. Here there is a popular ellipsis, which the nature of the subject requires to be thus filled up. “As far as respects their rejection of; and opposition to, the Gospel.” Carpzov paraphrases it: “ut quod medium reconciliationis Judeis adeo prosequuntur.” But this seems wandering too far.

The word ἔχθροι does not declare whose enemies; but the verses preceding and following shew that we must not subaud μον, with many Commentators, but Θεοῦ; and consequently the same word must be supplied in the antithetical word ἀγαπητοὶ. I know not whether the Commentators are justified in regarding ἔχθροι as a noun substantive; which not a little embarrasses the subject. (See Mr. Locke's note.) It rather seems to be an adjective signifying alienated (from the favour of God); and thus it will correspond with ἀγαπητοὶ. On this sense of ἔχθρος I have treated at Rom. 5, 10.

28. δὲ ὠμός. This expression, from its extreme brevity, is susceptible of more than one mode of interpretation. By it (as observes Crellius) may be signified both the final, and the impulsive cause. (See his note.) Many modern Commentators, as Locke and Koppe, fix on the latter; viz. “for your good and advantage.” So supra ver. 11. Others, and amongst these Crellius, prefer the former. But

* And this is adopted by most ancient and modern Interpreters. But, as Doddridge rightly observes, “though the most natural sense of these words, were they considered alone, might seem that the calling the Gentiles prejudiced the Jews against the Gospel; yet, as they generally rejected it before the Gentiles were called, the other signification appears preferable.”
I see no reason why both interpretations may not be received. I would moreover observe (what seems to have struck none of the Editors or Critics) that a comma should be placed after ἐξὸν; since the word must be taken twice. The sense, then, is: "they are indeed enemies: but they are enemies for your sakes, and advantage.

28. κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν, ἀγαπητοὶ δ. τ. π., "but in respect of their election, as the posterity of a nation generally chosen by God for his peculiar people, in that view they are beloved." Then the Apostle adds, by way of explanation, διὰ τῶν πατέρας, i.e. on account of, and in respect of the love which God bore to their forefathers.* "Thus the Apostle (observes Carpzov) means to hint, that the rejection is not so irreversible as to exclude all hope of their return to favour; and that there is no doubt but these may also be saved, if they only imitate the faith of their forefathers."†

* This subject is more than once treated of by Philo, from whom Carpzov cites the following passage, 797 B. To δ' αἵτων, αἱ τῶν ἄρχητερῶν τοῦ ἐθνὸς περιμάχητοι δικαιοσύναι, καὶ ἄρεται, αἱ καθά-περ φυτὰ ἄδανατα διαμένουσιν, δειδαλέα καρπὸν φυτεύσαι τοῖς ἀπογόνοις σωτήροι, καὶ πρὸς πάντα ὑφέλιμοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ τῶν διαμαρτάνοντες ιάσμα ἀλλὰ μὴ παντελῶς ἀνιάματα & 937 B. Δευτέρως δὲ τῇ τῶν ἄρχητερῶν τοῦ ἐθνὸς διάφορη, δὶ ταῖς ἀφεμέναις σωματικῶν ψυχῶν ἄπλαστον καὶ γυμνῶν ἐνδεκανύμενον πρὸς τὸν ἀραντὰ βερατεῖαν, τῶν υπὲρ νιῶν καὶ θυγατέρων ἱκετείας οὐκ ἄτελες εἰσώθαι ποιεῖσθαι, γέρας αὐτοῖς πρέχοντος τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ ἐπίκοιν ἐν εὐχαῖς.

† The whole passage is thus ably paraphrased by Weitstein: "Quod attinet ad Evangelium, cùm illud et ipsi rejeicient, et vos prædicari agerrimè ferunt, sunt inimici Dei, ab eo merito rejecti, ut vos in eorum locum substituamini: quod autem attinet ad electionem, quia Abrahamus primo vocatus et electus est, postea cum totâ et solâ natione fœdus initum est, addìta promissione de Messiâ mittendo negari non potest, Deum nationi huic singulariter favisse, et iterum fæctorum, si posteri mores majorum fuerint imitati." 2 Sam. 9, 7.

"This election (Taylor and Rosenm. observe) is the same with that mentioned in 9, 11. 11, 5. therefore the unbelieving Jews were not so cast off, as to be entirely deprived of the favour of God, agreeably to what he had long before declared, Lev. 26, 44 & 45. Deut. 4, 31. Jer. 30, 11. And this clearly shows the nature of that election, concerning which the Apostle discourses in 9, 10, 11." Whitby, however, observes, that in this Chapter there is mention of a double election. 1. ἐκλογὴ χάριτος, ver. 5 & 7., the Gospel elec-
29. ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. These words assign the reason why the Israelites even yet, on their ancestors' account, cease not to be beloved: and this is founded on the constancy of the Divine will, that decrees nothing of which the Deity can ever repent. (Koppe.)

Χαρίσματα signifies Divine benefits of every kind: and ἐκλογὴ is added, suitably to the present subject, and respects that calling and election by which the Israelites constituted the peculiar people of God. These χαρίσματα bestowed by God on Abraham and his seed, are said to be ἀμεταμέλητα, i.e. not to be repented of by him,* and, consequently, certain and

tion. 2. ἐκλογὴ διὰ τοῦτο παρέας, “an election for their fathers’ sake,” in which sense the whole nation of the Jews were styled the elect. Deut. 4. 27. 7, 6—8. 9, 5, 10, 14, 15. Gen. 17, 7.

* This word (though unaccompanied by authorities in most Lexicons) is frequent in the Classical writers; and signifies, like other verbs in τοῖς, either what is not repented of, or what cannot be repented of. Examples are adduced by Wets. from Plato, Aristot. 831 π., Polyb. Leg. 22., Aristot. Nic. 9, 4., Lucian Abl. 11., Dionys. Hal. L. 2. αὕτη γὰρ εἰσὶ βέβαιοι καὶ ἁλθεῖς τιμαί καὶ ἄναφαρετοί, χαρίεις τε καὶ ἀμεταμέλητος & Porphyri. 5. Pythag. p. 40. τὴν δ' ἐπὶ καλοίς καὶ δίκαιοι [ἡδονής]—καὶ παραχρῆμα ἤδειαν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐπὶν ἀμεταμέλητον. To which may be added 2 Cor. 7, 10.

It is well remarked by T. Edwards ap. Mant., that the gifts and calling of God are ἀμεταμέλητα, because promises of this kind are founded upon such grounds as cannot be altered; even upon the original fixed and permanent designs, intentions, and constitution of an all-wise Providence in the government of the world through successive ages, of which they are partial declarations or revelations."

On the sentiment, Elsner cites the following Classical passages. Plutarch 2, 551. οἷος ἄοιδος μεγάλας πράγματος οὐδενός and Seneca L. 6. de Benef. C. 23. “Adllice nunc quod non externa cogunt Deos, sed sua illis in legem externa voluntas est; statuerunt quae non mutaret; itaque non possunt videri facturi alicuius, quamvis nolint; quia quidquid desinere non possunt, perseverare voluerunt; nec igitur primi consiliis Deos posset. Sine dubio stare illis et descendere in contrarium non licet: sed non ide, quia quae illos in proposito tenet, ex imbecillitate permanent, sed quia non licet ab optimis aberrare, et sic ire decretum est.” Wolf, too, cites from Homer: Ο疱 γὰρ ἐμὸν παλινάγγειν, οὐδ' ἄκατηλον, Οὐδ' ἀπέλευνην, ὥστε κεν κεφαλῇ κατανύσασθαι. And Max. Tygr. Diss. 29. μετατίθεσθαι γὰρ καὶ μεταγνώσκειν προσφέρει μὴ ὅτι θεύ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀνδρὶ ἄγαθῷ. And Grothius refers for a similar sentiment to Maimonid, de Poenit. C. 7, § 5.

After quoting the above passages, Elsner throws out the following.
immutable; but which (as is plainly hinted) may be restored on repentance, and faith in the Messiah. It is quite evident (Mr. Turner very properly remarks) that this text has no bearing on the doctrine of the indefectibility of grace. The state of the Jewish people is a comment on its meaning.

30. The Apostle, now returning to his principal scope at ver. 26., namely, that there would be a time when all Israel should be saved, and on account of which the Apostle had said what precedes, now also keeps the same in view, and has reference thereto in the elegant comparison subjoined. (Crellius.)

Neither the construction nor the sense of the words is very clear, both being cast in the Jewish mould. Koppe renders: "That they are yet unbelieving, does not prove that they are condemned to eternal reprobation, for this mode of reasoning is refuted by the example of the Gentile Christians, themselves formerly unbelieving." By ὑμεῖς is evidently meant "you Gentile Christians." And ἐπειθήσατε must refer not only to unbelief as disobedience, but to neglect of worshipping the true God, and going after idols. So Macknight: "The disobedience of the Gentiles consisted in their losing the knowledge and worship of the true God, and in their worshipping idols, notwithstanding the true God made himself known to them, in every age, by his works of creation and providence. Rom. 1, 20."

30. ἔλεγθη, i.e. "have been mercifully and graciously introduced into God's church and covenant." It is rightly observed by Koppe, that ἡλ. is here used to indicate that salvation is not of human merit, but of Divine grace. (See also Mackn.) At

caustic animadversion: "Multa sanius de Dei sapientia majestateque judicaverunt Gentes Evangelii Luce carentes, quam qui Christiani vocari amant Sociniani, Remonstrantes, et Pelagiani omnes." A far more Christian spirit dictated the remark of Doddridge, that these testimonies of Pagan authors, relating to the divine perfections, might have taught some of our divines to speak more honourably of them than they do in some of their writings."
Romans, Chap. XI.

τῷ τῶν ἀξιοθείς must be understood ἐκ, which will here have the force of ἐκ, by, on occasion of. Mr. Locke renders: "through the standing out of the Jews who submit not to the Gospel. And so Schoettg.: "Incredulitas Judæorum in causâ fuit, ut Deus, qui summè bonus est, et homines beatae vitæ consortes esse cupit, gentes interea, nolentiibus Judæis, vocaret." To this mode of interpretation, however, Taylor, not without reason, objects; arguing that the rejection of the Jews was by no means indispensable to the admission of the Gentiles; that when the promise was made to Abraham, the calling of the Gentiles was not a secondary design, to take effect in case the Jews rejected the Gospel, but an absolute purpose to be accomplished, whether the Jews complied or refused." And so Macknight: "The Apostle does not mean that the Gentiles would not have been admitted into the covenant and church of God, by having the Gospel preached to them, if the whole Jewish nation had embraced the Gospel. The title of the Gentiles to all the blessings of the covenant with Abraham, was established by the covenant itself. But his meaning is, that considering the disposition of the Jews, their disobedience and rejection, and the consequent demolition of their church, in order to the erection of the church of God on a more enlarged plan, was necessary to the admission of the Gentiles into the covenant and church of God." Perhaps, however; it may be better not to aim at diving too far into the counsels of God. Nor is it necessary, since ἐκ cannot well signify more than "on occasion of," at though (to use the words of Mr. Slade) it is not the less true that their infidelity and rejection were known in the counsels of God, before the Gentiles were originally called.

S1. οὕτω καὶ οὕτως — ἔλεγον. On the punctuation and, as depending thereon, the sense of this

* And this is all the force that Chrysost. ascribed to it.
passage, Commentators are not agreed. Many place a comma after ἐλέει, rendering: "So have they now disbelieved and rejected the mercy vouchsafed to you, so as finally to obtain mercy themselves." And this seems sufficiently agreeable to the order of the words: but not so to the antithetical verse, which requires that the comma should be put after ἔνειθησαν, and, by an Hyperbaton, (a figure usual to our Apostle) the words ἔπετέρω ἐλέει be taken with ἔλεη-θωσι. Indeed, propriety of language demands this: for ἔνειθησαν does not admit τῷ ἔπετέρω ἐλέει, but requires the repetition of τῷ Ὁσρ preceding. Thus the clause ἵνα ἔλεθωσιν τῷ ἔπετέρω ἐλέει will exactly correspond to the antithetical one ἔλεαθτι τῇ τούτων ἀπειθεὶα: only ἔνειθησαν (which has here the present sense united with the past) must be interpreted suitably to the case, and be understood simply of disobedience, and refusal to receive Jesus as the Messiah.

Ἔσι here also means "on occasion of;" but includes a notion of the Jews being thereby the more excited to seek and obtain salvation. And this circumstance is touched on by Chrysost. (who adopts, together with many eminent modern Commentators, the foregoing punctuation and interpretation) thus: ἔσαθησε ὡστε αὐτοῦ ἐπιστάσασθαι τῷ ἧλιῳ μενόντας. See his excellent exposition of the whole.

The ἵνα (as Theodoret and many of the best modern Commentators have seen) has here the eventual force, which Theodoret calls a popular idiom. Thus Koppe: "cujus incredulitas is tandem erit exitus, ut et ipsi serventur." If the common interpretation be retained, the words will (he thinks) admit the following sense: ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸν ὡκ εξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι (ἐν ἐλέει) σωθῶσι. But this seems exceedingly harsh. The idea involved in ἐλέει is not less forcible on the former interpretation: for ἐλέει was doubtless intended again to remind them that salvation, even in those who ever so readily or obediently observed the call of God, was through mercy, or by grace and favour.
Whitby (ap. D'Oyley) thus paraphrases: "That they also may obtain mercy together with you, and you with them, the fulness of the Gentiles coming in with their conversion." The argument (he observes) for the calling of the Jews, runs thus: "If God hath called the Gentiles to His grace, after long idolatry and infidelity, though they were never before admitted to those privileges which the Jews enjoyed, nor had God promised to be their God for ever, much more will He withdraw His chosen people from their infidelity."

32. συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πάντως εἰς ἀπελθείαν. These words are susceptible of two interpretations, almost equally founded in probability. The ancient Commentators, as Chrysost., Photius, &c.; and some modern ones, as Glass, Zeger, Pâræus, Carpzov, and Wets., render: "hath convicted all of sin, hath proved that they are under sin, namely by his law (as Rom. 3, 19, 20 & 24. 3, 9. προστιμαζόμεθα γὰρ Ἰσαακοὺς τε καὶ Ἐλληνας πάντας ἵνα ἀμαρτίαν είναι) and their merits to be none at all." So Gal. 3, 22. συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή τὰ πάντα ὕπλ ἀμαρτίας, ἵνα ἐπαγγελεῖ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὸ τοῖς πιστεύοντες. This interpretation being adopted, we must suppose the word συγκλείω to be used after the Latin idiom, and in an unauthorized sense. Other Commentators, however, as Piscat., E. V., and most recent ones, interpret: "has concluded or shut up all to disobedience, and sin subjected them to its control." For (as Mr. Turner observes) "to shut up one thing under another, or to another, is to subject it to the control of that other. (See Raphel 2, 440—444.) This must, of course, be understood of God's permitting them to be subject to sin. (See Crellius.) According to this interpretation, at the passage of Gal. 3, 22., by συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφή must be understood: "has declared all (nations) to be subject to sin." And, upon the whole, this latter mode of interpretation seems to be the safer. As to the former, it is quite unsupported by Classical use. The Greek
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writers say, συνκλείειν εν τινι; here, too, εἰς ἀπεθανατον is for ἐν ἀπεθανατον. Thus Polyb. very frequently uses the expression συνκλείειν εἰς των or τι. (See Schweigh Lex. Polyb.) And so Dionys. Hal. 598, 92. Arrian E. A. 1, 3, 5. 1, 416. And as to the parallel passage at Galat. 3, 22. there the υἱο may very well be supposed put for εἰς: whereas εἰς cannot here well be taken in the sense of; nor is any example produced of such a signification.

As to the interpretations proposed by Locke and Mackn., they are contrary to the usage of the language, and utterly inadmissible.

It is plain that by πάντας are meant all men, all nations;* as in the parallel passage of Galat.

* The unbelief charged nationally on the Jews and Gentiles in their turn, in this and the two preceding verses, whereby they ceased to be the people of God, was evidently the disowning of his dominion; by which means they put themselves out of his kingdom, and so were no longer in the state of subjects, but aliens and rebels. And the mercy here spoken of, is their being undeservedly brought to the kingdom of God.—This, again, has nothing to do with the final acceptance of particular persons. (Taylor.) Yet it may be applied to individuals, mutatis mutandis. And, moreover, as is well remarked by Doddrt., “it is of great importance to bear in mind that this refers to different periods. First, God suffered the Gentiles, in the early ages of the world, to revolt, and then took the Abrahamic family as a peculiar seed to himself, and bestowed extraordinary favours upon them. Afterwards, he permitted them, by unbelief and disobedience, to fall, and took in the Gentiles on their believing; and he did even this with an intent to make that very mercy to the Gentiles a means of provoking the Jews to jealousy, and so bring them to faith by that which had at first been an offence in the way to it. This was truly a mystery in the Divine conduct, which the Apostle most rationally, as well as respectfully, adores, in the concluding words of the Chapter.”

For the following sensible and edifying reflections I am indebted to Reland, Antiq. Judaic. p. 2. C. 4. §. 11. (as translated by Bulkeley.) “To be concluded under sin is of no trifling import. It comprehends the guilt, the fears, the judgment, and the punishment of sin; as if he should say, “all are guilty; all shall be obnoxious to the judgment of God, to death, and afflictions.” Under these afflictions, that consolation which is here conveyed is to be particularly regarded. The Apostle instructs us, with respect to the cause and issue of these afflictions, that we are subjected to these evils on account of sin, but not that we should perish. He
33—36. Filled (especially by what has just preceded) with a most lively sense of human unworthiness and the Divine benignity, the Apostle now lauds and extols the wisdom and goodness of God, and that with such power of oratory, that no one possessed of any sense of sublimity and grandeur will hesitate to rank it among the noblest and most eloquent passages respecting the Deity to be found in the whole range of antiquity. (Koppe.)

33. ὁ βάθος, &c. There is something poetically and almost lyrically bold in the expression ὁ βάθος πλούτου. Koppe takes the β. τ. to denote "deep, unfathomable riches;" as Ps. 139, 6. Eph. 3, 8. And βάθος, he observes, is equivalent to ἄβουσσος; as 1 Cor. 2, 10. 2 Cor. 8, 2. Ap. 2, 24. There is so much the greater propriety in the epithet, since βάθος was commonly used, by the Classical writers, of whatever is great in general.* Carpzov here aptly compares Philo 486. Ὡ άφθονος αἰ σαὶ Χάριτες καὶ εὐεργεσίαι & 425. Ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφία, ὁ μέγας αἰς ἄλη-
adds, therefore, the manner of deliverance; and mercy is freely promised that consolation may be sure. This declaration will appear perspicuous and sweet when we apply it; when, in our fears and afflictions, we perceive that it belongs to us, and we shall feel ourselves supported by this promise of mercy. It is, therefore, an useful declaration, and we should have recourse to it in all afflictions; for it advises us of their final cause, and of free mercy. The term, expressive of universality, is to be noticed, that we may know that the promise is universal, and that each of us is really included in it."

* To this purpose Wets., among other citations, has the following Schol. on Hom. Od. 8. 385. κατὰ βάθους τῆς διανοίας ἐβουλεύοντο. Ἀρεχυλ. S. C. Th. 545. Βαθείαν ἄλοκα διὰ φρενός καρποῦμενος, ἐξ ἡ τὰ κεδνὰ βλάστανει βουλεύματα, Plato 134. βάθος γενναῖον (as in Homer). Plut. 1, 327: φρόνημα καὶ βάθος ψυχῆς. Themist. 134. βάθος διανοίας. Ἕλιαν V. H. 318. πλούτῳ βαθεῖ. So also Eurip. ap. Polyb. 12, 14. βαθυπλοῦσα εἰρήνη. Nonnus Dion. 1. βαθυ-
πλοῦτων παρακολῆγ. Ἀρεχυλ. Per. 471. Ed. Blomf. Ξέρεις ὅ τ' ἀγω-
μαχεῖν κακῶν ὅρων βάθως where the learned Editor compares 718. ἴνα τέ σε ἔλθῃ θανάτου, πρὶν κακῶν ἱδεῖν βάθος, and remarks: "Græci, cum alicujus rei abundantia esset, seu rerum secundarum sive adversarum, sive annorum, hac metaphorâ utebantur. Dice-
bant igitur βάθος πλούτου, βάθος λειμῶν, βαθὺ γῆς, βάθος κακῶν, βαθεία εἰρήνη."
ὅσις ποταμὸς, χαρᾶς καὶ εὐφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν πλημμυρών. I would compare a sentiment of the same cast, and similarly expressed, in Philo, p. 68 Λ. ἀδυνατοῦμεν δὲ πλούτον Θεοῦ ἀναμετρήσαι.

In speaking of the σοφία and γνῶσις Θεοῦ, the Apostle (as Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators observe) especially adverts to the wisdom of God’s economy with respect to national salvation, i.e. (as Hardy expresses it) “quâ cujusque gentis ingenia, propensiones, et mores clarissimè perspicit, ut dispensus quid cuique genti et temporì conveniat.” See also Rosenm.

33. ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα—ιδοι αὐτοί, “how unsearchable are his decrees and measures, both for good and for evil,” or “the whole governance of his providence, as exercised towards his creatures.” By the κρίματα, Grotius and most Commentators understand the governance of God’s providence; and by the ιδοι, the ways by which his plans are carried into effect. So Eurip. Hec. 743. (cited by Wets.) οὕτως πέφυκα μάντις, ὥστε μὴ κλύειν εξιστορήσαι σῶν ἰδῶν βουλευμάτων. Compare Ps. 119, 91, 92, 1. Is. 40, 13 & 14. Here Grotius cites Origen contr. Cels. Εἰσὶ γὰρ τινες εἰρμοί καὶ ἀκολουθίαι ἀφατοί καὶ ἀνεκδιήγητοι περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνες ψυχὰς διαφόρου οἰκονομίας. Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators carefully confine this sentiment to what has just been said, namely, of the Divine economy respecting the salvation of the Gentiles, and the final, but perhaps gradual, conversion of the Jews.

The epithets ἀνεξερεύνητα and ἀνεξιχνιαστοι are nearly synonymous, and form a parallelism: though the ratio metaphoræ differs; and the Commentators variously exercise their ingenuity. (See Turner.) The former word is used by Aquila and Symmachus; the latter, by the Sept. at Job. 5, 9, 9, 10., and in the Apocrypha. Here Wets. compares a passage of Schemoth Rabba 6. “Non perscrutatus est judicia mea, neque interrogavit me, quale esset
nomen meum; quod tu fecisti." Here I would compare a similar exclamation in Eurip. Hel. 717. ὤ δεις ὃς ἔφη τι ποιήλαν καὶ δυστέκμαστον.  
34, 35. τίς γὰρ ἐγκα νῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς, &c. Wets. (after Theodoret) paraphrases thus: "Quis novit scientiam Dei? quis consilium dedit sapientissimo? quis munera Optimo Maximo?" marking the distinction in ver. 31. between πλούτος, σοφία, and γνώσις. In this view of the sense, however, there seems something fanciful and precarious. The sentiment is more satisfactorily expressed by Koppe: "Providentia divina nec ingenio humano penetrari, nec consilii humanis adjuvandi, nec propria quadem hominis dignitate invitò numine fecti potest." It is thus elegantly paraphrased by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) 115 med. Μόνος αὐτὸς οἶδε τὰ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἔτερος. Σόφος δὲ ἀν, οὐ παρ' ἄτερον συμβούλου ἐσοφίζῃ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐσώ- τῳ αὐτάρκης ἐγένετο καὶ ἔστιν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀρχῶν πηγὴ ἔστι, καὶ ὅσα διδάσκω, οὐχ ἀμφιθνρ πειθῶν διδασκῶν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν οὐκείαν ἀγαθότητα. Ἐσ' ἔρχον αὐτῷ, τουτέστι, τῷ Θεῷ, ιδαν ἀνταποδοθησθήσεται αὐτῷ; τουτέστιν, ιδαν ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐεργεσία, αἰς ἀνταπόδομα λογισθεί πρὸς αὐτὸν γινόμενον;  
There seems no doubt but the Apostle has formed the passage from Is. 40, 13 & 14. Very similar, too, are Ἐπ. 9, 17. Sir. 18, 2-5., all which I leave to be examined by the student. Koppe compares Solon Frag. ver. 149. πάντη δ' ἀδικάτων ἀφανής νῦν ἀνθρω- ποιών. And I would adduce a similar passage of Lucian 1, 758, 40. οἱ δὲ ἐτὶ βλέποντες, καὶ πάνω ἐξερ- κεῖσθαι, τί ἄν δύνασθι συνειδῆν τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀπὸ γε τῆς ἐξαθέν ταύτης περιβολῆς.  
Locke and Hardy judiciously remark that this emphatical conclusion seems in a special manner to regard the Jews, whom the Apostle would hereby teach modesty, and submission to the over-ruling hand of the all-wise God, whom they are very unfit to call to account for his dealing so favourably with the Gentiles. His wisdom and his ways are infinitely
above their comprehension, and will they take upon themselves to advise him what to do? Or, is God in their debt? Let them say for what, and he shall repay it to them."

35. τίς πρεσβύτερον αὐτῶ, καὶ ἐ. ἀ. Grot. observes, that the sentiment is the same as at Matt. 20, 14. "Take that thine is, and go thy way." And he paraphrases thus: "Si cui rationes Divinæ dispensationis, a me hactenus allatæ, non satisfaciunt, cogitet non de redendâ gratiâ, sed de beneficio dando hic agit: beneficii autem sui quemque oportet esse arbitrum." Jaspis thus: "An Judæi primo loco de Deo bene meritâ sunt, ut eum quasi cogere possent ad beneficia ipsis tribuendâ? Ad Deum omnia omnino sic redeunt, ipso ordinante et efficiente, ut, quod ipse velit, tandem certissimè eveniat." Koppe compares a similar sentiment in Job 41, 3.

36. δὲ εἰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν τὰ πάντα. Koppe thinks there is no reason to anxiously discriminate between these phrases, which are (he observes) accumulated, from vehement emotion, and carry only this general sentiment, that all things depend upon Him. But I cannot agree with the learned Commentator. Nothing seems more unworthy of a sacred Critic and Philologist, not to say a reverent Theologian, than wrapping up things in this summary way, except in cases which admit not of certain determination: but this is not one of them. The clauses may very well be distinguished; and are satisfactorily explained by Theophylact as follows; Αὕτως ἡ πηγὴ πάντων, καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς πάντων, καὶ ὁ σωκευός πάντων. Πάντα γὰρ εἰς αὐτοῦ ἔχει τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν, ὡσπερ εἰς θεμέλιον τινα βεβηκότα ἵσταναι καὶ συνέχονται ἐπεστραμμένα πρὸς αὐτῶν. I would, then, paraphrase thus: From Him, as their original creator, all things are derived: through Him, as their continual preserver and constant conductor, all things consist and subsist; and to Him, as their ultimate end, all
things and all actions tend, so as to contribute to his praise and glory, illustrate his perfections, and finally accomplish his wise and benevolent purposes.*

CHAP. XII.

Now, as connected with the doctrinal, comes the
paraenetical and practical part of this Chapter, which
Theodoret introduces with the following fine
remarks. "On επερ έστιν δορθαλμός εν σώματι, τούτο τῇ συχτῇ
πίστις, καὶ τῶν θείων καὶ γνώσεις. δεῖται δὲ ομος αὐτῇ τῇ
πρακτικῇ ἀρετῇ, καθάπερ ὁ δορθαλμός χειρίων, καὶ ποδῶν,
καὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν μορίων τοῦ σώματος τούτου δὲ χάριν ὁ
θεῖος ἀπόστολος τῶν δογματικῶν λόγως καὶ τῷ θείῳ

* On the first two clauses there can be no doubt. The second is
confirmed by Acts 17, 28. "In Him we live, move, and have our
being;" and Heb. 1, 3. "upholding all things by the word of his
power:" and both of them by Aristot. de Mundo 6. (cited by Wets.),
who mentions it as an old adage of all nations; ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ τὰ
πάντα, καὶ διὰ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν συνεστηκεν, consist, subsist. As to the
third clause, it is less easy of determination. (See the Commentators.) The above explanation of it, however, is confirmed by Op-
plan Hal. 1, 409. (cited by Wets.) Zeu μάκαρ, ἐς δὲ σε πάντα καὶ ἐκ
σέβεν ἐφισιζοντα, where I would read ἐφισιζωαί. (See 1 Cor. 8, 6.),
and Marc. Anton. 14, 23. τὴ φύσις, ἐς σοῦ πάντα, ἐν οὐ πάντα, εἰς
σε πάντα, which passage is so strongly similar, that I suspect the
philosopher derived it from the Apostle: and surely a much greater
writer than he might have been pardoned for appropriating it, and
any writer, however eminent, might have been proud of it. The
trifling verbal variation may, I think, be accounted for from some
variety of reading in the MS. which the above mentioned author
used. Nay in the Vulgate we have in ipso, i.e. the εν σοι: though in the
third clause. Indeed the words seem to have been tampered
with by some one who was perplexed with the εἰς σε.

Groitus, in reference to the three links of this glorious chain, cites
Theocr. Idyl. (speaking of Ptolemy), "Ανδρίν δὲ ἀπ Πολεμαίου ἔνι
πρώτοις λεγέσθω, καὶ πάματος, καὶ μέσσος, which passage, I con-
jecture, was in the mind of Milton when he wrote the noble line :

"Him first, Him last, Him midst, and without end."

I see no reason, with Grotius and Wets., to limit this last verse to
the dispensations of God just treated of. It is, I conceive, meant to
be general. So Theodoret 128 ult. δ' (speaking of St. Paul) διὰ
τῶν Ἠμοίων πάσιν ἀγγέλων τῆν ὀφελείαν προσήγαγεν.
And of it Ammon says: "Vereor, ut brevius simulque rectius
delineari quae omnis theologie summa."
This, as Carpzov observes, treats of the moral and practical duties of justified Christians, and is rightly considered as the compendium and synopsis of moral theology. “It extends (continues he) up to 15—13., and consists of three sections. The first inculcates the general duties of Christianity, which respect all Christians, of whatever rank or degree, station or dignity. (C. 12.) Section 2. treats of political or social duties, such as are to be observed by Christians with respect to their superiors, their equals, and themselves. (Ch. 13.) Section 3. treats of private duties, economical and ceremonial, such as are to be attended to by Christians in their social intercourse with each other, especially towards those who have not hitherto been convinced, but are as yet weak in the faith.” (Ch. 14—15—13.)

The whole Chapter is said, by Grotius, to be Isocratean, in the ἰσόκωλα and antithesis.

1. παρακαλῶ σὺν ύμᾶς, &c. The Apostle now exhortst them to lead a life worthy of such Divine benefits, i.e. consecrated and dedicated to God, &c. This seems to be hinted at by the σὺν, which Wets. thus paraphrases: “Quia Deus ita vobis favit, et morte dignos ad spem vitæ æternæ revocavit, obscro vos per Dei misericordiam.” It is well observed by T. Edwards, that “the Apostle, having concluded his argument, proceeds, according to his usual method in all his Epistles, to draw an inference of exhortation from what he had before said, in order to persuade men to the practice of virtue and righteousness; and because the finishing point, in which his argument terminates, is the observation that all the great dispensations of Providence are, with unsearchable wisdom, designed finally to issue in events of mercy, it is therefore with great eloquence of affection that he lays the stress of his exhortation upon that particular motive.”

1. Διὰ τῶν ὁικτερῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ. I cannot, with Ori-
gen, see any emphasis in the plural. It rather seems to be a Hebraism founded on מִלְתָּן in the Old Testament, (see Gesen. Heb. Lex.) and (as Koppe observes) is equivalent to εἰλέος and χάρις. Compare 2 Cor. 1, 3. Phil. 2, 1. Col. 3, 12. Heb. 10, 28. Thus it is rendered in the Vulg. misericordiam

1. παραστήσαι τὰ σῶματα ύμῶν — Θεῷ, “that you consecrate your bodies to God.” Beza, Bos, Elsner, Alberti, and others, think there is here a sacrificial metaphor,* alluding to ceremontial observances. Theophyl., however, recognizes a military one. Παραστήσαι is here used for προσφέρειν, and corresponds to the Heb. מָנָא in Levit., and often elsewhere. See Gesen. Lex. Heb. Τὰ σῶματα (as is rightly observed by Beza and Koppe) is for ύμᾶς αὐτῶς† (as 6, 13. and James 3, 6. ἔλον τὰ σῶμα for ἔλον τῶν ἄνθρωπων), in accommodation to the preceding metaphor from sacrifices.‡ On the same principle Koppe


† So Schoettgen. “By a Hebraism (of which I have given examples in the note on 8, 27.), this signifies vosmet ipsum, yourselves. For God requires the service not so much of the body as of the soul.”

‡ Here the Commentators, as Elsner and Wets., compare the following passages. Isocrat. ad Nicoclem. ἥγος δὲ τούτο ελεῖν όμοι πάλαισθαι, καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην εἶναι όλην βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιότατον σεαυτὸν παρέχει. Hierocles. οἶδε τιμᾶν θεὸν ἐν προσφυγμένοις εἰρέοις ἑαυτὸν προσάγων. Porphyry. L. 2. § 45. de Abstinentia, p. 88., who calls the wise man externally and internally pure, ἄνδρα ἱεροῦν τῷ νοερῷ θεῷ, καὶ μετὰ λευκῆς εσθήτῃ καὶ καθαράς τῷ ὁμί τῇ ψυχῆς ἀπαθεῖς καὶ τῇ κοινότητι τὸν σώματος προσομοντα τῷ Θεῷ, οὐκ ἄλλοτέρων καὶ ὁδεινῶν χυμῶν καὶ παθῶν ψυχικῶν βεβαιμένον. Philo, p. 538 v. Bulkley, too, cites Hierocles in Aur. Carm. p. 24., who describes the good man as bringing or presenting himself; in the first place, a sacrifice and an offering unto God, and forming his soul into a divine image, and his mind into a temple fitted for the reception of the divine light. “For what other sacrifice (says he) canst thou bring, or what other image or form so congruous to deity, as that which the mental or rational nature, refined and purified, necessarily must be.”

I omit many passages from Philo and Josephus, and the Rabbinical writers, to the same purpose, cited by Carpzov, Wolf, and Deyling Obs. Sacr. T. 3, 318.
accounts for the following terms θυσίαν θῶσαν, ἀγιαν, εὐάρεστον τ. Θ., all of which appear to have been sacrificial terms. Thus, for instance (as Koppe observes), ἀγιας and εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ were common to all sacrifices. Ζῶσα, most Commentators think, is said in opposition to the common sacrifices, which were slain previous to being offered; q. d. "offer up, not slain animals (see Levit. 16, 10 & 20.), but a living sacrifice,* namely, yourselves." This, however, seems scarcely satisfactory. I prefer, with Photius and Jaspis, to suppose that it means the moral, i. e. tropical and spiritual sacrifice of the Gospel, in opposition to the corporeal and ceremonial ones enjoined by the Mosaic Law. Compare 1 Cor. 6, 20. Rom. 6, 3, 4, 6, 8 & 13.

Θυσία is obviously the Hebrew הָלִיךְ, or victim. Now this is ordered to be ἀγια: which term answers to the Heb. אָלֶל, ἀμανος, without spot, as was prescribed by the Law. The word following, εὐάρεστος, is exegetical of the preceding, and must not be taken with παραστ., as Estius and Koppe direct (which would cause a needless hyperbaton, and cripple the sense), but with Θεῷ; as the ancient and most modern Commentators take it. So Theophyl.

* So Carpzov, who subjoins the following exposition: " Θυσία Ζῶσα, hostia vivens, est oblatio ac sacrificium Novi Testamenti, non, ut in Veteri illo, cruentum, igne cremandum, mortete efficiendum; sed tale, quum intellectus, voluntatis, sensuum, ac membrorum corporis vita ex Deo in Christi sit, Rom. 6, 11, 13.: per Spiritum Sanctum, qui vivificat, excitata, Rom. 8, 5 & 6. Joh. 6, 63.: et, post abolitam mortem peccatorum, perpetuo sanctimoniae exercitatio consecrata. Rom. 6, 11 & 22. Judæis prohibitus erat, θανατομορτινία in sacrificium offerre. Multo minus Christianis offere licet sacrificium mortuum et cadaverosum."

This interpretation, too, is supported by Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators. Thus Theodoret: " The Apostle had before exhorted them to yield their members as instruments of righteousness, and to render themselves to God as those that were alive, from being dead; he now proceeds to exhort them to offer up a sacrifice of these, and a living sacrifice, i.e. not that their bodies should be slain, but be dead unto sin, i.e. no longer admitting its operation." So also Theophyl., who adds: "For when we mortify these, we live in the spirit." See also Photius ap. Æcumen.
"For the Jewish sacrifices were not altogether pleasing to God, "who has required these (says he) at your hands? but with these God is well pleased." Grotius compares Phil. 4, 18., and the Heb. הָדוּדְךָ הָדוּדִי, οὐκ ἐμνῄσκατε τῷ Θεῷ, Lev. 1, 9. 18, 17.*

1. τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν. On the construction and sense of these words Commentators are not quite agreed. Erasmus, Tolet, and Crellius, regard them as put in apposition with the preceding: so as either (if we have in view the grammatical construction) to cohere with the preceding accusatives, or (if the sense itself), to connect with the verb παραστῆσαι and the following; the clause assigning a reason; q.d. "for this is your reasonable service." And they refer to Eph. 5, 2. 1 Tim. 2, 6. Others, as De Dieu and Koppe, endeavour to remove this harshness, (which, however, is a common idiom in all languages) by taking λατρεία for the sacrifice. But this fails of effecting the purpose intended, and only embarrasses the plain sense of the words.

As to the λογικ., various are the senses assigned to it, which may be seen in Pole. The most obvious sense is that in which it is taken by Grotius, Schoettgen, Beza, Erasm., Zeger, Hammond, and many modern Interpreters, including Schleus. and Macknight, "with the mind and reason," mental and rational, "suitable to human reason and the Divine nature." There is (they think) here a reference to the irrational rites of Heathenism, and the merely corporeal ones of Judaism, whose service consisted

* Schoettgen, too, observes that this θυσία ἅγια and ἱβάπερτος is just such as is so often inculted in the sacrifices of the Old Testament: ותָּהוּדְךָ and חֵרֵדְךָ, by which are meant such things as are commanded by God, and esteemed pure by Him. "The Christian, therefore (continues he), ought to offer up unto God such works as are commanded by him, and which God himself accounts holy; otherwise our worship cannot please him. In this view, all those works devised by an αὐδαίρετος, or will-worship, are forbidden; though this sort of worship may to many wear the aspect of extreme sanctity."
trōn ἄλογον, of brute animals. "But we (Grot. paraphrases) offer a body in which the mind is compos rationis excellenissimae, and the actions are directed by reason." This, however, if I mistake not, is neither agreeable to Scripture, nor borne out by experience.* I therefore prefer the interpretation of Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, adopted also by Estius, Mede, Wets., Rosenm., Koppe, Deyling, Olearius, Dodwell, Carpzov, Jaspis, and others, viz. mystical, spiritual; as opposed to rites and ceremonies, which (as Wets. remarks) were observed even by those whose minds were unpurged. "Now the Apostle (says Jaspis) opposes to the external worship by sacrifices the internal and spiritual sacrifices." Carpzov. here cites a similar sentiment from that most spiritual Jew, Philo 850.

2. μὴ συγκριματισθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἄλλα μεταμφεσθε. These verbs must be taken in a reciprocal sense: "Do not conform, but transform yourselves." Some excellent MSS. have the verbs in the Infinitive; which reading is approved by Griesbach as being the more difficult. Both the terms here used are copiously illustrated by Wets. The former signifies to model oneself and one's manners after ano-

* Would that man were always compos rationis, and his actions under the guidance of reason! But, alas! not to mention the testimonies of Scripture, the language of our Evangelical Poet is, I fear, too true.

"Reasoning at every step he treads,
Man still mistakes his way;
While meaner things, whom instinct leads,
Are never known to stray."

The subject is learnedly illustrated from the Classical writers by Arndt. Misc. p. 102., and Amel. p. 542. Extracts from the former may be seen in Wolf's Cure. But as they only apply to the unfounded interpretation just mentioned, I shall omit them. See also Wolf and Carpzov, who rightly observe that this interpretation exactly squares with the opinions of Spinoza, the Naturalists and Anti-scripturarians (like the Rationalists of our days), who affirm that the principles of reason must be compounded with revealed Theology, and that Theology is to be built upon the double foundation of reason and revelation.
ther, imitate him; * and this force seems to rest in the σω.

By the αἰών is plainly meant the custom of the world; as κόσμος in 1 Joh. 2, 16.

2. μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τ. v. ἧ. Koppe regards this as a sort of Hendiadis for μεταμορφοῦσθε καὶ ἀνακαινώσθε κατὰ νῦν. To me the words appear to be exegetical, denoting in what manner, and to what degree, this change is to be effected, † namely, by putting on the new man, &c. Eph. 4, 24. See the notes of Whitby, Locke, &c. On μεταμορφ. Wets. aptly cites Seneca, Ep. 6. Sentio, non emendari me tantum, sed transfigurari.

2. εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν, &c. On the exact force of this phrase Commentators are not agreed. Crellius takes it to denote the terminus quo. The Greek Commentators suppose it to point out the beneficial effects resulting from this regeneration: Pæsus, "in what it consists." Cameron maintains, that the transformation is that habit of mind, of which the work is τὸ δοκιμάζειν. These interpretations are, however, not irreconcilable with each other, and may be united. The Apostle (I think) meant to point out by example the most remarkable effects of this regeneration: namely, τὸ δοκιμάζειν τι τὸ βέλημα τῶν Θεοῦ, which the best Commentators explain to


Wets. (almost all of whose examples bear the sense pretend) offers the following remarks: "Qui mores suos ad mores seculi corruptos conformat, non simulato sed verè malus est: sed poterat sibi ipsi talis non videri, ita ut excusatione hac uteretur, diceretque, se animam sanctum et honestum habere, licet, ut seculi moe est, vivereat ideo Paulus: nolite ait, similes esse seculo huic, ne fictæ quidem et simulato, ut multi dicunt. Talis simulatio cum verè pietate, cum internæ animi innovacione et transfiguratione convenire non potest."

† Meræμ. denotes a change (μεραδ) of the μορφη, or form, figure, disposition. On both the above terms see the excellent expositions of Theodoret and Photius ap. Ecumen.
prove, try, examine. Theophyl. διαγιγνώσκειν. So also Basil, Origen, and Hilary. Others take it to mean experience: and others again (as Mackn.), to approve. All these significations, indeed, are supported by good authority: but the first seems to be the most agreeable to the context: and it has this advantage, that it may include the rest. It is proper to observe, that this δοκιμάζειν must not be merely speculative, but practical. The τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ denotes what God would have men to do, including both belief and practice: and I assent to the Greek Commentators, and the most eminent of the modern ones, (as Paræus, Grotius, Schoettg., Locke, and Mackn.) that there is here an allusion to the comparative excellence of the revelations of God under the Law, and under the Gospel. Locke, indeed, thinks that these two first verses were meant to show the preference of the Gospel to the Gentile state and Jewish economy. In which view he paraphrases thus: “that you may, upon examination, find out what is the good, the acceptable, and perfect will of God, which now, under the Gospel, has shewn itself to be in purity and holiness of life: the ritual observances which he once instituted not being that his good, acceptable, and perfect will, which he always intended; they were made only the types and preparatory way to his more perfect state under the Gospel.” I would, however, put a comma after Θεοῦ ἀγαθῶν, and εἰλάφειτων, which will serve to clear the sense. Many Commentators, indeed, think there is no reference to the various revelations of God. And such is the opinion of Basil ap. Theophyl., who discusses the difference between the words; perhaps with more ingenuity than solidity or certainty. Yet I am inclined to think there is a climax intended: and such seems to have been the opinion of Wets., who thus paraphrases τέλειων. “Tunc perfecti eritis, et ex re ipsâ cognoscetis: Deum non postulare solum, ut quis domi bonus et pius sit, et non nisi ea vitia fugiat, quæ non sunt vitia seculi: sed ut sem-
per et ubique virtuti det operam, etiam contra mores seculi.” I certainly prefer this to the method adopted by Koppe, who wraps all up by treating these as synonymous terms.

3. λέγω γὰρ, &c. Now follows a more copious detail of particular Christian virtues, especially of those which the Apostle knew the Romans either greatly neglected, or paid too limited an attention to. Among these he most enlarges on humility, a virtue much neglected, especially by those who excelled in wisdom or ecclesiastical dignity, or had received certain spiritual gifts. (Koppe.) In this, however, there seems something too artificial, and systematical.

Γὰρ is taken by Koppe in the sense of exempli gratid. But as it stands at the commencement of the recensio of Christian duties now detailed, it may have what is called the inchoative force.

Δέιγμα has here the sense of ἐπιτάσσω, bid, tell, order; as in Matt. 23, 3. So Schoettg., who explains it jubeo.

3. διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοξῆς μου. Most modern Commentators explain this: “by virtue of my Apostolical office and authority; metonymy of cause for effect. (See Grot. and Crel.)* But this seems too limited and formal an interpretation. The Greek Commentators, on the other hand, take it to mean the Holy Spirit: which is certainly coming nearer the truth: for after δοξῆς ought, I think, with Photius, to be supplied Θεοῦ from the preceding. And this will confine χάριτος to the sense of an inspired or supernatural faculty graciously imparted by God; and which, in St. Paul’s case, would be the highest measure of inspiration. (See Mackn.) This is more usually termed χάρισμα;

as in ver. 6, (which sufficiently supports this interpretation) ἔχοντες δὲ χαρισμάτα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τῆς δοθείσας ἡμῖν διάφορα. So Theophyl. 118. Οὐκ ἔμοι λόγον λέγω, φησίν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄπο τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐνεπνευσμένος μοι. Dr. Mackn., too (very properly), interprets this χάρισμα “the grace of Apostleship, the gift of inspiration.” And Koppe, after much discussion, comes to nearly the same conclusion. Compare 1 Cor. 1, 4, 3, 10. Gal. 2, 9.

3. παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν. This may possibly be an Hellenistical and idiotsical expression for ἐκαστὸ ὑμῶν; as Eph. 1. 1. τοῖς ἀγίοις τοῖς ὑσίν ἐν Ἐφεσῷ. The Commentators also compare 1, 7, 7, 23, 16, 11. 1 Cor. 1, 2, 2 Cor. 1, 1. Yet it seems to have more emphasis than the other expression, and seems to imply every individual of you all, of whatever station or dignity. So Theophyl.: καὶ ἴδιοτὰ καὶ ἄρχοντι. Koppe would take it for τῷ ὄντι τί, i.e. τῷ δοκοῦντι τί; as 1 Cor. 1, 28. But this is quite inadmissible; since τί would thus be too emphatical a word to admit of being left to be understood: neither is it required by the sense.

3. μὴ ὑπερφοροῦνει παρ᾽ ὃ δεῖ φοροῦνει. It is not necessary (with Grot.), to take the Infinitive for the Imperative, since it depends upon the λέγω. We may observe, that the admonition * is rendered more striking by the paronomasia between the words φοροῦνει, ὑπερφοροῦνει, and σωφρονεῖ,† which are thus distinguished by Wetstein: “Ilud peccat in excessu per superbiam: Istud est justum de se et aliis judicium: Hoc vero significat modestiam.” The words παρ᾽ ὃ δεῖ φοροῦνει are accounted by Rosenm. a

* On the giving of which Wets. remarks: “Consilium aut stipem dare prudentum est et divitum: industria sanorum: patientia agrorum: modestia omnium.”

† Examples of this paronomasia are given by Grotius and Wets.; as Charondas ap. Stob. S. 42. προσποιεῖσθαι δὲ ἐκαστὸ τῶν τοιμών σωφρονεῖν μάλλον ἢ φοροῦνειν. Thucyd. 2, 62. οἶνος δὲ τοῖς ἔχθροις δίωμε, μὴ φορονόματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι. Sotades: “Ἀν ἄλαξονα, τούτ᾿ ἀνοίας ἐστὶ φρίαγμα” “Ἀν δὲ σωφρονής, τούτῳ θεών δύρων ὑπάρχει.”
mere periphrasis of ὑπερφορεῖν. But they are rather exegetical, and have an intensive force. Nor is the ὑπὲρ pleonastic, as Hardy supposes. Grot. compares ὑψηλοφορεῖν; and Koppe, 2 Macc. 9, 12. ὑπερφορανὸς φορεῖν. I add μείγδων φορεῖν, and Thucyd. 13, 45. ἐκαστὸς ἀλογιστῶς ἐπίπλευ τι αὐτὸν ἐδόξασεν, de se plus aequo sentire solet. Wets. thus paraphrases: "Dignitatem vos vestram tueri, et felicitatem agnosceri non veto; vobis Deus hanc gratiam fecit, ut ad Christum vocaret; in vos dona spiritūs sui largā manu contulit: sed ideo non superbire, et alios contemnere, quin potius eo magis modestiāe studere, et omnibus honore exhibere debetis."*

3. φορεῖν εἰς τὸ σώφρονεῖν. Here we have an acutē dictum, or paronomasia, the force of which will be perceived by observing that φορεῖν is a term mediae significationis; and that in σώφρονεῖν there is an allusion to the etymology of the word, which, as often in the Greek and Hebrew, inculcates a moral truth. This is well expressed by Theophyl. 119. Οὐκ ἔστω ἐπίθετα, ἵνα δεικτήσητε ὅτι τοῦ μη ταπεινοφοροῦν, παρατάσσει καὶ ἐξεύθετητε τῶν ἱδίων λογισμῶν, ὅ ἐστι ταπεινοφοροῦν. ὧν τούτω λέγεται σωφρονεῖν. Σωφρονεῖν (says Wets.) opponitur vel stultitiā, vel modesteū."†

* Schoettgen, however, makes the words of general application, as referring not to rulers only, but to all, both Jews and Gentiles, both of whom prized themselves overmuch on their wisdom, consequently despising Christian simplicity." "Now these (continues he) the Apostle exhorts φορεῖν εἰς τὸ σώφρονεῖν," i.e. to judge soberly of the divine revelation and Gospel announced to them; q. d. "For then the Jews will see that they must at some time quit the economy of the Old Testament; and the Gentiles will perceive that they cannot come unto God solely by the use of reason."
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These words lead us to suppose that irregularities had taken place in the exercise of their gifts at Rome, as at Philippi and Thessalonica.

3. έκάστος ας ο Θεός εμέρισε μέτρου πίστεως. 'Εκάστος ας (Grotesius observes) is for ας έκάστος, by a transposition common to St. Paul. See 2, 27. 'To me it seems rather that there is an ellipsis of ουτως. Theophyl. well explains: ας λογιζομεν οτι έκάστῳ εμέρισεν ο Θεος μετρον πίστεως. 'Επειδη γαρ τα γάρια ματα μαλλον εις απονοιαι έπηρε τους πολλους, δι αυτω τουτο, φησι, δει σωφρονειν, δι εις Θεος εμερισεν έκαστον το μετρον της πίστεως. It is plain that πίστει cannot here be taken in the usual acceptation. Most recent Interpreters, as Koppe and Morus, understand by it religious knowledge, and the faculties and qualities annexed to it.* But this seems too vague and limited a sense. It plainly appears from the following verses that something far more is required: though as to what that is, the early modern Commentators differ. It has, I think, been rightly seen by Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, including Theophyl., Photius, Theodoret, and ΟΕcumen., that πίστει has the sense of χάρισμα at ver. 6., and denotes the gifts and graces (always supernatural, and sometimes miraculous,) of the Holy Spirit. So Eph. 4, 7. ενι δε έκαστῳ ημων έδοθη η χαρις κατα το μετρον της δωρεας του Χριστου. This interpretation is also adopted by Carpzov, who thus explains: Μέτρου calls the mens sana, and Cicero the considerata judicia mentis. Here, however, is meant modestia animi. Wetstein concludes with a passage of Plut. 2, 83., somewhat parallel both in sentiment and phraseology with the one before us, where the philosopher bids us not be θαυμασται, παρ' δει, λαγων, η αιθρωτων, η καταρρουηρα, something like the niti admirari of Horace.

* "The word is here used (observes Koppe) in an extended sense, to denote every part of the character of a Christian animated by the divine spirit, whether understood as consisting in a knowledge of divine things, or in faith in God and in Christ, or in professing the doctrine of Christ παρασιηq, or delivering it with skill and ability, or lastly, discharging the other offices of the Church with fidelity."
πιστεως est diversus gradus ac portio diversa beneficio-rum et gratiae Dei, cognitionis Dei, ac donorum Spiritus Sancti, cum administrantium, tum sanctificantium, quae ille singulis distribuit ad commune bonum Ecclesiae, uti vult. 1 Cor. 12, 4, 11. Est sive amplior sive auctior mensurae quantitas, notitia rerum divinarum, quae Christianis piis unà cum fide obtigit diversimodè, per actionem Spiritus Sancti. 1 Joh. 2, 27." It is also adopted by Grotius,* and, of the recent Commentators, by Jaspis, who takes πίστις for πεπιστευμένων δωρεά, and explains the μέτρων πίστεως, "tutus ille modus et ambitus cognitionis et persuasionis in causâ religionis, additis viribus ad recte agendum donisque varius generis."

Macknight observes, that by exhorting the Romans to behave wisely, according to their measure of faith, the Apostle tacitly reproved such of them, as, not considering the nature of their own gifts, aspired to offices in the church for which they were not qualified."

4, 5. καθαρε ὡς ἐν ἐνι σάματι, &c. Here we have a familiar, and not unfrequent, illustration of the subject, from a comparison (by allusion) of the natural body, with the body politic, or social.† The compa-

* Who explains: "Quisque se gerat pro donis quae a Deo accept, nempe pro modo ejus quam habet fidei." And he observes: "Itaque μέτρων πίστεως, quod max dicit αναλογιαν πιστεως, proportionem fidei, est ipsa mensura gratiae data pro modo fidei. Vide infra, ver. 6. Eph. 4, 7. 1 Cor. 12, 7. 'Αναλογιαν proportionem primus vertit Cicero, quem securi sunt Latini alii. Hieronymus adversus Jovinianum 2. Tantum gratiae Christi infunditur, quantum valemus haurire." He thinks, too, that there is here an allusion to the services of the Levites; some of which were enjoined on youths, others on the middle aged, others on the old, Num. 4. 1 Paral. 15, 5. And he adds, "Erant illa vetera, nostrorum αριτυπα, exemplaria, Heb. 9, 24. In primâ illâ Ecclesiā pro fide erant dona, pro donis ministeriae." But Scharbau, in a learned Dissertation on this verse, (in his Obsa. Sacr. p. 80—85.) thinks there is an allusion to the different measure of unction or oil poured on the heads of the Priests: for the Holy Spirit was poured on Christians ἐκ μέτρων, on Christ ὦν ἐκ μέτρων, Joh. 3, 35. Heb. 1, 9.

† As in the case of the Apologia of Menenius Agrippa, in the celebrated oration of Liv. 3, 32. See also Clemens ad Corinth., cited.
tison, then, is made with the body of the Christian Church, considered as an Ecclesiastical Society.

Πράξις must here be rendered office, ministry, utility. On the sentiment (as applied to civil society) Wetstein cites Eustath. on Hom. II. κ. p. 719, 16. ὁρα δὲ καὶ μακτυριαν, τοῦ οὐ πάτι πάντα τὸν θεὸν διδόναι, οὐτὲ κακὰ οὐτὲ καλὰ· εἰ γοὺν καὶ εἴδος κακὸς ὁ Δῶλον, ἀλλὰ πολύκης.

5. οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἐσμέν ἐν Χριστῷ. Here we have the apodosis of the comparison. (Crellius.) And this rests in οὕτως, which may be rendered: “Thus, in this application of this comparison to the Christian Church.” Koppe takes οἱ πολλοὶ for πᾶντες. But however that principle may apply elsewhere, it is here unnecessary to be resorted to. Οἱ πολλοὶ signifies “we the many,” for οἱ όντες πολλοὶ, “we who are many,” &c. See 1 Cor. 10, 16. The sense then is: “In like manner we Christians, though many, are one body, have been united into, form one body* in Christ, i. e. in respect of Christ, considered with a reference to him as the head of the whole society.” So Jaspis, who renders: “Caput hujus societatis dum Christus est, se suo quisque mo- dulo ac pede metiatur, neque spernat alium, alio munere aliave dote ornatum.” See Ephes. 15 & 16. Wetstein refers to Rom. 16, 5, 7, 11 & 13. 1 Cor. 12, 2.


* Wetstein has here a vast number of Classical quotations, which are, however, of little importance; since they are merely parallel examples of a phrase too familiar to need any illustration, such as esse (or fieri) unum corpus.
5. ὃ δὲ καθεῖς, ἄλληλοιν μέλη. This Grotius and others explain as a construction of the singular with the plural, by the figure synthesis. But in this there seems something too formal. Pearce, Blackwall, Wolf, and Macknight, would defend the irregularity by taking the καθ' for καθ', i.e. καθά, contract of καθ' εἰτα. Which, however, is quite inadmissible. The truth is, this is an idiotical phrase, unknown to the Classical writers, and therefore solecistical, for καθ' ἐνα, of which we have another example in 8 Macc. 5, 34.* The sentiment is well expressed by Jaspis, as follows: "Unam Christianam societatem efficiamus, sed quilibet nostrum habet varia negotia mutui commodi promovendi causâ procurandâ; hæc quisque rite peragat fugiātque πολυπραγμοσύνη, sedulitatem malam."

6. In the style of this sentence there is some irregularity. Hence on the construction Commentators are not agreed. Many recent ones follow the method of Erasmus, Homberg, and Schoettgen, namely, by joining the words εχώντες δὲ χαρίσματα with the preceding words; taking δὲ for καθεῖρ. See Koppe and Jaspis. But this is liable to many objections, both in respect to construction and sense, which have been ably stated by Wolf, who adds: "Mihi quidem v. 5. comparatio inter corpus physicum ejusque membra diversa, et corpus spirituale, ejusque membra penitus absoluta institui videtur ab Apostolo, ver. 6. consectoriam, inde prono impetu fluens, non solum deducit, sed et eadem opera cum admi-

* Slade compares εἰς καθ' εἰς at Mark 14, 19., and observes, that the Hebrews use the nominatives absolutely. Koppe compares ἀνα ἐ εἰς at Apoc. 21, 21. But none of these are parallel. In the passage of Mark there is a pure Hebraism: and as to the principle of the nominative absolute it does not here apply. Nor is the ἀνα εἰς parallel; since there there is simply an ellipsis of ἐνα (Anglicè, "one by one") ; and it is found without the εἰς in distributive sentences. It is sufficient to consider the phrase in question as a popular one, and sui generis. Now propriety of language would require (as Koppe suggests) καθ' ἐνα πάντες, or εἰ καθ' ἐνα, or (as Piscator says) ὁ δὲ εἰς ἑκατός καθ' ἑαυτῶν.
tione conjungit hoc sensu: cum itaque diversa dona habeamus, v. c. *prophetiam*, habeamus eam, *secundum analogiam fidei*. Nostra explicatio per supplementum verbi *exortem*, *aptō* κοινοῦ repetiti, vel *prophetem*, nec rationibus linguae, in quâ sève vel ex antecedentibus, vel ex re ipsâ, verbum aliquod sub-intelligitur, nec scopo Apostoli adversa est. Apostolus enim omnino hic adhortatione aliquâ defungitur. Id manifestum est ex. ver. 9. *η ἀγαπή ἀντάκριτος*, i. e. *amor sit non fucatus*. Quae admonitio antecedentibus verbis eandem viam et habitum omnino vindicat. Et sensus hic convenientissimus nascitur etiam ex verbis illis: *sive ministerium*, versemur *in ministrando*. Id enim vult Apostolus, ut non alia consectemur, quam quæ nobis a Deo commissa sint, nec v. c. ad interpretandam Scripturam aliquis accedat, cui *diaconia* commissa est.” I cannot, therefore, but greatly prefer the common construction and interpretation, which is supported by the Greek Interpreters, and which our modern Commentators would not (I think) have deviated from, had they read the masterly discussion of the whole passage to be found in Photius ap. *Œcumen.,* which is worthy of that great Critic.* The *exortes*, then, is a nomi-

* My limits will only permit me to give a slight sketch of its contents. “There is (says he) in the sentence two figures, the *aptō* κοινοῦ, or zeugma, and the ellipsis. Thus the *exortes* must be taken at each member *aptō* κοινοῦ, and adapted to circumstances.” “Yet (continues he) something is left to complete the thought, as μενέω εν ἐν Ἐλαβέν ἐκαστὸς χαρίσματι, ἢ ἀρκείεσθω, ἢ στοιχεῖω, ἢ τι τουοῦτον ὄνον, εἶτε προφητεῖαν ἔχει τις, εἴτε διακοινιὰν, μενέων ἐκαστὸς, καὶ ὁ τῆν προφητείαν ἔχων, καὶ ὁ τὴν διακοινίαν, καὶ ὁ τὴν διδασκαλίαν, καὶ ὁ τὴν παράκλησιν ἔχων, ἀκλῶς ἐκαστὸς, εν ὧν Ἐλαβέ διακοινίας. He then proceeds to defend the extremely figurative style of the Apostle; and he grants, that though an attention to terms, syllables, figures, composition, &c. is of little importance, compared to the grandeur and momentous nature of the subjects, yet the Apostle condescended to use these, that he might gain upon the minds of men the more, and draw them to salvation. “If (continues he) the Apostle had abstained from them, some would have dared to charge him with deficiency in power of language, or with idiomatism, ἐκ τοῦ τοιοῦτον ἐξειν ἔξι δοῦν ἀυτοὶ συνιέντες, ὑπολαμβάνουσιν.
nativus pendens, from which εχωμεν must be repeated at each clause, and also such a verb as is suitable to the nature of the phrase. The sentence extends (I conceive) to the end of ver. 15. Yet it is difficult to reconcile the latter clauses with any notion of correct syntax. In translating, it is not necessary to advert to every particular, but consult the general intent of the Apostle, which was, to excite them to the zealous exercise of the various gifts and graces of a Christian; so, however, that those who possessed the higher kinds, should not thwart or interfere with one another.

6. ε ε προφητείας, sub. εχει. εχετω αυτην (i.e. χεισαθω) or ξιωντες, εχωμεν, i.e. προφητευσαμεν. On the nature of this προφητεία there has been considerable discussion. See Koppe, Exc. 3. on Epist. ad Eph., from which Rosenm. details the following particulars: "Προφητις, Νόμ, in genere est, quisquis cum Deo singulari quadam ratione est conjunctus, cui Deus revelat, quæ antea ei parum cognita fuerant. Exinde varias accipit significationes, ut de notet hominem, qui profert vaticinia, vel arcana aliorum hominum consilia regetit, vel subito spiritus divini impulsu ad docendum, cohortandum, consolandumque assurgit, vel carmen divinitus inspiratum decentat. Hoc loco προφητεία videtur esse donum ejusmodi, quo nonnulli Christiani, singulari quodam

And if, on the other hand, he had used them perpetually, the Apostolical character εν τοις παρερωμένοις τότερο. [Here I more than suspect a corruption of the text; though the Editor observes an altum silention. I conjecture εν αυτοίς (or αυτοῖς) παρερωμένος τότερο, sub. ήν.] "Thus, continues Photius, δηηηηζεν ουν συνετῶς και παντασφώς αμφώς εχθέσατο μάν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, ὦτε δείκῃ ράδιον εναι βουλόμενω το τοιότου, και δι τι ουν ἄγνοις ἐκέμεινε δε τῷ Ἀποστολικῷ χαρακτῆρι τῆν εὐθενείαν καὶ τὸ ἀπείρεγον καὶ καθαρόν καὶ αὐτοφυὴς τοῦ λόγου τιμῶν."

From the above curious passage we may learn, that the disputes about the style of the New Testament were not unknown in the early ages, and we see what side Photius took. Had he lived in the seventeenth century, he would have strenuously battled for the purity and even elegance of St. Paul's style, and would have been a far more formidable combatant than Georgius and his conperees.
**Romans, Chap. XII.**

*Spiritus Divini abrepti docebant.* Carpzov takes it to denote an *Interpreter of Scripture,* and he thinks that the ἀναλογία πίστεως signifies the articles of faith, and heads of Christian doctrine laid down in Scripture. This, however, seems too limited a sense, as the other of Koppe and Rosenm. is too vague. It should rather appear to denote one who, by Divine inspiration, not only interpreted Scripture, but explained and set forth all the mysteries of the Gospel, and publicly preached and exhorted, for the purposes of Christian consolation. So 1 Cor. 13, 2. “Though I have all prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge.” Now this is directed to be done κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, on which words much has been written. (See Dr. Campbell’s Dissert. 4. § 13.) It seems clear that they cannot be taken in the sense assigned by the Romanists, and some Protestant Commentators, (as Paræus and Beza,) or be supposed to refer to any *creed,* or *articles of faith,* of which, at this very early period, there appears not a vestige in ecclesiastical antiquity.*Neither is it agreeable to the force of the term, which is an idiom noticed by the antient Lexicographers; as Cyrill, who explains κατὰ ἀναλογίαν as a phrase signifying *pro ratione, pro râtâ portione.* And so Hesych. κατὰ μέτρον ἡ κανόνα. This sense, too, is confirmed by the Classical passages cited by Wetstein; as Demosth. pro Coronâ, who joins together, as synonymous τίμησις, ἀναλογισμὸς, and ἀναλογία. Philo, T. 2. p. 391, 15. κατὰ ἀναλογίαν τῆς κτήσεως. Plato, Polit. τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκαστὸν δεντες τῆς ἱππικῆς ἀξίας, οἱ τῇ τιμῇ πλέον ἀλληλών ἄφεσταις, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας τέχνης. Thus Wets. defines it: “Pro ratione ejus quod ipsi creditum et manifestatum est.” And he refers to Jer. 23, 28.

* Gataker explains it of the Apostolical doctrine, which was then (he says) well known and familiar; or rather, to the writings of the Old Testament, from which the Apostle used to refute and convince the Jews. And in nearly the same manner it is understood by Schoettg. and Carpzov.
Furthermore, by τῆς πίστεως is generally admitted to be meant (as just before) τοῦ χαρισμάτος, "the gift or grace bestowed." So Hardy: "according to the measure of the gift conferred by God, which, as it will not be equal, so neither will the exercise of προφητεία be equal." And thus Koppe: "with that measure of grace which every one hath received, let him be content, suoque se modulo metiri discat." And, in the same view, Macknight observes: "The Apostle’s meaning is, that such as enjoyed the prophetic inspiration were not to imagine, that because some things were revealed to them, they might speak of every thing; but that in prophesying, they were to confine themselves to what was revealed to them. The same rule we have at Eph. 4, 7." See also Creflius, who, pointing out the sense of κατὰ, acutely observes: "The Apostle means that there should be some proportion between the use of the gift, and the gift itself."

Doddr., however, thinks, that if we suppose the prophetic gift to be given in proportion to the exercise of faith, that is, of dependance on God, when he signified a disposition in general to impart it, we have the clearest explication the phrase will admit." And indeed this is nearly the same view in which the question is considered by the Fathers, as Chrysost., and all the Greek Interpreters. So Chrysost. 179, 15. εἰ γὰρ καὶ χάρις ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἐκχείται· ἀλλὰ τὰ μέτα παρὰ τῶν δεχομένων λαμβάνουσα, τοσοῦτον εἰπρέει, ὅσον ἀν εὑρή σκεύος πίστεως αὐτῇ προσενεχθέν. And Photius ap. Οἰκουμ. 368. ἦν δείκνυσιν ὅτι τῶν δοκῶντον μειονόντων χαρισμάτων, οἱ λαμβανότες εἰσὶν αἰτίων περὶ τὰ λαθεῖν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ χάρις ἐστί, τοσοῦτον μὲν τοι εἰπρέει, ὅσον ἀν εὑρή σκεύος ἐπιτηθεὶον ἐκατό καταστήσαι διὰ τῆς πίστεως. So also Justin Martyr, Apol. prim. (cited by Bulkeley): Πρὸς ἅναλογίαν αὐν ἐλαβε δυνάμεων παρὰ Θεοῦ τῶν λόγων ἀπαντηθήσεται, καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμφάνισεν, referring to Luke 12, 48.

Whichsoever of the two interpretations he adopted, one thing seems clear, namely, that (as Beza and
Crellius have well seen) the Apostle first lays down προφητεία and διακονία each as a genus, and then proceeds to enumerate their species, viz. of προφητεία two, and of διακονία three. An observation indeed which had been anticipated by Photius.

7. εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ. It is clear that the words διάκονος, διακονεῖν, and διακονία, though (as Photius observes) they be general terms, and used of the Apostles themselves, Rom. 11, 13. 1 Cor. 3, 5., yet are often, in the New Testament, used of some certain kind of offices undertaken for the cause of the Christian religion, (compare 1 Cor. 12, 5. 2 Cor. 9, 1.) and appropriated to those Christians who did not so much employ themselves upon the doctrines of the Gospel, as the external affairs of the Church, and of individuals. Among these there were especially the οἱ προστάτες, ἐπισκόποι, πρεσβύτεροι, as well as others of somewhat inferior rank and dignity, as the Deacons properly so called. See Acts 6, 1—7. In this passage, however, the προστάτες also seem to be comprehended. See the note on ver. 8. and compare Eph. 4, 12. 1 Pet. 4, 11. (Koppe.)

At διακονία must be understood μενέτω. Examples of similar ellipses are adduced from Arrian. Epict. 4, 4. & 8, 23. by Raphel and Elsner, the latter of whom subaudiς ἔτω (as in 1 Tim. 4, 15. and Ἁλιαν. V. H. 1, 31. οντες ἐν γεωργίᾳ;) which is certainly a more simple mode of supplying the ellipsis, and yields the same sense.

On the kinds of deacons, and various offices pertaining thereto, see Suic. Thes. 1, 862. and Bingham's Eccl. Ant. l. 2. c. 20.

7. εἴτε ὁ διδάσκαλος, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. It is rightly observed by Crellius and Koppe, that the Apostle here proceeds to enumerate and explain the different sorts of προφητεία.

Ὁ διδάσκαλος, scil. ὁ προφήτης. Koppe explains: "an inspired teacher of things, whether common and from any other quarter, or unheard of, and new." For that these cannot be the same with the διδασκα-
Romans, Chap. xii.

καὶ properly so called at Eph. 4, 11. 1 Cor. 12, 28., Koppe thinks apparent from the following word παρακαλῶν.

8. εἰτε ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει. The term is well explained by Koppe, “qui afflatu Spiriti Sancti incitatus, populum admonet, hortatur consolatur;” as Acts 13, 15. 1 Cor. 14, 3. He would not, however, understand παρ and διδασκ. of distinct offices, but both united in the same person. The two terms were (he adds) employed conjointly of those who, excelling in wisdom and eloquence, used to rise up in the Church, and address the congregation, for the purpose of instruction and edification.

Koppe thinks that from the gift of tongues, and healing of the sick, such as the Corinthians enjoyed, 1 Cor. 12., (which we call κατ’ ἐξοχήν, the gifts of miracles,) not being mentioned, we may infer that they were not possessed by the Roman Church; since, if they had, no good reason can be imagined why the Apostle should not have made mention of them. But this seems not a very correct inference. The thing, however, is uncertain, as indeed are many points respecting the constitution of the primitive Church.

The words ὁ μεταδίδωσι I consider (with Crellius and Koppe) as forming a distinct clause, to be referred to the διάκονια at ver. 7, and to be interpreted of these virtues as common to all Christians.* Ὁ μεταδίδωσι is taken by Schoettg. and Koppe to denote the person who collected the alms in the church, and distributed them among the Christian poor; (Acts 6, 3.) like the Hebr. שניא or נב. See Lightf. on Matt. 4, 28. and Vitrina de Syn. Vet.

8. ὁ προϊστάμενος, “Presides Ecclesiae, Bishop, Presbyter, Pastor;” by which names he is called in 1 Tim. 5, 17. 1 Thess. 5, 12.

Ὡς εὐλογοῦ, “he who takes care of the sick.” See

* Others, however, as Rosenm., think that at these words, and not before, commences a statement of the duties common to all Christians.
Acts 6, 1, seqq. So ἀντιλήψεις in 1 Cor. 12, 28. That ἐλεῶν may have this signification no one can doubt. See Luke 10, 37.* Koppe observes, that if the three terms be thus distinguished, there will thereby be removed a difficulty which otherwise can hardly be got over, namely, how προϊστάμενος should be mentioned in a passage which might seem to treat, not of ecclesiastical functions, but of the general duties of Christians.

It may further be observed on the words ὁ μεταδίδως, ἐν ἀπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἱλαρότητι: that we have not, in conformity with the preceding, ὁ μεταδίδως ἐν τῷ μεταδίδοναι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν τῷ προετάναι, &c., but to the offices are also joined those virtues which were required for the right administration thereof.

To proceed to the consideration of each of the terms by which these are expressed, ἀπλότης is a word of extensive signification; and therefore our chief guide to its true sense here must be the context. The antient Commentators, and many eminent modern ones, explain it liberality; (see Carpzov, Schoettg., and Wolf;) a sense, indeed, sanctioned by use, and which may be admitted here, if the passage be supposed to refer to private charity, but if to the office of distributing common contributions, then this virtue can hardly have place, and some other will be required, more accommodated to the nature of the thing. Now this may be expressed by one term, (and that a frequent sense of ἀπλότης) namely integrity, or sincerity, uprightness: which will include fidelity and impartiality in the distribution. Ammon explains it, "omnis διπλοτήτος expers."

The words following ὁ προϊστάμενος τῇ σπουδῇ plainly contain an admonition to diligence in the

* See also a long and excellent note of Dr. Macknight, which concludes thus: "The person who supplied the wants of the poor was called ὁ μεταδίδως, the distributor; but the person who attended the destitute, the sick, and the distressed, ὁ ἐλεῶν, the shower of mercy."
discharge of any ecclesiastical office and presidency.
(See more in Slade.)

8. ὁ ἐκλεῖσθαι ἐν ἱππότητι. The force of this admoni-
tion to private Christians is very obvious;* as in 2
Cor. 9. 7. "Let him give not grudgingly, or of ne-
cessity." See 1 Pet. 4. 9. Thus Schoettg. para-
phrases: "Qui objecta habet miserabilia, non debet
solicitus esse de crastino, sed leta mente sua distri-
buere." Yet ἱππ., alacrity to attend, cheerful man-
er, and kindly demeanour, would be a very useful
quality in him who had to visit the sick or the
afflicted. See Grot., Koppe, Doddrc., and Macknight.

9. Now finally follow the private virtues which are
to be cultivated by Christians: as is plain from the
article not being prefixed to the participle. (Koppe.)
The Apostle now shews how all the above may be
accomplished. (Theophyl.)

9. η ἀγαπὴ, ἀνυπόκριτος. Koppe explains this,
"love towards Christians;" which, however, seems
to be too limited a sense. Chrysost. and the Greek
Commentators better define it, "love towards our
neighbour," i.e. philanthropy. Origen and others
interpret it, "love towards God." But this seems
not to have been then in the mind of the Apostle. It is
agreed that there is an ellipsis of ἐστω, as in the next
clause ἐστε. Indeed, almost all the ellipses of this
portion may be said to be of the verb substantive,
modified in signification according to circumstances.
The word ἀνυπόκριτος occurs in James 3. 17 and
Sap. 5. 18. 18. 16. 2 Tim. 1. 5. 1 Pet. 1. 22. Theo-
phyl. paraphrases: "Let your love be undissembled,
for then alone is it really love."

Koppe and others take the participles ἀποστυγωνῖ-
tes, &c. for verbs. But that can only be by an ellips-
is of the verb substantive. In this whole verse
Grot. supposes an allusion to certain parts of the Jew-

* On this Theodoret remarks: η ἐκπολα ὑν εὐφροσύνην συντή-
τει, η μεταδόθεσιν ὑποψάλων τὸ κέρδος τρέφειν γιὰ τὸ ἐκθετικήν ὑν
ekρεδαὐνωτές.
tice, (with Wets.) how exceedingly energetic are the
terms ἀποστυγοῦντες and κολλάμενοι. Of the former
Wets. adduces numerous examples from Herod. 2,
47. 6, 129. Parthen. Exot. 8, 12, 20 & 36. Soph.
CEd. Col. 178. οὗ φίλον ἀποστυγεῖν, καὶ τὸν φίλον σέ-
βεσθαι. Anthol. 6, 8, 6, 1, 83, 3. Theophyl. ex-
plains it: ἐκ ψυχῆς μισοῦντες. And he has several
other illustrations of the force of the ἄπο, which,
however, he presses too far. With respect to the
latter term, κολλάω properly signifies to glue, and in
the middle voice is used as a deponent, with a reci-
procal sense, viz. to glue oneself to, to stick to (like
the Hebr. קָשֵׁל). Hence it comes to signify, follow
after, seek, observe, study, &c., as in the present pas-
sage. So Παρεύε: "non bonum frigidè probantes,
sed flagrantissimè complectentes." See also Carpzov
and Schoettgen. On the term κολλ. Theophyl. re-
marks: οὐκ ἄρκει ἢ τοῦ κακοῦ ἀποφυγῆ, ἀλλὰ δεῖ προσε-
ναι καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐργασίαν. He also observes,
that it is meant to enjoin a διάθεσιν ἀγαπητικήν, "par-
taking of that intimate nuptial union in reference to
which God has said προσκολληθῆται ὁ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς
τὴν γυναῖκα." Chrysost., too, has beautifully detailed
the component parts of this ἀγαπὴ ἀνυπόκριτος, and
he copiously illustrates the rest of the sentence. In
common with the Greek Commentators, and many
modern ones, he regards πονηρῶν and ἁγαθῶν as signi-
fying simply moral good and evil. But I assent to
Crellius, Pareus, Hardy, and Koppe, that the good
and evil is restricted by the context to that which is
done towards our neighbour, and therefore means
whatever may injure, or may benefit him.

10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργος. I am
inclined to think, that in this impressive injunction
there is a climax. For as the Apostle had just be-
fore charged them to preserve ἀγαπῆν, which is a gen-
eral term denoting philanthropy,* so now he enjoins

* For (as Crellius observes) ἀγαπῆ has here an extended signif-
ication, and relates to those who are not, in any sense, brothers,
and moreover, is rather shewn in actions than in words; while φιλα-
them to be φιλόστοργος τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ, where (as Crel-
lius observes) τῇ φιλ. is a dative of instrument, since
it denotes the mode in which we ought to be φιλο-
στόργος. And he renders the sentence thus: "intimo
quodam amoris affectu mutuo inter vos propensi,
quo illi solent qui sanguinis vinculo inter se juncti
sunt." Cameron thinks the Apostle here tacitly
censureces the apathy of the Stoics, recommending
sympathy in the good or evil of others.

Φιλόστοργος is properly used of the natural, and
therefore strong, affection which subsists between
parents and children: but it is also applied to any
other vehement affection.* The word is here ren-
dered by Tertullian affectuosi. Examples, both of
the natural and figurative sense, are adduced by
Wets.; as Plutarch. p. 152 c. ουδετέσσαρος τῶν τὸ φύσει
φιλητικὸν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ φιλόστοργον εἰς θηρία καταναλίσκον-
tas, ἀνθρώπους ἀφελόμενον. 2 Macc. 9, 21.

10. τῇ τιμῇ ἁλλήλους προηγούμενοι. The force of
this injunction is (I think) much mistaken by almost
all Commentators, who understand it of humility
(referring to Phil. 2, 4.); which would seem here
out of place. The context rather suggests the idea
of readiness to do good, and to treat others with kind-
ness, even anticipating them in it. This sense of
τιμῇ, namely, (as Schleus. explains,) observantia et
omnia humanitatis officia quae alii debemus, is found
in many other passages of the New Testament. Thus
Schleus. subjoins, as examples, the present passage,
and Rom. 13, 7. 1 Cor. 12, 29. Col. 2, 23. 1 Thess.
4, 4. 1 Tim. 6, 1. 1 Pet. 3, 7. And this interpreta-
tion is supported by Chrysost. and the Greek Com-
mentators. The words of the eloquent Father are

δελφία consists in kindly sentiments, and a sort of fraternal affec-
tion.

* The force of the term is elegantly illustrated by Chrysost., who
adds: Ἑλπιδος φιλεῖσθαι παρ' ἄλλου, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐπιτήδεα τοῦτο ψε
κατάρχων οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας φιλια τῶν μισθῶν καρπώσῃ εἰ-
πώς τοῖς τῆς αἰτίας δε ἦσαν ἀφελόμενοι ἁλλήλους φιλεῖν, λέγει καὶ
πῶς ἄν γένοιτο τὰ τῆς φιλίας ἀκίνητα.
as follow: ὦ σπουδή μη ὁκνῇ, τῷ πνεύματι ἔχοντες τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες. In the interpretation of this verse there has been no little difference of opinion among
Commentators. Koppe thinks we have here one sentiment expressed in three different ways; and that is this: "Consecrate your whole powers to the religion of Christ." But I see not how the passage can be considered in that light. To me it rather seems that of the clauses τῇ στουδῇ μὴ ἄκμηροι and τῷ πνεύματι ζεόντες, the latter is added by way of opposition. The question, however, is, to what do the words relate? Most Commentators refer them to the latter clause, τῷ Κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες. Some, as Chrysostom, Theophylact, Menoch., Parsæus, Tole- tus, Crellius, &c. to the former. And this is surely far more regular, and agreeable to the subject of the preceding verses. Besides, the terms στουδῇ and ἄκμηροι are far more applicable to exertion in the service of man, than zeal in the cause of God and religion. And it may be observed, that though the words are often used for the former, yet scarcely ever, I think, in the New Testament, for the latter.

In the structure of the phrase τῷ στουδῇ ἄκμηροι there is something remarkable. Crellius says that "two contraries are joined:" "Since no one can be diligently idle, or idly diligent." Yet he seems to forget the Horatian strenua inertia: but indeed it is unnecessary to resort to any such subtleties and refinements. The Apostle simply means, "let your στουδῇ have no portion of ἄκμης, want of alacrity." With respect to the next clause, τῷ πνεύματι ζεόντες, it is by some (as Estius, Toletus, and Carpzov) interpreted of the Holy Spirit. But most Commentators, both antient and modern, take it to denote fervency, zeal, impe- tus animi. It seems meant to illustrate by the contrary, or, (as Chrysost. and Theophyl. say,) to shew the mode of the preceding. The phrase occurs also in Acts 18, 25. (where it is used of Apollos,) ἔσων τῷ πνεύματι. And it is found not unfrequently in the Classical writers, from whom Wetstein adduces several examples, as Eunap. Ξedes. p. 45. ὡς ἐὰν ἀγανακτώντα κατέλαβε, καὶ τῷ θυμῷ περίζεοντα. Philo, T. 2. p. 178, 13. ἔσων καὶ πεπυγμένος ὑπὸ τῆς νομί-
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μου διαγανακτισεως. Though there it is generally used of anger. It is explained by Chrysostom and Theophylact διαγερημένοι, and θερμω.

As to the sense vulgarly (and merely with reference to our common translation)* ascribed to the words, namely as enjoining alacrity and zeal in the discharge of the business of life, and in our calling,† it is quite unsupported by the context, and adopted by no Commentators of note, except Doddridge, who not unfrequently errs in this way, and often with no better reason than to avoid losing a useful text. Jaspis unites this clause with the other, thus: "In omni vitæ negotio, in omni officiorum genere acri animi studium et fervor elueat. Summo animi vigore agite, quod vestrum est. Sit vobis imprimis in rebus ad rel. Chr. pertinentibus ἐνθουσιασμὸς quidam."

11. τῶ καλω δουλευοντες. In the reading of these words there is much difference of opinion. Almost all critics for the last century read καλω, which has been introduced by Griesbach into the text. Yet all that has been urged in its favour by Hammond, Mill, Wolf, Carpzov, Griesbach, and lastly by Mr. Bryant ap. Bowyer, seems insufficient to produce conviction of the truth of that reading. My limits will not permit me to enter at large into a merely critical question. I shall merely offer a few reasons which to me appear sufficiently valid to induce any one to reject that reading. 1. It is very weak in authority, being found only in three MSS. (one of them the interpolated Cod. Cant.) and in no antient version: nor is it supported by the Fathers (ex. gr. Chrysost.,) and the Greek Commentators. It rests almost solely on certain Latin Versions and Fathers, including some early editions. Its advocates indeed urge its greater suita-

* So Tindal: "Let not the business which ye have in hand be tedious to you."

† In this view it may be worth while to remark, that that bustling and active people, the Athenians, erected a statue δαυμοι σπουδαῖοι, as we find from Pausan. 1, 24, 3.
bleness to the context, meaning the following verses. But I see nothing to which it can be well thought to refer, except τῇ ἐκλείψει ἐπιμένοντες, which words convey no notion of persecution. Besides, as Wets. observes, "Non potuit Paulus hoc loco Romanis commendare ut tempore servirent, tum quia cum exhortatione, ut animo ferventes essent, consistere non poterat, tum imprimis quia semper in vitio ponitur, et adulatorum potius est et callidorum hominum, quam candidè et apertè agentium." To this Mr. Bryant answers, "that the vitium depends upon the ideas we annex to it. On the other hand, to recommend persons to submit to the times, and to acquiesce in what comes upon them, contains very salutary admonition." True (it may be replied) but however salutary, yet, if not agreeable to the context, it cannot be thought to have place. Besides such a sense requires the subaudition of the words and yet; which is a too arbitrary ellipsis.* I must not omit to notice a specious argument urged by most of the advocates for the new reading. It is, that the precept τῷ Κυρίῳ διωλέουντες is too general, and had been before brought forward at ver. 1 and 2, and therefore would not be there repeated. But to this it may be replied, that the words do not inculcate a general precept, but are only meant to enforce the observance of the former, on this motive, that the service was to be done, as done unto the Lord, commanded by him, and to be rewarded by him. And here (as often) there is an ellipsis of εἰς. This view of the subject (I must observe) is sup-

* It has been further urged, in order to establish this reading, by Carpzov and others, that it is pure Greek. That it is Greek, I do not deny; but whether good, I doubt. The only examples adduced are from Plut., Xiph., Anthol., and Pseudo-Phocylides (a no very unexceptionable witness). I suspect that it is only a Latinism, formed from tempore servire. I admit, however, that it is Greek sufficiently good for the Apostle. Yet that will not prove the phrase to have place here, unless it be suitable to the context; which (as I said before) it is not. It is justly accounted by Doddridge as unnatural, and tending to sink the sense.

12. τὴ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες τῇ διψεί υπομένοντες τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες. Many Commentators, ancient and modern, think that these three clauses are to be taken conjointly, as serving to shew the Christian's supports under adversity. Chrys., too, considers them conjointly, but in a different view, namely, as ὑπεκκαύματα τοῦ πυρὸς ἐκείνου. See his very eloquent explanation, which is, however, too fanciful and the phraseology turgid. Besides, how can διψεί be considered as an ὑπέκκαυμα. I rather assent to Theophyl., that the clause τὴ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες is meant to suggest the means and motives by which the above mentioned duties may be accomplished; namely ἐὰν τῇ ἐλπίδι συνεγεμένα. The connexion is also skilfully pointed out by Theodoret thus; 'Ο γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι ξέαν, καὶ προβῶμα τῶν δεσποτῶν δουλεύει, καὶ προσμένει τῶν ἐλπιδομένων ἀγαθῶν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν, καὶ τῶν προσπιτῶτων περιγίνεται πειρασμῶν, ταῖς τούτων προσβολαίς τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἀνικτάττων, καὶ τὴν θείαν χάριν διηνεκῶς εἰς συμμαχίαν καλῶν.

Τῇ διψεὶ υπομένοντες. The construction (which is not sufficiently attended to by the Commentators) is this: ἐν τῇ διψεί υπομεν. scil. τῇ ἐλπίδι, or ὑπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος. For the Apostle (I think) means to suggest that by this Christian hope they were to bear up under affliction. So Theophyl. Ἡσεθεὶ τῇ ἐλπίς τῶν μελλόντων ἐστὶ, φησι, διὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ μέγα καρπάσῃ καλὰ, τὸ καὶ καρπεῖον καὶ δόκιμον γίνεσθαι, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν διψειν υπομονῆς.
Τῇ προσεύχῃ προσκαρτεροῦντες, "assiduously persevering in prayer." Προσκ. is a very strong term. We have the same phrase in Acts 1, 14, and 6, 14., and προσκαρτερήσει in Eph. 6, 18. This clause is (as Theophyl. observes) meant to suggest another and most powerful means for accomplishing the above-mentioned duties. But then it must be fervent, persevering, and earnest prayer. See Chrysostom.

18. ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες, "communicating to the necessities of believers." Chrysostom and the Greek Commentators injudiciously (I think) press on the term κοινων. which, they say, means far more than παρέχω; as if it signified that we were to be partakers of their indigence: which is not only absurd, but by no means countenanced by the true sense of κοινωνεῖν, which is properly used with a Dat. of person, and a Genitive of thing, with παρὰ or the dative with ἐν, and denotes 1. to have any thing in common with, (as in the classical writers, from whom numerous examples may be seen in St. Thes. 5136.) and 2. to make any one partaker with us of any thing. So Gal. 6, 6. κοινωνεῖται δὲ δὲ κατηχομένως τῶν λόγων τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς. (Of this latter sense Budeus and Steph. Thes. adduce no examples from the Classical writers.) This, however, only expresses that we make him partaker with us, but does not infer the degree of participation. Thus when we give ever so small a sum to another, we make him participate in our property, though in a very small degree, and unequal proportion.* So that the term does not, in fact, materially differ from παρέχω.

Into another error too this same injudicious pressing on the term led the antient Commentators; namely, to represent charity as an ἐμπορία, and the gain as common. For (says Chrys. 182, 9.) κοινωνία γὰρ ἐστὶν. εἰσφέρεις σὺ χρήματα; εἰσφέροντι σοι παράδοσιν ἐκείνοι τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν* language far too lax and un-guarded. And this Theophyl. has pushed still fur-

* It is plain that this κοινωνία is only meant to be of our abundance. See Livy ap. Wets.
ther, by explaining thus: οὐ μὲν γὰρ χρῆματα διδᾶς,
ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀντεισφέρουσι τῶν υἱῶν. A most heterodox
doctrine (to say the least), and one of the worst
dogmas of Popery. As to the reading μνείας, it
is entitled to no attention, being supported by
only three MSS., and no Versions and early Com-
mentators. Koppe says that it makes no difference
in the sense; since κοινωνεῖν ταῖς μνείαις τῶν ἁγίων
is equivalent to μνημονεύειν τῶν ἁγίων. And he
refers to Gal. 2, 10. τῶν πταχῶν ὧν μνημονεύειμεν.
But that passage is little to the purpose; and without
some direct authority from St. Paul, or some other
sacred writer, this sense cannot be admitted. Nay,
if the true ratio of the word κοινωνεῖν be attended to,
no such can be expected to exist. Besides, on such
an interpretation, the singular, and not the plural
might be expected. Now the singular occurs else-
where in Scripture; the plural, I suspect, no where.
The truth is, if the reading were genuine, no other
sense could well be elicited from it than that which
has been laid down by most Roman Catholic Com-
mentators, namely, of making contributions for the
expenses of festivals to celebrate the memory of the
Saints on the days of their martyrdom. (See Wolf’s
Curae, and Carpzov.) But this is contrary to the
scope of the Apostle, and supposes (what has no
probability) that a persecution unto death of the
Roman Christians had long before existed; and
what is most fatal to this notion) that practice had
then been most firmly established, of which we find
no trace for more than a century afterwards! There
cannot (I think) be the least doubt but that the
reading was by crafty design introduced into the
text, from the margin, where it had been noted
down by some who, ignorant of the true sense of
ἁγίων (viz. Christians), and who living at a period
when the festivals of the Saints (properly so called)
were in general use, and their reliques enshrined and
adorned in the most costly manner, noted down
μνείας as an explanation, which was afterwards in-
troduced into the text.
The common interpretation, which assigns, not the memory of dead, but the indigence of living, Christians, as the sense, is supported by the words following, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διάκονος: for these two clauses are undoubtedly connected together, and after charity to the poor is enjoined hospitality to the Christian strangers.

14. διάκονος. This is a strong term, in which there is an agonistik, or, as some say, venestick metaphor. It is found in this figurative sense, both here, and in 9, 30 & 31. 14, 19. 1 Cor. 14, 1. διάκονος τὴν ἁγαθίν. It may, however, be too much pressed, in interpretation; and yet I cannot approve of the tame version of Macknight, "practise hospitality:" for (as Theophrastus observes) it is not μετιουτες φιλοξενίας. Doddridge renders "pursuing hospitality." But our language will, I conceive, scarcely bear this idiom. Our Common Translators have better rendered: "given to hospitality."

It is justly remarked by Doddridge, that it was the more proper for the Apostles so frequently to enforce this duty, as the want of public inns rendered it difficult for strangers to procure accommodations, and as many Christians might be banished their native country for religion, and perhaps were laid under a kind of bann of excommunication, both among Jews and Heathens, which would make it a high crime for any of their former brethren to receive them into their houses."* Schoettgen here adduces several Rabbinical passages in praise of hospitality.

14. After treating of brotherly love, the Apostle, in the verses following, up to the end of the chapter, (which are closely connected together, and mark the

* For the elegant illustration in his paraphrase the Dr. acknowledges his obligations to Mr. Blackwall; and that learned person might as well have acknowledged his to Theophyl., who borrowed it from Chrysostom. The eloquent Father has brought it forward as a proeme to his impressive ἱστορία, moral, or application, of the whole of this interesting portion of Scripture.
duties of Christians under the injuries of enemies) inculcates good will even towards enemies, and an entire abstinence from all vindictive feelings towards them. (Theophylact and Koppe.)

By διώκοντες is especially meant those who persecute for religion’s sake; and here it is proper to notice the emphasis communicated to the present injunction, first by the repetition of εὐλογεῖτε, “bless (I say);” ἡδίω, by the same thing being expressed negatively as well as affirmatively; which is called a Hebraism: though indeed it occurs also in the Classical writers.*

15. χαίειν μετὰ χαιρόντων—κλαιόντων.

Some early modern Commentators, as Tolet., take this as a general precept, enjoining love towards enemies as well as friends. This, however, proceeds on a wrong view of the scope of the sentence. As to the explanation of Koppe, it is too vague and indistinct. Crellius says the Apostle now passes to the duties of common life, both towards brethren, and towards all men. But it may be thought matter of doubt whether there be any transition. There seems rather to be some connection with the preceding, and this has been pointed out by the antient Commentators, Chrysost. Theophyl. &c., with somewhat more success than by the modern ones. The circumflexum, however, of the connection (if I mistake not) is this. After laying down an injunction which might have seemed παράδοτος, as respects enemies, the Apostle subjoins to it another which respects fellow Christians, and all fellow-creatures who are not enemies; namely, to feel unfeigned sympathy with them, both in prosperity and adversity; not so, however, that (as the early modern Commentators, followed by Hardy, explain) we are to be supposed to have the same feeling of their prosperity and adversity that they have, which is manifestly impossible.

* Besides the above sources of emphasis which have been noticed by the modern Commentators, there is another inherent in the terms themselves. For (as Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators observe) the Apostle does not say μὴ μηνιασκεῖτε, μηδὲ ἀμύνεσθε, but, what is far more, εὐλογεῖτε. And (continues Theophyl.) the Apostle has added μὴ καταρᾶσθε, meaning thereby that we should do neither that nor the other. For he who blesses them that persecute him for Christ’s sake, shews that he rejoices in suffering for the object of his affection: but he who curses, evinces that he does not so rejoice; and hence it is plain, that he does not love him for whom he is persecuted.” This mode of explanation seems greatly preferable to that adopted by most recent Commentators, who pare down and explain away the solid meaning of the terms εὐλογεῖν and καταρᾶσθαι, by making them equivalent only to well-wishing, and hating.
The μετά does not settle the degree of sympathy. That will differ according to circumstances, to detail which would be here out of place.

The true scope of the Apostle, and the force of this injunction, is admirably illustrated by Chrysost. He shows that it requires a more generous and philosophic spirit to rejoice with them that rejoice, than to weep with them that weep; since, in the latter case, nature inclines us to sympathy; but, in the former, the baleful passion of envy is apt to rise, so that it is difficult not to envy, and much more so, to rejoice with them. "And yet (continues he) there is no stronger cement to love than this sympathetic affection, when genuine. Think not, because you stand apart from calamities, that you may remain devoid of sympathy. For by that sympathy you may lighten the sorrow, if not remove the calamy of your suffering neighbour; and assuredly, enhance the satisfaction, if not increase the prosperity, of your rejoicing neighbour: κοινωνεί τοίνυν τῶν δακρῶν, ἵνα κοινωπή τὴν ἀθυμίαν' κοινωνεί χάρας, ἵνα μείωση τὴν εὐφροσύνην, καὶ ἠθές τὴν ἀγαθίν, καὶ πρὸ ἑκείνου σαύτων ὠψεῖσθαι, διὰ μὲν τῶν δακρύων, ἐλεήμονα κατακεκυκλώσειν, διὰ δὲ τοῦ συνήδεσμα, φθόνον καὶ βασανίας ἐκαταδιώκων. See also Theophyl. Theodoret has here the following brief, but pithy, exposition: Κοινωνείτε ἀλλήλους, καὶ τῶν λυπηρῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐνναιτίων τὸ μὲν γὰρ συμπαθεῖσαι, τὸ δὲ φιλιᾶς οὐχ ἔχουσί τοῦ φθόνον τῶν μῖμων. There is only one point on which I differ in opinion with Chrysost., Theophyl., and others; namely, when they suppose this verse has reference to the same persons as those who formed the subject of the last. For surely sympathy in the joys and sorrows of our enemies is not to be expected. And the εἰλογεῖν, it must be remembered, refers rather to words, than to feelings and sentiments, which (notwithstanding what Chrysost. says) cannot be διαθερμαίνεσθαι τῇ φιλίᾳ towards our enemies and persecutors. See some excellent illustrations of this subject by Bp. Butler ap. D'Oyley and Mant.

With the sentiment Wetstein has compared several from the Classical writers; ex. gr. Plaut. Amph. 3, 3, 3. Anthol. 1, 12, 5. Philostr. p. 736. Eurip. Iph. A. 406. Dio Cass. p. 255. And one from a Rabbinical writer. Bulkley, too, cites Xen. Cyr. s. f. "It is a very difficult matter to be able always to do good to those whom we wish to serve; but, for this very reason, we should be the more solicitous to appear pleased when any good befalls them, and to sympathize with them in their difficulties, and to prevent, as far as we can, their falling into them." I add the following. Xen. Cyr. 8, 2. συνηθόμενοι μὲν ἐκ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς φανερὸς εἶναι, συναρκόμενοι δὲ ἐκ τοῖς κακοῖς. Pollux 6, 136, 1. δὲ ἀξιότατοι μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοτροις, χαίρετε δὲ τοῖς ἀτάκτων κακοῖς. Liban. Orat. 52 c. συνηλεύεται τοῖς ἀνίμωμοις, συνχαίρετο τοῖς βαδίσατο. And 379 D. ίκανος παραμυθήσατο τῷ λυπουμένῳ μὲν συνηθήσατο, in which passage there is a lacuna, which I would thus fill up: λυπουμένῳ μὲν συναναπτήσαι, ἤδονείς δὲ συνεργήσαι. Soph. Ed. Col. 751. τοῖς γὰρ ἐμπείροις βροτῶν Μόνοις οὖν τε συνταλαίπωρεῖν τάδε, ι. e. κακῶν. So the Horatian, "Haud ignarus mali miseris succurrere disco. Oschyl. Agam. 764. Edit. Blomf. (showing how imperfectly this is done in
the last world.) τῷ δυστυχαγούτι δ' ἐπιστενάξειν Πάς τις ἐτοιμάζειν ἔγειρεν ἢ τοιμάζειν. Ἐκ τῆς ὑποκρίτης ἔπειτα, ἑταίρα ἐποίηκε τις ἄνθρωπος ἀνάμεσα θυσίας ἄρειμάν ἐν τῷ πνεύμα τῷ θεῷ ἵνα προσκευταῖ τοῖς ἐν ἀγίῳ ἐκείνῳ, ὁ ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῖς ἀπειλῇ ἔχειν. "It is not my manner to hate with those that hate, but to love with those that love." Soph. Aj. 255. Ἰππέρα δ' ἀνεβαίνει, εἰ νεώτερος τις αἴρεσιν, λάβων, Φίλους ἀνίκητοι αὐτοὶ ἤδονής ἔχειν, ἡ κοινὸς ἐν κοινοῖς λυ- πεῖναι ἔλευν; Eurip. Helen. 797. κακός γὰρ ὅσις μη σέβει τὰ δεσποτέων καὶ μικρόν καὶ μεγίστου κακοῦς. Eurip. Ion. 935. ἐν συνεδραίς γ' οἶδα γενναίως φίλους.

16—21. In these verses we have precepts respecting Christian prudence, which if any one will observe, he may avoid, or at least soften, many calamities. Here, then, two things especially are inculcated: a mutual concord among Christians (by which it is certain an indifferent condition may be bettered, and adversity be rendered far more tolerable;) and mildness and forbearance, even towards enemies, nay even a readiness, if possible, to render them services. (Koppe.)

16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες. These words, from the extensiveness and indeterminateness of the terms employed, admit of more than one meaning. In which view it is observed by Rufinus: "Sermo iste non natura sua, sed interpretatione obscurior factus est." One thing seems clear, that φρονεῖν does not, as some ancient Commentators maintain, relate ad intelligentiam, but ad affectum animi. And so Origen, Beza, Erasmus, Cameron, Crellius, and most Commentators since their time. The sentence is thus paraphrased by Erasmus (ap Koppe): "idem alii in alios (de aliis) sentientes nemo putet alium se minorem; sed omnibus se accommodet, de omnibus ex aequo bene sentiat." By Hardy (from the early Commentators and Crellius) thus: "Sit affectuum et animorum concordia; et aliar alterius commoda mutuo affectu promovete." But the simplest, and perhaps the truest interpretation, is that of Rufinus (cited by Wets.): "Hoc est quod dicit: ut ita de fratre sentiamus, ut de nobis ipsis, et ita velimus proximo, sicut et nobis volumus, ut in Evangelio dominus dicit: quæ vultis, ut vobis faciant homines,
et vos facile illis." Here Wets. refers to Rom. 15. 5. Phil. 2. 2. 3. 15 & 16.*

16. μὴ τὰ υψηλὰ φρονεῖτε, ἀ. τ. τ. σ. These two clauses undoubtedly correspond to each other. With respect to the first, the phrase μὴ τὰ υψηλὰ φρον. is equivalent to μὴ υψηλαφρονεῖτε at 11, 21., though far more elegant. So Lucian Herm. 5. (cited by Wets.) υψηλὰ γὰρ ἥδη φρονεῖς. To which may be added Lucian Somn. §. 32. p. 79. (cited by Bulkley) "Οσοὶ — μὲ πάνω μετέφασα μητὲ υψηλὰ ἐφράσθησαν — Μή· Ἐστιν τινα καὶ συνετοὺς λέγεις. Wets. here refers to Is. 26. 5. The neuter, therefore, ought to be dropt (as is done by the early modern Commentators and our common Translators) and the υψηλὰ be taken adverbially. Thus Tyndal well renders: "Be not highe-minded." Now this will guide us to the sense of the apodotical clause, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τακτεῖνεσχὰς קא plur. which is susceptible of more than one meaning; and, as it somewhat recedes from the usage of language, has occasioned some perplexity. Most recent Interpreters adopt the exposition of Koppe, who, adhering to the general sense of ἀπαγεθαι, explains the whole verse thus: "Do not, through pride, withdraw yourselves from intercourse with your afflicted brethren, but willingly associate with them, and bear their distresses." But I do not see how the notion of distresses can be elicited from συναπ., except by great harshness. It involves far less difficulty to suppose that the Apostle has here somewhat receded from the common use of the term,

* And he cites Homer II. § 361. τὰ γὰρ φρονεῖς, & τὸ ἐγὼ τερ. & ν. 437. πάντες ἐνα φρεσιν θυμὸν ἐχοντες. Aristid. in Alex. p. 80. μέγιστον δʼ ἢν ἢ μὲν πρὶς ἀλλὰ, ὅτι ἵσον φρονεῖν ἐπʼ ἀλλὰς εἰχὸμεν' ἐγὼ μὲν ἐκεῖνης ὡς διδασκόλῳ φιλοτιμούμενος, ὁ δʼ ἐν οίκειαι δόξης μέρει τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς τιθέμενος & in Cyzicinum, p. 246. τʼ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν δεῖ μὲν ἰδίῳ εὐθύκειν πράγμα, τοῖς δὲ παρότοι καιροῖς καὶ σφόδρα συμβαίνου. The same phrase τʼ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν, and in this same sense occurs in Liban. Or. 440 c. & 864 b. And I would add that τʼ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν and τʼ αὐτὸ often occur in Aristid. (as T. 1, 481 a. T. 2. p. 7.), and repeatedly in the Orat. περὶ ὁμονοιας, T. 2. 337. et seq.
and, as is thought by Chrysost. and all the Greek Commentators (surely better judges of phraseology, as well as sense, than modern Commentators can be expected to be), uses it for συμπεριφέρεσθαι, συγκαταβαίνειν. So Theodoret, who explains it συγκατέναι, to condescend.* The above Commentators, too, very rightly, take τοῖς ταξείσις in the masculine (for persons), not in the neuter, as many modern Commentators.

The ratio metaphoræ has (I think) been best pointed out by Beza, as follows: "Dicuntur συνατάγεσθαι qui in aliorum gratiam ab instituto itinere deflectant, ut illos assecentur." He has not, however, laid hold on the right clue, which is this. A person is said συνατάγεσθαι, when he is met with by a crowd, and is hurried away with them in the direction they are going. But, as passive verbs are often used in a reciprocal sense, so συνατάγεσθαι may signify to yield oneself to a multitude, and go with them. And this admits of a good as well as a bad sense; in the former of which it is here taken, and figuratively denotes to condescend to: which well expresses humility in its various offices, of course including that mentioned by Koppe, and that especially insisted on by Chrysost.: namely, of personally visiting, and relieving the sick.† In fact, it denotes a humble temper of mind, as shown in condescension to others, even though they may be supposed to be inferior to us in rank, station, or ability. And this is confirmed by what follows, which seems to be exegetical of the preceding.

16. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς, "be not wise in your own conceits, or in your own eyes." This,

* Thus Carpzov rightly takes the latter clause for ταξείνοφρονεῖν.
† In which view Wets. paraphrases thus: "Sit apud vos modestiae locus, sit demissis hominibus perfugium, sit auxilio pudori, i.e. Demittite animos vestros, atque eo loco vos esse existimate, quo sunt, qui tanquam humiles contemnuntur." Heb. 13, 3. Sir. 3, 20 & 22.
it may be observed, is exegetical of the preceding, and is an admonition repeated from 11, 25., where see the note. Φρονιμισθ is for σοφος. The words have the appearance of a popular and adagial dict, taken, it seems, from Prov. 3, 7. and Is. 5, 21. Koppe here compares Ἀeschyl. παρ' εαυτῷ τὸ δίκαιον ἔχειν. But there ἔχειν is for κατέχειν. The passage is we' paraphrased by Theophyl. as follows: Μη νομίζετε ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ εαυτοῖς, καὶ μη δείξατε ἐτέρου τοῦ συμβουλευομένου. η τὸ δὲν ὑποδημομένου. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ Μωσῆς τῷ Θεῷ αἰμίλει, ἀλλ' ἐδείξῃ συμβουλοῦ τοῦ πενθεροῦ.

17. μηθεὶ κακόν — ἀνθραίπτων. The Apostle, having thus far shown how studiously Christians ought to cultivate peace and concord one with another, proceeds to teach how they ought to do it with other men. (Crellius.) He, at the same time, inculcates forbearance towards enemies, and patience in bearing their injuries, as opposed to thirst of vengeance, which only serves to perpetuate hatred, and inflame animosity. (Koppe.) This, of course, only respects individuals, not communities. There evil may be recompensed with evil; as is clear from Rom. 13, 4. The precept, itself, is in perfect accordance with that of our Lord, which strictly forbids private retaliation.*

* A sentiment not unknown to the Jewish writers. To which purpose Wets. has, among other Rabbinical citations, one from Rabbi Simeon, who, improving on the maxim of Solomon ("He that rendereth evil for good, evil shall not depart from his house"), says: "He that rendereth evil for evil, evil shall not depart from his house." Nor are examples wanting even in the Classical writers. Thus Koppe compares Seneca de Irā 2, 32. Non enim, ut in beneficiis honestum est, merita meritis repensarr, ita injurias injuriis. And Strigil compares Valer. Max. Speciosis injurias beneficiis vincuntur, quam mutui odii pertinaciā pensantur. To which I add Polyæn. L. 5. p. 486, 1. ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐγχρωμίντες προσεκτικῶν ὅσ κακὼν ἡμινάμην, ἀλλ' ἀναβάς κακῶν. Plato, p. 36 π. οὐδὲ (δεί) ἀδικοῦμεν ἄρα ἀνθραίπτειν, ὡς τολλοῦ όισωτα. And a little after we have: τὶ δὲ ἀντικαταφροζεῖν κακῶς πάσχοντα ἦς τολλοῖ φασί, δίκαιον ὑπὸ δίκαιον; οὐδεμισθ. And again, 37. π. οὐκα κακώς πάσχοντα ἀνίσνεσθαι ἀντιδόρωντις κακών. There is also a passage put in the mouth of Dion. by Plut. Dion. 47., which is, perhaps, for beauty, not to be paralleled in the whole range of Classical literature: — τὸ γὰρ ἀντὶ τιμωρεῖται τοῦ προαδικέτεν νῦν δικαιότερον ὑπίσθατ' φύσι κινήμενον ὑπὸ μιᾶς ἀθένελες ἀνθρώπου δὲ κακίαν,
17. προοιμενοι καλὰ ἑνάκιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων. These words do not seem to have any very close connexion with the context. Koppe, indeed, would effect a connexion by a mode of interpretation receding from that supported by all other Commentators, ancient and modern. He considers the passage as taken from Prov. 3, 4., and, following the sense of the present Hebrew text, would render it: “conciliating the favour and good will of men.” But we are not compelled to follow the Hebrew text, with which we have here nothing to do. The words are from the Sept. Version, and can have no other sense than that assigned by the generality of Commentators; namely: “providing, taking care (to do) things honest, and of good repute, in the sight both of God and man.” Besides, the Apostle himself again uses the whole clause in that very sense, applying it to his own case, at 2 Cor. 8, 21., where see the note. And moreover the phrase προοιμίσθαι καλῶν occurs at 1 Tim. 2, 8., and in Sext. Emp., cited by Wetstein, and προοιμίσθαι τοῦ δικαίου in Joseph. Ant. 9, 1, 1. In all these cases προοιμίσθαι is for προοιμίαν ποιεῖσθαι, to take care of,* and is of frequent occurrence with various substantives.

ei καὶ χαλέπτων ἑπτην, ὅσον τῶν ἀγών εἶναι παντάπασι καὶ δύσκολον, ὅσε μὴ μεταβάλλειν χάριτι νικηθῆσαι ὑπὸ τῶν τολλάκις εὑρούντων.

To those, however, who may be inclined, on this ground, to doubt whether the sublime doctrine of unqualified forgiveness of injuries was indeed a new one introduced by Jesus Christ, I would answer, 1st, that it seems not improbable that the above cited writers might be indebted for this sentiment to the New Testament, which it can scarcely be supposed that persons so curious and investigating would neglect to peruse. Certain it is, that to the publication of the New Testament alone can we usually ascribe that higher tone, and more refined purity of ethics so observable in the moral philosophy of the second and succeeding centuries. Besides, in the above writers we have only the bare doctrine, unaccompanied by those all-powerful motives to its performance, which none but the searcher of all hearts could have devised, and unsupported by those divine sanctions which would vainly be sought for out of the limits of Christian Theology.

* Dr. Macknight, absurdly pressing on the sense of προ, renders premeditated.
(See Wetstein’s examples.) And it is in vain Koppe objects, that in the present case we have the Accusative, not the Genitive; since that syntax produces the same sense. I am surprised that the Commentators should not have perceived that in this construction there is an ellipsis of τοιεῖν, which makes the sense complete. The syntax is indeed rare; yet I have myself noted the following examples. Dionys. Hal. 515, 47. οὕτε προνοούμεναι αἰτίως — τὸ μὴ ὅρασθαι. Xenoph. ap Steph. Thes. ταῦτα προνοούμενη & Mem. 4, 312. τὰ συμφέροντα προνοεῖται περὶ τῶν μελλόντων. Hipp. 7, 10. ἕκεῖνο καλῶς προνοεύτα & Cyr. 41, 4. τὸ παραγεγελόμενον προνοεῖτε & 6, 3, 7. τὸ παραγεγελόμενον προνοεῖν, where Zeun, without reason, conjectures προσνοεῖν from the editio Guelph, which is indeed a vox nihili. Thucyd. p. 61. προσεκτικὰ ταῦτα & 6, 9. προνοεῖται τὸ σώματος τί.

Still the connexion is not clear. Koppe refers it to the preceding clause. But this mode of interpretation (as we have seen) is inadmissible. It is, indeed, referred to the preceding by Tolet. and others, and also OEcumen.; but on very weak grounds. Chrysost., however, decidedly unites it with the following clause. See his very ingenious and masterly exposition, which, however, does not, to me, appear very solid, nor his reasoning quite convincing. As the words εἰ δυνατὸν — εἰρημένοις are closely connected with the foregoing Μηδὲν κακῶς, &c., it is probable that προνοούμενοι, &c. is a parenthetical clause.* If there be any connection, it is with the preceding.

18. εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ἕμοι, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρημένοις. Koppe considers this as the same sentiment repeated; since the Apostle saw that in this mildness of disposition was placed the greatest safeguard of their happiness. But it is not, I think, a mere repetition: though (as Crellius observes) the

* And such seems to have been the opinion of Theophyl., who has the following sensible remarks: οὐχ ἵνα πρὸς κενοδοξίαν ἔως, τοῦτο φησιν, ἀλλ’ ἵνα μὴ παρέχωμεν καθ’ ἡμῶν ἀφομία τοῖς βουλομένοις. Τὸ γὰρ ἀσκανδάλιστον καὶ ἀπόροσκοπον ἡμαῖς.
study of peace is a kindred virtue, to that of bearing injuries; nay, the latter is a medium for practising the former. It is thought remarkable by Dodd., that Dr. Barrow adds "this must include living at peace with heretics and schismatics." But had Dr. Dodd. read Chrysost., the Fathers, and Greek Commentators, he would have thought it not at all strange.* And they are thus far right, that religious peace must be here included; yet not even peace must be purchased by compromising what we consider to be truth, when that truth is at stake; though, when that is not the case, we should strive that if ὁμοθελεῖα cannot be maintained, there may be as much as possible of ὁμονοία; since the latter may, with prudent management, lead to the former.

The expressions εἰ δυνατῶ, if it be possible,† and τὸ ἐξ ὁμοῦ (sub. κατὰ and μέρος) "as far as your part reaches, as far as depends upon you," (the latter of which qualifies or explains the former), seem to be introduced to illustrate the sense of the εἰρηνεύειν, which is, that you live at peace, or be friends with all men,‡ by bearing injuries from them, and doing them good in return; § so that (as Crellius says) it may be always peace on your part. τὸ ἐξ ὁμοῦ.

* So Chrysost. 186, 28. εἰ δὲ τοῦ τῆς εὐσέβειας παραβατιστουμένης ἵδιος, μὴ προτιμά τὴν ὁμονοίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ ἵστασο γενναίος ἦς θανάτου.

† This necessarily admits that it is sometimes not possible. "And no wonder (says Chrysost.) that this should not be possible, with respect to others, when it is not always possible with respect to man and wife."

‡ By πάντων ἰνθρώπων is evidently meant both Christians, Jews, and Gentiles.

§ Wets. here compares the following similar sentiments. Philo T. 2. p. 31. 28. κερδαινεὶν γὰρ κέρδος μὲγίστον εἰρήνην, καὶ τοῖς δὲ ἐκείνωσ ἀθενεστέρῳ παραχωρήσειν ὁτίνος οὖν ὃν ἰσχυρότερος: τὸ δὲ νικῶν δυνάμεος βούλουσ᾽ ἀν ἡγεῖται μὴ πυγμάχους τῷ δύνασθαι; μόνος δὲ οὗτος τὸ ἄριστον οὖν ἐν ῥώμῃ καὶ πλεονεξίᾳ τιθέμενος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀστασιάσει βιω καὶ τὸ ἑαυτῷ ἥκων μέρος ἕνυχάζοντι, πάντων ἢδοκεν εἶναι θαναμαστότατος. Britachoth, fol. 17, 1. Abai frequenter illud in ore habuit: Homo respondeat blandè, remittat iram, multiplicet pacem cum fratibus et propinquís suis, imo cum omnibus hominibus, etiam cum peregrinis in plateis, ut ametur supra et infra, et accipiat sit omnibus hominibus,
19. μὴ ἐκουσθῇσ ἐκδίκουντες. In interpreting these words, the force of the pronouns in this sentence must be especially attended to; since they are, I think, emphatic; and the scope of the whole is, to forbid private retaliation, and to enjoin the injured person to leave vengeance to others, i.e. either God, or the public and the laws.* And it is of importance to attend to this, since it will enable us to arrive at the sense of the next clause, which otherwise is not easy of determination. Now there are three ways in which the clause δοτε τότων τῇ ὀργῇ may be, and has been explained. The ὀργῇ may be referred to the person injured; and then the δοτε τότον, some think, will mean: "let it go, defer venting it, give space to that anger, which is a furor brevis, and may thus have time to cool." So the Arabic Version, Ambros. De Dieu, Surenhus, &c. But no such sense can be proved to be inherent in the words; neither would it be suitable to the words following, "for it is written," &c.

Others, as Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, Augustin, Luther, Vorstius, Beza, Casaub., Gatak., Cameron, Schmid, Grot., Le Clerc, Hammond, and Elsner, refer the ὀργῇ to God. So CEcumen. 372 A. δοτε τότων καὶ χαράν τῇ ὀργῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἀν γὰρ σὺ ἐκδίκησις σεαυτῶν, ἐλθοῦσα ἡ ὀργῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐχ ἔξω χαράν τοῦ ἐκδίκησαι ὃτι προεικοῦσα σεαυτῶν εἰ γὰρ σὺ μὴ ἄμωμη, ἔξω ἡ ὀργῇ. And Theophyl. 126. δοτε πάροδον τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ὀργῇ κατὰ τῶν ἐκδίκουντων

* This sense has been established by Grotius; and, for illustrations of it, I refer the reader to Soph. Οἰ. 320., where the Schol. explains: οὔτε μακροθυμεῖς ἐξηγεῖ τοῖς προπαθοῦσιν ἀντιμισσομένοις & Οἰ. Col. 214. Ἐσχ. Eumen. 981. Ἐσχ. Agam. 1234. Schol. on Ἐσχ. cheoph. 325. Plut. Dion. 47.

It is truly observed by Macknight, that "this precept is founded, as in religion, so in right reason, and in the good of society. For he who avenges himself, making himself accuser, and judge, and executioner, all in one person, runs a great hazard of injuring both himself and others, by acting improperly, through the influence of passion."
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υμᾶς. And this interpretation, which seems, upon the whole, the best founded, has been adopted by Wolf, Rosenm., Koppe, and Schleusner.

Others, again, as Vat., Drusius, Est., Menoch., Tirinus, Anselm, Cortius, Schoettg., Wets., and Hammond, refer the ὀργῇ to the injurer; i. e. by leaving him. In support of this interpretation Wets. cites Petron. 94. cede injuriae. Thucyd. 1, 33. εἶξαν τῇ ημετέρᾳ ὀργῇ. And he refers to the Pythagorean maxim, "Do not stir the fire with iron," i. e. υπείκειν τοῖς ὀργιζομένοις & 462 β. δεὶ δὲ μηδὲ πείζοντας αὐτῇ (τῇ ὀργῇ) διδόναι τόπον and other passages, though less to the purpose.* But in the last citation, διδόναι χώραν ὀργῇ signifies to give way to our own anger, not to yield to that of another: and in that of Thucyd. the phrase is itself determinate: which is not the case with this of St. Paul. Besides, the term ὀργῇ must thus be taken for the violence or injury of the angry person: which would be very harsh.

The context, then, by which alone the sense can be determined, requires the second† interpretation, which is decidedly preferable: and as it has not been confirmed and illustrated by any Classical passages, the following may be acceptable. Eurip. Suppl. 511. ἐξηρτεύεται ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ τιμωρούμενος. υμᾶς δὲ ὑβρίζειν οὐκ ἔχειν τοιχόν ὑβριν. Phocyl. 13, 72. μὴ μιμῶ κακότητα. Δίκη δὲ ἀπελέψειν ἄμυναν Πειθῶ μὲν γὰρ ὄνειρα ἔσθι δ᾽ ἔρην ἀντιφυτεύει. Theophyl. 126. s. f. remarks, that this is πρὸς παραμυθῆναι μικροψύχων, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀλλὰ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν οὐς ἰδεῖν ἑαυτοῦς ἐκδικηθέντας. The sentiment is, however, injudicious; since (as Crell. well observes) when it is said that by their forbearance

† Oleander and Koppe would unite the first and second interpretations: a method surely uncritical and inadmissible. Schoettgen would conjoin all three; which is the very acme of absurdity,
and patience Christians leave place for Divine vengeance, it is not meant that this vengeance is their intention, but only that it is the event, or result, of their patient endurance and forbearance.*

19. ἐμεῖς ἐκδίκησις ἔγα ἀνταποδόσα. The words are from Deut. 32, 35. (cited also at Heb. 10, 30.), where the pronouns are both emphatical. The second clause is exegetical and intensive.

20. ἔὰν ὁδε πεῖν, &c. It is rightly observed by Crellius, that the ὁδε shows this precept depends upon the preceding. And Chrys., Theophyl., and Ecumen., have well seen that there is here a sort of climax; q. d. "I not only exhort you εἰπροεῖν, but I enjoin you to do good to your enemy. This will be, indeed, the test whether vindictive feelings are thoroughly suppressed; namely, whether you are ready to perform the common offices of humanity towards him, if he should need them." For this is all that is meant by feeding him, and giving him drink; these being adduced as an example; though they must extend to all such benefits as the person might have claimed had he not injured you. The expressions themselves are taken from Prov. 25, 21 & 22. Πηγνίζειν, from Πηγή (and that from ψωμός, ψάω, ρυάο), signifies, literally, to give a bit, a mouthful; but in the Sept. it answers to the Heb. יָבָשׁ, "to give one to eat, to supply food." See Schleus. Lex. Vet. Test. Πηγνίζειν signifies to give drink; as in Matt. 10, 42. 25, 35., and elsewhere.

It is, however, of more importance to attend to the sense of the controverted passage, ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν, αἰνού, on which various have been the opinions of Commentators and Theologians, all of which it cannot be expected that I should review. To such only as have any semblance to truth or probability can I advert. The most popular opinion for the last century is, that there is here a metaphor derived from founding, i.e. an allusion to the melting of lead, or other fusible metals; and that the expression signifies, "thou shalt thereby melt down his enmity, and warm him to kindness and affection." (See Macknight.) And this

* For the patience here inculcated may be referred to both those classes into which the philosopher Epictetus has distributed this virtue, the δὲ κνεμ. and the ἀδικημ. bear and forbear.

K 2
mode of interpretation was adopted by Jerome, Hilary, Piscator, Vorstius, Schottus, Francke, Hanum, Schultens, Wolf, Heumann, Doddridge, Taylor, Macknight, and Jaspis. But, however ingenious, there is not, as far as I can find, sufficient authority for it either from Classical or Rabbinical examples, and it is devoid of all support from those who may be supposed to have best understood the import of Greek phraseology. And as there is not a shadow of proof that this is the sense, so there is the greatest reason to think it is not. For the phrase, both in the passage of Proverbs 25, 21. (from whence this passage is taken,) and wherever else it occurs, (as in Ps. 140, 9 & 10. Is. 47, 11. Ezek. 10, 2. 4 Esdr. 16, 52.,) is always used of severe and Divine punishment. Thus evidence, both positive and negative is against that interpretation, which, in fact, could only have originated in well meant but mistaken views of the import involved in these words, as if it were impossible to exclude from the common interpretation a notion of vengeance, unworthy of the Apostle, and little accordant with the precepts of our Redeemer. But this, as will be seen further on, is founded on narrow and partial views of the sense, such as do credit rather to the head than the heart of those who devised them.

2. Near akin to this mode of interpretation is that first (I believe) thrown out by Augustin, and afterwards adopted by some early modern Commentators, as Crellius, and especially Hammond; and, in the last century, adopted by several Commentators of note, as Schoettgen, Doddridge, Carpzov, and Ammon; namely, that "by this conduct thou wilt touch his conscience so severely, that he will repent of his injury." But this seems very far fetched, and, like the former interpretation, is devoid of all authority; for I cannot reckon as such the mode of applying the passage found in a modern Jewish Rabbi.

The mode of interpretation which I shall now proceed to detail is the most antient, and, I think, by far the best founded one; it is supported by the Greek Fathers and Commentators, all the later ones, except Augustin and Jerome, and a very considerable part of the modern Interpreters, as Beza, Estius, Cameron, Gomar Grotius, Whible, Wetstein, Hardy, Rosenm., Koppe, Schleusner, Slade, and Turner; namely, that the words are expressive of acute pain, and severe punishment, even that of the Divine wrath and vengeance. Now this is supported by the united authority of all the passages of the Old Testament where the expression occurs, and therefore we can hardly suppose it to be otherwise used here. Besides, the context in this case requires it; for the words preceding treat of the Divine vengeance. Nor is there any well-founded objection to the above sentiment itself, when properly understood. See Chrysostom, and especially Ecumen. and Theodoret. The sense is thus expressed by Grotius: "Si alter illa tanta tua patientia ac beneficientia ad meliorem mentem revocari non potest, graviss eim impenet det poena." And

* Thus, for instance, in the passage of Prov. after the words here cited, are added, ὅ ἐν Κύριος ἀνταποδόσει σοι ἀγαθῷ; by which it is plain that evil was meant by the expression ἀθρετικὸς σωφρόνα, &c.
be observes: "Dicimur facere, cui rei occasionem praebemus, ut Luc 16, 9. Tertullianus libro de Patientiâ, Plus improbum illum cadis, sustinendo. Ab eo enim vupulabIt, cujus gratia sustinet." Koppe translates the passage thus: "Si alter illa tanta tua patientia et beneficentia non redierit ad mentem meliorem: gravis ei impendet poena." And he lays the following down as the sentiment intended to be expressed by the Apostle: "Deum sibi presentem est ei iurius cujusvis utorem, has ipsas hostium inuiarias eo minus perhorrescentem leitoresque perferrent; tum imprinis ipsis eorum adversariis, maximè Judeis, ut hi hac ipsa peanum divinaram, quas sua erga patientes benignosque Christianos crudelitate certo sibi contrahebant, comminatone a novis atrociobusque iurijus abstererentur."

The enemy is not, however, to be thus treated from any wish or intention* of drawing down the Divine wrath upon him. It is only meant that this will be the consequence, namely if he does not repent, but persists in his enmity and injury: for (as Locke and Turner observe) the persevering wickedness and impenitence of the injurer are to be supposed. So that St. Paul merely states in what the conduct of both parties will result; without intimating that the injured will be gratified.

This last interpretation, I repeat, seems, upon the whole, true; though it must be confessed that the language employed by some in detailing it (especially Chrysostom and Theophylact) is too unguarded. Wetstein (oddly enough) intermixes both interpretations in the following paraphrase. "Hoc faciens, aut ipsum tibi reconciliabas, aut saltem te ipsum tutum praestabis, nec te ipsius peccatoris et calamitatis implicable. Sin contra feceris, et malum malo rependeris, etiam supra teum caput fulmen decidet." Out of the very few examples which can be found in ancient history of returning good for evil, one is here adduced by Wetstein from Tacit. Annal. 2, 55. "Tantâ mansuetudine agebat, ut eam orta tempestat raperet in abrupto, possetque interitus inimici ad casum referri, miserit triremes, quorum subsidio discriminí eximieretur." Some others are found in Xenoph. Cyv. and Anab.

Rosenm. thinks it not necessary to interpret these words of Divine punishments. But for this opinion there is not the least foundation; since in the Old Testament the expression is invariably so applied, and the context here evidently requires this.

21. μη νικα ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ—κακὸν. This verse is not, I think, so closely connected with the preceding

---

* So Theodoret 135. εἰδέναι μὲντοι χρή, δε γνω ἐκτο θέρα-πειείν προςήκει τού διομενεί, ίνα μεῖον έκέινος τίσων δικαί' ὁ γάρ θείος ἀπόστολος ταῦτα προσέθεςε, σέβεσαι τοῦ άνδρομένου βουλήματος τού θύμου, οὐ τῷ ἀγαθῷ συν κακῷ ανδήσαι πειρόμενος· ἐτι γάρ φιλοσοφεῖν κελεύει, καὶ τῇ ἐξει διδάσκει. And so Euseben. 372 ν. μη διάθεσαι κακοτον υμεγέτει ὑπερ γαρ παραμυθει σου εἰρηνα τὰ εἰρήματα, ὃτι ὑμείς καὶ ποιήσων, ἄνθρακες πυρός τεράσσει, οὐκ ίνα μὲν τα σύνες ποιήσει. See also Photius ibidem.
as to support the second interpretation above-mentioned; but seems an independent one: though it bears a strong affinity to it. The Apostle seems here to rise still higher; and intentionally employs the expression νικά είν τῷ ἁγαθῷ, to effectually prevent any misunderstanding of his last words, as giving any countenance to procuring evil to one's enemy. And this view of the scope of the passage is confirmed by the following admirable exposition of Theophyl. 187. med., founded on Chrysost.

Τοῦτο δέν ἔκειν ήμᾶς τοιαύτη γνώμη, τοις ἐγχρώσις, ἵνα πλείονα κάλασιν αὐτοῖς ἐπέγασας, τούτῳ γὰρ ἐστὶν δί λέγει. Μὴ μικροῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, τοῦτο ἐστι γὰρ ἐστὶ τούτο. ἀλλὰ στοιδάζῃς μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ ἁγαθοτείχῃ σου νικήσαι εἰκένων, καὶ μεταβάλλεις απὸ τῆς κακίας. Ὑπερ οὗ εὑρεθῇ ἀνώτερα, πρὸς παραμομοίῳ τοῖς μικροψυχίαις εἰπε νυν δὲ τὸ τελεωτερον ἔισηγήσατο.

ROMANS, CHAP. XII. XIII.

In this second section of the practical part of the Epistle (namely in this whole chapter) are inculcated the moral duties to be observed by all Christians: 1. Those towards superiors (ἐξουσίαι ὑπερέχουσαι), the supreme magistrates † and princes eminent in dignity and station (see Phil. 2, 3.), and especially the Roman Emperors. And there was need of the admonition, since at that time there were at Rome both Jews and Christians who, from hatred of the tyranny of Claudius and Nero, had, there is reason to believe, plotted against them. (Carpzov.)

The connexion of the last and the present Chapter is thus ably pointed out by Theodoret. 135. s. m. Οὕτω διὰ τούτων τὸ ἴδιος παιδεύσας, παρακελευταί καὶ τοὺς ἀρχούσι τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀπονέμειν τιμὴν προσβεί γὰρ ἀτή τοῦ παίαγιον πνεύματος πλούσιας τὴν χάριν δεξάμενος, ἀς τινες, τόφῳ μᾶλλον ἡ δὴ διότι κεχρημένοι, τῶν βιωτικῶν ἀρχικῶν καταφρονήσουσι, μείζους εαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν γνώσιν ὑπολαμβάνοντες ἔλλας τε καὶ τὴν κατα- 
χυσίσας αὐτῶν δέξαμεν ἀποτριβόμενος τοῦτο ποιεῖ. διεβάλ- λοντο γὰρ, ἀς τοὺς κύλως ἀνατρέποντες νόμους καὶ οἱ μεν ἔλεγον, οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάρεισιν οὐ δὲ, δι᾽ ἐπερ ζήτω εἰσαγονήσει προφοιν τοῖνον ἐνύμισε καὶ περὶ τούτων νομοθέτησαι.

"Well did the Apostle know (observes Koppe) how impatient the Jews were of the Roman yoke."

* For αὐτῶ and ἀτῶς found in many MSS. I would read αὐτῶ, and subaud τὸν ἐχθρόν from the ἐχθρόν preceding, which is also to be supplied at prosedécto. As to the reading αὐτῶ, it appears to have arisen from the ν final being absorbed by the ν following and initial.

† So the Latin Potestas (See Facciol. Lex.), and the Italian Podestà.
And he refers to Joseph. Ant. 17, 2, 4. and Acts 18, 2. compared with Sueton. Claud. 25. "Lest therefore (continues he) the Christians, a great part of whom at least were Jews, should be hurried away by a desire of innovation, and thereby disgrace the doctrine of Christ, and at the same time bring on themselves evils and calamities inevitable, the provident Apostle, after explaining at large the nature and divine origin of government and magistracy, exhorts the Christians to faithfully and with alacrity discharge these duties: especially since he saw that what he himself had previously disputed concerning the liberty of Christians, might easily, by imprudent and ill disposed persons, be misconstrued, as if at variance with the authority of magistracy. The same admonitions are found at Tit. 3, 1. 1 Pet. 2, 13, and 14. (Koppe.)

Verse 1. πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαι ὑπερεχούσαι ὑπο-
tασσέσθαι. The Commentators observe that πᾶσα ψυχή, like the Hebr. וב 것이다, in Genes. 1, 10, 12, 5., is for ἐκαστὸς. But it seems to me a far more energetic expression; q. d. "Let every individual without exception," &c.; of course implying of whatever rank of subjects, and of whatever order, whether secular, or ecclesiastical.

Ἐξουσίαι ὑπερεχούσαι, "the higher powers." This signification of ἐξουσία is not unfrequent in the later Greek writers, and examples are adduced by Wets. and Koppe. So Potestas in the later Latin writers; as Amm. Marc. 14, 1. Celsæ potestates. Whence pudestia in the Italian. The expression celsæ podes-
tates is exactly parallel to this of the Apostle. All Commentators are agreed, that by the powers are meant (abstract for concrete) the persons who exer-
cise the powers; i. e. magistrates, οἱ ὑπερέχουσαι (as in ver. 3. 1 Pet. 2, 13. Sap. 6, 5. 2 Macc. 3, 11.), οἱ εὐ ὑπερεχοῦσαι (1 Tim. 2, 2.), οἱ κρατοῦσαι (Joseph, B. 11, 7.), προέχουσαι τοῖς ἀξιώμασι. (Joseph. Bell. 7, 11, 1. It refers therefore to all who ὑπερέχουσι,
are set over others, are in authority; including magistrates and officers of justice of every kind.

With this sentiment Wets. compares Pausan. Eleac. 2, 3. οἱ πάντες ἀνθρώποι θεραπεύουσιν τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ἐν ἵσχυ.

1. οὗ γὰρ εστὶν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. That to some singular providence of God the origin and whole fortunes of rulers are to be referred, is an opinion so common to and constantly prevailing among all people, that it may seem to have been instilled by the Almighty himself. (Koppe.) To this purpose we have, among other passages cited by Wets., Hesiod. Th. 96. ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλεῖς. Homer βασιλεῖς διογενεῖς and διοτρεφέος. Callim. Hymn. in Jov. Ex δὲ Διὸς βασιλεῖς, ἐπεὶ Διὸς οὐδὲν ἀνάκτων Θεότερον, τῷ καὶ σφί τεῖν ἐκείνων τάξιν. Hom. II. a 279, b. 205. Dio Chrys. 1. p. 3. c. Epict. 29. τῷ δὲ βελτίστων σοι φανομένων οὕτως ἔχῃ, αὐτὸ ὧν τῷ θεῷ τεταγμένος εἰς ταύτην τὴν τάξιν. Joseph. B. 2, 3, 7. (de Essenis) τὸ πιστὸν δὲ παρέξειν πάσι, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς κρατῶσιν, οὗ γὰρ δίκαι θεοῦ περίγνεσθαι τιμὴ τὸ ἄρχειν. Koppe, too, cites Plin. Paneg. Si adhuc dubium fuisse, sorte casuque rectores terris, an aliquo nomine darentur, principem tamen nostrum liqueret divinitas constitutum. Ammon compares Sueton. Tit. C. 9. Principatus fato datur. See also Prov. 8, 15 and 16.

Αἱ δὲ σῶσιν ἐξουσία, “the powers which exist, and are such,” i. e. not merely sovereigns de jure, but de facto. It is well remarked by Grotius, “Imperia omnia post vocationem Gentium Deus regit, ac mutat, non communi tantum illâ providentia, per quam multa relinquuit naturali ordini, sed sapientia attemperat subditorum utilitatis, aut, si ita me- ruerint, poenis. Fecit hoc et olim Deus aliquoties, Prov. 28, 2. Psalm. 75, 6 and 7. Dan. 2, 21 and 37. At Christus hoc universaliter a Christianis credi et pro certo haberi voluit, Joh. 19, 11.”

*· To the above view, however, it is objected by Macknight, that here αἱ ἐξουσίαι ὑπερέχουσι, being distinguished from οἱ ἄρχοντες,
It is plain that ἀντιτασσόμενος and ἀδεστηκεν are used

ver. 3, must signify, not the persons who possess the supreme authority, but the supreme authority itself, whereby the state is governed; whether that authority be vested in the people, or in the nobles, or in a single person, or be shared among these three orders: in short, by the higher powers is denoted that form of government which is established in any country, whatever it may be." "A remark (adds he) which deserves attention, because the Apostle's reasoning, while it holds good concerning the form of government established in a country, it is not true concerning the persons who possess the supreme power, that there is no power but from God, and that he who resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. For if the person who possesses the supreme power in any state exercises it in destroying the fundamental laws, and to the ruin of the people, such a ruler is not from God; is not authorised by him, and ought to be resisted. But with respect to the words οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῶν ἐξουσίας εἰς μᾶς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, for there is no power but from God, it must be observed that they were meant to correct the pride of the Jews, who valued themselves exceedingly because they had received a form of government from God. The government of every state, whether it be monarchial, aristocratical, democratical, or mixed, is as really of divine appointment as the government of the Jews was, though none but the Jewish form was of divine legislation. For God having designed mankind to live in society, he has, by the frame of their nature, and by the reason of things, authorized government to be exercised in every country.—At the same time, having appointed no particular form to any nation but to the Jews, nor named any particular person or family to exercise the power of government, he has left it to the people to choose what form is most agreeable to themselves, and to commit the exercise of the supreme power to what persons they think fit. And therefore, whatever form of government hath been chosen, or is established in any country, hath the divine sanction; and the persons who, by the choice, or even by the peaceable submission of the governed, have the reins of government in their hands, are the lawful sovereigns of that country, and have all the rights and prerogatives belonging to sovereignty vested in their persons." Macknight.

All this, however, seems not to the point. Such refinements are not to be sought in a passage like the present, written populariter. Moreover, when it is said that the governor is sent from God, it can only be implied that he is permitted to be so by the real, though inscrutable, providence of God; though mediately appointed by the authority, or invested with it by the consent of man. The very constitution of government (as Mr. Slade observes), which is said to be derived from God, is framed by the will and consent of a people. God has ordained that there should be governments, and therefore governors, and that they should be obeyed: but still, every particular arrangement is left to human discretion.
as synonymous; and though the former may seem to be the stronger term, yet it simply means to resist, frequently both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers. (See Schl. Lex.) Διάταγη, like διάταγμα and διάταγις, signifies ordinance. See Schl. Lex. Vet. Test. et Nov. Test.

Schoettg. and Wets. compare a similar sentiment of Bereschith Rabba 14, 8. R. Jodan dicit: quicumque faciem suam obfirmat contra regem, idem est ac si illam obfirmaret contra majestatem divinam.

"As the precept (observes Mackn.) in the foregoing verse, and the declaration in this, are general, they must be interpreted according to the nature of the subjects to which they are applied. Wherefore, since the power, of which the Apostle speaks in both verses, is the form of government, and not the rulers of a country, the subjection to the higher powers enjoined in the first verse, is not an unlimited passive obedience to rulers in things sinful, but an obedience to the wholesome laws enacted for the good of the community, by common consent, or by those who, according to the constitution of the state, have the power of enacting laws. To these good laws the people are to give obedience, without examining by what title the magistrates who execute these laws hold their power; and even without considering whether the religion professed by the magistrates be true or false. For the same reason, the opposition to, and resistance of, the power, forbidden in the second verse, is an opposition to, and resistance of, the established government, by disobeying the wholesome laws of the state, or by attempting to overturn the

The general sense, too, is well expressed by T. Edwards, thus: "Christians are not, by the freedom of the Gospel, exempted from any ties of duty or subjection which by the laws of their country they ought to observe towards the governors or magistrates of it, (though heathens,) any more than their fellow-subjects. On the other side, these rules do not tie them up any more than their fellow-citizens (who are not Christians) from any of those civil rights which, by the law of nature, or the constitution of the country, belong to them."
government, from a factious disposition, or from ill-will to the persons in power, or from an ambitious desire to possess the government ourselves. These precepts, therefore, do not enjoin obedience to the magistrates in things sinful; and more especially in things morally good, and which tend to the welfare of the state. Besides, as in the following verses, the Apostle has shewn, from the nature and end of their office, that the duty of rulers is to promote the happiness of the people, it is plain from the Apostle himself, that they who refuse to do things sinful, or even things inconsistent with the fundamental laws of the state, do not resist the ordinance of God, although these things should be commanded by a lawful magistrate, because in commanding them he exceeds his power. And, that opposition to a ruler, who endeavours utterly to subvert the constitution, or to enslave a free people, is warranted not only by right reason, but by the Gospel, which teaches, that rulers are the servants of God, for good to the people, and are supported by God only in the just execution of their office.”

All this may be very true, but it does not seem to have been contemplated by the Apostle, whose injunction is expressed popularly and generally, without reference to some few exceptions, or to the extreme cases in which resistance may be lawful.

2. οἱ δὲ ἀνθρωπότεροι ἐαυτοῖς κείμα λῆψονται. These words are considered by Bp. Sherlock and Mr. Slade as not referring to the preceding, but rather as forming the introduction to a new argument. This, however, though countenanced by Koppe, is not agreeable to the usual force of δὲ, nor (I think) suitable to the context. The δὲ manifestly signifies autem. And so it is rendered by the Vulgate. The above harsh construction was resorted to by Bp. Sherlock, in order to justify the explanation of κείμα adopted by him (in common with many other interpreters, as Chrysost. T. Aquinas, Paræus, Vorstius, Tolet., Vatab., Whitby, &c.) namely, temporal punishments. But this is at variance with the context:
for, as Crell. truly says, the scope and connection of the Apostle's argumentation requires the word κρίμα to be understood of divine rather than human punishment. Hammond has here a very masterly annotation on the force of the term κρίμα in Scripture, which will (like almost every thing from this most learned, able, and honest Divine) amply repay an attentive perusal. From what he has said there can be no doubt but that both these senses must here be united.

2. ἐαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψωνται. This seems an Hebr.-nistical phrase, formed (as Koppe thinks) on the Hebr. מָנאָם, and equivalent to κρίνεσθαι at Jas. 3, 1. and Matt. 23, 14. Koppe, too, takes ἐαυτοῖς to mean sed culp. But this seems supposing an emphasis unwarrantably. It should rather appear that the ἐαυτοῖς is pleonastic; since this is supposed by the force of the middle voice; which, however, is not much attended to by the Scriptural writers, who often add a dative of the personal pronoun, as if the verb were in the active voice.

3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος—κακῶν. The connexion of these words, or at least the force of the γὰρ, is not very clear. Theophyl. and Crellius well observe, that the Apostle meets a tacit objection, such as: "It is hard that I should be in continual fear of the κρίμα of the magistrate." To which the answer is: "There is no reason for fear, so long as thou doest well: for rulers are not a terror, &c."

Φόβος, for φόβῳ, by a metonymy of the effect for the cause, signifies that which strikes fear, the terriculamentum, whether a person, or a thing. See 1 Pet. 3, 14. This use is also found in the Classical writers. Thus Schleus. in his Lex., compares Soph. Phil. 1244., Eurip. Troad. 1165., and Justin 9, 1, 1. Xerxes terror gentium. And so an inscription cited by Wets. : εἶμι κρίτης γὰρ ἦτος ἱδρίκος, τοῖς δ’ ἀδικοῦσί δεός. Examples of a similar sentiment are cited by Schoettg. and Wets. from the Rabbinical writers.
Here it is observed by Grotius. “Post argumentum ab origine, alterum addit ab usu, cujus causā constituta sunt imperia, nempe ut improbitate repressā tutius vivant boni. Hoc autem plenissimè præstant boni Reges, nali quoque aliquatenus, vel sui causā. Et ququam interdum aliquid vitii intervenit, nunquam tamen non satius est esse principes, quam non esse. Nam ut rectè Tacitus, Vitia crunt donec homines, sed neque hæc continua et meliorum interventu pensantur. Et, quomodo sterilitatem aut imbres et caetera naturæ mala, ita luxus vel avaritia dominium toleranda.” And he compares Joseph. Bell. 2, 28. and Cic. de Leg. 2. Leges improbos supplicio afficiunt, et defendunt, ac tuentur bonos.

8. ἰδείς δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; So Liban. Or. 210 D. εἰ δὲ μείζων ὁ φόβος τῆς ἐξουσίας. Tacit. Agric. 9. ubi officio satisfactum, nulla ultra potestatis persona.*

4. Θεὸς γὰρ διάκονος ἐστι σοι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. This suggests another reason why we should be subject to the power, not only as being the minister of God to us, but as appointed by God for our own good. For in the last words rests (as Koppe observes) the force of the sentence. By good, the Commentators remark, is meant good, both natural, civil, and moral. (See Pole.) Διάκονος is used as λειτουργὸς Θεοῦ at ver. 6. Here Wets. aptly cites Plut. 63 D. ὑπηρεσίαν θεοῦ τὸ βασιλείου ἤγούμενος, δόγαι ἀνιστησία, καὶ οὐκ ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀργεῖν τὴν ἐν σοὶ τοσαῦτην δικαιοσύνην. Philo T. 2. p. 200, 46. θεοῦ γὰρ ὑπηρέται πρὸς τέκνων σποράν οἱ γονεῖς· ὁ δ’ ὑπηρέτην ἀτιμάζον, συνατιμάζει καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα. Grot., too, quotes Seneca Ep. 78: Errare mihi videntur qui putant Philosophiæ fideliter deditos contumaces esse ac refractarios et contingentes Magistratum ac Regum, eorumve per quos publica administrantur. E contrario etiam nulli adversus illos gratiores sunt, nec immerito: nullis enim

* i.e. “he threw off the mask of power.” There seems to be an allusion to the masks which the tragic actors wore, when representing the characters of kings and great personages.
plus praesent quam quibus frui tranquillo otio licet. Itaque hi quibus ad propositum bene vivendi aditum confert securitas publica, necesse est ut auctorem hujus boni, ut parentem colant. And he remarks: “Sicut hac in re Magistratus multum sapientibus prosunt, ita et sapientes, præcipue Christiani, plurimum Magistratibus. Nam multos corrigendo, et meliores reddendo etiam quam Leges humanæ præcipiunt, detrahunt illis magnam severitatis materiam, efficientque ut placidius imperent”

4. οὐ γὰρ εἰκή τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ. Grotius observes on the litotes in εἰκή, i.e. gravi de causâ. By bearing the sword is meant having the power of life and death; which was represented by the Roman magistrates being girded with the sword, or having it carried before them: * a custom which is partly retained in modern times. See Grotius, who refers to Tacit. L. 3.,† and says that in the Rabbinical writers frequently occurs the expression Rex, qui portat gladium. It must be remembered that decapitation was the most frequent capital punishment, and that often performed (as is usual in Germany) with a sword. A very striking plate representing this mode of execution may be seen in Johnes’s Froissart.

*Εκδίκος, an avenger. For ὁ ἐκδίκων. (See at 2, 5.) Thus in 1 Thess. 4, 6. the Lord is said to be the ἐκδίκων πάντων τῶν, the punisher of all such. The word also occurs in the Greek Translators of the Old Testament, (See Schl. Lex. Vet. Test.), and in Aristæus and Cheroboscus, cited by Wetstein. The εἰς δὲ γὰρ Koppe accounts as redundant. But that is certainly not the case. The words have much meaning;

* So Sueton. Galb. 11. (cited by Wets.): Iter ingresquis est paludatus, ac dependente cervicibus pugione ante pectus, nec prius usum togæ recuperavit, quàm oppressis, qui novas res moliebantur. 
† To which I add Liban. Ep. 1048, where it is said that a good and mild king will rejoice, & τὸ ἔλεος ἔργοι. Philostr. V. Ap. 7, 16. τοὺς τὸ ἔλεος φέροντας. & Vit. Soph. 1, 95, 2. δικαστοῦ γὰρ δεῖ ταύταις ἔλεος ἔχοντας. Herodian. 3, 11, 4. ταρπήρητος τε αὐτῷ ἔλεος... Philostr. V. pp. 4, 42. ἐφ᾽ ἂν τὸ ἔλεος ἦν, qui praetor erat.
though they are somewhat inelegant in their present position; and for that reason they were omitted by some antient librarii, (as in the Cod. Cant.) ex emendatione.

5. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι—συνείδησιν. It is not necessary to press on the sense of ἀνάγκη (as is done by some early Commentators). The necessity (as Hardy observes) is not absolute, but hypothetical, (compare Matt. 18, 7.), or, as Schl., in his Lex., explains, necessitas, quae est e nexu rerum humanarum inter se invicem, et ipsa natura humana. It is therefore better to render it, with some Commentators, oportet, καθηκόν ἐστι. Indeed it is to be regarded as a popular phrase; q. d. (as Hardy paraphrases): “if you are impressed with any reverence towards God, or regard for your own tranquility and safety, it is necessary for you to be under subjection to them.” Koppe thinks the expression is equivalent to δεῖ ὑποτάσσεσθαι. And Wets. refers to Hebr. 16, 23. and Matt. 18, 7. Nor is this merely an Hellenistical use. Grot. compares the Sophoclean ἄργωντες εἰσίν, ὥστε ἵππεικεῖν. And Wets. cites several examples of ἀνάγκη from Plato and Xenophon. I add Soph. CEd. Col. 605. ἃτι σφ’ ἀνάγκη τῇδε πληγήναι καθιν. See also Carpzov. The thing is, indeed too plain to need any further illustration. So that it is surprising some eminent Theologians and Critics, as Luther and Michaelis, should favour the reading ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, which is objectionable, both on the score of propriety of language, and correctness of doctrine. Neither is it supported by any authority. For the reading ὑποτάσσεσθαι without ἀνάγκη, in some early MSS. and Fathers evidently a paradiorthesis. The Vulg., indeed, supports the interpretation of Michaelis: but its authority is not so great as to alter the state of the case.

The obedience here inculcated is manifestly political, and not religious. And this is all that seems necessary to be kept in view. (See the Commentators.) The words following suggest the motives
for this obedience, namely, not only διὰ τὴν ὁργήν, out of dread of the penalty incurred, but also for conscience sake. And here again we have a popular mode of expression, deviating from the Classical use, but of which the sense would seem too obvious to need any explanation, were it not necessary to so paraphrase σωνείδ. as to shew the connexion between this and the following verse. Now this, I conceive, is most successfully traced by Theopyl. 129. as follows. Ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οἵ μόνον ἡ ἔργα καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ, ὡς ἀπείθης, καὶ κολασθῆς ἀφόρητα: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἣν μὴ δοξής ἀσυνεδρίας ἐλεῖν καὶ ἀγνώμον περὶ τῶν εἰργάσεων. Εἰργαζόμενοι γὰρ οἱ ἀρχηγοί μεγάλας τὰς πόλεις, διὰ γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ βίος ἡμῶν συνιστάται καὶ εἶναι μὴ ἔστω, πάντα δὴ ἀν ἀρχηγόν τῶν δυνατωτέρων τοὺς ἀσθενεστέρως καταπίπτοντάν. Η σωνείδησις σω τοῖνυν, φησὶ, πειθέτως τιμῶν τῶν τὰ τοιῶν καὶ χαριζομένους σοι.

The exalted principle of acting for conscience sake, and not merely from fear of penal statutes, was not unknown (in theory at least) to the Hea-than philosophers. Thus Wets. compares Hor. Ep. 1, 16, 52. Oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore: Tu nil admittis in te formidine poenae Democr. Sent. ἡ διὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ δέον ἀπέκεοθαι χρείων ἀμαρτημάτων. Aristot. Eth. 10. ult. οὐ γὰρ πεφύκασι αἰδοὶ πειθαρχεῖν, ἀλλὰ φόβοι, οὐδὲ ἀπεχοθαί τῶν φαιλαν διὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς τιμωρίας. See also Cic. Parad. 5.

It is well observed by Hardy, that from this passage it is certain that human laws, legitimately enacted, are not only binding in foro externo, but in foro conscientiae et Dei, and not only bind the transgressor to punishment, but to blame.” Thus transgression becomes not only a breach of law, but a sin.

6. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρος τελείται. The connexion, and the real force of the γὰρ (which has not, I think, been distinctly seen by our modern Commentators), seems to have been correctly laid down by Theopyl.
on the former verse, whom see: The first γὰρ refers to their high usefulness; the second γὰρ subjoins an additional reason, namely, that they are appointed by God to a ministration which is, upon the whole, highly beneficial to men.

It is certain that the words εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τέλειον (as all the ancient Commentators, and also many modern ones of note are agreed), must be referred, not to the antecedent φῶς τελείων, but to the λειτουργεῖν, which is comprehended in λειτουργολ. This, indeed, is so clear, that I am surprised Koppe should have revived a mode of interpretation which could only have arisen from ignorance, or wilful misrepresentation; namely, that of referring εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τέλειον to the τὸ τελείων, i.e. for “they are continually attending to the collecting of the taxes”; which involves an absurdity: for that would be no reason why we should pay them. Besides, it compels us to take (with Koppe) λειτουργολ Θεοῦ for the tax-gatherers—dropping Θεοῦ! All which is so harsh and contrary to the context, and so much at variance with every principle of sound interpretation, that it deserves not a moment’s attention. And be it observed, that the word προσκ. is much too strong a term to be employed of merely collecting tribute: whereas, on the common interpretation, it is very suitable. Thus in Acts 1, 14., and Col. 4, 2. we have προσκ. τῇ προσεχή, and 2, 42. προσκ. τῇ διδαχή and Acts 6, 4. προσκ. τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου. That it is a very strong term is also apparent from Ephes. 6, 18. εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τέλειον ἀγρυπνοῦντες ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτερίᾳ, where there is the same construction as in the present passage. And Koppe on that place himself admits that the words are put for ἀγρυπνοῦντες καὶ προσκαρτεροῦντες. I should not have thought it worth while to dwell so long upon an interpretation manifestly unfounded, had it not supplied a petty hold to infidel cavillers, from which to level the shafts of their puny ridicule at the venerable Apostle.
AEITOURGY is a very strong term, properly denoting (as Schlesner, in his Lex., observes), persons who were obliged, either by their own tribe, or the people at large, to perform certain public forms of worship, or at their own expence to supply the wants of the state, and, in a case of necessity, undertake all the most burthensome and irksome offices in the state, yield up their property, nay, even their life and blood, to promote the welfare of the state. For the etymology and Scriptural application of the word, see the note on Luke 1, 28. It is almost unnecessary to observe, that without the faithful and conscientious payment of taxes, the ends of the aetourgia in question could never be attained. So Tacit. Hist. 4, 74. (cited by Koppe and Rosenm.) Nec quies gentium sine armis, nec arma sine stipendis, nec stipendia sine tributis haberi queunt. And yet it is God's will and pleasure that such aetourgiai should be performed; and therefore it is his will that the taxes necessary to their support should be rendered. It is manifest, however, that this only applies to taxes legally imposed, and necessary to the purpose in question.

The student will remark the discrimination between εἰσπράξεως and εἰσφορῶν. As to the difference between the terms φόρος here, and τέλος at the next verse, it is not, indeed, of any importance to the doctrine, but it may be observed that, according to the opinion of the most learned Philologists and Antiquaries, φόρος and φόρα denoted the land tax and the capitation tax, and are nearly the same with the κώρας at Luke 40, 21., where see the note. The τέλος were the vectigalia, and the customs levied on the imports and exports. In illustration of which Koppe aptly cites Justin Martyr Apolog. 2. Φόρους δὲ καὶ εἰσφόρους τοὺς ὃς ὑμῶν τεκαγμένης πανταχεῖν ἕως πάντων πειρομένα φέρειν.

7. ἀποδότε οὖν τὰς τοῖς ὀφειλάς. The word ὀφειλάς is a general term, and may denote whatever is due;
and this both in a physical and moral sense. Here it denotes both; as appears from the words following, which are exegetical. It is plain that at ῥα some participle must be understood. I prefer, with Koppe, aιτεύμενοι. Others take τῷ for ῥ, and supply ὁμολογεῖτε. But this seems too arbitrary an ellipsis.

By φόβος, Koppe observes, is meant the reverence due to a superior; by τιμῇ, the offices of respect to equals. And certain it is that τιμῇ is used not only of equals, but of inferiors. (See Schl. Lex.) yet here the Apostle has only in view governors, who, as respects their station, are superior to the governed. I am inclined to think that the words in question are only two terms expressive of the same thing, though in different degrees; φόβος denoting the reverential homage due to Kings, and principal rulers; τιμῇ, the respect due to all who are in authority. This seems preferable to fancying certain distinctions in the words, which it would be difficult to prove; such as that imagined by Doddr. and some early modern Commentators, who take φόβος to denote the inward disposition; and τιμῇ the external behaviour proceeding from it.

Mr. Weston here compares the following elegant passage of Soph. Antig. 886. κράτος δ' ὅπερ κράτος μέλει Παραβατών οὐδεμιᾷ τέλει.

8. μηθεὶς μηθεὶς ὁμολογεῖτε, εἰ μὴ τῷ ἀγαπῶν ἀλλήλους. The Apostle takes occasion, from the word ὁμολογεῖτε, to pass from what respects the political law to that which regards morals; and shows that these precepts, as they had been before Moses', so now also did they remain, but with the glorious supplemента of the Christian dispensation. (Grot.) The injunctions concerning the duties towards Heathen magistrates terminated at ver. 7.; and in the present and following verse the Apostle proceeds to treat of the mutual offices and duties of Christians one towards another.

The general scope of the sentence is indeed plain;
but some doubt has been raised respecting the exact sense, and this has arisen from the word ὀφείλετε, which some ancient and modern Interpreters, as Ar. vers., De Dieu, Koppe, and Rosenm., take in the indicative, and render thus: "Ye owe nothing to any one, except mutual benevolence;" i.e. the whole circle of your duties is comprehended in mutual benevolence. But this I cannot but consider very harsh, since the Apostle is here occupied with in-junctions and the Imperative is several times used both in the preceding and the following verses. The common mode of interpretation is supported both by the ancient and by most modern Interpreters, and is very well made out by Theophyl. as follows. Τὰς μὲν ἡλικίας ὀφείλεις ἀπέδωκε μηδέποτε δὲ τὴν ἀγάπην ἀποδώναι θελήσετε, ἀλλ' ἀδίκος αὐτὴν ἔχετε διηνεκές. Μὴ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ σύμερον ἀγαπητίκην ἐτεθέλει διὰδείσυν πρὸς τὴν πλησίον, νομίσομεν ἀποπληρώσαι τὴν ὀφείλην, καὶ διὰ τούτο παρίστατο αὐτὴν αδικίαν. Ἀλλὰ διηνεκὸς νόμιζε τὴν ἀγάπην χρεωστείν τῷ πλησίον. So also Carpzov: "This charity (which Photius calls the mother of the virtues) Paul here describes as a continued debt, which is ever being paid, and yet is always owing, and is never quite discharged in this life."* This passage has been thus elegantly imitated by Augustin Ep. 62. "Semper debeo charitatem, quem sola, etiam reddita, detinet debitorem."†

* "Other debts (says Grot.) are paid off, and therefore done away, but the debt of love is never discharged, but continues."

Nor is there any reason to object to the seeming harshness of the expression, since (as Photius observes) it is an acule dictum, and must not be too much pressed upon.

† And also by Milton, Parad. Lost, 4, 55. (cited by Wets.) as follows:

"A grateful mind
By owing owes not, and still pays, at once
Indebted and discharged."

With this divine doctrine of Christian Charity, one may contrast the misanthropic spirit of the most Heathen writers, of which there is a curious instance in an Epigram from the Anthol. 1, 15, 6. (cited by Wets.) εὑδαίμων πρῶτον μὲν ὁ μηδὲν μηδὲν ὀφείλων· εἰτα δ' ὁ μὴ γήμας· τὸ πρῶτον δοσις ἅπασιν.
8. δὲ γὰρ ἀγαπᾷν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, νόμιζεν τεκληρώσει. By the other is meant τὸν ἀνθρώπον: for ἀνθρώπον, another, means any other person with whom we have any sort of connection: and so St. Paul here explains: τὸν ἀνθρώπον, one's neighbour. Indeed a greater than St. Paul, in his inimitable parable of the good Samarian, has taught us to thus extend the signification of ἄνθρωπος, making thereby the command as unlimited as the benevolence of the Deity, and co-extensive with the sphere of human action.

Here it is as unnecessary to point out the superiority, in this respect, of Grecian over Pharisaical ethics, as it is for me to prove that the word in this sense is frequent in the purest Greek Classics, that point having been already established, beyond the reach of controversy, by the erudite labours of Raphaelius on Matt. 5, 43. See also some long and learned illustrations of this idiom in the notes to the celebrated "Spital Sermon" of a late venerable and most eminent Scholar. p. 43.

Πεπληρώσεις has the sense of implere solet. Schleus. renders: "omnia officiorum genera aliis praestare, maxime officium mutui amoris." By the νόμον is meant the law in general; not, as it is understood by some Interpreters, that which respects our neighbour only.

9. τὸ γὰρ. Οὐ μοιχεύεσθαι, &c. At τὸ γὰρ there is an idiom, in tracing the nature and force of which, Commentators are not quite agreed. The early Interpreters regard it as put for ἢ. But the more enlightened views of construction, developed during the last two centuries, have shown this to be erroneous. Camerar. and others think it is put δεκτοῦσι, as the article neuter frequently is. But surely there is nothing of δεκτοῦ here. There is, I conceive, an ellipsis of some word, which I would supply, with Koppe, by γεγράμμενον. Thus we have a clause in the place of a noun.

The Apostle, it may be observed, has not arranged these commandments in the order in which they stand
either in the Hebrew, or the Greek versions; though (as Koppe remarks) he follows the latter rather than the former. See Mark 10, 19. Luke 18, 20. Koppe refers to Fabr. Bibl. Gr. 4. C. 4. p. 110 seqq. I would add that a passage, similar both in construction and sentiment, occurs in Philo Jud. 749. ἀλλὰ — οὐ μοιχεύεις — οὐ φονεύεις, οὐ κλέψας, καὶ ταλαντα ρευμ. Philo there refers to the second or prohibitory Pentad of the Decalogue; the idiom is frequent in the best Greek writers.

The words οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις are not found in six uncial, and several other MSS., and have been cancelled by Griesbach, though not, I think, on good grounds. The number of MSS. which have them is very small, compared with that of those in which they are not found: and the Homoiteleuton suggests an obvious reason for the omission; though not, perhaps, to such an extent. And it is true that one may account for the introduction of the clause, as well as for its omission. But if it had been introduced, it would, I think, have been in another place. For after οὐ κλέψεις it would seem that οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις ought to have followed: and so the Librarii removed the irregularity by cancelling the clause. To such petty niceties, however, our Apostle pays little attention. After all, the question is of no great importance, since the prohibition, if not expressed, cannot but be understood, being included under the comprehensive words καὶ εἶς ἄτερα ἐντολή.

9. καὶ εἶς τις ἄτερα ἐντολή, “and whatever other commandment there may be.” On this idiom I have before treated at Mark 11, 25., and I would here add an example from Artemid. 9, 65. καὶ εἰς ἀλλο. In the words ἄτερα ἐντολή there is a brevity frequent in the popular style: for any other must be understood with the limitation, “namely, of the same nature with those just adverted to,” or “connected with the duties which we owe to each other;” as, for instance, to honour our parents.

9. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιώται, &c. The
verb ἀνακεφ. signifies properly to cast up an account, reckon up the items of it; and, figuratively, to comprise, as it were, under one head, comprehend in a small compass.* Λέγει has here the sense of ἀπεικόνισις, sententia, general precept; as in Joh. 4, 37. Grot. observes that the Hebrew writers have the saying “Lex tota in hoc ἀνακεφαλαίωσαι, Dilige Deum tota corde et tota animâ atque substantiâ.”† And he adds that these precepts are also called by them the summâ magnæ. It is remarked by Chrys. that this love is the beginning and end of virtue, which has this root, this foundation, and chief head.”

The future tense is, by a Hebraism, put for the Imperative. With respect to the term τὸν πλησίον, neighbour, it literally signifies he who dwells near us:‡ but (as Grot. observes), in the Mosaic law, it denotes one subject to the same law. In the Gospel, however, the word has a wider acceptance, and comprises every individual descended from our first parents, without any distinction of nation, manners, customs, religion, or race.” In this sense, every man is the Christian’s neighbour, and especially any one with whom he has to do in any way whatever.

Koppe here reads, from some MSS., σεαυτόν. But that seems a mere paradiorthesis. The common reading is supported by the use of the best writers. See Porson on Xenoph. Anab. and Matth. Gr. Gr.

By loving one’s neighbour as oneself is, I conceive, not meant that we should love him as much as our-


† De Dieu (from Hesych.) explains the ἀνακεφαλαίωται by ἀναλαμβάνεται, and he subjoins ἐπαναλῆψε, ἐπιλογεῖα. But that is merely the rhetorical sense, which does not here apply.

‡ So also R. Akiba (cited by Koppe) ἤτιμα ἵππα legis est in his Levit. 19, 18. Diligès proximum tuum, sicut te ipsum.

§ So Prov. 3, 29. “Devise not evil against thy neighbour, seeing he dwelleth securely by thee.”
selves,* but in the same manner, though not to the same degree, as we love ourselves.† And this is confirmed by the words following, which seem to be exegetical, and meant to shew the nature of this love; namely that we should be as careful to avoid injuring him as we would of injuring ourselves.

Now this is not impracticable, and may therefore be justly expected of us. And let it be remembered that no one can commit a crime without injuring his neighbour. For, as Aristot. Nic. Eth. 9, 8. p. 413. (cited by Bulkley) observes, Τὸν δὲ μοχθὸν οὐ δεῖ βελάνει γὰρ καὶ έαυτὸν, καὶ τοὺς πέλας. Φαύλοις πάθειν ἐπόμενος.

10. Ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακῶν οὐκ ἔργαζεται. This is (as I before observed) exegetical of the preceding. Here (the Commentators remark,) we have abstracts for concretes, q. d. “He who loveth another doth no harm to him,” &c. But it may very well be understood thus: “Love, i. e. (the love here enjoined) consists in not injuring any one.” And true indeed it is that a great part of the love we bear to our fellow-creatures is only required to be shown by not injuring them: which will often operate as a positive benefit. Some eminent Commentators, however, maintain that more is here meant than is expressed, namely, that there is included an admonition not to suffer our neighbour to be injured. And certainly to suffer him to be injured, and do nothing to prevent it, is a sort of injury. Others, again, think there is a meiosis, by which is also to be understood bene-fitting and doing good.‡

* Which would be contrary to nature. So Aristid. οἶμαι τοῦ φιλεῖ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις συμβεβηκὸς ἢν οὐκ ὑπερ εἴτι μηδὲν έαυτὸν μᾶλλον φιλεῖν.
† So Cajetan and Estius ap. Pole, who explain: “Eo modo quo diligis teipsum; hoc est, amore amicitiae, quod est velle illi bonum, honestum, utile, delectabile, propter illum, non propter te, sicut tibi ipsi hec bona propter teipsum.”
‡ And in this view Mr. Slade observes, that “the principle of love extends much farther than not injuring, and necessarily leads to the active and universal exercise of benevolence.”

The sense of the passage is thus ably discussed by Crellius: “Quòd si quis dicat, legem non tantum prohibere ne proximo malefacia-
10. τιμήσας εἰς νόμον ἡ ἄγανις. The sense of these words is not in itself quite determinate. They may signify (as some early modern Commentators interpret) that 'love is the end and scope of the commandments respecting our neighbour;' or (as others explain) that in 'love consists the fulfilment of the law;' which latter interpretation seems to be more agreeable to the words preceding. "Hence (observes Koppe) the same precept is by St. James 2, 5, styled the νόμος βασιλικὸς, and by St. Paul, 1 Tim. 1, 5., the τέλος τῆς ἐγγέλλες." It is remarked by Theophyl. and the other Greek Commentators, that the Apostle shows both kinds of virtue to be inherent in charity or benediction; namely the abstaining from evil, which is implied in κανον ὡς ἐργάζεται, and the doing of good, as indicated in τιμήσας εἰς νόμον ἡ ἄγανις; τὸν δὲ κληρον καταρθέν ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν άρετὴν, τὸν διὸ τοῦ νόμου δεικνυόμενην. The τιμήσας, (Carpzov observes,) is meant to indicate that the substance and sum of the precepts of the second table consists in love towards our fellow-creatures.

11. καὶ τούτῳ, εἰδότες τὸν κατά. The Apostle now passes to the third part of the Chapter, in which is contained a general admonition to true holiness of life, and the laying aside of certain vices which he has both here, and in the preceding chapter, reprehended. (Crell.)

In order the more to excite and confirm their zealous observance of the virtues which he had thus far enjoined, the Apostle adds this new reason, that the return of Christ to the earth, and the blessings he will bring with him, are events not far distant. Now this holiness of life, and abstaining from evil, is com-
pared to the conduct of men who are placed, as it were, in the broad day-light, and view of their fellow creatures, and are therefore held in moral restraint by such full observation: a similitude to be traced from the figurative use of light and darkness to denote virtue and vice, common both to the Biblical and the Classical writers. See Ephes. 5, 8 and 14. 1 Thess. 5, 4 and 5. 1 Pet. 2, 9. Matt. 25, 1—11. Joh. 3, 20 and 21. 1 Cor. 6, 8. Comb. Hebr. 10, 25. (Koppe.)

Here there are inculcated the duties of Christians towards themselves, to the end of the chapter. The transition is indicated by the words ἐκαίνητα. (Carpz.)

The Greek Commentators, with less than their usual judgment, apply the words solely to the virtue of charity, just before enjoined. But certainly (as is rightly observed by Crellius) they belong, not to the words immediately preceding (at which the Apostle had made a kind of digression) but to the whole of the Apostle’s exhortation, in which had been prescribed the various virtues and duties of Christians, especially a non-conformity to this world, which indulges in various kinds of carnal pleasures, and the living in peace and harmony with all.”

The Greek Commentators and the early modern ones have not well seen the force of the formula καί καρπὸν. Some, as De Dieu, and Carpzov, take it absolutely, in the sense of quocirca. This, however, seems precarious. Others more rightly consider it as elliptical, and supply ὁμοῖοι; and by this understand “this especially.” So Grot., Hardy, Koppe, and also Theodoret, who explains it by μᾶλλον. Traces of this idiom are, if I remember, found in the Classical writers. There is a similar ellipsis in Corinth. 6, 8. and Hebr. 10, 25. καὶ τοσοῦτον μᾶλλον, ὅπως βλέπετε ἐγιγραφείν τὴν ἡμέραν. Hammond would supply μᾶλλον ὑφείλετε; and Carpzov παρακαλῶ, from ch. 12. 6. But these subauditions seem somewhat precarious.
Some modern Commentators, as Koppe, regard one or other of the words καιρόν and ἀρα as pleonastic: which, however, seems rather uncritical. I prefer, with the generality of Commentators, to regard καὶρον as signifying opportunitas, tempus opportunum. Rosenm. renders: “considerantes quale jam sit tempus, qualis opportunitas.” Now this is meant to suggest that the time is critical, as being short, and hence whatever is to be done must not be delayed. So elsewhere, “Behold now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation.” Of the phrase, εἰδέναι τοὺς καιροὺς Wets. adduces examples from Plutarch and Libanius. Koppe, too, compares Plato Apol. Socr. ἀλλὰ γὰρ ήδη ἀρα ἀπιέναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀποδονομέαν, ὑμῖν δὲ βιασόμενοι.

The words δει ἀρα, &c. seem to be exegetical of the preceding.

11. δει ἁρα ἡμας ήδη εξ ὑπνου ἐγερθήναι. The ἁρα is well rendered by our English Translators “high time.” The phrase εξ ὑπνου ἐγερθήναι is thought by Grotius to be a military allusion, such as the Apostle frequently uses. And he compares the Horatian “nunc excitatur classico miles truci.” I cannot, however, here recognise any such. The verbs excitare and égερεσθαι are, by the Greek and Latin writers, used generally of being roused from sleep. In ὑπνοι there is another metaphor. The sleep meant is that of negligence, security, ignorance, vice, and sin in general.* So Theophyl. 131. δει ἡμας εξ τοῦ ὑπνου τῆς βαθυμίας ἐγερθήναι, καὶ εἶναι étymouς προς τὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἄξει ἐργα. The force of the metaphor is copiously illustrated by Crellius and Carpzov, the latter of whom thinks that the expression denotes a knowledge of sound doctrine, and a virtuous and holy life. Certain it is that there is in-

* Carpzov, however, does not here understand by ὑπνοι the sleep of security and sin, since the Apostle is addressing himself to justified Christians, but remissum studium, indolence, as opposed to alacrity and ardour in the attaining a knowledge of the Christian religion and the will of God.
volved in the ὅπων ἐγερθήμα: the being, as we say, awake to a sense of duty, alert to a life of vigilance, prudence, virtue, and religion.

The next clause suggests the reason for this: νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον, &c. In the interpretation of these words, Commentators are not a little divided in opinion. The most favourite notion for the last century has been, that σωτηρία signifies the doctrine and knowledge of salvation; and that ἐγγύτερ. has the figurative sense, "easier of comprehension, better understood by." An interpretation first promulgated by Crellius, and afterwards espoused by Mackn., Rosenm., and Schleus. in his Lex. But though this may be admitted as no ill founded reason for the exhortation, yet it seems somewhat frigid, and, what is more, the signification in question of ἐγγύτερ. has never been established on any certain proof. For as to the passage of Rom. 10, 8. ἐγγύς σου τῷ ἔθνε, it is not apposite; since it is a quotation from the Old Testament, and the harshness of the Hebraism is softened by some accompanying adjuncts: which are not here found.

Others, as Hammond, Whitby, Wells, Slade, and Valpy, suppose that the term alludes to the manifestation of Divine favour to the Gentiles, exhibited in the rejection of the Jews, which was soon to be illustrated by the ruin of their city and polity, and which the Apostle had before represented as producing σωτηρία to the Gentiles. Thus ἡ σωτηρία will allude to the deliverance of the disciples from the persecutions of the unbelieving Jews, by the destruction of Jerusalem. (See Mr. Slade.) But this seems somewhat harsh and precarious.

Others, again, as Locke and Koppe, take ἡ σωτηρία to mean the literal advent of Christ. And Koppe observes, that the Apostle, in order to excite his readers to the practice of the above virtues, adds this consideration, that the return of Christ to this earth was not far distant; an event which would be accompanied with salvation to the righteous. He then
Romans, Chap. XIII.

refers to his 2d Exкурsus on Thess., to shew that the Apostle, by the wise permission of Divine Providence, cherished the opinion and hope of Christ's speedy return. This, however, is liable to many objections, which are ably stated by Whitby on 2 Thess. 4, 15. and in his Discourse by way of enquiry, &c., added to his Annotations on 2 Thess. p. 488. et seq. Such an error cannot, surely, be supposed to have existed in an inspired Apostle. Besides, the opinion is contradicted by himself at 1 Thess. 4, 15. and 2 Thess. 2, 1 and 2. Neither are we compelled to adopt any such interpretation here; since, if the second interpretation above detailed be not thought admissible, there is yet another, which, as it is the most antient, so, if I am not mistaken, it will turn out to be the best founded; namely, that by σωτηρία is meant the period of death, when every one's fate will be determined, and which to the righteous will be the commencement of eternal felicity. An exposition espoused and ably supported by Taylor. This too, appears to have been the only one known to the antient Commentators. (See Chrys., &c.) The whole passage is well illustrated by Theophyl. as follows: Ἐστιν δὲ οὖν ἐν ἄρχῃ μὲν τῆς πίστεως στουδωνίας αὐτῶν εἶναι, ἐπαρ προίκτος τοῦ χρόνου ἀποφυγέωνον διότι καὶ τὸν μᾶλλον ἑγγείζομεν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰωνι. Σωτηρίαν γὰρ τούτων ἀναφέρεται ἀπὸ τοῦ χρηστεύσεως ἀνόμαλος τοῦ γὰρ ἁμαρτητοῦ οὐ σωτηρία, ἀλλὰ ἀπαίδεσθαι ἐστιν. Ὡσε ἐστὶν ἑγγείζομεν τῷ μέλλοντι ἣμέρα, μᾶλλον ἑπιτεύγημεν τῷ στουδῷ.

Here we must attend to the force of ἐπιτεύγημα, which has been well illustrated by Grot. "Πιστεύειν (says he) is one of those verbs which sometimes denote action either in its commencement, progress, or conclusion. (See Exod. 4, 10. and Neh. 8, 3.) Here it must denote the commencement of action." Hence some Commentators also supply πρῶτον: which, however, is not a legitimate ellipsis. The Syriac Translator renders, “than when we were converted to the Christian faith:” and Markland:ap.
Bowyer, “than when we first made profession of our faith.”

12. ἡ νῦν πρόκοψεν, &c. The Apostle continues the metaphor employed in the last verse: though the sense of νῦν and ἡμέρα must depend upon the mode of interpretation adopted in that verse; either (as Mr. Turner observes) as understood of heathen ignorance and Christian knowledge, or, of human imperfection, misery, and wickedness, and future virtue and happiness. Mr. Slade (from Whitby and Macknight) interprets it, “the more glorious display of Gospel light, which followed the signal overthrow of Jerusalem.” The darkness and corruption (says he) both of the Jews and Gentiles, being thereby in a greater measure removed. Luke 1, 78 & 79. Acts 26, 18. Eph. 5, 8. 1 Thess. 5, 5. 1 Pet. 2, 9.

Πρόκοψεν, “is far advanced.” The word προκόψει signifies properly to cut forward, as in making a road through a wood: 2dly, to get forward: 3dly, to go forward, advance. An example of its use with νῦν is cited by Wets. from Joseph. B. 4, 4, 6. τοὺς προκατοίκους. The context here fixes it to the sense “far advanced.” Thus Theophylact explains it, πρὸς τέλος. See 1 Joh. 2, 8. Wetstein compares a similar metaphor of νῦν in Sanhedrim, fol. 104, 2. ad Thren. 1, 2. “Flevit propter noctem, i.e. propter opera noctis.”

13. ἀποδοθείη αὐτῷ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους—Φαντά. In the explanation of this figurative phraseology the Commentators are not quite agreed. The chief question is, whether in ἔργα there is a notion of armour, for defence, or only of dress. The latter has been supported by Beza, Beausobre, Koppe, Rosenm., and others. But it does not appear to me that any sufficient proof has been adduced of this use of the word. The former interpretation (which is supported by the antient Greek Commentators, and most modern ones), is, I think, the best founded. I cannot, however, approve of the refinements pro-
ceeding upon an excessive pressing of this notion of armour, which have been introduced by Chrysost., Theophyl., Doddr. and Carpzov; refinements which seem not to have been intended by the Apostle. By the ἐπικαίνωσις, ἥτις ἐπικαίνωσεν, what are called, at 6, 13. the ἐπικαίνωσις, ἥτις ἐπικαίνωσεν.

13. ἀσεβεία ἐσχημάτωσε περιπατήσαμεν, “let us walk (i. e. live) decorously and decently, as men do who live and act in the day,” i. e. in the full view of the public. This the Apostle illustrates by a reference to those vices which were, in antient times, committed almost exclusively in the night. Of this sense of ἐσχημάτωσε Koppe has given some illustrations. He recognizes in it a metaphor taken from the splendid garments worn by actors. (See his note.) The word, however, seems to mean no more than “what has a good σχήμα, what sits well upon the person,” and therefore becomes him. And here it is well observed by Theophylact, Οὐδὲν γὰρ σχῆμα ἐσχημάτωσεν ἀκίνητον, ὁποῖος ἀμαρτίας ἀσπέρ καὶ ἐσχημάτωσεν οὐδὲν ἀτόλλο πρότερον, οἷς ἀρετῇ.

As to the words following, κόμοις, μέθαις, κοίταις, and ἀσεβείας, it is not necessary to anxiously distinguish them. Though Wetstein says, “κόμοις gravius est peccatum quâm μέθην, et ἐρίς quâm ἡμᾶς, ergo et κοίτη pejor quam ἀσεβείᾳ.” But it would be difficult to prove all this. They may better be regarded as two classes of vices; the former, those of drunken revelry,* the latter that of unlawful venery of every kind, and usually springing from the former. The words following, ἐρίς καὶ ἡμᾶς, will represent the effects which almost unavoidably result from both those vices.† See the illustrations of Theophylact.

* The κοίνος is explained by Theophylact, ὁ μὲν μέθης καὶ ἐβρεικὸς ἄφραγμα, δὲ καὶ παροιμία λέγεται.
† Among the other numerous Classical passages adduced by Wetstein, in illustration of the revelry and obscenity of antient times, is a very witty one from Epicharmus, ἐκ πόσος δὲ κόμος, ἐκ
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In καίτας καὶ ἀσέλγη, the Syriac Translator seems to have recognized an hendiadis for concubitu impuro. The latter expression, indeed, seems to be in some measure exegetical of the former; for, as Theophylact observes, It is not κοίτη that is forbidden, ἀλλὰ τὸ πορνεύειν.

14. ἄλλ' εὐδόκασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰ. Χ., i. e. "take upon you his manners, follow his example." A metaphor derived a re vestiarid, or perhaps from the theatre. It is found both in the Hebrew, as שול, and in the best Greek writers. Carpzov refers to Ptochen de Ling. Gr. N. T. pur. § 118. Examples are adduced by Gataker in Cinn. L. 1. C. 9., and also by Wetstein.* Ammon here renders, "induite potius mentem verè Christianam;" and Mr. Turner, "become assimilated to the character of Christ." The phrase to put on Christ occurs, Schoettgen observes, twice in the New Testament, and is used once theoretically, Galat. 3. 27., and once practi-

κώμον δ' ἐγένετο θυατία· ἐκ δὲ θυατίας διέκ γένετ', ἐκ διεκή δὲ καταδίκη. Carpzov, too, aptly cites Philo 192. Γαστριμαργύλα τοις ἡ ὁπαδῶς ἐκ φύσεως ἀκολουθεῖ συνομίας ἡδονημαίαν ἐκπονοί, καὶ ὀστρόν ἀνεκδώκετο, καὶ λύττων ἀργαλεωτάτην ἐπιφέρουσα. Ὄταν γὰρ ὑπὸ ὀφοευγίας καὶ ἀκράτους καὶ πολλῆς μεθύς ἀνθρώπων πεινῶν, οὐκέτι κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν διάγνωται πρὸς τὰς ἐρωτικὰς μίξεις ἐνεχυμένους, κύματος καὶ θυραυλοῦσι. I add, Ἀελιαν 6, 1, τὴν ἀκολοθίαν κοίτην ἁπείρατο.

* As Lucian, Gall. 19. ἀποδοσόμενος δὲ τὸν Πυθαγόρα, τίνα μετημβίσσω μετ' αὐτὸν; Dionys. Hal. L. 11, 5. συνέκτι μετημβίσσω- 

Toes, ἄλλα τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκείνον ἐκδύομενο. Liban. Ep. 966. Tac-

cit. Ann. 15, 45. "Grææa doctrina ore tenus exercitus, animum bon-

nis artibus non induerat." And 16, 38. "Nisi proditorem palam et 

hostem induisset." The Commentators also cite Chrysostom, as 

noticing it to have been a common phrase in his time, to express 
great love of any one, and uninterrupted intercourse. But this is 

scarcely apposite, since that, in fact, imports no more than our 

vulgar adage, Such as one is hand and glove with another. But the 

idea is quite different with that here meant to be inculcated 

by the Apostle, which only implies imitation of our Lord, as in Phil. 

2, 5. "Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus."

In the numerous other passages cited by the Philological Com-

mentators of εὐνοεῖσθαι, ἀποδοτέσθαι, iudere, esvere, there is no 

more than a slight allusion to conduct considered figuratively, as a 
dress. Nay our own use of habit is no more than this.

VOL. VI.
cally, in the present passage. Carpzov remarks, that we put on Christ in two ways: 1. In regeneration and justification, if we impute to ourselves, by faith, the innocence, righteousness, and obedience of Christ (Gal. 3, 27.); also, if we be closely conjoined with him; as in ver. 12. ἐνυσώκεσθαι τὰ ἐπλα τοῦ φωτός. 2. In sanctification, if we imitate the virtues, life, and manners of Christ, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit. So that it is the duty of Christians to be συμμορφοί τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ νικὸν αὐτῶν, Rom. 8, 29.” See also Macknight, whose examples, however, are not all of them opposite.

14. καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθαι εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. It is not worth while for me to detail the harsh and forced interpretations of this passage which have been given by some recent Commentators, as Koppe. The common one is at once natural, and agreeable to the context, and is moreover supported by the authority both of the Greek Commentators, and the most judicious of our modern Interpreters. Nay even that innovating refiner Ammon acknowledges it to be the true one, and thus ably paraphrases the sentence: τῆς δὲ σαρκὸς μὴ οὕτως προνοεῖτε, ἵνα τρέφητε τὰς ἐπιθυμίας. Gal. 4, 16. Foventes sensum Christianum corporis vestri ita curam habete, ut τὸ ἐπιθυμικὸν semper pareat τῷ ἡγεμόνιον.” It is manifest that by σαρκὸς is meant τοῦ σώματος; and the εἰς denotes the end of action. The sense then is, “Do not so make provision for the body as to gratify its lusts.” The phrase προνοίαν ποιεῖν is also used by the best Greek writers.*

Koppe observes, that by ἐπιθ. are here meant not

* From whom Wets. adduces numerous examples; as Anonym. pro Aristomene ἐνῷ φονεών τοὺς ἀνθρωποῖς, καὶ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμίαν πρόνοιαν, ἀνδρείας ἁμα καὶ συνετός. Dionys. Hal. Λ. V. 46. πρόνοιαν οὐδεμίαν τῆς ἐκείνου ψυχῆς παρὰ τὸ νικήν ποιεῖμενος. Thycyd. 6, 9. νομίζον διόμως ἀγαθὸν πολιτείαν εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς νοῦς προνοητικεί τοῖς πρόνοιαις, ἐκ πολλῆς καὶ συνεχοῦς τελειωμάτως αὐθεντικοῦ. So the Latin writers used the phrase curam habere.
only vitia anime, but the ipsa facta externa, such as κώμοι, κοῖτα, μέθαν, ver. 13. This, however, seems to be refining too much. 'Ἐπιθυμία is here used in a bad sense; as at 1 Pet. 4, 2 & 3. 1 Joh. 2, 16. and elsewhere. Nor is this sense confined to the Scriptural writers. So the word occurs in the following apothegm of Chrysippus ap. Athen. 337 A. πάντων μὲν πρωτίστα κακῶν ἐπιθυμία ἐστὶ.

It may not be unedifying to compare the purity and spirituality of Christianity, with the bestial grossness of the Epicurean system. So the founder of it himself, as cited by Grot.: Οὐ γὰρ ἔγονε ἔχω τί νοσώμα τ' ἁγαθόν, ἀφαιρέω μὲν τὰς διὰ χυλῶν ἠθονάς, ἀφαιρέω δὲ τὰς δὲ ἀφροδισίαν καὶ τὰς δὲ ἀκροαμάται καὶ τὰς διὰ μορφὰς.

It is evident from the words of the Apostle (and the Greek Commentators especially notice this), that he does not throw any hindrance in the way of a proper care of the body, but only forbids indulgence in its lusts. For, as observes Theophylact, p. 138, οὐδὲ ἄν ἐνν πρόνοια λοιπῶν, ὅταν τὴν βλάγνα άνάπτυς, ὅταν τὴν χάμιν χαλεπὴν ποιῆς. Ἐν δὲ μόνον, ὅπως ἐγιαῖνουσαν ἐκεῖς τὴν σάρκα περιετέρα δὲ μηδὲν περιεργάση, ὅστε τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῆς ἄναψαι, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν τὴν στουδὴν περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ ἀνάλοικα.

Whether the Apostle meant (as is thought by Rosenm.) to advert to the ascetic notions of the Essenes, who regarded the body as a prison or clog to the mind, and to be treated with every sort of harshness and severity, is somewhat doubtful, since such opinions were almost wholly confined to Palestine. If the Apostle had any farther purpose than that of general exhortation, he may, as writing to Romans, be rather supposed to advert to the dogmas of the Stoics.

CHAP. XIV.

The third section of the practical part of this Epistle treats of various duties, private and civil, to be performed in daily intercourse,
especially towards those who, not fully satisfied as to the abrogation of the ceremonies which had been formerly instituted in the Mosaic Law, do not in this respect evince faith, but hesitate concerning the eating of certain foods, and the regarding of times. Then he shows the use of Christian liberty in things μέσουs and ἀδιάφορως, things indifferent. Lastly, he subjoins an exhortation to the preserving concord both among Jews and Gentiles recently converted to Christianity. This ἰδιός occupies the whole of ch. 14, to the thirteenth verse of the following chapter. (Carpzov.)

To the precept inculcating love one towards another, of which he had begun to treat, the Apostle subjoins an admirable corollary, highly necessary in those times and circumstances. Many Jewish converts were zealous of the complete observance, both by themselves and others, of the moral precepts of Moses, nay even the ritual ones, Acts 15. These, then, were not well affected towards the Gentile converts, who observed not those rites. On the other hand, the Gentile converts, conscious of the liberty granted in the Christian Dispensation, wished to exclude the Judaizing Jews from communion with them, 11, 18 & 21. Hence would have followed schism, which would have exceedingly impeded the progress of the Gospel. To prevent this evil, the Apostle takes a middle course, and recommends the Jewish converts to adhere to their own opinion, and yet, at the same time, not to charge with impiety those who thought otherwise. The Gentile converts he admonishes not to shun communion with their Judaizing fellow Christians, nor despise them as simple and dull of understanding. Great, indeed, was the struggle the Apostles had to maintain between these two classes; in accommodating themselves to which, sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other, according to time and circumstances, and yet so as to reconcile both parties, they eminently displayed their prudence and philanthropy. (Grotius.)

Of this third portion of the practical part of the Epistle Schöetgen gives the following plan:

"It may be distributed under three heads, in the first of which the Jews in particular are addressed, ch. 14, 1—18: in the second, the Gentiles in particular, 19—23: in the third, all of them at once, 14, 1—13.

In the first part we have, 1st, a Proposition: That no one is to be judged or condemned because of certain kinds of food, v. 1 & 2. Adly, Arguments: 1) Because we are all servants of God, ver. 3, 4, 7, 8, & 9. 2) Because every one ought to live according to his knowledge, and the dictates of his conscience, ver. 5. 3) Because both may be done to the glory of God, ver. 6. 4) Because every one shall give account of himself to God, ver. 10—12. 5) Because no one ought to put a stumbling-block in his brother's way, v. 13—15. 6) Because in the Christian Dispensation distinction between meats is done away with, ver. 16—18. In the second part we have, 1st, a Proposition: That peace and edification is to be followed after, and no stumbling-block to be thrown in another's way, ver. 18 & 19. Adly, Arguments: 1) Because meats are things too inconsiderable to deserve being made an occasion of offending others, ver. 19, 20,


21. 2) Because every thing is to be done according to a conscience certain, not doubtful, ver. 22 & 23. In the third part we have, 1st, a Proposition: That no one, whether Jew or Gentile, ought to please himself, ch. 15, 1, 2, 7. 2dly, Arguments: 1) From the example of Christ, ver. 3 & 4. 2) Because God loveth both the Jews and Gentiles, ver. 8—12. 3dly, A wish, ver. 5, 6, & 13. (Schoettgen.)

Some Commentators, as Koppe (and indeed Carpzov), think that by the weak in faith are here meant those among the Christians who were attached to the severe discipline of the Essene, and abstained from flesh, either wholly or partially (i.e. on certain days). And it is well known that such kind of abstinence was not unusual both among the Jews, and also the Greeks and Romans, the former practising it from religious scruples, the latter from philosophical dogmas. See Porph. de Abatinent. And this is further confirmed and illustrated by various passages of the antients adduced by Grotius, Carpzov, and Koppe; as Seneca Ep. 108. Clem. Alex. Irm. i. 7. Philo ap. Euseb. Pr. Ev. i. 8. fin. Philo 594 c. Joseph. in Vit. S. Clem. Alex. Pædag. i. 2. Canon. Apost. 501. Orig. c. Cels. 4: Euseb. Hist. Eccel. 4, 3. But all that Koppe has proved is, that the Essenes may be here included, not that they were especially intended, for, as Morus (cited by Rosenm.) justly observes, those on whom religious concord is here enjoined were persons who had united together in one society, consisting both of Jews and Gentiles: and surely this concord did not depend upon the question, whether any one would choose to disclaim this or that food, from philosophical opinions, but from the injunctions of the Mosaic Law." The same learned Theologian further observes: "In N. T. libris ibi contra merum Judaismum dici, ubi Judaice legis vis in decernendo delectu ciborum sublata dicitur, et ostenditur malè agi, quod ea vis adhuc inculceatur Christianis, et contrario ibi contra opiniones Judaismo additas; delectum illum commendantes, dici, ubi defensio hujus delectus niti dicitur nugia et affectatione insignis sapientiae aut pietatis."

The scope of the chapter is well illustrated by Theophyl., as follows: "Many of the Jewish converts, even after having embraced the Christian faith, still adhered to the observance with respect to meats, abstaining from the flesh of swine, since they as yet dared not entirely abandon the law. Then, that it might not be said they abstained only from swines' flesh, they abstained from every kind of flesh, and lived entirely upon herbs. Others again there were, further advanced, who, holding themselves bound by none of these observances, taunted those who practised the same. The Apostle therefore was apprehensive lest the more advanced, by unseasonably and injudiciously attacking the notions of the less advanced, should cause them to fall from the faith. He, then, wisely steers a middle course. For he does not venture to reprove the assailants, lest he should encourage the less advanced in their tenacious adherence to ritual observances; nor, on the other hand, could he commend them, since he would thereby have rendered them the more vehement in their opposition; but he addresses an exhortation accommodated to both parties."
1. τὸν δὲ ἀσθενῶντα τῇ πίστει, προσλαμβάνεσθε, μ. e.
δ. δ. Β) τὸν ἀσθ. the best Commentators understand one who is doubtful, or not fully persuaded of the propriety or impropriety of certain things in themselves indifferent, and is not satisfied as to the liberty which Christianity allows in those cases.* Πίστις does not here signify the doctrine itself, nor the assent to it; but a full persuasion of mind as to what is lawful, or unlawful: and the article seems to be put for αὐτοῦ. Theodoret well explains τὸν ἀσθ. by τὸν ταῖς νομικαῖς παρατήρησι δεδουλομένου.

Προσλαμβάνεσθε is variously interpreted; and indeed it will admit two or three senses, any one of which would not be unsuitable here. Some explain, "receive into Christian communion and fellowship." Others, support, confirm; since (say they) this verb, like ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, may signify to lay hold by the hand, and raise up any one when falling or sinking." This, however, may be doubted. Προσλαμβάνεσθαι signifies properly "to lay hold of, and draw any thing to us;" and as this generally implies protection, support, so here the first-mentioned interpretation, with the adjunct notions of protecting, cherishing, kindly treating, taking into familiar intercourse, &c., may, I think, represent the sense intended. The word is used nearly in the same manner infr. 15, 7. There is also a kindred passage at Gal. 6, 1. καταφτιζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραστη- τος. See also Ps. 27, 10. 64, 4. 79, 24. Sept.

1. μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. On the interpretation of these words Commentators are not agreed. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) explains: μὴ διακρινόμενοι ἐπὶ τῇ ἁσθενείᾳ, καὶ σκανδαλιζόμενοι, καὶ λογισμοὶ πόλ- λοις παρατόμενοι. ἀλλ' ἂις ἁσθενῇ ὅντα πάσης θεραπείας ἄξιον τε. Rosenm. (from Knatchbull) renders: "ne in ipsius sententiam curiosè inquiratis, eamque se-

* Grotius, however, explains it: "Quo Christianismum quidem amplexus est, sed non omnia a Christo, aut Spiritu ejus revelata pernoscit, præcipue verò mysterium illud quod septimo capite aperire capuit Paulus."
verè damnatis." *Diakriνεν* here signifies *dijudicare*; as in Matt. 16, 3. 1 Cor. 6, 5. Koppe regards the words as equivalent to ἄνευ διακρίσεως καὶ διαλογισμοῦ. Others, however, as Slade and Turner, render: "not with a view to the agitation of doubtful questions, or unprofitable useless discussions." All of these interpretations are sufficiently agreeable to the context; but it is not easy to determine which yields the truest sense, since the expression deviates from the general *usus loquendi*. The sense is probably best represented by Mr. Valpy: "bewilder him not in the discussion of abstruse and subtle controversies."

2. ὅς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὃ δὲ α. λ. ε. The Apostle now illustrates the thing by an example, and withal shows why he has given the precept.

The syntax ὅς μὲν—ὁ δὲ, for ὅ μὲν—ὁ δὲ, or εἰς μὲν ἑτερος δὲ, deserves attention: on which, and its kindred phrase, see Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 419. and Viger. c. 11. It is chiefly found in the later Greek writers. An example from Polyb. is cited by Koppe.

2. πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, "is persuaded to eat, thinks he may eat." This seems an idiomatic expression. By *πάντα* is meant all meats without discrimination, even those forbidden by the Mosaic Law; or perhaps, with a view to the opinions of the Essenes, flesh, as well as vegetables. Ammon thinks that there is here reference to the common feasts mentioned in 1 Cor. 8, 4. seq., at which some, from a dread of partaking of meat which had been offered up to idols, abstained from all food but vegetables.

3. ὃ ἐσθίαν τὸν μὲν ἐσθίοντα μὴ ἔξουδενεῖτω. At ἐσθίοντα must be supplied πάντα. Ἐξουδενεῖτω, "set at nought, despise, and account as superstitious." Κρινεῖτω, for κατακρινεῖτα, "condemn as impious and unworthy of the favour of God." By προσελάβετο is meant, "has received him, accepted him, admitted him to the benefits of the Christian religion, without subjecting him to any restraints in respect of such ritual observances."
4. ὁ τίς εἶ; ὃ κρίνειν ἄλλοτριον οἰκετήν; This seems to be a popular form of speech, equivalent to, “by what right dost thou pretend to exercise a privilege of judging another man’s servant?” Yet examples of ὁ τίς εἶ; occur in the Classical writers. Ἀλλότριον is put (as Koppe observes) for ἄλλοτριον κυρίου. An example apposite in respect of the thing, as well as the expression, is given by Wets. from Xen. de Rep. Ath. 1, 10. ἀν τις τίπτῃ τὸν ἄλλοτριον δοῦλον, γράφει εἶπαι κατὰ τὸν τυπτότα.

As to the clause τῷ ἰδίῳ Κυρίῳ στήκει ὁ πίπτει, Commentators are not quite agreed upon its sense. The best founded opinion seems to be, that the terms are judicial, and signify, the former to act rightly, or stand in judgment; the latter to be in the wrong, delinquere, to fall in judgment. Now the phrase stand in judgment often occurs in the Old Testament. Rosenm. explains the term στήκειν “certus animi esse, persuasus de sua sententiā, rectè agere; and πίπτειν, incertus errare.” The sentiment is thus laid down by Koppe: “Non est nisi Dominus ipse, qui possit eum absolvere aut condemnare.”

4. σταθήσεται δὲ. This must be understood in subservience to the interpretation of the former clause. Locke renders it: “he shall stand in the family.” But for this signification there is no authority. Rosenm. takes it to mean, “his uncertainty shall be removed.” This, however, is obscure and dubious. It must, I think, signify, “he shall stand fast, or shall be held free of blame, and not be punished.”* (See Macknight and Koppe.) Ammon very well paraphrases it: “neque enim is, qui se cibo quali-cunque pollui posse negaverit, propterea cadet sententia; potest enim Deus eum absolvere, vel sine legis Mosaicæ observatione.”

Under δυνατὸς, able, is also comprehended willing; as elsewhere more than once in the Epistle.

* So Carpzov understands the word, explaining, “consistet ac stabiliter;” “Deus succurset imbecillitate, ut στῆση, stet;” “God will not condemn him, nor permit him to fall so as never to rise more.”
So 11, 23. δυνατός γὰρ ἐστι ὁ Θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρεῖται αὐτῶς.

5. ὅσι εἴπει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν. Here the severer, or the laxer discipline of Christians in the observance of external rites is illustrated by another example, namely, as contained in distinction of days as well as meats (such as the Sabbath, Passover, Pentecost, σκηνοτηγίαι, &c.), which some held holier than others, and maintained that on them there should be an abstinence from all work, and a devoted attention to the worship of God." So Theophyl. 136. Ἥσαν τινες ηστειόντες, ὁ καὶ τῶν χοιρείων ἀπεχώριοι ἤτοι τινες ἡμέρας. ἔτεροι δὲ πάντοτε ἐστίντες, οἱ καὶ κατεξριννοι τῶν ηστειόντων. Περὶ τούτων οὖν ηγεμονία ἄλλος ἄλλως κρίνει, καὶ ἀδιάφοροι εἶστι τὸ πράγμα. Such is the common interpretation, which Koppe, however, deserts, and thinks that in ver. 5 & 6. there is contained the same sentiment, (namely, concerning abstinence from food,) only a little altered. "For (says he) in all the rest of the chapter there is no further mention of distinction of days, but, on the contrary, the Apostle often returns to the former one, of abstinence from flesh." This reasoning, however, is scarcely conclusive. There is (as Rosenm. observes) no cause why the Apostle should not, after interposing another admonition, revert to the former subject. As to what Koppe, however, says on the abstinence of Christians from flesh on certain days, it is confirmed by Theodoret, whose words are these: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ διήνεκοι ἀπείχοντο τῶν βραμάτων, οἱ δὲ ἐνίας ἡμέρας. Nay also by Chrysost. 201, 38. ἐνταῦθα δὲ μοι δοκεῖ ἡμέρα καὶ περὶ νηστείας αἰνίττεσθαι. Καὶ γὰρ εἰκὸς τῶν νηστευόντων τινὰς τῶς μὴ νηστευόντας κρίνει διήνεκος, ἡ καὶ εἰ ταῖς παρατηρήσεωι εἰκὸς εἶναι τινὰς τῶς ἡμέρας ἀπεχώριον, καὶ ἤτοι ἐγκεντρεῖται. And, upon the whole, this interpretation seems to deserve the preference. It is worthy of observation, that Theophyl., who lived in an age when the system which we call Popery was pretty far advanced, fearful lest the Apostle's words
should be thought to render nugatory the observation of the fasts enjoined in the Romish Church, slips in (or some later Romanists for him), without any authority from Chrysost. or any of the early Fathers: ταύτα δὲ συγκαταβαίνει αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ νεόφυτον τῆς πίστεως αὐτῶν. A distinction truly Jesuitical!

5. κρίνει ημέραν παρ' ημέραν. Koppe here notices the παρὰ with an accusative in the sense compared with: and he refers to Viger. de Idiostim. ch. 9, 6. He would, too, subaud άνεότεραν, διαφαραστέραν ἄλλην ἄλλης ημέρας. The above sense of παρὰ is, indeed, found in the Classical writers: but the ellipsis of άνεότεραν is not a little harsh. That word seems to be implied in the παρὰ, which not only signifies than, but more than, i.e. better than, like ὑπὲρ and the Hebr. ὅ. Of this sense see examples in Schleus. Lex. in voce. § 5. and consult the Philologists there quoted.

In the antithetical clause must be supplied, as the context requires, ἴσην, i.e. “equally appropriate to religious purposes.”

5. ἐκαστὸς ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοὶ πληροφορεῖσθα. Here again there is a brevity of expression which requires that there should be supplied from the context (as Koppe suggests) ἐσθιῶν καὶ μὴ ἐσθιῶν, κριῶν καὶ μὴ κριῶν ημέραν.

5. ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοὶ πληροφορεῖσθα. On the sense of these words there has been much variety of opinion. Many Commentators, as Erasm., Grot., and Doddra., take them to mean, “let every man freely enjoy his own sentiment,” And Grot. thinks the expression equivalent to the Hebr. וַיִּמֹּדְנְנֵהֵל נֶאֶפֶּר נֹּסָן; and he cites Eccl. 8, 11. ἐπιληπτότης καρδία υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦ παιδίων τὸ παιδίων. He also compares a sentiment of Evenus: καὶ πρὸς μὲν τούτων ἄρκει λόγος εἰς τοὺς παλαιοὺς, ὅτι μὲν ταύτα δοκοῦντ' ἐστιν, ἔμοι δὲ τάδε. And another from Sophoc. Οὐκ ὅτι μὴ τάδ' ἐστιν ἐν γνώμῃ φίλα, Κεῖνος τ' ἐκεῖνα στεργεῖτο, καίγω τάδε. Wets., too, compares one from Plut. t. 2. p. 12 a. περὶ μὲν ὧν τούτων, ὅτως ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν πέπεικεν,
This interpretation, however, seems scarcely warranted by the context. Others, but less admissible, may be seen in Pole. The one most agreeable to the context seems to be that adopted by the antient Greek Commentators, also Vatabl. De Dieu, Koppe, &c., namely, "quisque de sua animi sententia certus fieri studeat." De Dieu paraphrases: "Qui dies et cibos non discernit, faciat id quia de libertate Christiana persuasus est apud mentem suam. Qui adhuc discernit, faciat idem qui Legem vigere adhuc in animo persuasum habet. Quisque quod persuasum habet placere Deo, faciat." So that, upon the whole, the sense is correctly enough represented in our common version: "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Dr. Whitby very well paraphrases: "Let every one act with fulness of persuasion that he doth what is lawful."

6. ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν, Κυρίω φρονεῖ. Verses 6 & 7 are parenthetical; and (as Crellius observes) the Apostle here conjoins examples of both the discrepant sentiments, as well in respect of days, as of meats, and shows, by a new reason, that those who in this instance think differently from each other, ought not to despise or contemn one another.

The meaning of ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν is plain from the context: but there seems in it an idiomatic and popular use. The term φρόνησις may be exactly paralleled by our verb to mind. The sense, then, is: "he who minds, observes, keeps holy the day." So παρατηρεῖν in Gal. 4, 10.

Κυρίω is for εἰς τὸν Κύριον, διὰ τὸν Κυρίον (as Theophyl. explains), "with a reference to the Lord, and in obedience to his understood will." The clause εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ must be accommodated so as to apply both to the ὡς σήμερον and the ὡς μερίσθην. In the former case the sense is plain, and relates (I think, both to the returning thanks for the food,* and to the

* With a reference, too, to the blessings thereby supposed to be imparted to it. See Deut. 8, 10. and 1 Tim. 4, 4. (Ammon.)
Christian liberty of unrestricted participation. In the latter case the sense is less obvious. The best Commentators explain: "returns thanks to God for the gift of abstinance." The scope of the passage is well traced by Theophyl., as follows: 'Ἐν ἡπτούμεν μόνον, φησιν, εάν διὰ τὸν Θεόν τὸ πρόγμα γένηται, καὶ εὐ-
χαριστώμε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἔσθιαν καὶ οὐ ἔσθιαν' οὕτω γὰρ γενόμενον, οἰκεῖον ἐστι. So also Chrysost. 202, 13. οὐ περὶ τὰ καλὰ τὸ πρόγμα ἐστι, τὸ γὰρ ἡπτούμενον, εἰ
diὰ τὸν Θεόν καὶ οὕτως κακὰ κατὰ οἰκεῖον ἐργαζόμεναι, εἰ ἀμφότεροι εἰς
eὐχαρίστησιν τελετῶσιν καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ οὕτως εὐ-
χαριστοῦσι τῷ Θεῷ εἰ τοιόν άμφοτέροι εὐχαριστοῦσιν, οὐ
tολὴ τὸ μέσον.

7. οὐδὲς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος. It is plain that by no one is meant no Christian. The sense of the ex-
pressions ἐστιν ἐὰν, and ἐστι οὐκ ἐσεῖν, is best de-
termined by the context. The former plainly signifi-

cies, "to live after our own judgment, will, and plea-
sure."* Now the dative depends upon ἐν, which often has the sense of conformably to. With respect to the clause ἐσεῖν τῷ Θεῷ, its meaning is not so clear. It may be best understood ex opposto; though on the exact signification to be assigned Commentators are not quite agreed. The sense seems to be this: "No one has, at death, any power over himself and his fate in another state of existence, nor ceases to depend for every thing upon God, by whom he is to be judged." Koppe wraps

* This Wetstein has illustrated by a comparison with several Classical passages; as Menander ap. Stob. 130. τοιν' ἐστι τὸ ἐὰν, ὁπὶ ἐστιν ἐὰν ἡμῶν. Plut. 1, 819 ν. αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ἐὰν μόνος ἐστιν καὶ ἐσεῖν. Eurip. Ion 646. ἐὰν ἐκεῖν ἐὰν, ἡ ἡ ἡ καὶ μεγάλαις χαίρεται, οὐκ ἐκεῖν τὶ ἡ ἐκεῖν. Besides several-

passages from the Latin Classics, in which occurs the phrase eversi sibi, tibi, &c. Kypke, too oppositely compares Demost. ad Phil. Epist. p. 66. οἴ τις παρ' ἐκείνοιν διώκειν οὐκαδέ καθεὶ καθήμενον, οὐκ ἐκεῖνον Φίλιππου ἐοιντες. And Antiphon ap. Stob. 66. p. 432. "Certe si mihi corpus alterum, quale meum est, accederet." Wetstein also compares a similar sentiment of a Rabbinical writer. Aboth 4, 32. "Non tuā sponte formatus es, non tuā voluntate na-
tus es, non tuā voluntate vivis, non tuā voluntate moreris, non tuā voluntate redditurus es rationem Regi omnium regum."
up the sense too briefly, I think, by interpreting both expressions as merely signifying, "that whether alive or dead, we are in the power of God." Grotius paraphrases the passage thus: "Christo qui nos suos fecit, et vitam et vitæ omnia, et ipsam mortem consecrare debemus, et parati sumus."* And Taylor observes, that the Apostle's argument stands thus: "According to the principles of true religion, and of the Christian religion in particular, we are not our own, we are all Christ's,† we are his disciples and subjects, and his will should be the rule of our consciences and conduct. Therefore, as we should not make our own wills or sentiments a rule to ourselves, much less should we make them a rule to others; as if they were to live to us, like servants, to pay us obedience." Jaspis, after laying down the sense nearly as above detailed, draws the conclusion, "uti ergo Christo integrum relinquimus judicium, sic lenitate erga alios opus est, ver. 10. qui his in rebus nostro judicio non sunt subjecti."

That by the Lord is here meant Christ, is plain from ver. 9, "where (observes Koppe) it is probable that the same being was conversant in the mind of the Apostle at ver. 6. under the name of God."

7, 8. ἔαν τε γὰρ—ἐστε. Here there is a continu-

* And Carpzov thus: 1. None of us liveth to himself. No one is to suppose that he may live and act according to his own pleasure, and is to give an account of his actions to no one but himself. But we must conform our actions to the will and pleasure of the Lord, and consider that we ought to be devoted to Him, and live in obedience to Him, and that we shall have to give an account of ourselves to Him. 2. No man dieth to himself, i.e. so as to be at rest, and not have to give an account to any one of the things which he has done in this life; but when we die, and appear before the tribunal of the Lord, our Judge, every one will give account of himself to the Lord."

† Schoettgen here compares Tanchuma: "Thine was Moses, as well in death as in life." And Carpzov cites Philo 498 a. (on the words of the Almighty, "sumite mini primitias.) ὅπως καὶ, ἠτάθα παραίτεις, μὴ κανοίς, ἀλλὰ Θεῷ λαμβάνεις—Τῇ γὰρ "Ωτί καὶ σωμάτων καὶ πνευμάτων αἱ ἀρχαι καὶ Θεὸν ἔλεγασαντι μύσιν. And 1078 a. τῷ Θεῷ μόνῳ ἔσται καὶ ἔσται ἐνόπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.
ation and repetition of what was said at ver. 7. The Apostle (Cremilus observes) collects the whole into a short compass, drawing the inference, "Whether, therefore, we live," &c. It is here remarked by Rosenm. "Est igitur necessitudo hominum cum Déo, quae pertinent ad omnem vitam, ad omnia genera factorum, in quibus locus est conscientiae sui, proposito, causis, consilioso, per quae cum religione conjunguntur."

9. εἰς τὸ τοῦτο γὰρ Χ. καὶ ἀνέθανε—κυριεύω, "for for this end and purpose Christ died, and, after his resurrection, rose again unto glory, and yet liveth, that he might be sovereign of the whole human race, both the quick and the dead."

* It is hence meant to be inferred, that we live unto Christ, and, not at the will and pleasure and for the purposes of men. Rosenm. here judiciously remarks. "Hæc omnia autem eo consilio dicuntur, ut appareat judicium de hujusmodi factis, quæ deflectum ciborum concernunt, non pertinere ad homines, sed ad Deum, ad quem unum omnis religio refertur, et quicquid in hoc genere fiat id ita judicandum esse, prouti hoc, quod fieri et omitti in non necessariis potest, ab eo, qui facit vel omissit, ad Deum referatur, conjungaturque cum necessariis officiis, ne hæc damnum capiant. Unde concluditur, uti judicium, ne nostrum quidem sit, sic lenitate erga alios opus esse."

In this passage there are several various readings, none of which, however, make any material alteration in the sense. Some few MSS. and Versions omit the καὶ before ἀνέθανε. But as to the MSS., their number is too inconsiderable to merit much attention; and as to the Versions, they are scarcely admissible evidence in so minute a point. The common reading is defended by the usage of the Apostle;

* Wetstein has ably stated the argument thus: "Christ both died, returned to life, and now liveth, and will live to all eternity. Had he not returned to life, he could not have redeemed us: had he not returned to life, he could not have power over us: did he not live an immortal life in Heaven, he would not have that power."
whose style is πολυσώδεσμος. So that much stronger evidence than that of the MSS. in question would be requisite to authorize the καί to be cancelled. As to the words following, there is reason to think that a clause has been introduced from the margin. Thus καί ἀνέστη is omitted in some MSS., and many Versions and Fathers; and καί ἀνέστησεν in some MSS. and Versions. Koppe and Griesbach, on the authority of a considerable number of MSS. and Fathers, edite καί ἀνέστη καί ἐξήσεν: which reading may be thought, upon the whole, to deserve the preference, since there is too little evidence to authorize the omission of either clause. If, indeed, any one were omitted, it should rather be καί ἀνέστη: and then the common reading ἀνέστησεν will be preferable.*

With the νεκρῶν καί ζώντων κυριεύσῃ, Wets. compares Suidas (speaking of Mercury) καί ζώντων καί τετελευκότων ἄρχει, and Diodor. 5, 6, 8. (speaking of Hades) δίο καί τῶν τετελευκότων κυριεύει. Compare Phil. 2, 10 and 11.

10. σὺ τὶ κρίνεις τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου; Here the Apostle urges a new reason to dissuade them from exercising rash judgment and condemnation; and this is suggested partly in the word ἀδελφ.† which is emphatic; but chiefly in the words following, πάντες γὰρ παραστήσομεν τὰ βέμπται τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which import that we are all equally amenable to this judgment, and therefore are not warranted in judging, much less contemning and despising each other: all must be left to the judgment of one great and true Estimator, and none ought to presume to intrude upon his province. Now this must, of course, be understood with especial reference to the subject in question, namely the observance or non-observance of any ceremonial rites.

* This reading Carpzov strenuously defends; and he observes, "Græci verbo ἀναστήσαι utuntur eâ notione, ut sit revisiere de novo, i. e. post resurrectionem se vivum ostendere."
† The force of this term is too obvious to need illustration. It will be sufficient to refer the student to Pole’s Synop.
Koppe thinks that the first ἄφες refers to the weaker; and the second, to the better informed Christian. The καὶ, it may be observed, signifies "on your part." Ἐγὼ οὖν εἰς σέ, set at nought, despise. By πάντας are meant all without exception, both the weak and the strong in faith and knowledge. Πάραστ. is a judicial term, representing graphically the posture of the criminal when appearing at the bar of judgment.

The passage is thus paraphrased by Rosen. "Quid occupas Christi officium? Illius est, de occultis judicare. Solus novit, quantum cognitionis quisque acceperit, quantum ab eo pro talenti sui modo exigi debet." And by Wets. thus: "Vis judex sedere? stabis judicandus ipse." Mackn. draws from hence and from Phil. 2, 10. the well founded conclusion, that the souls of men, at death, will neither sleep, nor fall into a state of insensibility. (See his note.)

11. γέγραπται γὰρ Ζῶ ἐγώ. The position, that all men, without exception, shall be judged by Christ, is now confirmed by a passage of the Old Testament, namely Is. 45, 23.; what is there said of Jehovah, being here ascribed to Christ.† (Koppe and Rosenm.) There is here a slight variation, which some Commentators attribute to the Apostle's citing from memory. It seems rather (I suspect) to have arisen from some variation in the Hebr. Text, together with a freedom of version, such as, in accommodating passages of the Old Testament, the Apostles were justified in exercising. The Hebr. and Sept. have, "I swear by myself," of which "as I live," may be considered as no unfaithful paraphrase, being (as Koppe observes) formed after the model of Num. 14, 21

* So Jaspis, who paraphrases: "Cur vos infirmi sodales firmiores, aut cur vos firmiores (provectiores) timidiiores illos damnare auditis?"

† On which Koppe remarks: "And no wonder; since that he is united with him most closely, is an opinion perpetually expressed both by the Jewish writers, as often as they speak of the Messiah, and by the Apostles, as St. Paul and St. John. See on 9, 5. and the first Epistle of St. John.
and 28. Jer. 22, 24. Ez. 5, 11. For ἐξομολογήσεται the Sept. reads ὅμειται. But there the Cod. Alex. has ἔξομειται, which may have been the reading in the Apostle's time. Some MSS., too, of the Sept., have τῷ Θεῷ, and not τὸν Θεὸν, which is the textual and the general reading. Upon the whole, the sense of the Prophet is faithfully expressed by the Apostle. The Prophet, it may be observed, treats of the propagation of the Jewish religion among the Gentiles, and it is predicted by him that they will acknowledge and worship the true God.

13. ἄρα οὖν ἐκατοστὸς ἕμων περὶ έαυτοῦ λ. 6. τ. Θ. Here the sense is too plain to need any exposition: and on the phraseology it is only necessary to notice, that δεῖ is for ἄποδασει, by an idiomatic and popular use: though examples of the simple verb are cited by the Philological Commentators from Xenoph., Aristot., and Plutarch. Here, it may be observed, God is represented as an ἐδώνος (on which word see Blomf. on Ἀeschyl. Pers. 820. and compare Hebr. 13, 17. and 1 Pet. 4, 5.)

13. μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνομεν. In these words is contained a conclusion drawn from the preceding and from the former part of the chapter. (Crellius.) Here it is inculcated, that we must not only abstain from unjustly judging those who entertain different sentiments in things appertaining to the conscience, or knowledge of right or wrong; but also beware lest the weaker be by our actions and sentiments aggrieved, and thus be led into sin. (Koppe.) This judging, indeed, is dangerous in doubtful points; since the judgment you pass on another will be passed on yourself, Matt. 7, 1. (Rosenm.)*

* And he details the scope of the verse as follows: "Aliam rationem afferit Paulus, cur lenitate sit utendum in dijudicandis aliis, delectum ciborum probantibus vel improbantibus, at cur nemo suam de hac re sententiam aliis, ut necessariam omnibus, obtuderet debat. Hujusmodi nempe iniquoribus judiciis et agendi modis alio facile posse co adduci, ut contraria suas persuasioni agant, et contra conscientiam peccent."
The Commentators notice the ambiguous dictum, or antanailasis, in κρίνωμεν and κρίνατε, which (as Koppe observes) it is difficult to express in any version. A similar antanailasis in στασιάζεσθαι is adduced by Raphel from Herodotus. In the former case the term denotes to pass severe and unjust judgment upon; and in the latter signifies resolve, statuere. In the same manner judicare is used for constituisse in Cic. ad Fam. 7, 33. "Mihi judicaturn est."

The terms πρόσκομμα and σκάδαλον are synonymous: though the latter is the plainer one, and seems to be exegetical of the former. Grotius, indeed, and others, take the former to mean a trifling lapse, or trip, the latter, an utter fault.* But this distinction seems unauthorized.

By ἄδελφος is meant any fellow creature, and especially fellow Christian.

14. οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι εὖ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι οὐδὲν—κοινός. The Apostle here meets an objection, which might be advanced against this precept. (Crellius.) Μεθ' ἐδίδαξεν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπιπλήσειν τῷ ἀσθενοῦτι, δοματίζει λοιπόν περὶ τῶν βραχυμάτων, παιδεύων τῶν ἀσθενεστέρων, μην δεδέναι, μηδὲ τρέμειν ταῦτα αἰς ἀκάθαρτα. (Theophylact.)

The clause οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐ. K. 'I. is a breviloquentia for "I know and am fully persuaded, (from the teaching of Christ himself)." Οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι is a strong expression, which also occurred supra 8, 38. Wetstein, too, cites an example of it from Machon ap. Athen. 13. p. 581 c. οἶδα γὰρ ἄκριβος καὶ πέπειθ', ὅτι, &c. The words εὖ 'I. X. are well paraphrased by Theophyl. thus: ὁς ἀνθρωπίνοις λογισμοῖς, ἀλλ' εὖ X. 'I. (scil.) παρ' αὐτοῖς μαθοῦν, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν πληροφορίδεσις.

Κοινός here corresponds to the Hebr. נָאָѣ, ἀκαθαρ-τὸν, impure, and was by the Hellenists especially

* Mr. Slade explains the former of those scruples, which put difficulties or discouragements in the way of a brother, and make him take offence; the latter, of those which may shake and impair his faith."

"The Apostle (observes Rosenm.) supposes that no law to that effect had been given to the Gentiles; and that, with respect to the Jews, it was abrogated, he had before shown.

14. εἰ μὴ τῷ λογισομένῳ, &c. The εἰ μὴ is for ἀλλά. Λογισομένῳ τί literally signifies "to him that considers any thing." Compare 2, 3, 3, 28. 4, 8, 8, 18. Ἐκείνῳ κοινόν, "in respect of him it is unclean." It is here observed by Capellus, that nothing is lawful to him who believes any thing to be unlawful, or as long as he believes it to be so. And Paræus ap. Pole observes, that from this passage Theologians maintain, than "an erroneous conscience binds man, not indeed to act according to it, but to avoid acting contrary to it: and the reason is, that actions are estimated by the will, and the will is moved by the object known: so that he who acts against the dictates of the understanding, has the deliberate intention of sinning," &c. This doctrine was not unknown to the Rabbins. So Maimonid. de Jubilaeo 5, 2. Id pendet ab ejus opinione. Si reputet ea tanquam ligna, ecce sensentur ligna; si reputet ea tanquam fructus, ecce censentur fructus.

15. εἰ δὲ διὰ βρῶμα ὧν ἀδελφός σου νυσταίνει. The διὰ βρῶμα νυσταίνει, the being brought into grief may be understood with reference to the pain of self condemnation any one would feel on being induced, by the example of another, to eat what he believed to be unlawful. So Dodd. "The grief is that which arises from a consciousness of having acted amiss, in conformity to the example of a person considered as superior, whether in rank or genius, knowledge or piety." Or it may advert to any such weak brother being hurt at the licence claimed and used by another, and the superstition charged by that other on
himself. And so most of the earlier modern Commentators, and also Rosenm., interpret. Some, however, as Bishop Hall, Hammond, Elsner, Carpzov, Koppe, and Schleus., take οὐσεῖται for σκανδαλίζεται: and indeed οὐσεῖν is often used in the best Classical writers in the sense "to aggrive," in any way whatever. Of this signification Elsner adduces several examples, which might easily be increased, were it necessary. The passage is thus paraphrased by Carpzov. "Si propter esum offenditur frater tuus, et ad iram aut indignationem tui provocatur, vel tristitia afficitur, aut illicitur ad peccandum." And he observes: "Prout diversa sunt diversorum ingenia, etiam ζ οὐση diversam affectionem." Wolf strenuously defends the common interpretation, and restricts the word solely to grief. But it is unnecessary to dilate so much upon a point involving no material difference; since to be grieved and to be aggrieved are notions closely cognate.

15. Οὐκ ἦν κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς, "thou dost not act according unto love, in love, agreeably to the dictates of love." For (as Koppe observes) it is the part of love, not only to bear with a weaker brother, but, for his sake, to suffer one’s own liberty to be somewhat circumscribed, especially in a matter which involves nothing that is unlawful.

15. μὴ τῷ βραχιοτατι σου ἐκείνων ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστοῦ ἀπέθανε. The disputations between Limborch, Wolf, Elsner, and others on this clause might very well have been spared; since it is evident that ἀπόλλυμι is here used in a popular and restricted sense; and, at all events, (as Elsner remarks) it does not necessarily imply final perdition. The sense of this term depends upon that of οὐσεῖται: but it cannot possibly import more than "cause him to fall from a state of salvation;" whether that fall shall be final or temporary, will depend upon his future repentance or non-repentance. Ἀπόλλυμι, therefore, denotes the bringing him into a state of present reprobation, from which it must be difficult for him to rise; and
thereby doing thy part to produce his final reprobation and perdition. The circumstance ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε is skilfully thrown in, to shew the peculiar baseness of this conduct, since it involves a contravening of the designs of Christ in favour of one's brother.

16. μὴ βλασφημεῖσθω οἷν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθὸν. On the interpretation of ἀγαθὸν Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Grot., Hammond, Vorstius, Piscat., Estius, and Toletus, take it to mean "Christian Liberty:" and they appeal to 1 Cor. 10, 29. But this requires a somewhat tortuous application of the words. Erasmus and Carpzov take it to refer to the ἡ πληροφορεῖα τοῦ ἱδίου νοὸς, before mentioned. This, however, seems to be no less harsh than the former interpretation. It is surely more rational to understand it, with the antient Greek Commentators, and some modern ones, as Rosenm. and Koppe, of the Christian religion, the Christian faith, the ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ of the next verse, by a periphrasis. The passage is thus paraphrased by Koppe. "Suffer not, by your fault, the transcendent benefits of the Christian religion should be despised and profaned by the Gentile nations." See 2 Cor. 6, 3. and Rom. 7, 13. I would here compare Philostr. V. App. p. 555. οἷς διαβάλλειν αὐτοῦ καὶ τα ἐπανομένα.

Βλασφ., "be brought into calumny, contempt, hatred;" which must necessarily arise from the mutual strifes and disputes of those who profess a religion of peace.

17. οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις. A popular and familiar mode of expression for, "In the Christian religion and the worship prescribed by it, it is not meats and drinks that are considered, but virtue, peace, spiritual joy, &c. i. e. in order to the attainment of the kingdom of Heaven, we have no need of abstinence from meats, but of righteousness, peace, &c. The sense, then, may be thus expressed. "For the hope of future felicity with Christ is not placed in the freely partaking of, or the wholly ab-
staining from eating and drinking, but in a true and
divinely spiritual benevolence and humanity shown
towards others; to which he who piously endeavours
to attain, shall be approved by God and man.”
(Koppe.)

I cannot, however, assent to Koppe, that δικαίο-
σων here signifies benignitas. That seems included
under εἰρήνη. Whereas δίκαιος signifies righteousness
generally. Zacharias, Schoettg., Carpzov, and Am-
mon indeed take it to denote justification: and they
refer to 5, 1. 6, 22. Gal. 5, 22. But those passages
are evidently of another character. The context
here requires the sense of δικαίος above laid down.
Εἰρήνη is well explained by Koppe “concordiæ ser-
vandæ studium.” So εἰρηνικός in James 3,17. With
respect to the χάρα, on that Commentators are not
quite agreed. Some, connecting it closely with ἐν
πνεύμ., explain it, “an inward joy arising from the
consolations of the Holy Spirit.” And indeed that
sense is supported by not a few passages of Scrip-
ture. Yet the context would seem scarcely to allow
of it here. I prefer, with Hammond, Scott. Doddr.,
Rosenm., Koppe, and Schleus., “studium exhilarandi
alios, ac promovendæ aliorum felicitatis.” (See
Doddr.)

I must not omit to observe, that the above inter-
pretation of the whole clause is supported by the
authority of Theophyl., whose words are these: Εἰς
tὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσάγει ἡ δικαιοσύνη, ποιτεστίν,
η καθόλου ἄρετη, ὁ ἀμεμπτὸς βίος, καὶ εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν
ἀδελφὸν, οὐχ ἢ φιλονείκια καὶ ἡ χάρα ἐκ τῆς ὀμοστας,
οὐχ ἢ λύπη ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιπλήξεως. Ἑπεὶ δὲ ἐστὶν εἰρήνη
καὶ χάρα καὶ ἐπὶ ποιητῶν πραγμάτων, ἐπήγαγεν, ἐν
Πνεύματι ἄγιον.

18. ο γὰρ ἐν τούτοις δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ—ἀνθρω-
ποις. At ἐν τούτοις Koppe supplies φρονήμασι. But
it seems more regular to subjoin πράγμασι, and take
it to denote temper and dispositions, including a
yielding spirit, in the using or non-using things in
themselves indifferent.
18. ὁ δοῦλος υἱὸς Χριστοῦ, "he who serveth Christ, by obediently performing all his injunctions in such respects." The words εὐάρεστ. and δοκεῖ. are perhaps here synonymous; though Koppe thinks that δοκεῖ is purposely applied to God, and not to men, in order effectually to exclude all idea of human merit, and all ground for boasting. This, however, seems too fanciful. It appears, in fact, to have been a popular expression.*

19. ἀρχὴ ὑπὲρ τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διακομητέ. This is a conclusion drawn from the preceding; q. d. "Since a peaceable spirit is so well pleasing to God and man, let us study peace." Διακομεῖ, it may be observed, is a stronger term than διατείν. In τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης and τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς there is an usual idiom for τῆν εἰρήνην and τὴν οἰκοδομήν. In the latter term there is (as is not unusual with the Apostle) a metaphor derived from architecture. It must here denote the promotion and increase of Christian virtue. See 15, 2. 1 Cor. 14, 3 & 5, 12, 26. 2 Cor. 5, 1, 10, 8, 12, 19, 13, 10, Eph. 4, 29. Theophyl. well explains: προσέχει ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀλληλων συφελείας ἑνεκα πάντων ποιεῖν. And upon the whole sentence he judiciously remarks, that τῆς εἰρήνης is meant, especially of the less advances, Christian; and ὁἰκοδ., of the more advanced in spiritual knowledge, who is admonished not to cast down his brethren by causing them to be scandalized; yet the words εἰς ἀλληλους show that these duties are common to both, and reciprocal; and peace is mentioned first, since without it, it is impossible to promote edification."

20. μὴ ἑνεκεὶ βραφοματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Here the sentiment inculcated at ver. 15. is again repeated.

* Of which Schoettg. gives an example from Berachoth, fol. 17, 1. Ut diligatur superius (in cælo, scil. a Deo), et desideratos sit inferiorius (in terrâ), et acceptus hominibus. Wets., too, cites Joseph. Ant. 16, 6, 7. To which may be added Simplic. Comm. 5, 40. (cited by Bulkley.) "Ὅπερ γὰρ ἄρεστόν δόκει Θεῷ καὶ τοῖς ἐμφροσύν ἀνθρωποις, τοῦ ἀν εἰν σπουδής ἄξιον τῷ σωθησόμενῳ."
By the ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ many Commentators understand the Christian brother, considered as the workmanship of God: and they refer to Eph. 2, 10. and 1, Cor. 9, 1. But in the former passage we have ποίμα, and that without the article: and the latter evidently requires the interpretation which I shall now proceed to state; namely, that of the ancient Commentators, and most modern ones, who here suppose that by τὸ ἔργον is meant (with an allusion to the architectural metaphor which had just preceded) the faith and Christian piety of the person in question; and it is ascribed (they think) to God, as being excited, promoted, and preserved by him. Chrysost. and Theophyl. explain it σωτηρίαν. See 1 Cor. 15, 58. Phil. 1, 6.

20. πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ, ἀλλὰ κακὸν, &c., "all (meats) are pure and permitted: there is no one κακὸν (Tit. 1, 15.), all are pure, as well by nature, as by the permission of God." Ἄλλα κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τ. δ. τ. ε. At κακὸν must be supplied βρώμα. The words may be referred either to the weak Christian, who, if he eateth διὰ προσκόμματος (i. e. συν προσκόμματι, stumblingly, with an uncertain and dubious mind), sinneth; or, to the more knowing and advanced Christian, who, if, by eating, he offends and causes another to sin (διὰ προσκόμματος, for μετὰ προσκόμματος, i. e. occasioning an offence to him), he also sinneth. The latter interpretation seems preferable, on account of what follows. (Koppe.) Theophyl., however, and many others, adopt the former mode of interpretation.

21. καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον. Grot., Hardy, Rosenm., and not a few other Commentators, take καλὸν as a positive, for the comparative melius. This, however, is not necessary. It may be preferable, with Koppe, to consider καλὸν as put for προσήκον: which is certainly more agreeable to the usus loquendi. The καλὸν may be viewed in several aspects, as consisting of many particulars on which see Pole's Synop. The use of κρέα in the plural
for the singular, is an idiom deserving of attention. Wets. adduces several examples of it; as Homer. κρέα πολλὰ σωπίσσιμε. Athen. 540 c. ἄλωμελη κρέα· and 130 E. τέτταρα λήψῃ κρέα μικρὰ. Xen. Cyr. 2. ἐγένετο ἐκάστῳ τρία κρέα.

21. μηδὲ ἐν ὕ. Here there is an ellipsis, in which must be supplied either, (with Grot. and most other Commentators,) τοιεῦ, or, with Koppe (who refers it not only to wine, but other intoxicating drinks), τοιεῦ. The former, however, seems the more natural and regular ellipsis: neither is it quite certain that any other intoxicating drinks were known in ancient times. 'Εν ὕ, “by which.” Προσκόπτει is for σκανδαλίζεται.

The words ἦ σκανδαλίζεται ἦ ἀσθενεῖ are omitted in three MSS., and some Versions and Fathers; and even rejected by Mill and Koppe, as being a gloss. This, however, can hardly be true of ἦ ἀσθενεῖ: and if that clause be genuine, so probably is the preceding one. Besides, the omission in so few MSS. may be accounted for on the principle of the homoioteleuton. Both the clauses, too, were read by Chrysost.; and there is, I think, great emphasis in the use of three terms so nearly allied to each other. And, in this view, Theophyl. remarks, that by all these the Apostle draws on the more confirmed Christian to the help of his brother, as being in all respects weak.* See the masterly comment of Chrys.

* And, advertling to the three terms, he observes that the Apostle by προσκόπτει hints at the blindness of the neophyte; by σκάνδ. hints that he is κοῦφος, and by ἀσθενεῖ, that he is ὀλιγοπνεός.

Wets. regards σκάνδαλον as a stronger term than πρόσκομα, and he subjoins the following paraphrase: “Si importunè instas, ut frater ex Judaeis edat cibos lege Mosis vetitos; aut ille movetur ut edat aut non. Si non edit, animus illius a te magis alienabitur, et tuus ab illo; ut ipsum ridebis et contemnes tanquam superstitionem: ille te judicabit impium, qui nullà Legis a Deo latae reverentia ducatur. Hoc siet cum injurià et damno utriusque vestrum, amicitia enim mutua frigescet. Si vero, ut tibi placet, edat, adhuc pejori loco res est, agit ille contra dictamen conscientiæ suæ, et tu ipsum ad peccandum adegesti. Illud est πρόσκομα, hoc σκάνδαλον. Hoc pacto grave et lethale vulnus ipsi inligitur, ἀσθενεία πρὸς
From a passage cited by Wets. from Augustin, it appears that wine was scrupled at by some weak brethren, on the same ground as was meat; namely, that what was publicly sold had sometimes been used at libations to the honour of the Heathen gods.

22. οὐ πίστιν ἔχεις, "thou hast faith (thou sayest), be it so." The ancient Greek Commentators, and the early modern ones, read this clause interrogatively: but the other seems the more spirited mode, and therefore more agreeable to the style of the Apostle.

By faith is here meant a persuasion that what one is doing is right and lawful; or, in other words, the assent of the conscience. (Rosenm.) So Schöttg., who explains it: "plenissimum persuasionem et certitudinem de veritate et bonitate opinionis sua." And he observes: "Theologi Scholastici secuti vocant conscientiam rectam." Koppe, however, refers it simply to πληροφορία of action, but also to the doctrine of Christ, which makes the primary merit of a Christian consist in yielding assent to the merits, promises, and precepts of Christ.

22. κατὰ σεαυτόν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, i.e. "keep this persuasion to yourself, and your God; use it when you have no other witness; and do not employ it so as to offend your fellow Christian, and weaker brother." "Here (observes Theophil.) the Apostle hints at the more advanced Christian, as being κενόδοξον." Of the phrase κατὰ σεαυτόν ἔχειν. Wets. adduces an example from Heliod. 7, 16. ἔχεμύθει καὶ κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε, καὶ μηδενὶ φράζε. And he also cites a similar sentiment from Epict. Arrian 4, 8. εἰτ πολὺ ἐπειραμένη λαυθάνειν φιλοσοφῶν καὶ ἣν μοι φησι τοῦτο αὕτελμον προτόν μὲν γὰρ ἢδειν, ἢσα καλῶς ἐποίουν, ὡστε οὐ διὰ τὸς θεατᾶς ἐποίουν, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἐμαυτῶν ἡσθενον ἐμαυτῶ τῶ καλῶς — πάντα ἐμαυτῶ καὶ τῷ θεῷ. He also compares Marc. Anton. 7, 58. μάνων προσέχει καὶ θέλε κάλος εἶναι σεαυτῷ. The phrase ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, it may be

θάνατον, quam mors consequetur comm. 15, 20. 16, 17." But this seems rather ingenious than solid.
observed, corresponds to the Heb. יְשָׁרִי, It here seems to signify, “with a reference to God.” The sense, then, is: “keep it to thyself, and use it towards God only.”

22. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων — δοκιμάζει. Δοκιμάζειν and κρίνειν, Wets. observes, are opposed to each other, as the Latin probare and improbare. And he paraphrases thus: “Felix qui se ipsum non damnat, in eā re quam faciendum probat, præfert et eligit.” Koppe refers to a similar sentiment in 1 Joh. 3, 21. Ἐν δὲ δοκιμάζει is for ἐν ἐκείνῳ δοκιμάζει. This maxim, as Theophylact remarks, must be confined to the subject in question.

23. δὲ δὲ διακρίνομενος — ἔστιν, “and he, doubting (whether it be right to eat), is condemned, i.e. is liable to be condemned (nay is self-condemned), if he eat, because he doth it not from faith.” The passage is explained by Theodoret thus: ‘Ο δὲ μετὰ τινος διακρίνομεν ἐσθίων καθ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ψήφων φέρει. And by Theophyl. 141. Κατακέραται, Διὰ τί; οὐχ οὐκ ἀκαθάρτον ἢ τὸ βρῶμα, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐπίστευεν οὐτὶ καθαρόν ἐστίν, ἀλλ’ ἠψατο τοῦ βρῶματος, οὐς ἀκαθάρτον. After πίστεως must be understood τοις οἱ φάγει.

22. πᾶν δὲ δὲ οὐκ εἷς πίστεως, ἀμαρτία ἐστίν, “for whatever is not done with a full persuasion that it is lawful, is sinful.” Wets. compares a similar sentiment in Plin. Epist. 1, 18. Si tutius putas illud cautissimi cujusque præceptum: Quod dubitas, ne feceris; id ipsum rescribe, and Philo 1, 5659. Gro-tius, too, cites Cic. de Offic. Quod dubitas (quum sit an iniquum) ne feceris. Indeed, it appears to have been a not uncommon saying among the Jews. To which purpose Koppe cites from a Rabbinical writer: “Hic est magnus Canon legis: Quicquid utrum licitum sit an illicitum tu nescias, id tibi illicitum est.” To which may be added Ketuvorth, fol. 15, 1. (cited by Schoettg. on Acts 15, 29.) Novem sunt tabernæ, quæ omnes carnem mactatam vendunt, una vero illarum vendit carnes morticinas. Si quis ergo emit, et nescit ex quâ emerit, si dubitat, prohi-
bitum ipsi edere: quod si vero (in plateâ) inveniat, sìs ex tâ polu esse creditur, i.e. licitum. This, Ammon observes, is a locus de moralitate quam subjunctum dicunt facile princeps. And it has been applied most ably by Dr. Paley in his Moral Philos. L. 1, 7. fin. Chrysost., however, remarks: taïta de pànta pei tês prokeimènès ipobèseos èrntai, ou pei pàntov. And certainly this is applied by the Apostle only to the case in question: but that is no reason why it should not be made, mutatis mutandis, of general application. This will, however, in no respect, justify Augustin for inferring from hence, that the very best actions of the Heathens were only splendid sins. For (as observes Mackn.) though they had not faith in any divine revelation, they might have the faith mentioned by the Apostle; i.e. a firm persuasion of the lawfulness of their own actions, and an inclination to please God by doing what they thought right and acceptable to him. Wolf, Carpzov, and others, however, make it an aphorism extending to faith of every kind, not only historical and of conscience, but also of doctrine; as when used of a justifying faith. But all this is more easily asserted than proved.

Many distinguished Critics would here introduce, from several MSS., a doxology also found in 16, 25, 26 & 27.: and Griesbach, with his usual rashness, has received it into the text, though for this position of the doxology there seems little foundation. The evidence, both internal and external, is greatly in favour of the common arrangement. I shall not, however, enter at large into the consideration of this purely critical question; since what Mr. Slade has written may suffice for most of my readers; and I shall only observe, that though doxologies are sometimes found in other parts of the Apostolical Epistles as well as at the end of them (See Eph. 3, 21. Phil. 4, 20. Heb. 13, 20.), yet not, I think, so as to interrupt the connexion of any discourse: which would
be the case here. As to the conjectures and hypotheses of Jerome, Semler, and others, they merit little attention.

CHAP. XV.

The commencing verses of this Chapter are so closely connected with the concluding ones of the preceding, that it is surprising the division should have been made at so improper a place.

The connexion is thus traced by Koppe: "Every one may, indeed, use his own judgment and persuasion: but we should be indulgent to the weakness of others, lest we furnish to them an occasion or incitement to sin."

1. ὃπείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τ. ἅ. β. By the οἱ δυνατοῖ, as opposed to τοῖς ἀσθενεῖς, must (as Koppe and Rosenm. remark) be understood the more abundant in knowledge, and the stronger in faith (14, 22, compared with Luke 24, 29. and Acts 7, 22. δυνατὸς ἐν λόγῳ); and by the ἀδύνατολ, those less skilled and knowing, and therefore in hesitation and doubt as to the lawfulness or unlawfulness of any thing. Both the physical and moral sense of ἀδύνατος is amply illustrated by Wets.*

By the ἀσθενήματα are evidently meant "false and superstitious opinions:" and the term βαστάζειν must, in this context, signify to bear with, and con-
sequently, with a reference to the subject in quest-
on, to avoid doing in their presence what might
shock their prejudices, or afford them an example
of what they could not conscientiously approve.*
The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Wets.:
"Si quis pedibus aeger est, non ideo gestamus potius
et adjuvamus. Si quis morbo decumbit, etiam cons-
sulimus, ut a carnisbus abstineat. Quid si animo
aeger et infirmus sit? Annon tunc potius ejus mi-
seri et vicem ejus dolere, eumque ferre justum
est?" In this, however, there seems something
rather ingenious than solid.

1. μη ἐαυτοῖς ἀφέσκετεν, "and not to aim at pleasing
ourselves (only)." Ἰρέσκετεν ἐαυτῷ seems to have
been a not unfrequent phrase.†

2. ἐκαστὸς ἡμῶν τῶν πλησίων ἀφέσκετεν εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν
πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. Here the Apostle gives a limi-
tation to his precept, that this complaisance might not
degenerate into mere abject subservience (as that of
the ἀφέσκος in Theophr. Char. Eth. 5.); adding εἰς
tὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. Hardy explains this: "Illi
se accommodet, etiamsi sibi gratum non sit, modo
sine peccato." This interpretation, however, pro-
ceeds on a wrong view. Nor can I assent to those
who place a comma after ἀγαθοῦ, thus making (as
Koppe indeed seems to prefer) εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν and εἰς

* Of this condescension to the weaknesses of others, the Apostle
gave not only the precept, but the example; as we find from 1 Cor.
9, 22. 10, 33.
† Several examples of it are adduced by Wets.; as the following
from Xiphil. σφόδρο φρενήρης (humoursome), οὕτε τοῖς ἄλλοις
ἡρεσκεν, οὐρ' αὐτῶς ἑαυτῷ. Plato Protagora. εἴγνων γὰρ ὃτι οὐκ
ἡρεσκεν αὐτῶς ἑαυτῷ Ῥαίς ἀποκρίσαε ταῖς ἐμπροσθεκ. Seneca Epist.
115. Dum sit magnus et opinionem securus [animus] et ob ipsa,
quae aliis disлицeant, sibi placens. Athen. p. 58 c. Ἐρέσκεν ἑαυτῷ.
Theophr. Ch. Eth. 5., where he depicts the ἀφεσκος, the contrary
to whom is the αἰφάδην. Ἀeschyl. P. V. 186. παρ' ἑαυτῷ τὸ δίκαιον
ἐχων, where the Schol. explains: πάντα δικαίων ὁμοίοιν τοιείς,
αὐτῶς ἑαυτῷ ἄρεσκον, καὶ δίκαιον νομίζειν εἶναι, ὅσπερ ἐν βούλησι τράττειν.
The Latin writers, too, frequently use the phrase tibi and sibi
placere.
two synonymous terms: which is surely an unjustifiable curtailing of the sense. As to the mode of interpretation adopted by Ammon, who takes it as equivalent to εἰς ἀγαθόν, "for good," i.e. in things pertaining to religion;" it is quite inadmissible; since, in fact, the τὸ here has the force of αὐτῶν; as the older Commentators have rightly seen." The clause εἰς οἰκοδομήν seems to have been added, to qualify and explain the former; and it is therefore not necessary to resort to the interpretation just mentioned, since the words εἰς οἰκοδομήν are sufficient to limit this to things pertaining to religion. On the εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, Theodoret well observes: ἔστι γὰρ ἀρέσκειν καὶ ἔστι λύτη καὶ ἐαυτὸ καὶ τοῦ πλησίου. To which purpose there is an apposite passage in Theophyr. Ch. Eth. 5. περὶ ἀρεσκείας — ἢ δὲ ἀρεσκεία ἐστὶν — οὐκ ἔστι βελτίστως ἡ δόνησις παρασκευαστική.

It is judiciously remarked by Chrysost. and Theophyl., that the words εἰς οἰκοδομήν were added, to prevent a perversiof of the δωνατολ, or stronger, who might say, in reference to the weaker one: "By pressing him to participate of all meats and drinks, without restriction, I draw him to what is good." But it must be good for him, to his Christian edification. So that such a procedure, even if good in itself, yet being inopportune, would tend to destruction rather than edification. For an ill-timed rebuke does not edify."

3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐαυτῶν ἀρεσεν. The precept is further enjoined upon us by the example of Christ himself, who sought not his own glory, who lived not to himself, and who bore the most cruel injuries without complaint.

It is well observed by Koppe, that the sentiment "he bore the insults of men," is clothed in the words of Ps. 69, 10. οἱ πνειδισμοὶ τῶν πνειδιζόμενων σέ ἐκέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμε, which agree exactly with the Heb. and the Greek version. The words are admitted by Rosenm. to be strikingly applicable to Christ; yet Koppe will not allow them to be more than an ἀρ-
commodation, and denies that they were primarily meant of the Messiah; observing: "Psalmum in suo contextu ex consilio auctoris de Messiâ agere probari non potest." But the onus probandi rests with him. It is (as Mr. Turner truly remarks) for him to prove that the application varies from the intention of the original author." Besides, he himself admits that various other sentences of the Old Testament were, by the Jews of that time (nay even by those of the present day), conceived to treat of the fortunes of the Messiah. And whence could have arisen such an opinion, unless it had had its foundation in tradition handed down from the times of the Prophets themselves? Moreover, the Apostle himself, in the following words, refers to those numerous passages which occurred in the Old Testament, as written for the instruction and consolation of believers in the Messiah.

4. ἐστι γὰρ προεγράφη — διδασκαλίαν. It is well observed by Grot., that this clause is inserted, in order to meet a tacit objection, that the passage does not belong to us, but unto David; or (to use the words of Crellius) that it has no reference to Christ or to Christians, olim hæc contigisse, aliam horum, aliam illorum temporum et rerum rationem esse. To which the answer is: "It does indeed appertain to David, but it is admitted by all Jews to be typical of Christ." (See 1 Cor. 10, 6) Theophyl. adds, "for our imitation."

4. ἦνα, διὰ τῆς ύπομονῆς — ἔχωμεν. Here more than one mode of construction and interpretation has been devised. Some Commentators think there is an Hendiadis in τῆς ύπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως. This, however, is (I think) too bold. It should seem that ἦνα has the eventual sense, and that the purport of the whole sentence is, to represent the result of what had been written aforetime, namely "so that by patience, &c. we may have hope." The question, however, is whether ύπομονῆς is to be taken with γραφῶν, or not. Now this is a point of no very
easy decision, and on which Interpreters differ. It seems most probable that it ought not: and such is the opinion of many eminent ancient and modern Commentators.

The sentence is thus explained by Chrysost. : Ἰνα ἐκπέσομεν (τοικὰς γὰρ οἱ ἄγανες ἐσώθεν, ἐξώθεν) ἵνα νευρόμενοι καὶ παρακαλούμενοι παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν, ὑπομονὴν ἐπιδείξωμεθα, ἵνα ἐν ὑπομονῇ ζῶμε, μένουμεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλπίδος: ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλων εστὶ κατασκευαστικά, η ὑπομονή, τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἡ ἐλπίς, τῆς ὑπομονῆς: ἀπερ ἀμφότερα ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν γίνεται. And by Theophyl. 144. as follows: Εὐσκεξει ὅτι καὶ εἰς ὑπομονὴν πεισασμῶν αὐτῶν παρακάλει, καὶ φησίν: ἵνα ὑπ’ οὗ τῶν γραφῶν νευρόμενοι ὑπομένομεν, καὶ ὑπομένοντες δεικνύομεν ἐν ἑαυτὸς πᾶσαν τὴν ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν καὶ βεβαιόντας. Ὁ γὰρ ὑπομένων, ἐκεῖνος δοκεὶ ἐπίτις ἔχειν τῶν μελλόντων ἁγαθῶν: ὥσπερ ὁ ἀνυπομόνητος, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐκπέπτωκεν.

By ἐγκώμεν must be understood κατέχωμεν, “hold fast.” Τὴν ἐλπίδα. Here the article seems to be used for the pronoun possessive, “our hope.”

5. o δὲ Θεός τῆς ὑπομονῆς, καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως διά ὧμὶν τὸ αὐτὸ φθονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις. The Apostle now addresses himself ad vota.

God is said to be “the God of patience and consolation,” because he produces them in us, by supplying various means by which that virtue may be generated; and in order to enable us to meet all sorts of evils with unbroken courage, and unshaken constancy, he supplies us with various solaces. (Crelr.) Since in the mutual concord of Christians the Apostle found the best alleviation of injuries from without, so to the cultivation of this virtue he especially exhorts them. (Koppe.)

When God is here said to be the God τῆς ὑπομονῆς, καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως, we are not to consider only the media by which all things are made to work for good in the end, and the religious solace to be found in Scripture, but also the supports, assistances, and comforts of the Holy Spirit, or the paraclete, a very high degree of whose graces were vouchsafed to the vol. vi.
primitive Christians, but from whom Christians of
every age may expect “sanctifying influences as are
given to every man to profit withal.”

Koppe here compares the similar formulas Θεὸς
tῆς ἑλπίδος, ver. 13., and Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, 15, 33.,
1 Thess. 5, 23. And Grot. observes, that the ge-
nitive in the New Testament sometimes denotes the
object, and sometimes the effective cause.

5. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἄλλῃ λοις, κατὰ Χρ. 'Ἰ. It is
rightly observed by Crellius, that the τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν
is to be understood, not so much “de sententiarum
ac opinionum, quam animarum ac voluntatum con-
spiratione.” So Tirinus and others ap. Hardy, who
interpret it of “similar affections and good will in
bearing their mutual infirmities, to the removal of all
altercations on the distinctions of meats and days,
that there may be no διχοτομία.

The words κατὰ Χριστὸν 'Ἰ. may, as Koppe says,
be referred either to ἄλλῃ λοις, for ἄλλῃ λοις τὸς κατὰ
Χ., or to τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.

6. ἡκά φωνηματῶν ἐν ἐκ στόματι δ., that “when ye
praise God, ye may do it, as with one mouth, so also
with one mind, with unanimity, without strife, ha-
tred, or contentions.” And so Grot., who observes,
that there is here a reference to the antient doxo-
logies and litanies.

Δοξάζησε, praise, celebrate. Compare Joh. 15, 8.
1 Cor. 6, 20. On φωνηματῶν* see Acts 2, 46. and the
note there.

6. τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν 'Ἰ. Χ., “the

* Of which phrase, and also of ἐν στόματι, Wets. has here
adduced several illustrations; as Plato ap. Pollic. 9, 102. εἰ ἐνὸς στό-
ματος. Plato 775 D. μιᾷ ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ εἰ ἐνὸς στόματος πάντας συμ-
φωνεῖν’ & 595 c. πάντες γὰρ εἰ ἐνὸς στόματος ἴμωσι. Arist. Εὐ.
667. οἷ δ' εἰ ἐνὸς στόματος ἰσπαρτᾶς ἀνέκραγον, where the Schol.
explains: ὄροθυμαδὼν καὶ μιᾷ φωνῇ. He also subjoins several other
examples of εἰ ἐνὸς στόματος from Aristides, Galen, and Anthol.,
and likewise of uno ore, from the best Latin writers. It should
therefore seem that ἐν ἐκ στόματι is an Hellenistical phrase. Of
the examples of ὄροθυμαδὼν the most asposite is one from Demoeth.
Phil. 4. ἐὰν ὑπειρά ὄροθυμαδὼν ἐφ' ἰκερείας καὶ λήτας τραπεζᾶν.

7. διὸ προσλαμβάνετε ἡλληνίκα. This very consent of mind would especially be declared, if the Gentile and the Jewish Christians mutually assisted and supported each other: for to these two kinds of Christians the τὸ προσλ. ἡλληνίκα. seems to pertain. (Koppe.)

Διὸ is pregnant with meaning, and is well paraphrased by Grot.: "Since these things are so; since love forms a principal article in the Christian faith." On the force of προσλ. see the note on 12, 1. ὑμᾶς, "you all, whether Jews or Gentiles."

7. εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. This clause admits of two modes of explanation. 1. If referred to the προσλ. ἡλληνίκα. it will signify, "ad honorem Dei;" q. d. "and this your mutual love will redound to the honour of God." And so Chrysost., Theophyl., and many early modern Commentators. 2. It may, with most recent Commentators, be referred to what immediately preceded, i. e. "hath placed you in a state of salvation by which you may finally attain to the glory of God." This Koppe thinks preferable, on account of ver. 8 & 9., in which is declared how Jesus Christ hath promoted the glory of God, viz. by receiving Jews and Gentiles into his favour.

That this passage has a reference to Church communion, has been shown by several able Commentators. See Doddr. and Mackn., or Slade.

8. λέγω δὲ Ἰ. Χ. διάκονον—πατέραν. Here we have a reason for the preceding. Many MSS. indeed read γὰφ, but, as it should seem, from a gloss. The
argument is thus stated by Rosenm. : "Quia Christus et Judæis (v. 8.) et paganis (v. 9.) prodesse, atque ex ambobus unum cœtum efficere voluerit, debet alter Christianorum alteri lenem esse, atque ita secundum exemplum Christi inservire, neque vero eum infestare." It is observed by Mr. Turner, that either St. Paul carries on the argument for mutual concession and favour, from the character and office of Christ; or, having before mentioned it, ver. 7., he is led thereby to the subject of his Epistle, the extending of the Messiah's kingdom to the Gentiles, the prominent idea in his mind. 

Διάκονος περιτομῆς is rightly regarded by Rosenmuller as a brief and popular expression for διάκονος Θεοῦ ἀποστελλόμενος πρὸς τῶν περιτετμημένων, where we have the abstract for the concrete, as often. Koppe here compares Matt. 20, 28. "he came not to be ministered unto, but to minister." See also Joh. 13, 14. Phil. 2, 7.

8. ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, "for the establishment of the truth of God." So Koppe: ἐν τῷ συνιστάναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, i. e. "faith in keeping his promises." In the words following, εἰς τὸ βεβ.—πατέρων, is (as Koppe observes) more clearly shown what is meant in the ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας Θεοῦ. In ἐπαγγ. πατέρων (as Grot. remarks) the genitive is a genitive of object; and the sense is: "the promises made by God to the Fathers, namely the Jews, to whom the promises of a Messiah appertained." Βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, "to do that which God had promised that he would sometime do." And so Koppe interprets. The word βεβ., it may be observed, is especially applicable to ἐπαγγελ. Thus Polyb. p. 364. (cited by Wets.) βεβαιῶσειν τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. Aristides, βεβαιώσει τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. Compare 1 Cor. 1, 12. Gal. 3, 17. Eph. 5, 32. Here it is observed by Wetstein: "Christus ipse eō usque se demisit, ut eorum, qui a multis contemnuntur, minister esset: περιτομῆς contemptus nomine."

9. τὰ δὲ ἐδε ὑπὲρ ἔλεος δοξάσαι τὸν Θεὸν. Koppe
observes that there is an anacoluthon. The exact construction, he says, would have been this: ῥὰς δὲ ἐναντίον δικαιόσυνος ἔλαια ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ ἐλεούς θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ δοξάσας αὐτοῦ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ. Here Rosenm., with many Commentators, subauds λέγω and ὁφειλέων from the preceding; and he refers to a similar ellipsis at 4, 13., and lays down the sense as follows: "Although Jesus only by himself announced the Gospel to the Jews, yet the Gentiles have not been neglected, but they themselves also ought to magnify the goodness of God, for so weighty a benefit imparted to them, though from no obligation of promise."

9. καθὼς γέγραπται, "thus may be fulfilled what was written." It is well remarked by Taylor, that the Apostle is persuading the converts to a cordial coalition in public worship, and is giving each party a substantial reason why they ought to unite their hearts as well as voices. But as it would be more difficult to persuade the Jew, he applies to him several quotations out of Scripture.* Ps. 18, 49. Deut. 32, 43. Ps. 117, 1. Isa. 11, 10. the first and last of which, as Whitby shews, the Jews interpreted of the Messiah."

On the sentiment see 11, 31 and 32. Wetstein aptly adduces a Rabbinical writer. Megilla, fol.14, 1. ex quo tempore Judaei terram promissam ingressi sunt, nemo gentium Deo canticum dicere potuit; postquam vero in captivitatem ducti sunt, denuo coeperunt jus habere ad glorificandum Deum.

9—12. The first passage is from Ps. 18, 50. (with the omission of κύριος after ἑνέστι), and is quoted from the Sept., which closely follows the Hebrew. The next passage is Deut. 32, 49., following the Sept., and receding from the Hebrew, which reads, ἀναστὰ Ἑβραῖ, celebrate the nations, his people. The third passage Ἀνείρε,—οι λαοὶ is from Ps. 117, 1., and follows the Greek, which agrees with the He-

* Which, as Wet. observes, are taken from the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms.
brew. In the fourth,"Εστι τῷ ἴδα (stirps, Apc. 5, 5. 22, 14.) τοῦ Ἰσαγαγόν, from Is. 11, 10., he closely follows the Greek, without (as it seems) consulting the Hebr. In the three former passages is contained this sentiment: That Jehovah shall be known as the true God among the Gentiles as well as the Jews. The last contains the promise, that a King shall be born from the Jews, another David, to whom even the nations not Jewish shall render obedience. (Koppe.)

12. δὲ αὐτῷ ἔχειν ἐλπίον. The Hebrew text is, "Him shall the Gentiles consult," i. e. from the Messiah, as the common author of the salvation of all people, not only the Jews, but the Gentiles shall seek their oracles, i. e. will desire to be taught by him the means of obtaining salvation; and will therefore place their trust in him." (Rosenm.)

It is observed by Turner, that τῷ ἴδα and ἀναστάσεως undoubtedly mean the same person; as is probable from the parallelism. "The word root (continues he) is often used by the Hebrew writers for sucker springing from the root. Comp. Rosenm. on Isa. in loc., or see Isa. 53, 2. Hos. 14, 6."

13. δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πληροῖς ὡμᾶς—πιστεύειν. Epilogus est epistolæ, quam aliquoties claudit, qui continget votum Apostoli, quo Romanis quædam a Deo precatur. (Crel.)

In this verse begins the fourth, and the last part of this Epistle, namely, the epilogus, or conclusion, which, it may be observed, is written with admirable prudence and wisdom. Now this may be considered as forming two parts: in the former of which the Apostle addresses endearing language to the Romans, and apologizes for what he has written, ver. 14. to the end of the chapter. In the latter he testifies his love at large, and in various ways. And this occupies the whole of the last chapter. (Carpzov.)

Here the Apostle earnestly entreats of God, that the Gentile Christians may be preserved, and con-
firmed in this hope of felicity which the Scriptures had claimed for them. Thus there is a close connexion between ver. 12 & 13. (Koppe.)

13. Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος, &c., "May God, from whom alone is to be expected whatever you hope in this life, or in the next," &c. Πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης. The general sentiment is thus expressed by Koppe: "In ampectendà et profitendà religione seuros ab omni malo felices beatosque vos reddat." And the εἰρήνη he explains vacuitas a malo, tranquillitas, securitas. Others, however, take it to denote concord and unanimity. But this seems too harsh an interpretation. Χάρα, i.e. "joy that you are Christians, together with the other consolations and grounds for rejoicing, which the Gospel alone can supply."

13. εἰς τὸ πεπιστευκὸν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι—ἀγίου, "that ye, by the powerful aids of the Holy Spirit, shed abroad in your hearts, may abound more and more in this hope. (See Theophyl.) Wetstein here compares Philo 2, 116, 47. τὰ δὲ ἄγαλμα καὶ μηχανήματα ἡμῶν, καὶ πάσα ἡ δύναμις ἐν μόνῳ τῷ πιστεύειν θεόν κεῖται.

14. πέπεισμαι ἢ—ἀγαθωσύνης. Since not only the immediately preceding verses, but the greater part of the whole Epistle was written with the especial intent that the Jewish Christians might be excited to sentiments of love and affection towards the Gentile brethren, the Apostle now (towards the conclusion of the Epistle) excuses the liberty, and, as it were, boldness which he had used in treating on that subject, by pleading the strong obligation, and sacred duty enjoined on him from heaven, by which he was especially bound to render service to the Gentiles, and, in every way, to commend their cause to the Jewish Christians. Which sentiment, indeed, again gives the Apostle an occasion of dwelling on his own merits respecting the conversion of the heathens; and to declare, moreover, what he had resolved to do for the further propagation of the Gospel among
those nations, ver. 16. seq. (Koppe.) So Theophyl.
'Εσει δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν τραχύτερον τοῦ λόγου ἐποίησε, βεβατεῖν
λοιπῶν. Grotius, too, remarks: "Solet Apostolus
monita sua emolliere quasi ex superabundanti adhi-
bita, ut eo magis suos ad officium excitet. Simile
loquendi genus & Tim. 1, 5. Hebr. 6, 9."

By the ἀδελφοὶ may (I think); with Koppe, be un-
derstood the Roman Christians generally, and not
the Presbyters only; though it is not necessary to
suppose that the commendations were applicable to
every individual of the body.

Καὶ αὐτοὶ, "ye yourselves also;" which (as Pisca-
tor observes) involves the farther sense, "even with-
out my admonition; even though I admonish you."
Here Beza compares the Homeric τῷ μὲ στειδοῦτα
καὶ αὐτὸν ὥτρωνι;

Theophylact notices the strength of the terms
μετολ ἀγαθοτύνης and πεπληρομένοι πάσης γνώσεως. The
ἀγαθοτύνη, it may be observed, has all the lati-
tude of signification found in our goodness, and espe-
cially denotes benignity and integrity. So Theo-
phylact explains it, ἁγαθὴς γνώμης καὶ φιλαδέλφων.

14. πεπληρομένοι πάσης γνώσεως. This (as was just
observed) is a strong expression; for (as Theophyl.
remarks) the Apostle does not say, "ye have all
knowledge," but, "ye are filled with all know-
ledge." There is, too, perhaps, a climax. For (as
Theophylact observes) it would be of no service to
have goodness, and not to know how to use it. As
to the πάσης γνώσεως, it must not be pressed upon
in interpretation; (as when Koppe renders it, "in-
signis quaedam rerum divinarum intelligentia.") Its
sense is, I think, determined by the words following,
δυνάμεως καὶ ἀλλήλους νοοῦντεῖν. It signifies, then,
filled with all knowledge necessary for the purpose
of mutual instruction. Here Carpzov compares 1
Joh. 2, 20. "Ye have an union from the Holy
One, and ye know all things." And 27. "But the
anointing which ye have received of him abideth in
you: and ye need not that any man teach you."
The καὶ in the next clause is pregnant with meaning; and the sense is: “able not only to understand the doctrines of the Gospel, but to explain, teach, and instruct others in them.” This, indeed, rather requires the reading ἄλλως, which is supported by powerful authorities, and is probably the true one. Wetstein here adduces numerous passages illustrative of νοετείνω, as the following from Menander: ἄπαντες ἐσμέν εἰς τὸ νοετείνω σοφοὶ αὐτοὶ δ' ἀμαρτάνοντες οὐ γνώσκομεν. Athen. κολάζειν δὲ ἐν δίκη δούλους δεῖ, καὶ μὴ νοετοῦντα, οἷς ἐλευθέρους, ἥρποτεσθαί ποιεῖν. Indeed the word is of frequent occurrence in the best Greek writers. Schleusner defines it, “ad sanam mentem revocare verbis.” But that is not always the sense; as will appear from the following passage of Aristoph. Vesp. 254. εἰ, νῦν Δι', αὖθις κονδύλως νοετείσθε εὖ ἡμᾶς.

15. τολμηρότερον δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν. The Apostle here replies to a tacit objection: “why, then, have you plied us with admonitions,” &c., and states the reason why he had written with such boldness and authority. (Crellius.)

Τολμηρότερον, “paulo liberius,” somewhat boldly. Αὐτὸ μέρος may be construed either with ἔγραψα, and signify, “in some parts of this Epistle;” or with τολμηρότερον. But the former seems the more regular mode. It thus signifies “ex parte aliqueatus-nus,” quodammodo. Schleusner, in his Lex. compares Arrian, Ep. 1, 27, 17.

15. ὡς ἐπαναμιμηθέχων ὑμᾶς. Koppe takes this for ὡςτε ἐπαναμιμηθέχων. This, however, is not necessary: nay, if I mistake not, the other is equally good Greek. With the sentiment (viz. of admonishing those who are supposed to know,) Wetstein compares Demosth. Phil. fin. ἐκαστον ὑμῶν, καίτερ ἀκριβῶς εἰδώτα, ὡμοί ἐπαναμιμήσας βούλομαι. 2. Pet. 12, & 13. The words διὰ τὴν χάριν, &c. Koppe observes, are to be closely connected with those that commence the next verse. And Rosenm. renders, “vi numinis mihi a Deo demandati.”
16. *eis τὸ εἰναὶ με λειτουργὸν* I. X. ε. τ. τ., "that I should bestow my especial attention on the conversion of the Gentiles to the religion of Christ." This seems to be the simple sense: but the Apostle has here expressed himself by a formula derived from the Jewish religion, in order thereby to impress more strongly on the minds of the Jewish Christians the weight and dignity of the Apostolical office. He, therefore, does not call himself διάκονος, but λειτουρ-γος, a sacred minister, a priest; which is the perpetual signification of λειτουργεῖν and its derivatives, in the Greek versions of the New Testament. (See Schl. Lex.) Nor does he say that it is his office ἐκπόνεσθαι, but λειτουργεῖν τὸ εἰαγγέλιον. Finally, he does not make the fruit of his labour consist in this, ἵνα ἐντολαφώσῃ τὸ ἔθνη εἰς θεον διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου: but in this, ἵνα γένηται πρόσφορα τῶν ἔθνων εἰκονοδεῖται θυγασμένη, (ἀγία, ἡ προσεπεχθείσα τῷ θεῷ,) ἐν τοῦ ἁγίῳ, "ut ipsi offerentur Deo tanquam victima sacra ei et acceptra (12, 1)." (Koppe.) Not only these, but προσ-φορά and θυγασμένη are sacrificial terms, and are not, with the early Commentators, to be rendered too literally, or pressed on. It is rightly remarked by Carpzov, that λειτουργεῖν τὸ εἰαγγελίον τοῦ Θεοῦ merely means to preach the Gospel, as a priest of the New Testament, that Gospel by which men are con-secrated unto God, and made υἱοὶ θεοῦ, ἁγία, εὐαγγελιστή τοῦ Θεοῦ, Rom. 12, 1. Phil. 2, 17. So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) *Eis τι δὲ ἐδόθη μοι ἡ χάρις; εἰς τὸ εἰναὶ με λειτουργὸν καὶ ιερεὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Μὴ τοῖνυν μοι μεμερεσθε, ἦν ὑμῖν ἐμιλοῦ αὐτῷ γὰρ μου ἱερατική τὸ καταγγέλλειν τὸ εὐαγγελίου. Μάχαιραν ἔχα τὸν λόγῳ θυσία ἐστε ὑμεῖς; τῆς ἀν μέμβοιτο τῷ ιερεί την μάχαιραν ἑπάγωντο τοῖς πρὸς θυσίαν ἀφαρισμένοις; Indeed there is inherent in the word a sense somewhat more profound than that which is laid down by Koppe, who, by the way, takes no notice of the words ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, which are explained away by Rosenm., but very properly dwelt upon by Doddridge, and especially by Macknight.*

* Whose words are these: "According to the law, the sacrifices
17. ἔχω δὲν καύχησιν ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τὰ πρὸς Θεὸν. "I have therefore a cause or reason for boasting, because, like a true priest, I offer up men as victims sacred to God, by Jesus Christ, and bring them to the Divine religion, and the felicity conjoined with it." (Koppe.)

Καύχησις, "reason for boasting." So Phil. 3. τὰ πρὸς Θεὸν, suitably to the metaphor in which the Apostle yet continues, must be supplied προσεκλήσε, equivalent to προσφοραὶ δυσταί, Hebr. 2, 17. 5, 1. Wetstein compares Isocr. ad Demon. εἰσεβεί τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς. And ad Nicocl. οὗ τὰ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εἰσεβοίμεν.

18, 19. οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω λαλεῖν τι ὅν, &c. There is an obscurity in these words (proceeding, as Ammon thinks, from the modesty of the Apostle), which our Interpreters have not been successful in removing. Grot. and Carpzov lay down the following sense. "For I can scarce dare to say, or speak out, how much Christ has done by me, as well in words as in works, nay miracles, so that so great numbers of Gentiles should obey the truth." This, however, Koppe pronounces a very harsh interpretation: and he proposes the following: "I can never venture to boast of the labours of others, and not my own." But how such a sense can be elicited from the words, it is difficult to see, and still more to recognise in it any thing of the Apostolic spirit. Koppe indeed proposes another interpretation, by which the words are

were sanctified, or made acceptable to God, by being salted and laid on the altar by the priest, Matt. 23, 19. Mark 9, 49. But the Gentiles converted from idolatry to the worship of the true God, through the Apostle’s labours, were offered by him to God as a free will offering; and were sanctified, or made acceptable to God, by the influences and gifts of the Holy Ghost, which the Apostle had conferred on them. By these gifts, the Gentiles were strongly confirmed in the faith of the Gospel, and cleansed from their former impurities. This was an exercise of the priest’s office, and a sanctification of the offering which was far more excellent, effectual, and acceptable, than the sanctification and offering of the sacrifices of beasts prescribed in the Law."
a mere formula veracitatis sua contestanda; q. d. “I will say no more than what Christ has really made me instrumental in effecting; I will not exaggerate, nor deceive.” And this is adopted by Rosenm. and Turner. But it seems as objectionable as the preceding interpretation. Mackn. uses a still greater liberty, by inserting a whole clause, contrary to the rules which regulate such insertions; and, what is more, producing a very frigid sense.

Under these circumstances, it is necessary to resort to the fountain heads of interpretation as they are found in the antient Fathers; and, if I mistake not, we shall here, as on many other occasions, find that there alone is preserved the pure unadulterated truth. I shall give the interpretation of Theophyl., as being the shortest, but it is founded on the authority of Chrysost., and is confirmed by Ξεκumen. Theodoret, Photius, and others, p. 148. Εστείλη εἶπεν, ὃτι λειτουργὺς ἐμι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐθνη, φησιν ὅτι ὁν κομπάξαο, οὐδὲ ἀλαξονεύομαι τι ὃν ὦκ ἐποιήσα, μᾶλλον δέ ὦκ ἐγὼ κατειργασάμην, ἀλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς κατειργάσατο, ἐμι δράγας χρησάμενος. Εἰτε γὰρ φθέγγομαι τι λέγων καὶ φιλοσόφων περὶ τῶν υἱῶν, εἰτε ἐργάζομαι θέλων πολλεῖν μεταν. ἡ καὶ θαυμάσατα τελῶν, πάντα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Cum dixisset, minister sum Evangelii ad omnes gentes, adjicit, Non sum arrogans, nec arroganter jacto quicquam eorum quae non feci; imo non ego feci, sed Christus effect me instrumentum usus. Sive enim quicquam loquar de caelestibus disserens ac philosophans, sive operer, divinam conversationem exercens, sive miracula perficiens, omnia sunt Christi. The obscurity, in fact, is occasioned by a remarkable brevity of expression, arising in modesty.

The λόγῳ refers to the preaching of the Gospel; and the ἐργα, to the miracles by which he proved his Divine commission: for the words following, ἐν δύναμις σημεῖων καὶ τεράτων, are exegetical of the preceding.

19. ὁστε μὲ ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλημ, &c. Here are enumerated the limits of the regions within which his
Apostolical labours had hitherto been confined; namely, Jerusalem on the East, and Illyricum on the West. It must be observed that the term κυκλῳ may here, (by the usage of the best Greek writers,) have great latitude, and comprehend a very extensive radius of country about Jerusalem, including Palestine, Syria, and the adjacent parts of Arabia. But Jerusalem is especially mentioned, from its being the centre whence the rays of Divine knowledge beamed.

On Illyricum, see Strabo and the other Geographical writers, or Cellarius.

19. πεπληροκέναι το εὐαγγέλιον τ. Χ. Here we have a mode of expression differing widely from the Classical usage, and which may very well be reckoned among the Hellenistical phrases of the New Testament; though it can only exactly be paralleled by Col. 1, 25. πληρώσαι τω λόγω τοῦ Θεοῦ. The early Commentators seem to have been much perplexed with the expression, which they render “fully evangelize.” The later Interpreters, as Vitrinja and Koppe, more judiciously, regard it as a Hebraism derived from a similar use of the correspondent term בָּאָל, to complete, perfect, (which, especially in the Chaldee dialect,) often signifies to teach. And this interpretation is confirmed by the authority of the Syriac Version. After all, however, it may perhaps be a vox praegnans, and signify, “I perfectly fulfilled my office, that of preaching the Gospel.” And this, if I mistake not, was the mode in which Chrysostom understood the word.

20. ἀὐτῶ δὲ φιλοτιμοῦμεν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. The participle φιλοτ. depends upon the preceding ἀφτε πεπληροκέναι, and it may be taken as the participle imperfect; though in translating it must be expressed by the verb in the preterite, “Thus have I striven.” Φιλοτιμεῖσθαι (it may be observed) is a very strong term; and the force of it is illustrated by Wets. and Kypke with many examples. It signifies properly “to be studious of, and to seek after
honour;" and since such a pursuit implies zeal and labour and diligence, the verb comes to denote generally to do any thing with great labour, diligence, zeal, &c.: and this is by most Commentators thought to be the sense here; though Koppe, keeping close to the primitive import, takes it to mean: "I regard it as an honour," &c. But the former interpretation is by far the more rational one: and certainly the latter never entered into the thoughts of the Greek Commentators.

20. οὐκ ἐκὼν οἰνομάσθη X., "not so much where Christ was named." The οὐκ has here the sense of non tam: for, as Rosenm. observes, Paul found disciples in certain places where he discharged his office; as at Ephesus, Acts 19, 1.: nay at Rome, where a Church was already founded, he thought proper to preach the Gospel.

20. ἵνα μὴ ἐκ' ἄλλωτρων θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῆ. The sense of these words is too obvious to need explanation. The Commentators remark on the fondness of the Apostle for metaphors taken from a foundation; as 1 Cor. 3. 10. Eph. 2, 20. And they might have added, that this has every appearance of having been a proverbial phrase, examples of which I remember to have met with in the Classical writers.

21. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγοσται, "thus was fulfilled in my case," &c. Plainly an accommodation of the words of Is. 52, 15. (by the common consent of the Jewish Interpreters referred to the Messiah) to the Apostle's own case." This quotation exactly agrees with the Sept.; but in the Hebr. there is nothing corresponding to ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ.

22. διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμεν τ. τ. τ. δ. The διὸ refers, not to what immediately preceded, but to ver. 19 and 20., and expresses the cause why the Apostle had not yet come unto them, namely (as Koppe states the case) because the Romans had received the Gospel from other hands, and because the Apostle's plan, namely of first propagating it where it had never yet been delivered, had hitherto kept him too
much occupied with perpetual labours, to attend to Rome, or any place where the Gospel had been already preached.

Ἐνεκοστάρμην τοῦ ἐλθείν expresses that he had intended to come unto them. Theophyl. supplies πολλάκις ἐπιχειρίων, καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν ὅμως ἐκαλύθην. The ἐνεκοστ. is explained by Heysch. ἐπεσοδιπόμην. So at the beginning of the Epistle we have ἐκκαλύθην ἀχρι τοῦ δεύρο.

23. νυν δὲ μηκέτι τότον ἔχων ἐ. τ. κ. τ. The sense of this passage is thought to be somewhat uncertain, τότον ἔχειν being a phrase of extensive signification. It may either mean, as Theodoret and several modern Commentators explain, "there being no longer any place remaining where Christ has not been preached, i. e. any fit place, viz. any city of celebrity; whence the Gospel could easily be communicated to the circumjacent villages. This, however, requires too harsh a subaudition. I therefore prefer, with Chrysost., Theophyl., and several modern Commentators: "there being no longer any sufficient or urgent occasion for my ministerial labours here. And so τότον ἔχειν is used in Hebr. 12, 17.; though Slade goes much too far, when he says the whole Country had embraced the Christian faith, so that there was no place, and therefore no opportunity, for the exercise of the Apostle's labours in the work of conversion. Κλίματα is to be taken in a popular sense; as when we say: "this part of the country, region;" as 2 Cor. 11, 10. Gal. 10, 21. Properly speaking, the word denotes one of those divisions of the sphere between the Equator and Arctic pole, of which the antient Geographers made seasons.

Ἐπιπαθέαν ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθείν, "having a strong desire to come to you." This word is rare; but ἐπιπαθής occurs in 2 Cor. 7, 7 and 11. and Ezech. 23, 11. Aquila. The expression has much energy; ἐπι having an intensive force. Ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, "for several years," viz. (as Koppe thinks) four, i. e. from the time at which the Apostle had, by means of
Aquila and Priscilla, received a knowledge of the Church at Rome.

24. ais ean to be to, i.e. τὴν Σπανίαν, εἰλείομαι πρὸς υμᾶς. Here ais ean signifies "as soon as:" a sense rather uncommon, but found in some of the later Classical writers. Examples from Cebes are adduced by Koppe, and these have the subjunctive; which confirms the common reading here; for some MSS. have τοπεύομαι, which is adopted by Koppe.

Σπανίαν is for Ἱσπανίαν, which indeed is read in several MSS. and Editions: but there is reason to think that the contract form is at least as antient as the age of the Apostle. (See Koppe.)

Whether this journey was ever taken, is doubted: and certainly the words of the Apostle only declare his intention to take it. The Roman Catholics, indeed, not only assert that it was taken, but maintain that Paul staid in Spain two years. It is, however, remarked by Koppe, that writers of the most credit, (as Eusebius and Origen) do not mention the journey, even where they might have been expected so to do. (See Euseb. H. E. 3, 3.) "Nor is there (continues he) any certain vestige of it in any antient writer. The passages of the Fathers which are usually appealed to, either (as in the present one) only signify the Apostle's intention, (as Cyril, Hieros. Catech. p. 204.), or offer the mere opinion, resting solely on this passage of St. Paul; as Athanas. ad Dracont. T. 1. p. 956., Hippol. de XII Apostolis, p. 510., Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor. § 510. προηλθεν ἐως Ἡλληνικῷ καὶ Ἰταλικῷ καὶ Σπανικῷ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Chrysost. Homil. 7. in Paulum, and Theodoret on Philipp. 1, 25. and on 2 Tim. 4, 17. As to the inscription of Gruter, Thees. p. 278. NERONI CAES. AUG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC. LATRONIB. ET HIC QUI NOVAM. GENERI HUM. SUPER STITION INCULCAT. PURGAM. it was strongly suspected by Scaliger and Gruter themselves.'"

Thus far Koppe, to whose opinion I can scarcely assent. He has not proved that the antient Fathers, (as Clem. Rom., Hippol., Athanas., and Chrysost.,) spoke from mere opinion founded on the present passage; and Theodoret, be it remembered, usually draws from very pure sources. To me it appears highly probable that Clemens Romanus and the others had positive authority, now lost, for their assertion. I know not how else to account for so general a persuasion as that which is found in the early Ecclesiastical writers. I grant that we cannot from hence prove that Paul was the original founder of the Church of Spain. Dr. Doddridge, indeed, observes: "It appears probable from hence, considering the principle which St. Paul chose to govern himself by, of not building on another man's foundation, that no Apostle had yet planted any Church in Spain; which, as Dr. Geddes justly remarks, very ill agrees with the legend of St James; for, according to that, he had
now been 15 years in Spain, and had erected several bishoprics there." The probability, however, is very slight; and the principle of precarious application. To me it seems by no means unlikely that a country in such close connection with Greece and the East should have been, by this time, in some degree evangelized; though whether to the extent represented by the legendary historians of the Roman Catholics, or not, may seem doubtful. This, however, may be thought entitled to credit, namely, the one plain and simple circumstance, that St. James first planted the Gospel in that country. And this, considering the great extent and population of that country, would not exclude an occasion for St. Paul's labours.

24. καὶ ὑπ’ ὑμῶν προεμφύτηναι. On this word see the notes on Acts 15, 3. 17, 18., to which I add the following illustration, from Soph. Æd. Col. 1067. τῶν δ’ εἶτε παίδες καὶ προεμφύτας φίλων;

24. ἐάν ὑμῶν πρωτόν ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπληθῶ, "after I have been partly refreshed." Here must be supplied τῆς θεᾶς, συνουσίας, or the like. In illustration of which Koppe cites Ælian St. H. 5, 21. (on peacocks displaying their gay plumage) ἐάν ἦρα ἐμπληθήναι τῆς θεᾶς τῶν παρεστατά.

25. νυνὶ δὲ περεύομαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. The Apostle adds this, that they may not expect him very soon. For before his journey into Spain he must go to Jerusalem.

Περεύομαι, "I am on the point of departing." Διακονών τοῖς ἅγιοις. The verb διακ. signifies properly "to minister, by preparing and setting provisions on the table:" but it also denotes, in a general way, "to promote the good of others;" and that either by the contribution, or by the distribution of necessaries, for their support. So Luke 8, 8., 2 Cor. 8, 19., and Hebr. 6, 10. διακονώντας τοῖς ἅγιοις.

On these eleemosynary collections see Acts 24, 17. 2 Cor. 9, 12. Acts 6, 1. 11, 29.

By τοῖς ἅγιοι are meant the Christians.

26. εὐδοκήσαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία, &c. "for the Macedonians and Achaians have thought good to make a common collection for the benefit of the poorer of the Jerusalemish Christians." In this same sense κοιν. occurs in 2 Cor. 9, 13. Hebr. 13, 16.
27. εἰδόκειαν γὰρ, καὶ οἶδελθεῖν αὐτῶν εἰσιν. There is here (as Grot. says) an anaphora together with an epanorthosis. Yet neither he nor the Greek Commentators have distinctly seen the force of the γὰρ, which is very elliptical, q. d. "For I acknowledge it was of their own good pleasure, without necessity." Then the καὶ must (I think) be taken for καίς, and yet. Ὡσελθεῖαν αὐτῶν εἰσιν, "they are under obligation to them," i. e. moral obligation, on which Grotius enlarges, like a learned Civilian; but very unnecessarily.
27. εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς—αὐτοῖς. Koppe remarks that πνευματ. and σαρκικ. here signify divine and human; with an adjunct notion in the former of dignity, excellence, and utility; and in the latter, of imbecility and unworthiness. And he refers to his 5th and 9th Excurs. on Galat. But perhaps it is a simpler, and truer mode to suppose, that the former is said of the things of the soul, and another life; and the latter, of those of the body and this life. There is a similar sentiment in 1 Cor. 9, 11.
Κοίμανειν τινι signifies "to make one partaker with," carrying a dative of the thing, and a genitive of the person; as Rom. 12, 13.; or taking a dative of the person and a dative of the thing, dependent on ἐν; as Gal. 6, 6. Sometimes, however, as here, it is used intransitively, "in the sense "to be partaker with any one;" and the dative is governed of ἐν expressed, or understood. See Phil. 4, 15. 2 Tim. 5, 22. Some Commentators indeed here take κοίμ. in a transitive sense: but that is incurring an unnecessary harshness.
Schotttg. compares a similar sentiment in Synops. Sohär. R. Jehuda veniens in locum quendam, ubi εἶδεν azyma mittebant, respondebat, se pretium pro illis soluturum: illisque mirantibus dicebat: Annon permittetis, ut id faciam pro verba legis? atque sic fecit.
28. τούτον ἐπιτελέσας, καὶ σφαγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τούτον. 'Επιτελέσας may be rendered, “having despatched and accomplished this office.” 'Εφραγμένοι is by the best Commentators interpreted, “having safely delivered this money, as under seal.” So Chrysost. 287, 28. who explains, οἱ εἰς βασιλικὰ ταιεῖα ἐναποθέμενοι, οἱ ἐν ἀσύλῳ καὶ ἀσφάλει χαρὰ. So also Carpzov, who renders “consignavero.” And he compares consignare in Sueton. Claud. 26. and consignatio in Quintil. Instit. Or. 12, 8. To which may be added our consign. Carpzov, then translates the passage thus. “Si collectam eleemosynam, sigillo obsignatam, et mihi datam atque commissam, illis fideliter tradidero.” The above interpretation is also adopted by Loesner, who adduces an example of this sense from Philo 607 c. ἀπέκρυπτε τὸ ἀκλίνες τῆς εὐφραγίας ἐν βεβαιω παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐδό μέλα σφαγισάμενο. & 588 e. ὁ ἀσφαλὴς θεός ἦστιν ἐνσφαγισάμενος οὐδὲ ἐθήλη τὸ ἀσφάλειαν.

The Vulg. and some Commentators prefer assignavero. But this is far less apposite. 

Τὸν καρπὸν τούτον. This may be understood in a two-fold sense, as the fruit of their Christian beneficium, and of his Apostolical labour. The recent Commentators understand it of the benefit itself. But this is refining away the sense. Compare Philo 4, 17.

29. οἴδα δὲ ὅτι ἔρχομενος—ἐλέουσαν. The Apostle now shows how desirable will be his visit to them. (Crel.)

These expressions are very strong, and must not be explained away, as is done by too many recent Commentators. The sense is: “I know that, when I come, I shall come with the most exuberant blessings and benefits of the Gospel, and the religion of Christ.” Chrysost. paraphrases the passage thus. Οἴδα δὲ ὅτι ἔρχομενος ἔσωμαι ὑμᾶς ἐν ἄπωθι εὐδοκιμοῦντας, καὶ κομάντας τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς, καὶ μυρίων ἁγαθῶν ἀξίων ἐπαινῶν τοῖς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. And so Theophyl., who further explains τηρῶμαι εὐλογιας τ. έ.
t. X. e. by πάντα τὰ ἄγαθα τὰ ἄξια τῆς εὐλογίας, i.e. τοῦ ἔπαινου τοῦ κατὰ εἰσαγγέλου. Koppe interprets the εὐλογία τοῦ εἰσαγγέλου, "the benefits redounding from the doctrine of salvation by Christ," i.e. the χαρίσματα πνευματικά mentioned at 1, 11. And these, indeed, I think, are especially intended.

30. παρακαλῶ δὲ ύμᾶς, ἀδελφοί—συναγαγόμεθα μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑ. ἐ. π. τ. Θ. The Apostle concludes with conjuring them to commend himself and his fortunes among the Palestine Jews to God." And this he does both by Christ, whose religion they profess, and by that love which is the fruit of the Spirit; entreating that they would aid him and his efforts, by the co-operation of their prayers to God on his behalf.

The word συναγαγόμεθα often occurs in the Classical writers with a dative of person, but almost always in a physical, not (as here) a moral, sense. Many examples are adduced by Elsner and Wets. It is not, perhaps, necessary to press on the primary signification so much as is done by some of the early Commentators*; yet it is a strong expression, and hints that the prayers must be earnest and persevering. Thus the Latin Classical writers have the phrase "contendere precibus."

31. ἵνα ῥυθῆναι ἄπο τῶν ἀκεφαλοτροπίων, &c. The Apostle here hints how necessary it was that he should have the aid of their prayers, considering how great a danger he would encounter. It is well observed by Koppe, that the Apostle does not desire to be preserved from calamities, but only that he may be so strengthened as to be enabled to overcome them, and that he may be the means of cheering the afflicted Christians at Jerusalem. Compare Acts 20, 22. 23, 11.

Ῥυθῆναι, "be delivered from the attacks of the unbelieving Jews."

* In this respect the Greek Commentators have shown more judgment. They moreover notice the deep humility involved in this request.
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31. ἵνα ἡ διακονία μου ἦ eis Ἡ. εὑροθέκτον γ. τ. α. By διακονία is meant, not (as Grotius, Rosenm., and others, suppose) the alms collected by Paul, but his exertions in collecting them, and now in conveying and distributing them. The Apostle, it may be observed, was apprehensive that even all these pains bestowed on benefiting them would scarcely suffice to remove the prejudices they had been induced to harbour against him, as an apostate from the Mosaic Law. (See Chrysostom.) To this purpose it is well remarked by Ammon: "Videmus Paulum, vel dona fercement, timuisse exulceratos sibique infestos fratrum Hierosolymitanorum animos. Neque hoc tereum: aegerrime enim deliniri poterant vel beneficia adlatis, Acts 21, 20 seq." Doddridge, too, well observes, that "how extreme their bigotry and rage was, appears from their behaviour to him at the very time here referred to, Acts 21—24."

32. ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς, "that I may, by the will and pleasure of God, be permitted to come unto you," ἐν χαρᾷ, i. e. σὺν χαρᾷ, "with joy," namely, the pleasure of having succeeded in my mission. Καὶ συναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν, "and that we may have a mutual pleasure in each other's society."

38. ὅ δὲ Θεός τῆς εἰρήνης, &c., Hebr. יְשַׁרְיָהו, "the author and fountain of these and all other blessings, both spiritual and temporal, be with you, help and favour you."

CHAP. XVI.

Koppe observes, that he sees no reason to recede from the common opinion, that this chapter forms an integral part of the Epistle; and he refers to an Ex-cursus of his, in which is examined and refuted the contrary opinion of Semler. The chapter is (he says) an Appendix, or what we call the Postscript,*

* Added, as Wetstein thinks, after the Apostle had read the Epistle to the Church at Corinth.
in which Phœbe is commended to their affectionate attention, various salutations transmitted, and divers admonitions and exhortations intermixed."

1. συνέστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην, "I commend to you Phœbe." The name occurs in Sueton. Aug. 65. This Phœbe seems to have been in the company of those who conveyed the letter; though not herself the bearer; otherwise the Apostle would have added τὴν φέροντα ὑμῖν ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολήν. See ver. 22. Eph. 6, 21. Col. 4, 7 and 8. Phil. 2, 25—29. Phil. 11 and 12. That she was not known at Rome appears from the addition οὕσαν διάκονας τῆς ἡκκλησίας τῆς ἐν κεχρεαίοις. There were doubtless more Christians travelling in company to Rome, to one of whom the letter was committed. Now Phœbe is mentioned, as especially needing the friendly notice and assistance of the Roman Christians.

Τὴν αδελφὴν ὑμῶν, "our sister in the faith, and therefore dear to us." Διάκονας τῆς ἐ. τ. ἐ. κ., a Deaconess." Now, according to the constitution of the primitive Church, there was an order of females attending on part of the public business of the Church, which consisted of two kinds: 1. Elderly women (πρεσβύτιδες) presiding over, and superintending the morals of, the female Christians; and 2. διάκων, who discharged some of the offices of the ministry, as baptizing the female converts, and who also collected and distributed the contributions for the relief of sick and poor females, and discharged other minor offices. So Plin. Ep. 10, 97. necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis, quœ ministrae dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quærere,* where see Vossius. Consult, too, Coteler. ad Constitt. Apost. 3, 15, and especially Bingharn, Ant. Eccl. 11, 12, as also Suic. Thes. in v. διάκων. (and also Doddr. and Taylor. Edit.)

* Wetstein, too, cites Theodoret, H. E. 3, 10. γυνὴ γὰρ τις ἐπισταθεὶς καὶ τοῦ τῆς διακονίας ηκυμένη χαρισμάτος, and refers to Jerome on this passage.
The Church at Cenchrea, which was the port to
Corinth on the Asiatic side, was probably an append-
age to that of Corinth, or regarded it as the Mother
Church. (Koppe.) Doddr., however, thinks it had
a pastor of its own.

2. ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέχηται ἐν Κυρίῳ τ. ἀ., that ye
receive her ἐν Κυρίῳ, "in the name of Christ, on ac-
count of Christ." Ἁξίως τῶν ἁγίων, in such a man-
er as Christians ought to receive each other." It is
rightly observed by Grot., that the adverb governs
the case of the primitive adjective. And this is fre-
cquent in Thucyd.; ex. gr. 6, 16. 8, 39. 10, 69 and 86.
2, 58. See Matth. Gr. Gr. 485.

2. καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ, literally, "stand by * her,
assist her," ἐν δὲ ἄν ύμων Χριστί, "in whatever busi-
ness she may need your assistance." On the nature of
this business we are left in the dark. Some sup-
it to have been a cause at law brought on appeal
before the Imperial Court. (See Macknight.) The
term πράγμα, however, is of very general applica-
tion, and may extend to business of every kind.

3. καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ προστάτις πολλῶν, "for she hath
been a protectress and supporter of many." Προστά-
τις is the feminine form of προστάτης, which is fre-
cently used for the Latin Patronas. Nor was the
form Patrona unknown to the Latin authors. It
should seem, however, to be here employed in a
somewhat lower sense than προστάτις usually carries
with it in the Greek writers. So Theodoret: προστα-
σίαν ὡς ύμω, τὴν φιλοξενίαν καὶ κυριεύοντων καλεῖ.
Both words are copiously illustrated by Elsner and
Wetstein. See more in Macknight.

3. ἀστάσασθε Π. κ. Α. τοὺς συνεργοὺς μεν ἐν Χ. Ἰ.
See Acts 18, 2 & 26. and the note on 1 Cor. 16, 19.
Πρ. is a diminutive, like Livilla, and many other
names occurring in the Classical writers.

* In παραστ. there is, Rosenm. remarks, a military metaphor;
from παραστάτης, a soldier who stood next another in a line; as in
Joseph. B. 2, 13, 7. and the best Greek writers.
3. τοῦ συνεργοῦς μου ἦ. Χ. 'Ι. "my coadjutors, co-operators, ἐν Χ. 'Ι., in promulgating the doctrine of Christ." So Phil. 2, 25. συνεργόν καὶ συναρτασμόν μου. 1 Thes. 3, 2. συνεργῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: and elsewhere not unfrequently in St. Paul’s Epistles. It is thought by Vitrigna and Schoettgen, that as the whole liturgy of the Jewish Church was preserved by the Christians, they also retained the titles of the ministers of the Word, except that of Rabbi, which was abolished by Christ himself. "Now among these (continue they) is ῶλλος, fellow colleague, which meant one who had been advanced to the dignity of Rabbi, but, out of modesty, did not assume the name, till after the death of those who had advanced him to the honour. Thus, here Aquila and Priscilla are called Ἱερεὺς, since the title Apostle they could not, neither wished, to assume." The learned Commentators then adduce a great number of examples which prove the existence of such an office in the Jewish Church, but by no means sufficient to countenance their notion, that the Apostle here intended to invest Aquila and Priscilla with a title of Ecclesiastical dignity. Nor is there any proof that συνεργός was the word by which the Ἱερεύς was expressed: and as in the other passages of the New Testament where the word συνεργός occurs, there is no vestige of such an allusion, so I cannot think there is any here; and I can only see in the notion that too great fondness for system and hypothesis which distinguished Lightfoot, Vitrigna, Rhenferd, Schoettg., and which has done, more or less, all those who have dedicated themselves to any confined branch of study, as that of the Rabbinical writers.

4. οἷνος ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τῶν ἐαυτῶν πράξεων ὑπάρχουσας. This is a strong and hyperbolical expression, for, "they hazarded their lives for my preservation." The expression literally signifies, "submitted their necks to the sword."

It is a phrase which rarely occurs in the Classical writers, yet something similar is adduced by Wets. from Diod. Sic. 1. 32. p. 596. κλαίοντος δὲ τοῦ προσβυ-
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5. καὶ τὴν κατ' ὀικών αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, i.e. (as the Greek Commentators, and some modern ones explain) "their Christian family." (See Koppe and Chrysost.) But it should rather seem, as is the opinion of OEcumen., Beza, Mede, and most Commentators since their time, that the expression refers to a congregation which met at their house: for there is reason to think that they would scarcely yet be allowed the privilege of having public buildings for religious worship. They probably as yet worshipped in small congregations, assembled κατ' ὀικὼν. And to this there is possibly an allusion in Acts 20, 20.

The names from Epænetus to Olympas occur no where else in the New Testament.

5. ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαίας. There is here a remarkable var. lect. Several antient MSS. and some Editions and Fathers, read Ἀσίας, which is preferred by Grot., Mill, Bengel, Whitby, Koppe, and Rosenm., and has been received by Griesbach. Indeed, it is so well supported both by external and internal evidence, that there is every probability it is the true reading. The very nature of the term ἀπαρχὴ suggests the idea of one person only (see 1 Cor. 15, 20.); and as in 1 Cor. 16, 15. Stephanus is called the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαίας, Epænetus could have no claim to the name. Mr. Slade indeed urges, that it is possible Epænetus might have been one of that family to which this appellation is given; and he might have been the earliest convert in the household of Stephanas. Thus, though Epænetus, as an individual, was the first fruits, yet the same term was applicable to the house of Stephanas, as a family."
bility, however, involves so many arbitrary suppositions, that it must be acknowledged to be very faint, and by no means to rise to probability. Ammon defends the common reading, on the score of its being the more difficult one, and thinks it likely that 'Asiae arose from emendation. But how it should be thought the more difficult reading I cannot see. The ἀκαρχὴ is applied by Ammon to the many Corinthian converts (mentioned at Acts 18, 8.) collectively taken. But this is too harsh to be admitted.

7. Ἀνδρόνικος, Andronicus. A frequent name among the Romans; as, Andronicus Rhodius, Livius Andronicus. Ἰωνίας, Junia, a feminine form of Junius. This was probably the wife, or sister, of Andronicus; and these, as being relations of Paul, were most likely Jewish Christians.

Into the etymological speculations on these names I shall not enter, as they are too uncertain to deserve attention.

Συναγματίων. See Coloss. 4, 10. Philem. 28. To which captivity the Apostle refers is uncertain, since he was often in bonds. Clemens Rom. Ep. ad Corinth. c. 5. says seven times.

7. ὅτινες εἰσὶν ἐνίσχυμοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. It is somewhat uncertain what this is meant to indicate. Whitby, Koppe, and others, take it to mean, that they were eminent teachers; ἀποστόλος being sometimes used in a lower sense; as in 2 Cor. 8, 23. Phil. 2, 25. But in both those passages the article is not found, as here, which, I think, determines it to mean Apostle in the highest sense. And such is the view adopted by the generality of Commentators. Thus ἐν will signify inter; q. d. “who were held in highest consideration by or among the Apostles.”

8—15. Salutations are sent to six and twenty individuals, and two whole families. By this it is indicated: 1. that Paul, though he had not yet been at Rome, still well knew the Christians who resided there: 2. that he well remembered them, since he called them all by name, and assigned to each his
commendation; 8. that he felt persuaded the Romans would not take this letter amiss, though written somewhat boldly, Rom. 15, 15. (Carpsov.)

8. Ἀμπλιάτω. Koppe compares Ampliatus, and observes (referring to Gruter’s Thesaur.) that it was a frequent name among the Romans. Τὸν ἄγαπησάν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. Rosenm. remarks, that the formulas ἐν Κυρίῳ and ἐν Χριστῷ have a definitive force, i. e. indicate in what sense, and with what restriction, the verb to which they are affixed is to be taken.

9. Οὐδεμιᾶς. A frequent name among the Romans. Στάχυς, Stachus. A Greek name, which occurs once in Gruter.


Aristobulus and Narcissus. Not unfrequent names among the Romans. Theophyl. explains τὸς ἑπτας ἐν Κυρίῳ by τοῦ πιστοῦς.

12. Ὁρφιαναῖ καὶ Ὁρφιανα. Both these names occur in Gruter’s Inscr.; the former of them also in Justin. 39, 2. Κατιόσας ἐν Κυρίῳ, “who laboured in the cause of the Lord and our Religion.” It is well remarked by Theophyl. 136. Οὕτως ἐκαστῶν κατὰ τὴν ἄξιαν ὑπαμάξει, αὐτῶς τὲ προφυτεύσας ποιῶν, καὶ ἐτέρως εἰς ἔκκλην διεγείρων.

Περσίς, Persis. A name also occurring in Grut., and which is supposed to be one of those derived from country, as Myra, Syra. And we ourselves have not a few names of this sort, as Norman. The word does not necessarily denote a slave; since freedmen, after emancipation, retained their names; and persious might have it, though without being slaves.

13. Ῥοῦφος. A name occurring in Mark 15, 21. This was a son of Simon the Cyrenian. Ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ, i. e. “a select or approved Christian.” Slade thinks the expression might be intended to.
distinguish him from others of the same name, which was a common one; and therefore that it is only equivalent to τῶν ἀδελφῶν, v. 23. This, however, is harsh; and the use of the article does not here seem applicable: though I acknowledge it is adopted by Theophyl. at τῶν δόκιμων, ver. 10. By τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμὸν is meant “his mother by nature and birth, and mine by grace and in affection.” Theophyl. says it was intended μαρτυρεῖν τὴν γυναικὶ τὴν ἀρετήν.

14. ἀσκάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ερμᾶν, Πατρόβα, Ἐρμῆ, κ. τ. σ. α. ἀ. The Hermas here mentioned is supposed to have been the author of the Pastor. The name Patrobus occurs in Martial 2, 32. and elsewhere. Indeed, almost all the names mentioned by Paul occur somewhere or other in Gruter’s Thesaurus of Inscriptions. As these last persons are not mentioned with any terms of encomium, we may suppose them to have been inferior in Christian graces to the preceding, yet deserving of an affectionate mention.

15. Φιλολογὸν καὶ Ἰουλίαν. Both names frequent among the Romans. Julia was probably wife or sister of Philologus. Καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους, “and all the Christians resident with them.” It is plain that Peter was not now at Rome; and therefore the tradition respecting the Bishops, as promulgated by the Roman Catholics, is utterly disproved by fact.

16. ἀστάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλίματι. Koppe thinks that the salutation was to be given in the name of Paul. This, however, seems an ill-founded notion; though I acknowledge it is supported by the authority of Theodoret and Cæcumenius. Without dwelling, however, on this opinion, it may be observed, that as the Apostle had before bid them salute certain persons in his own name, so he now bids them salute each other. The reason for which seems to have been alone seen by Chrysost. and Theophyl. The words of the latter are as follows: Ἐνα μὴ ΦιλολογInterruptedException
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On this kiss of peace and love much has been written by Grotius. Whitby, and others, who trace it to antient Oriental custom, and one borrowed from the Synagogue. It appears that, in the Apostolic age, the kiss was given to each other at the end of the Liturgy, and before the Communion Service. It was understood to express mutual love, and, in things spiritual, equality. This custom continued during a great part of the first century, and is noticed by several early Ecclesiastical writers cited by Grot. and others; as Justin Apol. 1, 85. ἀλληλοὺς φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν. Tertullian de Oratione: Quæ oratio cum divortio sancti osculi integra? Quem omnino officium facientem impedit pax? Quale sacrificium est, a quo sine pace (i.e. pacis osculo) receditur. Constitut. Apostol. 1, 2. c. 57, εἶτα καὶ ἀσπαζόμεθαν ἀλληλοὺς οἱ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀλληλὰς αἱ γυναῖκες, τὸ ἐν κυρίῳ φίλημα—καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο προσευχόμεθαν οἱ διάκονοι υπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσης. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτα γινέσθω ἡ θυσία, ἐστώτος πάντος τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ προσευχόμεθαν ἱεροχώς καὶ οὗτων ἀνενέχθη, μεταλαμβάνεται ἡ ἐκκλησία τάξις καὶ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ κυρίακος σώματος καὶ τοῦ τιμίου αἵματος: where see Cotelerius. Why the Apostle has not more frequently made mention of this custom, (having only adverted to it here, and in 1 & 2 Cor. and Thessal.), has been the subject of various and uncertain conjecture. Be the cause what it may, there is reason to think that this custom, so liable to abuse and misrepresentation, was laid aside at a very early period of the Christian Church.

16. ἀσπάζομαι ύμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τ. Χ. On this there is no occasion to raise any difficulty, since, as Grot. observes, we need only suppose the Grecian Churches, and especially those which Paul had
visited, and with which he was, doubtless, in frequent communication by letter. See Erasm.

Some MSS. and Fathers have πᾶσαι. But this seems from the margin.

17. ἀδελφοῖ, "brother Christians," not the Presbyters only, to whom the letter was delivered, but all the rest of the Christians likewise. (Rosenm.)

Being about to conclude the Epistle, he now touches on the subject of those disputes and dissensions which he had heard prevailed among the Roman Christians, the suppression of which was one principal purpose of the Epistle. Of these, then, he admonishes them to beware. He bids them mark those that caused divisions, and raised factions, and also those that occasioned scandals and offences among the unbelieving. Now these σκάνδαλα might arise both from the immoralities of those who made profession of Christianity, and from those who, by the introduction of heretical and false opinions, caused the Heathens to take unjust offence at the Gospel. But, from the context, it should seem that the former scandals were most in the mind of the Apostle.

17. ἐκκλιναίτε ἀπ' αὐτῶν, "avoid familiar intercourse with them." So στέλλεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, 2 Thes. 3, 6. Wets. compares Plut. 2, 479 Λ. ἐν δὲ δικαιοσυνεσι λαὶ ὁ πάγκος ἐμορθε τιμή, οἰκετή, διάβολος, η καλαξ παρεινθ θυμαίος, ἡ κολύμη βασικάνος. And he refers to Apoc. 2, 14.

18. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἤμων Ἡ. Χ. οὐ δουλεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ. Who these heretics were, and what their doctrine, cannot with certainty be determined: yet, from the subject of the Epistle, it seems probable that they were Jews who, together with an outward appearance of sanctity, joined an immoral, or, at least, a sensual life (which last seems to be adverted to in the words δουλεύουσιν τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ*), and sought no more than to make the pro-

fession of the Gospel a means of obtaining a luxurious living. See Rosenmuller and Michaelis in loc. 18. καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἔκκαθασι τ. ἀ. The terms χρηστολογία and εὐλογία are (rightly I think), by many Commentators, thought to be synonymous. Thus our Common Version: "good words" and fair speeches;" meaning deceiving speeches, or words only. And so the best Classical writers use χρηστολογία as Menand., Herodian, and Anthol., cited by Wets., who quotes the word χρηστολογία from Eustath. on Hom. II. ψ. p. 1437., and also compares S. A. Victor Epit. 34. blandus magis quàm beneficus: unde eum Graeco nomine χρηστολογον appellavere. Plat. εὐλογία ἄρα, καὶ εὐαρ-μοστία, καὶ εὐσχημοσύνη And Aretalogus from Ju- venal, 15, 15.

18. τῶν ἁκακῶν. The word ἁκακὸς often signifies, not only harmless, but guileless, ἄπλους, unsuspicious of evil. See the numerous examples adduced by Wets., to which I add Thucyd. 3, 83. καὶ τὸ εἰσέβα τὸ γενναῖον πλεῖστον μετέχει, καταγελασθέν ηφανίσθη. 19. ἢ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπάκοι εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο. The sentence is well paraphrased by Koppe as follows: "vestrae ipsorum famae et estimationi id debetis cum vestra in religione constanti ubique tetrarum laudibus celebretur." Υπακοή, "obedience to the doctrine of Christ." Ἀφίκετο, "has become known to all." So Hipoccr. (cited by Rosenm.) тολούτε σου. τὸ κλέας τῆς ἐν ἐντρυκῇ σοφίης πεφοιτηκέν καὶ ἐς ἠμέας ἀφίκεται.

19. τὸ ἔφ᾽ ύμων, scil. μέρος, "on your behalf, on account of you." This seems preferable to supposing, with Koppe and others, the τὸ to be redundant. Wets. compares from Ach. Tat. τὸ ἐξ' ἐμοι. 19. Θέλω δὲ ύμᾶς σοφοὺς — κακῶν. Grotius very well explains this: "I wish you to be so prudent as not to be deceived, and so good as not to deceive." Koppe paraphrases:" Velim vero, ut vestra de rebus divinis humanisque sapientia sit cum virtute.
conjuncta, et ab omni pravitate et calliditate quàm maximè aliena." The learned Commentator then refers to Matt. 10, 16. 1 Cor. 14, 20. Eph. 4, 13—15., and observes, that the contrary disposition is described in Jer. 4, 22., and Sanhedrim 21, 1. Vir facit sapiens in improbitatem. Wets., too, compares Eurip. Bacch. 654. Δ. σοφὸς εἰς πλήν ἔ δει σ' εἶναι σοφὸς, & Π. ἡ δεὶ μάλιστα, ταύτ' ἔγγυς ἐφον σοφὸς. It is well remarked by Theophyl., that the Apostle’s words hint that some of them had been deceived.

19. ἀκέραιον εἰς τὸ κακόν. The word ἀκέραιος, whatever it may be derived from,* has two significations; 1st, a passive one, injured, unhurt. And Schleus. Lex. refers to Diodor. and Josephus. But it also occurs in Thucyd., Xenoph., and many others of the best Classical writers. 2d, an active (as here), namely, one who does not injure, who is uninfected with fraud or violence, &c. ἀπλωσ; as it is explained by the Schol. on Eurip. Or. 920. Theophyl. explains it, ἀκέραιος εἰς τὸ μὴ κακοποιεῖν ἔτερος. So Matt. 10, 16. ἀκέραιοι ὡς περιστεραί. Joseph. Ant. 1, 2, 2., and Arrian Epict. 3, 28. μεγαλοφύσι καὶ ἀπλωσ καὶ ἀκέραιοι. In Philo, 2, 15. it is joined to ἀμεμπτος.

20. ὅ δ' Ὁδ̄ες τῆς εἰρήνης συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑ. τ. π. ν. Most modern Commentators understand by Satan those persecuting Jews and Judaizers, who are styled in 2 Cor. 11, 15., the messengers and ministers of Satan; and by συντρίψει, the taking away the power of those agents to deceive and persecute, by the destruction of Jerusalem, together with those deceiving. (See Whitby.) This mode of interpretation, however, too much favours the notions of those who deny the personality of Satan. Grot. has far more solidly annotated on the words thus: "Explicatur sensus ὑπονολάς loci Gen. 3, 15.

* A point on which Etymologists are not agreed. I prefer to regard it as the same with ἀκόρασ, unmixed.
Nam ibi per serpentem intelligi Satanam consentiunt omnes Hebraei: ideo Satan dicitur Hebraeo ψάρις ἄρχατος; Apost. 12, 9. δρακόν sæpe in eadem Apocalypsi. Habet Satanas calliditatem, et studet nocere, ut serpens aut draco. Hoc autem vult dicere Apostolus, Satanas est qui per novos illos Doctores eam, quæ est inter vos Christianos ex Judæis et ex Gentibus vocatos, concordiam cepit rumpere: sed non diu durabant ejus astus; facile pars major et sanior cæteras ad sanitatem reducit."

See also the early modern Commentators ap. Pole. Yet, after all, there can no where be found so much apposite matter within so small a compass as in the words of Theophyl. 158. fin. (founded on Chrysost.) "Since there were divisions, the Apostle invokes the giver of peace that he would suppress the scandals. Now he does not say ἐποτάξει, but, what is more, συντρίψει, and that not only those who were the workers of the scandals, but Satan, the chief and primary mover. The συντρίψει is but precatory and practical; and the σὺ ταξέι consoles them by suggesting the speediness of the deliverance." See also Doddridge.

20. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. μεθ' ὑμῶν. These words need not, I think, be referred solely to what immediately preceded, but may be understood generally; q. d.: "And for these and all other purposes may the favour and help of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you."

These words generally form a concluding clausula of an Epistle, and were probably meant to do so here; but (as many Commentators conjecture) the Apostle, having an opportunity of adding something more, subjoins another postscript, containing some further salutations; and then concludes with the usual clause.

21. Ῥώμας, Timotheus: then residing at Corinth. Luke. This some suppose to be the same with Luke, who was then, they think, with Paul (see Acts 20, 5.); or Lucius the Cyrenean, mentioned vol. vi.
in Acts 13, 1. Which latter opinion seems preferable; for (as Ammon remarks) Luke was then at Philippi. Besides, there was so much communication between Corinth and Cyrene, that it is probable enough that Lucius should have been then there.

Ἰάσων, Jason. Probably the person mentioned in Acts 17, 5—9. Σωσίπατρος. Probably the person mentioned in Acts 20, 4. by the name Sosipater, the Berrhean.

22. Τέρτιος—Κυρίω. These are the words of the amanuensis employed by Paul to write the Epistle. It has been conjectured that this Tertius is the same person with Silas. But Ammon remarks that the Σιλας and ἁμανύμβορον do not well correspond; and that it is improbable a prophet, as was Silas, would condescend to perform the office of an amanuensis; for that was the province of the disciples of Paul (as Titus, 2 Thess. 3, 17.), and not his colleagues.” This latter reason, however, seems of little weight.

The words εν Κυρίω are, by the best Commentators, referred to ἀσπασμον: which seems preferable; since, if they be joined with ἡ γραφας, they will involve considerable harshness.

23. Γαίου, Gaius. Commonly supposed to be the same with the one mentioned in Acts 19, 29 & 20. But he was a Macedonian born at Derbe; this one, a Corinthian and the ἐνος not only of Paul, but of the whole Church. This Gaius was probably the same with the one mentioned at 1 Cor. 14., and who (as Origen tells us) was afterwards Bishop of Thessalonica.

By the ἐνος μου καὶ τ. e. o. the best Commentators think is meant, that he allowed the Corinthian Christians to hold their meetings at his house. By the οἰκῳνόμος τῆς πόλεως is meant the city treasurer, or steward: an office of great dignity. Thus in Joseph. Ant. 11, 6, 2. Artaxerxes is said to have ordered his secretaries to write to the nations on behalf of the Jews, τοῖς τε οἰκονόμοις καὶ ἄρχουσιν. (Koppe.) Wets. cites Marmor. Oxon. Nεῖλας οἰκο,
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νόμου Ἀγίας. Inscr. Spon. ἀμέριμνος σικώνυμος τῆς πόλεως.

24. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου — ἡμῖν. These words Paul now adds with his own hand, as was his custom. Such an appendix ought to have been, to all readers, a sufficient proof that this Epistle of Paul is genuine. Compare 1 Cor. 16, 21. (Jaspis.)

25. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζει, &c. The clausula 25—27. is in some MSS. found at the end of ch. 19., where see the note.

25. τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζει. Since some verb is wanting to which the dative may be referred, these words are usually construed with δόξα at ver. 27.; and ἡ is thought to be pleonastically added par anacoluthon.

25. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, "per Evangelium (meum)," "the doctrine which I teach." And so Mackn. "What the Apostle wished the Romans to be established in was those essential points of doctrine, which he always preached, and which he had inculcated in this letter; namely, the gratuitous justification of Jews and Gentiles by faith, without works of law; and in particular the justification of the Gentiles, without subjecting them to the law of Moses. These doctrines he calls his gospel, or good news, not in contradiction to the good news of the other Apostles, as Locke fancies, to the great discredit of the rest, whose doctrine was the same with Paul's so far as it went, but in opposition to the doctrine taught by the Judaizers, and other false teachers, who added the law to the Gospel, on pretence that the Gospel was defective in rites of atonement."

At δυναμένῳ there is, I think, an ellipsis of μόνον.

25. κατὰ ἄποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χ. ἡ σ. "The Apostle (says Mackn.) calls the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of the church and people of God, without subjecting them to the law of Moses, a mystery, because it was a doctrine of much greater importance than any doctrine taught in the
Heathen mysteries; and because, like these mysteries, it had hitherto been kept secret.” The phrase κρύονις αἰανίως is referred by Locke and Taylor to the Jewish αἰανες, or ages under the law. This, however, seems fanciful. (See the long note of Macknight.) It may suffice to render κρύονις αἰανίως, with Grot., “longissimo tempore.”

25. σεσιγμένου, hidden.

26. φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γ. π., “but now (see Eph. 3, 5 & 10. Col. 1, 26. 1 Pet. 1, 12.) is made manifest.” If the τε be genuine, the construction is: “now and already by the writings of the Prophets;” and this with especial reference to the prophecies concerning Christ; as 2 Pet. 1, 20. If it be cancelled, διὰ γραφῶν will be taken for κατὰ γραφὰς, “accommodate ad Prophetae oracula.” (Koppe.) But this seems harsh; and therefore the former mode is preferable; and certainly there is no good authority for the omission of the τε. It is plain that κατ’ ἐπιταγήν τοῦ αἰανίων Θεοῦ must be referred to φανερωθέντος.

Θεός αἰανιός. Koppe paraphrases: “the same God who from eternity had destined them to be promulgated at their proper time.”

Εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως, for εἰς τὸ ὑπακοήν τῇ πίστει, i. e. εἰς τὸ πιστεύειν.

27. μόνῳ σῶμα Θεώ. Koppe says this is for σοφο-τάτο Θεῷ. But it is a far stronger expression than that. God is said to be the only wise God, as being the sole author of all wisdom, and the fountain from which it proceeds. “This wisdom (observes Hardy) is not mere knowledge, but practical knowledge shown in the proper government of things, by which all things are directed by the most suitable means to the best end.” Here Wets. compares the following sentiments from the Classical writers. Phocyclid. 49. εἰς θεὸς ἐστὶ σοφὸς. Diogen. L. præm. 12. φιλοσοφίαν δὲ πρῶτος αἰνώμασε Πολύμαχος, καὶ ἐαυτὸν φιλοσόφον— μηδέν γὰρ εἶναι σοφὸν ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλ’ Ἰ. θεῖ. Philo T. 1. p. 457, 4. τὸ γὰρ μηδὲν οἴεσθαι εἰδέναι πέρας ἐπιστή-
μης, ἔνδε διὸς μόνον σοφῶ τοῦ καὶ μόνον θεῶ. To which
I add Aristid. T. 3. 519 c. ὅν γὰρ ἀξίω σοφῶτατον
εἶναι Θεῶ.

These words διὰ Χριστοῦ may be referred either to
μόνον σοφῶ Θεῶ; which will require the subaudition
of ἐνεργεῖται; or to the words following. But the
former seems to be the more regular construction.
FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

CHAP. I.

In this Epistle various subjects are treated. I. The dissensions which had arisen among the Corinthians, and the pride of those engaged therein, the Apostle sharply rebukes, and exhorts them to concord, ch. 1—4. Then follows II. a reproof because of an incestuous person not having been expelled from the society, ch. 5.; and III. because of the quarrelsome and litigious spirit to which many were, in a manner, enslaved, ch. 6, 1—11. Then IV. the Apostle admonishes them to abstain from fornication, and not to abuse the Christian liberty, ch. 6, 12—20. He answers various questions put to him by the Corinthians, and treats V. of Christian matrimony; ch. 7. tot. VI. of idolothyta, ch. 8, 1—ch. 11, 2. VII. of women making their appearance veiled at the congregations of Christians, ch. 11, 2—16. VIII. of the Lord's Supper, ch. 11, 17—34. IX. of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, ch. 12, 13, 14. X. of the resurrection of the dead, ch. 15.; finally XI. of the collecting of alms in the Church, ch. 16. (Rosenmuller.)

Wets. remarks: "Corinthii non minus lascivia quam opulenta et philosophiae studio insignes fuerunt." And after adducing a vast number of citations, from the Greek and Latin, illustrative of the character of the Corinthians (none of which my limits will permit me to insert) he subjoins the following observation: "Ex his planius intelligimus,
quaε Apostolus in Sophistas et sophismata contra resurrectionem mortuorum, in scortacionem et incestum, denique in divites avaros Corinthisi scrispit."

In ver. 1—9., Rosenm. observes, is contained the exordium of the Epistle, in which the writer modestly conciliates the goodwill of his readers."

1. Παυλος κατος αποστολος Ι. Χ. This is a brief and elliptical expression, denoting an Apostle of Jesus Christ, especially called and constituted by him.* Here St. Paul has reference to his extraordinary and miraculous call recorded in Acts 9. It is no wonder, therefore, that he should, in most of his Epistles, advert to it, and especially on this occasion, since (as Doddridge remarks) there were those in the Church of Corinth who affected to call the authority of his mission into question. See Whitby and Mackn.

Δια θεληματος Θεου. This is rendered by Schleus. Lex. "quaε fuit divinâ benignitate." And Krause compares a similar use of the Hebr. צר. This, however, seems an unnecessary refinement. I see no reason to deviate from the common interpretation decreto. See Eph. 1, 11. Gal. 1, 5. Hebr. 10, 10. Thus in a kindred passage of 1 Tim. 1, 1. we have κατ' ενταγην Θεου. Valckn., in his Scholae on this Epist. p. 23. thus distinguishes θελημα and θυλη. "Θελημα, voluntas, propriè est animi jam determinati statutum, decretum. θυλη contra et θυλωμα propriè tantum deliberationem animi nondum determinati indicant."

With his own name the Apostle couples that of Sosthenes, who is by many thought to be the person mentioned in Acts 18, 17., and whom they suppose to have been now chief of the Synagogue at Corinth. This, however, (as Rosenm. observes) is mere conjecture; and on no better foundation rests the opinion of others, that he wrote this Epistle at Paul's

* It is thought to be founded on a similar use of the Hebr. נר. See Gesen. Hebr. Lex.
dictation. See 16, 21. That Paul himself wrote only the concluding verses, is certain; but whether Sosthenes was the scribe, is, like the other conjectures, doubtful. Hence many think that Sosthenes is named in conjunction with Paul, from having been with him, and entertaining the same sentiments with himself. These conjectures, however, do not rise above probability. Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators simply suppose that the Apostle joins Sosthenes with himself, out of modesty. And Doddr. observes, that "it was both humility and prudence in the Apostle thus to join his name with his own, in an Epistle in which it was necessary to deal so plainly with them, and to remonstrate against so many irregularities."

Many modern Commentators, as Crellius, Simon, Valckin., and most recent ones regard the article as indicating the celebrity of Sosthenes; q. d. "the brother." But the Apostle often uses it when no celebrity can be supposed; as in Rom. 16, 23. Κόσμιος ὁ ἀδελφός. The force of the article seems rather to be that expressed in our common version; as standing for the pronoun possessive, or rather carrying with it the ellipsis of the pronoun. Bp. Middleton thinks that the expression merely designates him as a Christian convert: which, in fact, comes to the same thing, since it requires the subaudition just mentioned.

2. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ—καὶ ἕμεν, "to the body or assembly of Christians resident at Corinth." Ἡγιασμένος ἐν Χ. τ., κλητὸς ἅγιος. Both these expressions are designations of Christians, and used (with reference to the phraseology of the Old Testament) of those who are separated from the bulk of the heathens, and set apart for religious and holy purposes, for the profession of true religion. See Deut. 7, 6 and 14, 2. and consult Bessen on 1 Pet. 1, 2. and Bp. Lowth on Isa. 18, 8. By κλητοὶ are denoted Christians, those, who being called, obeyed the call, and were thus placed in a state of salvation. The Jews
(Krause observes) called themselves the ἔθνος, *the peculiar people of God;* and therefore this is by the Apostle especially applied to Christians. See Rom. 1, 7.

2. σὺν πάσιν ὡς καὶ οὗτοι τοῖς ἡμῶν. Here τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. is regarded by the best Commentators as a periphrasis for *Christians;* ἐπικ. often signifying to invoke for religious purposes, *to worship*; as Acts 2, 21. 2 Tim. 2, 22. and Joel 3, 5. Hammond and Locke take the words to signify "called by the name of Christian," or "called Christians:" which comes to the same thing, but is not so well supported; for in Acts 15, 17. James 2, 7. the phraseology is different; since (as Wolf remarks) the phrases ἐπικαλεῖσθαι ὄνομα ἐπὶ τινος, or τινι, and ἐπικαλεῖσθαι ὄνομα, do not signify the same thing, and the Sept. and New Testament writers do not use them promiscuously, but in a different sense: ἐπικαλ. having, in the former case, an active, in the latter, a passive sense. So also Whitby, whom see.

Σὺν πάσιν. Rosenm. would render aequē ac; like the Hebr. יְ in some passages of the Old Testament: and he refers to Gal. 3, 9. This, however, seems too harsh; and it is certainly more natural to interpret the words in their usual sense (as do Chrys. and the Greek Commentators, and most modern ones), and take them to signify "all of Achaia," for ἐν παντὶ τῶι τοπῷ, which must be closely joined with τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις, signifies any where else in the territory, namely of Corinth: regarding Corinth and the parts adjacent, in which alone the Gospel seems to have been extensively professed, as an Ecclesiastical Division, or Bishoprick. Thus the name Catholic, given to the Epistle by Chrysostom, will be taken in so limited an acceptation as not to afford any reasonable objection. The above mode is also, I find, adopted by Ziegler and Bp. Pearce.*

* The manner in which Wetstein understands the ἐν παντὶ
2. autēn te kai ἔμων. The Greek Commentators, and many eminent modern ones, as Le Clerc and Rosenm., refer these words, not to τόκῳ, but to Κυρίω, and regard them as a sort of correction; q. d. “Our Lord, did I say? Not so, but theirs as well as ours.”

3. χάρις ὑμῖν — Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. See Rom. 1, 7. and the note. Semler would understand the χάρις of the forgiveness of sins, through Christ; referring this word to the Gentiles, and the εἰρήνη to the Jews. A mode of interpretation, however, which seems too systematical and hypothetical. We must understand, in a general way, the gifts and graces obtained by the Gospel. It is also observed by Semler, that χάρις is not here to be taken in its usual sense, of the grace of calling, but as denoting beneficium, with reference to those gifts and faculties not common to all Christians. And he refers to Acts 18, 17. And Theodoret, Òcumenius, and Rosenm. Chrysostom, however, and Theophylact, are of a different opinion.

The Apostle, Rosenm. remarks, now directs his discourse to the dissensions by which the bonds of peace had been broken among the Corinthians; and, though he knew himself to be contemned by some, yet he shews an absence of all resentment, and rather wishes them well, by thanking God for their common salvation.” Theodoret judiciously notices this captōκῳ differs from that of all other Commentators. His words are these: Paulus ab Ecclesiâ Corinthiacâ distinguuit omnes ubique locorum invocantes nomen Domini; illi sunt, qui Corinthi sedes fixerant, hi mercatores et nautae hospites, qui Christo nomen dederant, eumque modo Corinthi, modo in patriam reversi invocabant.”

This, however, is rather ingenious than solid.

* Wetstein, however, remarks, “Paulus suum locum vocat, ubi ipsa per praedicationem Evangelii Ecclesiam fundaverat. Tacite se atque Southenem Corinthum, Act. 18, 17., opponit peregrino falso Doctori, qui in locum non suum irrepearat, 2 Cor. 10, 13 & 16.” And he cites Dionys. Hal. 2, 6. Οὐαλέριῳ καὶ παντὶ ἄλλῳ γνώμῃ ἀγορευέν ἐν τῷ έαυτοῦ τόκῳ κατὰ τόν ἄρχαῖον ἐθισμόν, καὶ κόσμον ἀποδόσωμεν.” But few, I think, will agree with the learned Commentator.


tatio benevolentiae: and it is truly remarked by Doddridge, that this language and that of the next verse would have a tendency to soften their minds, and dispose them the better to receive the plain reproofs which the Apostle was going to give them, and which, in their circumstances, faithful love extorted from him.

4. πάντοτε, “as often as I offer up my prayers to God.” Ἐν Χριστῷ, because of Jesus Christ.

5, 6. The Apostle now more fully explains what he had said, by enumerating those various benefits of which the Corinthians had been made partakers by Christ and his doctrine. (Krause.) Ὅτι ἐν πάντι ἐπλουτίσθης, “that by him ye abound. ἐν πάντι, scil. χάρισματι, grace, such as Christians receive from God. Here πλουτίσθης is for περισσεύω; as in 2 Cor. 9, 8; 12; 1 Thess. 3, 12; Eph. 1, 7. It is rightly remarked by Crellius, that ἐν πάντι λόγῳ is meant to explain the preceding ἐν πάντι; q. d. in omni, inquam.”

5. ἐν πάντι — λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει, both together may denote a complete and perfect knowledge of the Christian religion. (See Schoettgen.) Λόγῳ answering to the Hebr. יד, res; though it may refer to elocution in preaching, and perhaps (as some say) that highest sort of it which included the gift of tongues. Γνώσει is confined by Semler to the interpretation and explanation of the Old Testament. And indeed this (especially if referred to the prophecies of Christ and his religion) may be included: but it is only (I think) a part of the Apostle’s meaning. Semler says, this language plainly shews that he had in view chiefly the masters and doctors. Which, however, seems hypothetical. The Apostle rather meant it of all generally, though in various proportions, just as it might apply; and apply it would to many.

6. καθὼς τῷ ματρύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐθεμαυχη̣θῇ ἐν ὑμῖν. The καθὼς Rosenm. would render postquam. But this signification is unsupported by the examples he adduces. Krause renders it siquidem; which, he
thinks, introduces a *transition*. Some of the early modern Commentators, including Semler, render it *prout*; and Schleus. *quod*; as in Acts 15, 14. 2 Joh. ver. 3. I prefer *prout* and our common version *even as*. It is observed by Crellius, that the sense of *similitude, comparison, &c.* is often lost in this particle, which often denotes the *unius rei ex alterd consecutionem*.

6. τῶν μαρτύρων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. There are several senses of which *μαρτύρων* is susceptible, none of them unsuitable to the present passage: *either* (as it is understood by Hardy, from the early modern Commentators) "the *Gospel* which testifies of Christ," or (as the recent Commentators, Rosenm. and Krause, explain) "the *Christian doctrine* and instruction;" as 2, 1, 2. Thess. 1, 10. 1 Tim. 2, 6. 2 Tim. 1, 8. where it is explained by *κύριον*. Chrysost. and Theophyl. explain it *κήρυγμα*, as referred to the testimony which Christ bore of himself; as in Apoc. 1, 2. The first two interpretations may, however, be united.

6. *εβεβαιωθη*, confirmed. The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Krause. "Doctrina Christi se talen vobis præstitit, ut dubitare non possitis, quin omnia complectatur, qua ad felicitatem consequendam pertinent; usus et experientia vos edocuerunt, religionem Christianam esse saluberrimam."

7. *αυτε* ωμάς μη υπερείσθαι εν μηδεν. X. Rosenm. observes, that these *χαρίσματα* are not only gifts extraordinary, but also, and here especially, the ordinary and general benefits of Christianity; as the tranquillity it bestows, and the firmness, constancy, energy, and progress in well doing, which it imparts.

7. *Αυτοκεφαλεια* την *αυτωκέφαλον* I. X., "expecting the revelation, to judgment and destruction;" called the *second advent, ευφανεια, &c.*. See 2 Thess. 2, 8. 1 Tim. 6, 14. 2 Tim. 4, 1—8. Tit. 2, 13. *Αυτοκεφ* αλε* μυν* carries with it the notion of *secure, sine metu*. Compare Rom. 8, 18. It is observed by Theophyl.
that ἀποκαλ. is used to hint that he now τάρεται, κρυπτεται δὲ τότε ἀποκαλυφθησεται.

8. ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὡς ἐγς τέλος ἀνεγκλήτως. The ὃς may be referred either to Χριστῶ, the nearer, or to Θεός, the remote antecedent at ver. 4. The former mode is adopted by many Commentators; the latter, by Beza, Camerar., Grot., Calvin, Crellius, Simon, Heuman, Bengel, Hardy, Wets., Pearce, Semler, Rosenm., and Mackn.; and it is, I think, preferable. For, as Mr. Valpy observes, there is a manifest distinction here between him who βεβαιώσει, and our Lord, whose day is mentioned. And he paraphrases thus: “God will do all that is requisite on his part to render you unblamable to the end; so that you shall not fail of it through any want of divine grace necessary to that end, or any unfaithfulness to his promise, who hath already reconciled you to himself, through the death of Christ, to present you holy and unblameable, and unreprouvable in his sight; if you continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel.”

“Εἰς τέλος. Rosenm. explains semper; comparing the Heb. בְּנַח and εἰς τέλος, Joh. 13, 1. Matt. 10, 22. and elsewhere. And in nearly the same manner it is understood by Crellius. In this mode of interpretation, however, there seems something frigid and formal. I prefer, with other Commentators, to interpret it of the end of life. And so it is understood by Wolf.

Εἰς τὰ εἶναι ἀνεγκλήτως, “that you may be unblamable.” Krause refers to a similar use of ἀμέως at Ephes. 1. 4.; and observes that Hezych. explains it ἀνυφόσως. He also refers to Suic. Thes. 1, 329. The sense is: “liable to no trial and punishment;” which includes acceptance and reward. Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν L. X., “in or at the day of our Lord,” i.e. the day of judgment. Grot. and Krause take ἐν for εἰς. But this is unnecessary, and indeed far less opposite. So that it is useless to cite examples of ἐν τῇ for εἰς τῇ. It may be observed that this
designation of the day of judgment is frequent in the New Testament.

9. τιστὶς ὁ Θεὸς, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ ιεροῦ αὐτοῦ I. X., "God is faithful to his promises." A saying, Krause observes, frequent with the Apostle, and answering to the Hebr. שְׁלוֹם. It is also found in the Rabbinical writers. (See Schoettgen's examples.) Δι' οὗ is for ὕφ᾽ ὑπὸ, "by whom, by whose benevolent care." Ἐκλήθητε, "ye were brought into the Christian Church, placed in the way of salvation." See Schleus. Lex.

Εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "to the end that you might be partakers of the felicity which he has destined for his son," &c.

10, 11. The Apostle now proceeds to complain of various schisms which had arisen in the body of the Corinthian Christians, with the intent, if possible, of restoring concord. (Krause.) The Apostle, too, endeavours so to vindicate the simplicity of Christian doctrine, as well against the ambitious boasters of Greek Philosophy as against the superstitious Jews, that he may recall both of them to the truth, ver. 10. —ch. 4, 21.

10. διὰ τοῦ ἀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ημῶν I. X., "in the name and by the mandate and authority of Jesus Christ committed to me." (Rosenm.) Doddr., however renders: "by the venerable and endearing name of our Lord Jesus Christ." And he observes, (from Erasmus), that this is beautifully and properly opposed to the various human names under which they were so ready to enlist themselves. The same view of the sense is also taken by Locke, who adds: "A form that I do not remember the Apostle elsewhere uses:" which ought to have made him suspect that the interpretation was ill founded. Yet it is also supported by Elsner. Mr. Slade, too, adopts this interpretation, and observes, "It could not be thought, that they should agree in opinion upon every question, but their being all members of one common head was a powerful argument for their
maintaining "a perfect unanimity of design," a general agreement on all matters of importance, a love of union and peace."

10. Ταῦτα οὖν λέγετε πάντες. In ταῦτα λέγειν is, I conceive, included το αὐτὸ φρονεῖν; as in Phil. [2, 2. So, among the Classical citations adduced by Wets., Thucyd. 6, 31. Βοιωτοὶ δὲ καὶ Μεγαρεῖος το αὐτὸ λέγοντες ἦσοψαμον, where the Schol. explains: τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχοντες. Polyb. 2, 62. ἄλλος οὖν τὸς καθ' ἡμᾶς καιρὸς, ἐν οἷς πάντες ἐν καὶ ταὐτὰ λέγοντες μεγίστην καρ-πούσαν δοκοῦσιν εὐδαιμονιάν. & 5, 104. δεύτερον μάλιστα μὲν μετέπειτα πολλοίς τοὺς ἔλλειπας ἀλλήλως, ἄλλα μεγάλα μέρη ἑρέμου ἔχειν τοῖς θεοῖς, ἐν λέγοντες. ἐν καὶ το αὐτὸ πάντες, καὶ συμπλέκοντες τὰς χείρας. Others confine it to agreement in doctrine. And so the Greek Commentators and Semler. But this is an undue limitation of the sense, which the Apostle himself more fully unfolds in the next words, in which he not only says "that there may be no schisms among you," but ἵνα ήτε κατηγορομένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῶ νοτ.

The term σχίσματα is synonimous with διχοστασία, ver. 33. and Gal. 5, 21. where also occurs αἱρέσεις, sects. And this seems to be the sense here,* though it may include broils, and disagreements of every kind.

The Apostle, continuing the same metaphor, then uses the elegant term κατηγορομένωι, the force of which has been well illustrated by Elsner and Raphael. It

* So Dr. Nott, who observes: "In this place the 'schism' appears to have consisted in the formation of religious parties, which pretended to follow, one the cause of St. Paul, and another that of Apollos. In chap. 11, 18. the charge is grounded upon the adoption of new modes, which some had wantonly introduced in the administration of the sacrament. And in chap. 12, 25. the offence of schism appears to have consisted in the violation of that subordination of teaching, ministering, and governing, which was originally appointed in the Church. 'Schism,' therefore, may be defined to be an open violation of church unity, when individuals assume to themselves the power either of forming new communions, or of instituting new rites, or of creating a new ministry, in opposition to such as have been established by regular authority, as being the ministry and the ordinances originally of Apostolic institution."
signifies "to repair a broken vessel, or restore a torn vestment;" and thus metaphorically denotes to restore concord, which has been interrupted.

Rosenm. observes that νοῦς signifies union of minds or will; γνώμη, opinion, or the same judgment in fundamental points of religion. So the trite saying, "Idem velle, et idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia est."

11. ἕν τῶν Χριστίαν. Subaud ὁικεῖον or the like. So the Syr. "de domo Chloes."

12. The Apostle now proceeds to more fully describe those schisms. No one, he says, can easily be found who does not wish to be numbered with one sect or other, or does not give his especial approbation and support to the opinions of this or that doctor.

The formula λέγω δὲ τῶ Ῥώμη both in the New Testament, and the Classical writers (see the passages cited by Raphael) has the force of explaining and more expressly indicating what has been before somewhat obscurely said; and answers to the Latin sic ilicit, nimimum, hoc est. (Krause.) So Grotius. And this is, upon the whole, a correct statement of the force of the phrase; but it may here signify, "I mean thus, that one of you says: I am of Paul," &c. "Έκαστος does not mean every one, but it is only to be understood of the generality. Λέγει is explained by Semler and Krause gloriatur, "pretendit in contemptum." But this is wandering too far. The sense seems to be "professes this." In ἤνω Παῦλου some substantive is to be supplied, either μάθητες or μέρους.

12. ἤνοι μὲν εἰμι Παῦλου—Χριστίαν. There is something here at which both antient and modern Interpreters have stumbled. It has been thought surprising that Paul, who so discountenanced all sectarism, should mention himself as the head of a sect. That Apollos and Peter should have been heads of sects they think improbable; and of Christ it can in no sense be conceived. Hence many antient and modern Commentators think that Paul, from unwil-
lingness to bring forward the real names of those sectarists, has used fictitious ones. And they refer to 4, 6. μετακρημάτισα. But that passage is quite of another nature.* [See Storr, and Krause. Edit.] Nor does there seem any reason why Paul should designate various sects, namely of those who professed to adhere to Paul, or Apollo, &c. There might be, and doubtless were, sects among the Corinthians, and yet the teachers to whom these persons adhered, might be little aware of, or at least not countenance, them. Some might prefer Paul, as being their first instructor (and more profound in religious knowledge. Edit.); others, Apollos, as being more eloquent than Paul: and others, Cephas (i.e. Peter), on account of his fame, or induced by some of his disciples who had come to Corinth, and who, we may suppose, would be of the Judaizing Christians. Hence Paul refers the blame not to the teachers, but to the Corinthians. (Rosenm.) As to the words ἔγω δὲ Χριστῶν, there is no need to cancel them, with Pearce, or to read Χριστοῦ, with Bentley and Markland. They are, as Rosenm. observes, not to be understood as involving any censure,† but added to complete the enumeration of sects.

The above view of the subject (which seems the best founded) is also supported by Grotius, who has illustrated the sense from an interesting passage of Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Cor., which plainly refers to this very state of affairs at Corinth: 'Ἀναλάβετε τὴν

* Whitby, too, in refutation of this opinion, observes: "That this is here said, not by a fiction of names, or persons, under which the Apostle taxed the heads of the sects among the Corinthians; but that they really divided upon these accounts is evident, first, from St. Paul's thanking God that he baptized so few of them, lest they should have occasion to say he baptized in his own name, and so made disciples to himself; secondly, from the words, let no man glory in men, for all are yours, whether, Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, ch. 3, 11 & 22."

* So Theophyl. 168. Οὐ τοῦτο ἐγκαλεῖ, διότι λέγουσιν, ἐγώ δὲ Χριστοῦ· ἀλλὰ διότι οὗ τάντας τοῦτο λέγουσί.
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επιστελήν τοῦ μακαρίου Παῦλου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου τι προί
tov úmín en ágkh toú evánggelíou égraphe; et' álheías
pneumatików épésteileν úmín peri autou te kai Kηφᾶ kai
Ἀπόλλων, diá tò kai tóte pροσκλίσεις úmás peποιήθαν:
ἀλλ' ἣ πρόσκλησις ἔκεινη ἕτοι αμαρτίαν úmín προσέπεθεν
προσεκλίθητε γὰρ Ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις, καὶ ἀνδρὶ
dedókimenó̂n pαρ' αὐτοῖς nων kai kατανοῆσαν, tías
úmás diéstrefan. See also Whitby, and especially
Semler, to whose opinion, however, (though adopted
by Rosenm. and others) I cannot assent, namely,
that by Χριστῷ is to be understood a brother of
Christ, meaning James: which is so devoid of all
probability, that it is not worth enlargeing upon.

As to the order in which the names are put, on
this there has been much uncertain speculation. It
is plain that Χριστῷ is put last, for the purpose (as
Theodoret observes) of more strongly shewing the
absurdity of confounding the disciples and the mas-
ter. And this is especially enlarged on in the next
words.

18. The impropriety of this factious spirit is
evincen by two arguments. (Krause.) Or rather
three, according to Crellius.

18. μεμερισταί ὁ Χριστὸς; "are there more Christs
than one; is Christ split into sundry parts. So
Theophyl., Menoch., Tirinus, and the Scholiasts.
This interpretation, however, though supported by
Elsner, seems fanciful and precarious. Others give
the words a metaphorical sense, i. e. "is the mystical
body of Christ, namely his Church, divided." So
Beza, Piscat., and Macknight.—This, however,
seems frigid and inapposite. The best founded in-
terpretation seems to be that of Grot., Simon, Sem-
er, Rosenm., and most recent Commentators, namely,
"is the doctrine of Christ, the Gospel, &c.

The Philologists here compare Polyb. 8, 18. στα-
σάνατες γὰρ πρὸς σφας ἐμερίσθησαν, οἱ μὲν πρὸς Ἀριστα-
ζον, οἱ δὲ πρὸς τὴν λαδίκην. Herodian, 3, 10. ἦτε περὶ
τὰ θεάματα αὐτῶν, ἢ τὰ ἀκρόαματα σπουδὴ φιλονεικὸς
ἐκάστοτε ἐμερίζετο. Heliodor. 7, 4. διεστάτη τὴν δια-
νοίαν, καὶ ἐμερίζετο εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἐκάτερον ἐπιθυμίαν.
13. ἢ εἰς τὸ ἄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθη; "were you bound by baptism to obey the injunctions of Paul?"
For "to be baptized to, or to the name of, any one," is, to be bound, or to bind oneself, by that form, to obey the religious injunctions of such a person, whether of faith or practice. See Matt. 28, 19. (and the note on that passage.) Rom. 6, 3. Gal. 3, 26. compared with Acts 8, 16, See also Mackn. and Locke in loc.
14. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ, &c. This phrase must (I think), with Semler, Crellius, and most recent Commentators, be taken in a popular sense, for: "I exceedingly rejoice:" an idiom not confined to the antient, but found also in most modern, languages. And so it is understood by Chrysost.
The Apostle means to say, that his enemies would thus lose a fair occasion of censuring him, as if desirous of making to himself partisans. It is observed by Chrysost. and Theophyl., that this must not be understood as meant to depreciate baptism, but to lower the conceit of those who were proud of conferring it: τὸ μὲν γαρ ἐβαπτισμόνα μέγα, τὸ δὲ βαπτίζειν οὐ μέγα.
The Crispus here mentioned was the ruler of the Synagogue, of whom we read in Acts 18, 8.; and Gaius, Paul’s host, when he was at Corinth, 16, 29.
15. ἵνα μὴ τις εἰς ἔβαπτισθ. Crellius here, as often, refines too much, when he says that the ἵνα denotes, not the finem sui facti, sed effectum, seu eventum. Nor is he warranted in supposing that Paul neither himself baptized, nor permitted any to be baptized; than which nothing can be more improbable. No views of caution and prudence could justify such an omission.* The plain case is, that

* Burnet, indeed, thinks that the reason why Paul baptized so few was, because baptism was delayed till some considerable time after conversion to Christianity, and that the Apostle did not stay so long in a place as to do it. But, as Doddridge observes, it does
Paul foresaw the possibility of such an aspersion, and took this measure as the best adapted to give no colour to it. See Grot., Theodoret, and Doddru.

16. ἐβάπτισα δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἑρωδίαν οἶκον λατινὸν οὐκ οἶδα—ἐβάπτισα. I assent to Wolf, that by house are here indicated all the family, of every age, sex, and condition; and Wolf and Vitring. Obs. Sac. L. 2, 6. p. 81. rightly maintain from hence the use of infant baptism in the primitive Church. Wolf aptly appeals, in proof, to Ignat. Ep. p. 21. ἀπάγομαι τοὺς οἴκους τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου σὺν γυναικὶ καὶ τέκνοις. On this subject see the masterly Dissertation of Wets. Matt. 28. fin.

Σαρμίνιον οὐκ οἶδα—ἐβάπτισα. This is, as Grot. says, an Epanorthosis prioris dicti. Λατινὸν, further, besides; as Acts 27, 27. Οὐκ οἶδα εί, “I know not whether.” A phrase indicating at least uncertainty, and shewing, Cæcumnon observes, the little interest he took in the matter. Wolf paraphrases; I am unconscious of baptizing any others.” So Semler: “Vix arbitror, dubitovaldé.” And the former thinks the εί does not infer uncertainty, but may be taken for δεί. This, however, seems to be a mere shift, and is here inadmissible; since, when associated with οὐκ οἶδα, εί cannot but imply some degree of uncertainty. Neither is there any reason to explain away such a sense; since, as Doddru. observes, the expression of uncertainty as to such a fact is by no means inconsistent with inspiration, in that view and notion of it which he has stated in his Discourse on that subject, annexed to his Family Expositor. It is observed too, by Whitby, that St. Paul’s inspiration, or Divine assistance, in writing his Epistle, did not reach to an information in such things as these, but only to direct him into all truth he was to teach unto the Churches.*

not appear that baptism in these earliest and purest ages was long delayed; and it is certain that this cause could not take place here, as Paul continued at Corinth eighteen months.

* So Rosenm. “Theoræ convivæ Apostolorum, nunnisi ad religionis doctrinam pertinuit, nec ita est intelligenda, quasi nihil eis memo-
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17. ὁδ' γὰρ ἀπέστειλε—ἐφαγγελίζεσθαι. This is to be understood (like many other expressions) comparati, i.e. "not principally to baptize:" for (as Schoettg. observes) baptism might be administered by others;* but the chief office of the Apostles was εφαγγελίζεσθαι. Now εφαγγελίζεσθαι here, and in many other passages of the New Testament, signifies "to deliver, or teach, the truths of the Gospel."

"The Apostle now (observes Rosenm.) passes to a vindication of his doctrine, and the method he had pursued in communicating it. Up to ch. 2, ver. 2, he treats of the nature of his doctrine, and declares that this he cannot accommodate to the prejudices of men, so as, like Pseudo-Apostles, to keep out of view, or sophisticate what would be cried down by many, and seem to them foolishness. Then chap. 2, 3. seqq. he details the method he had pursued at Corinth in preaching the Gospel."

17. οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, ἀλλ' ἐν λόγῳ σοφίας, οὐ σοφιᾶς, ὁ λόγος σοφος; as in 2, 13. ἐν διδακτοις ἀποφασίσεως σοφίας λόγοις, ὁ λόγος σοφίας, i.e. not what appeared to men learning, acumen, eloquence, &c. For though Rosenm. regards the λόγος as denoting solely the subject, as distinguished from the words; and others understand the oratory, and others again, the philosophical and rhetorical acumen which distinguished the Sophists, yet it seems to refer, more or less, to all of these. It is well paraphrased by Theophyl. εὐγλαστικα, καλλιεργεία.

17. ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. By the

* And these (as Doddridge says) inferiors; this office requiring no extraordinary abilities, and being attended (at least immersion) with some trouble and inconvenience." So Rosenm. "Baptismus per quemlibet impieti poterat, sicut illi a Petro conversi in Pentecoste non omnes ab ipso fuerunt baptizati; at predicatio rei erat maximè digna Apostolis, et maximè cum periculo conjuncta."
"If the Apostles had preached in sōphē λόγου, some would have been led to say that they brought over men by the persuasiveness of their oratory, and not by the power of the person preached: which would be the injury and loss of the crucified Jesus. But preaching with popular simplicity, they shewed that the crucified Jesus had done the whole." Theophylact then proceeds to illustrate the κεν. by the following example. "A Greek asks me concerning some divine truths above my comprehension. If I attempt to prove these from syllogisms and heathen wisdom, I shall shew my weakness; for no reason can prove these. And so this my weakness will appear to be the weakness of the Gospel, and the most important truths of it will appear empty and vain." See also Photius ap. Æcum., who explains κεν. by κατευθυνόμενοι; q. d. "Paul was not sent to teach them philosophy, or rhetoric, or eloquence, but truths of far higher importance, as showing the atonement for sin, or method by which atonement for sin and reconciliation with God could be attained."

The above must be considered as chiefly applicable to the Apostles; for, as Dodd. observes, amidst all the beautiful simplicity which a deep conviction of the Gospel tended to produce, there was room left for the most manly and noble kind of eloquence; which therefore the Christian Preacher should labour to make habitual to him." See Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. cited by Slade, and consult Schoettg. Hor. Heb. and the writers there quoted.

18. ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, "the doctrine of the crucifixon of Christ, and the benefits thence re-dounding to Christians." Τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένους μαρία
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ἐστι. It is rightly remarked by Theodoret, that ἀπολλυμένοις is put for ἀπυστοῦσι; and σαβομένους, for πιστευόντας, that this (says he) ἀπὸ τοῦ τέλους τῆς προφητείας τῆς. So Grot., who observes: "Rem denotat ex effectu;" since those who disbelieve the Gospel, perish. See Joh. 3, 18. Thus in 2 Cor. 2, 15 and 16. men are divided into the σαβομένους and the ἀπολλυμένους. We may, then, paraphrase thus: "to those who disbelieve, and reject the Gospel, and therefore perish, &c., but to those who believe and embrace it, and are thereby saved." And in the same manner the expressions are interpreted by Crellius.

18. μαριὰ ἐστι. "it is to them, it appears to them, folly, foolishness." So Thucyd. 5, 41. τοῖς δὲ Δακε-δαμονίους τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔδοκε μαρία εἶναι τῶν. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) here well remarks, that some unbelievers in Corinth deridingly said: "It is folly to preach a crucified God: for if he had been God, he would not have suffered himself to be crucified. But he who could not escape from death, how can he be raised from the dead?" "Now (continues Theophyl.) it was likely that believers would be extremely indifferent at these perversions. The Apostle, therefore, means to say: Be not surprised: for to those who are perishing, even the means afforded by God for salvation appear to be folly." I can only refer my readers to the admirable illustrations of Chrysost. who commences a most eloquent Homily with the following exquisite passage (p. 266.) Τοῖς κάμπωσι καὶ ψυχοφραγοῦσι καὶ αἰ τροφαὶ αἰ υγιεῖς ἀνθείες, οἱ φίλος καὶ οἱ προσήκουσι ἐπαγχείς καὶ οὐδὲ γνωρίζονται πολλά-κις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔνοχλειν δοκοῦσιν οὕτω δὴ τοῖς τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπολλυμένοις συμβαίνει εἰσόθη τὰ γὰρ πρὸς σωτηρίαν φέροντα ἀγνοεῖσι, καὶ τοὺς κηδομένους αὐτῶν ἔνοχλειν νο-μίζουσι γίνεται δὲ τῶν οὐ παρὰ τὴν τοῦ πράγματος φύσιν ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν ἑκείνων νόσον.

The sense of δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐστι is: "it is God's powerful means of bestowing salvation on men. Theophyl. 171. explains: σοφίαν ἐμφαίνει ὁ σωτήρ."
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δυνάμει, ἃν, δι θανάτῳ θάνατον ἔλυσεν. Περιευσμα γὰρ
dυνάμεος, τὸ, πίστωτα νικῶν' σοφίαν δε, ὅτι τοῦτο τὴ
τρεῖς ἅτομοιας διέσωσε. So Grotius.

19. γέγραπται γὰρ, i.e. "so that what is written
(by Is. 29, 14.) may be here applied." This passage
of Isaiah treats of the false prophets, and evil coun-
sellers of Hezekiah, who seemed to themselves wise.
The words are quoted from the Sept., (See Surenhus.
on Quot. p. 520.), and signify: “I will destroy and
frustrate the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nought
the understanding of the prudent.” Now by the
wise and prudent are here meant those who seem so:
and by ἀπολογεῖσθαι and ἀποδείξω is meant: “I will make
their folly evident.” Ἀδερέω is, I think, properly a
law term, and signifies to abrogate or repeal; and
hence comes to signify in a general way vim et au-
ritatatem adimere. See Schl. Lex. By σοφία is
here meant mere human wisdom, and especially that
sort of erudition in which the Greeks especially
prided themselves. In the parallelism σύνεσιν is syn-
nonymous with σοφίαν. The word, often signifies, in
the Classical writers, what we call clever; as in
Thucyd. 3, 87. and 1, 84. συνετὸς ἄγαν. Theophyl.
well paraphrases ἀπολογεῖται τὴν σοφίαν ἀπὸ
ἀποδείξεως, “shew its inutility, and inability to discover
the mode by which may be attained pardon and
atonement for him, reconciliation with God, and the
blessings springing from it.

20. τοῦ σοφοῦ; τοῦ γραμματεύς; τοῦ σ. τ. α. τ.
These words are also a quotation from Scripture, or,
at least, formed from it. They bear a strong re-
semblance to Is. 38, 18. where there is the same
point in τοῦ—τοῦ. (See Surenhus. p. 522. and Vi-
trings in loc. or Whitby.)

In showing the inefficiency of human wisdom for
the purposes in question, the Apostle is understood
by the best Commentators to strike both at the Gen-
tile and the Jewish wisdom: and first, the former,
by σοφοῦ, which word is well explained by Theophyl.
φιλόσοφος. Now those among the Greeks who ap-
plied themselves to intellectual, especially moral and
ethical, enquiries, were antiently called σοφοὶ, which answers to the Hebr. הימם. Thus the seven wise men were called oi σοφοὶ. Afterwards, however, such enquirers were-called φιλοσοφοί. Yet the above use of σοφῆς may be said never to have been quite laid aside.

The γραμματεὺς is plainly the Jewish ἔφη, which, Grot. observes, in the Hellenistical style, denoted a Civilian and Historian; now in a certain sense, the Jewish scribes were both.

By συνετής Grot. understands "an explorer of the works of nature," Physicus: and he refers to Baruch 3, 23. oi ἐκείνων τὴν σύνεσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. But there the expression is different, and the complexion of the whole passage dissimilar. Besides, ἄλωνος would not have been the term employed, nor would the τὰῦτα have been used. Moreover, the term σοφ. signifies, not an inquirer, but a disputer. The sense, then, is: where is the subtle disputers of this world only, the Sophist, who rests on mere human wisdom?" See the Commentators ap. Pole and Wolf, and especially Fuller, who (in common with Witsius Misc. Sacr.) observes that such an one was called by the Hebrews עזר: and hence the mystical and allegorical Commentators on Scripture were termed עזרים. And so Fessel. Adv. S. 1, 201. and Lightfoot.* These and other learned Rabbinical scholars, however, seem, as usual, to carry the matter too far. Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, with more judgment, refer it chiefly to the Gentile

* And also Schoettgen, who observes that these συνετής, עזר, were persons who deduced from Scripture many allegorical, anaogical, mystical, and caballistic senses, and moreover could hold such subtle disputations concerning the δεινώσεις and παραπαράβολοι decrees and customs. And he adds: "Quibus rebus codem modo sibi placetant, ac temporibus barbaris et obscuris Scholiastici, qui Theologiam et Philosophiam tam subtiliter et acute prospuerunt, ut vix ipsi scirent, quid sibi voluerint. Sed Deus utramque et Judæorum et Scholiasticorum ψευδονομία ἀλλην stultam fecit, ut, quo ante nemo refutare, aut isdem contradicere poterat, postea publicè et sine periculo irriderentur."
subtle disputants and sophists, τῶν λογισμῶν καὶ ἐρε-βων τὰ πάντα ἐπιτρεπόντας. I see no reason why the Apostle may not be thought to have in view the συγκαταλ., both Jewish and Gentile. That the Apostle had the latter in view appears from what follows.

On the force of the ποι ἦς. Commentators are not quite agreed. It is, I think, a popular phrase, and best explained in a popular manner; q. d. "What has he done; what fruits can he show? None." Or, "He is no where; he cannot show his face." See Grot.

20. οὐχὶ ἐμφάνισεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τ. κ. τ. On the sense of these words, the Commentators vainly perplex themselves. (See Pole.) The simple truth is, that God, by promulgating a plan of salvation which no human wisdom could have devised, much less accomplished, has thereby placed in a strong point of view the weakness and inefficiency of mere human wisdom for the purpose of salvation. So Theophyl. 171. ἀνεφέσητον ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν ωσαν ἐδείξε, καὶ ἔδειξε μορφὰν, οἷς μὴ ἰσχύσασαν εὑρεῖν τὸ ἀληθές.

21. ἔπειθε γὰρ ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ, &c. These words, Theophyl. and Crellius observe, shew the cause why God did so; and are exegetical of the preceding. "For since, or after, the world, even the wisest, had failed to attain a knowledge of God, and a method of reconciliation with him."

The expression ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ is of uncertain interpretation. (See Pole) Vorst., Lightf., and Hardy explain: "in theologia sua circa Deum, sapientia, quae Deum habuit, non auctorem, sed objectum." This, however, seems harsh. Schoettg. explains it: "philosophiam quæ divina, Deique donum est." The best Commentators are agreed that there is an opposition between this phrase and the one just after, διὰ τῆς σοφίας. It must, I think, mean "the wisdom of God, as conspicuous in his works, both of nature and revelation." See Grot., Beza, and Wolf, and especially a passage cited from Voss. de Orig. Idol. cited by Wolf, and here referred to by Slade.
21. διὰ τῆς σοφίας. This, as appears from the antithesis, must signify: "by the force of its own wisdom." Σοφία denotes intellectual enquiry of every kind.

21. εἰδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς, "thought good, vouchsafed, decreed;" or "it pleased God." See Luke 12, 23. Gal. 1, 15. Col. 1, 19. Διὰ τῆς μαρίας τοῦ κυρίου μάρτιος, is for διὰ κυρίου μάρτιος μόρον, "by a Gospel which was thought * folly, or foolishness, as being devoid of all that the world called wisdom." This phraseology, which, it must be admitted, partakes of the poetical cast, is found in the Classical writers, though chiefly in the Dramatists. See Vorst. Phil. Sacr. C. 3.

21. σωσαι τοὺς πιστεύοντας, "to place in the way of salvation those that such believe," viz. in the doctrines propounded by this preaching. On the above sense of σωγος I have treated on Matt. 1, 24. From the use of σωσω in the latter part of this sententia bimembri, I cannot but think that a clause is left to be supplied in the former member; namely at τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω, "knew not God, nor the mode of propitiating him, (and consequently must have perished)." See Whitby's excellent annotation.

22. ἐκείνη καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι σημείον αἰτοῦσιν, καὶ Ἑλληνες σοφία ζητοῦσι. The Apostle now shows by what cause, and through what prejudice neither the Jewish nor Gentile wise men believed.

The Jews, it is said, sought a sign.† How so? it

* An example of this figure occurs in Thucyd. 6, 17. Τ. 2, 348, 6. Edit. Bekk. οὐκ ἀπεργότις ἢ ἄνοια, i. e. what you call ἄνοια. So also Soph. Antig. 95. Ἄλλ' ἐξα μὲ καὶ τὴν ἔξ ἐμοῦ δυσβουλίαν. And Οἰ. Ὥ. 397. Ἄλλ' ἐγώ μόλυνον, ὃ μοῦ ἐιδὼν, οἰδίπος ἐκαύσα τοῖς.† Or signs; as some MSS., Versions, and Editions read, which is received by Griesbach; but too rashly, I think. For though the authorities in its favour are strong, yet, as to MSS., the difference is so small that their authority is but slight; and that of the Versions is not quite unexceptionable testimony in such a case. Besides, the common reading is defended by internal evidence, as well as external testimony. For none could reasonably have desired more than one such σημείον.
may be asked. Had they not been favoured with many signs, both exhibited by Christ and the Apostles? True: but not what they properly called σημεῖα, by which they meant signs from heaven; as in Mark 8, 11. (where see the note.) There were probably those who desired some such sign as their deliverance from the Roman yoke, by an interposition similar to that whereby the host of Pharaoh was suddenly drowned in the Red Sea; or that of Sennacherib’s army, destroyed in one night: or some such as that of bread being given them from heaven; the Sun standing still, &c. How prone the Jews were, in all ages, to ask for such signs, sacred history assures us, and the Rabbinical writings confirm this. See Schoettg. Hor. Hebr. and also Doddridge.

*Ελληνες σοφίαν ἔγγραψαν. The Apostle here excellently sketches the characteristics of the Jews, and the Gentiles. The Jews seek a sign, and that such an one as shall be agreeable to their wishes, and agreeable to their gross conceptions. The more rational Greeks do not so much ask for miracles as require wisdom, but it must be that of their own kind, or (as Hardy, from Grot. and the early Commentators, explains) human wisdom, philosophical reason,* set off by the figmenta oratoria; they wish whatever is said to be deduced and proved from natural principles; and whatever cannot be proved or comprehended by reason, as a mystery of faith, they would explode. Thus in both cases, each wishes and calls for that on which his heart is set, which he has been accustomed to, and therefore demands.

The Apostle then subjoins: Ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν, &c., in which sentence there is a short clause left to be supplied. Grotius subauds the following: “Non rationes adferimus, sed testimonium de re conspectâ.” And Doddridge: “Unmindful of all unreasonable and petulant demands.” It seems, too, that the

* So Chrysost. *Ελληνες ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἡμᾶς ηθορείαν λόγων καὶ διενόητα σοφισμάτων.
words σκάνδαλον and μαρτίον, though put in apposition with Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, require to be expressed thus: "Though it be to the Jews a stumbling block, (as contrary to all their secular expectations,) and to the Greeks foolishness, as not resting mainly on the principles of reason:" or, as Grotius phrases it, "Insipidum illis videbatur nihil adferri de rerum principiis, de finibus, de animi natura: quæ elementa sunt apud Græcos sapientiae moralis."

24. αὐτοῖς δὲ καθοίς Ἡ. τ. κ."Ε., "but (we preach) to those who are called (and obey the call), whether Jews or Gentiles." (See Grot. and Vorst.) Θεοὶ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν. These words ought, I think, to be taken as put in apposition with the preceding Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, and signify: "Which doctrine of Christ’s crucifixion, and those which depend upon it, are, i. e. carry with them, an illustration of the power and wisdom of God." There is here, Grotius observes, a metalepsis; since by Christ God shewed both his power to convert men (see Rom. 1, 16.), and his wisdom, treated of in Rom. 11, 33." And he refers to 2, 7. and Isa. 53, 11. Many Commentators are of opinion that the power of God is spoken of with reference to the Jews; and the wisdom of God, with reference to the Gentiles. In which view Doddridge paraphrases: "To the converted Jews his mission is confirmed by miraculous evidence, and the accomplishment of prophecies far more important than any event which their carnal brethren expect; and the believing Gentile finds it infinitely fuller of Divine wisdom and goodness to a lost world, than any system of philosophy that was ever invented." But the paraphrase of Whitby is closer, and more faithful. Rosenm. refers the δύναμιν and σοφία to the καθοί, or Christians generally; observing: "Nam veri Christiani experientur vim illam divinam emendandi animum, quæ inest huic salutari doctrinæ. Experiuntur etiam sapientissimè egisse Deum in eo, quod non per Philosophiam, sed
per talem doctrinam, simplicem et planam, omnium huminum captivi accommodatum, ad salutem perduere velit humanum genus." This explanation, however, of the former member is too limited.

Wetstein here cites Aristid. p. 16. σχεδον γὰρ δύναμιν τοῦ Δίας εἶναι λέγων τις αὐτῇ ἐκ τούτων, ὅπι ἐν ἀμαρτίαις.

25. ὅτι τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφότερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ. This sentence (which is obscure from its extreme brevity) is meant to meet a tacit objection, and give a reason for the preceding position. The sentiment intended to be expressed is this: "Most wise are all the counsels and plans of God, though they may seem to men foolish." (Crellius, Krause, and Rosenm.)

To advert to the phraseology, which is popular, τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ is for τῇ μαρτίῳ τ. Θ.; and after σοφότερον must be supplied τοῦ σοφοῦ, taken from that word. Of this brevity, which is often adopted to avoid tautology, Grotius adduces an example from Pliny. Here, too, as Sclater says, there is a concessio ironica; the words being spoken after the opinion of men. The passage is thus paraphrased by Rosenm. Most efficacious are the means which God uses, to bring about the best ends; even though they appear weak and insignificant."

Again in the ἀσθένει τοῦ Θεοῦ, as Grotius remarks, there is signified comparare what is weak in power: and at ἱσχυρότερον must be supplied τοῦ ἱσχυροῦ. The Apostle has reference to what was said at ver. 21. Here the sense is obvious. See the Paraphrases. Grotius compares a similar sentiment in 1 Kings 12, 10. and Wetstein one from Plato.

26. βλέπετε γὰρ, &c. In order to prove what he had said, that few in the Church were wise according to the flesh, the Apostle appeals to the examples of the Christians themselves. Τὰ γὰρ therefore refers to 6, 23. (Crel.)

"Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλησιν ὑμῶν, " for ye see the mode
of your calling* or the situation of those who have embraced the Christian religion. "Οτι, "namely that." By σοφωι κατα σάρκα are meant those who had the wisdom of the flesh, the body, mere human and not divinely revealed, wisdom of this world only.

Днвατοι, ενγενείς, powerful, noble. Here must be supplied κέκληται from the context, namely κλησιν preceding.† "It might (observes Rosenm.) have seemed that the Christian religion could not have risen without the aid of the learned, the powerful, and the noble: but the event shewed that God does not need the assistance of men." This indeed seems to have been the Apostle’s own reflection.

On the fact in question, that almost all the Christians were of the poorer and labouring classes, Grot. has the following beautiful remark, “Not that the Gospel rejects persons of any sort; but that the less burdened more easily tread the narrow and steep path.” (See Matt. 5, 3. and 19, 25. and the notes there. See also Lactant. 7, 1.)

27. ἀλλὰ τὰ μαρά τῶν κόσμων ἐγελεξατω. By ἐγελεξατω must be meant “placed in a state of salvation;” synonymous with the calling just before mentioned. A use of the word which requires us to advert to the genius of Hebrew phraseology, and which is well stated by Schl. Lex. 1, 765. He notices τα in the sense love, approve, and benefit: and adds, that “as the Christian religion may well be reckoned among the greatest benefits of God, and a striking indication of the benevolence of the Deity, so ἐγελεξατω is, in the New Testament, ascribed κατ’ ἐξοχήν to God, inasmuch as he, of his own benevolent will, not only offers to men this saving Religion, and destines it for them, but really confers it upon them.

* Κλησις, it must be observed, includes the assent and acceptance.

† Which seems far preferable to the mode adopted by Slade, who supplies εἰσιν, or ἐκλεξει, from ἐγελεξατω in the following verse. As to Macknight’s manner of filling the ellipsis, it is quite inadmissible.
And thus the term here simply denotes the being brought to the Christian religion.”

Τὰ μαρὰ and τὰ ἀσθενῆ are neuters for masculines, according to the frequent usage both of the Scriptural and Classical writers. Nor is there any occasion, with Mackn., to supply πρόσωπα, nor, with Calvin and Hardy, to consider the positive as here put for the superlative; still less with Grot. and most modern Commentators, to take κόσμοι for κόσμῳ, in the sense, “those who appeared so to the world:” which is too harsh, and not agreeable to the next verse. I prefer with the Vulg., Pagninus, Beza, and Piscat., to regard it as equivalent to “in the world.” The word seems to have been added chiefly for the sake of perspicuity.

27. ἵνα τοὺς σοφοὺς κατασχύνῃ, i. e. “to put them to shame, by showing that what they could not effect by their wisdom, had been accomplished by what they accounted foolishness.” So Theophyl. 174 (from Chrysost.) Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ μεγίστη αἰσχύνη τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐστα ἰσαυρίτης ἔτι τῆς ἀγορᾶς χειροτέχνην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶς φιλοσοφοῦντα, καὶ τὸν ἀσθενῆ καὶ ἐνκαταφρόνητον τοὺς ἐν δυναστείᾳ καὶ πλούτῳ ταπεινοῦντα.

With respect to the τὰ ἀσθενῆ and the τὰ ἰσχυρά, the former term, it may be observed, was applicable to the Apostles in all respects, both in birth, station, and acquirements of every kind; and the latter, equally so to the Gentile philosophers.

28. καὶ τὰ ἁγιατνὶ τοῦ κόσμου, ignoble: as opposed to the ἐγνευὴ. By the ἐξωθεμένα are meant those that were made nought of, most contemptible. The term is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament; and in the Sept. it answers to the Hebr. ἁπάν, which is sometimes rendered ἀποδοκιμαζέων.

28. καὶ τὰ μηδένα, ἵνα τὰ ἔντα καταργήσῃ. The Apostle adds another link to the chain of antithesis, by an expression which partakes of the hyperbole, or Oxymoron, but is not unfrequent in good writers.*

* Of the examples adduced by Elsner and Wetstein, the following are the most opposite. Eurip. Troad. 608. ἵπποι τὰ τῶν θεῶν,
Kata

p a y. is here, as often, to be understood logice, i. e. in the sense, "to cause men to see that those persons are nobodies, of no esteem."

2). ὑπὸς μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σάρξ ἐ. α. There is here a strong Hebraism. For, as Grotius and Rosenm. remark, "μὴ πᾶσα Ηβραῖς universaliter negant." And σάρξ answers to ὄργα, and signifies man. (See the examples in Schl. Lex. Vet. et Nov. Test.) Ἐν αὐτῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ is another Hebraism, and is well explained by Grotius, "ubi cum Deo res est." Theophyl. 174. paraphrases the whole verse thus: Διὰ τοῦτο ταύτα πεποίηκεν ὁ Θεὸς, ἵνα καταστείλῃ τὸν τύφον καὶ τὴν ἀλαζονείαν τῶν τα τοῦ κόσμου φρονούντων, καὶ πεισθῇ πάντα αὐτῶ ἀνατιθέναι καὶ μὴ καυχάσθαι ἐν αὐτῶν αὐτὸν. 30. εἰς αὐτὸν δὲ ὅραει ἐστε, &c. The Apostle here places Christians in opposition to those who have been decorated with these carnal qualifications; and he shows that they ought, contrary to the usual custom, to hold all their dignity as from God, and refer it solely to him. (Crepellus.)

At εἰς αὐτὸν must be understood μόνου. The words are to be taken emphatically; q. d. "from him alone, and not from men." Ἐστε ἐν Χ. Ι., "ye are become Christians." The same phrase (which savours of Hebraism) occurs in Rom. 8. 1.

30. δὲ ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν σοφία, &c. In these words (which are of no very easy explanation) we must especially attend to the force of the Hebrew and Hellenistic idiom. There is throughout the sentence a metonymy of the effect for the cause; and we have also ὡς τὰ μὲν πυργοῦ ἄνω τῷ μηδὲν ὄντα, τὰ δὲ δοκοῦντ' ἀπώλεσαν. And Hercul. fur. 314. εἰ μὲν σθενάντων τῶν ἐμὸν βραχίων ἦν τις ὑβρίζων, ἢδεις ἐκαίσατ' ἄν' Νῦν δ' οὐδὲν ἔμενεν. Joseph. Ant. 1. 13, 2. Θεὸς—ὅτα ἰεροῦ καὶ τῶν οὐκ ὄντων εἰς εὐσποράν ἀρθρώσω παραγαγεῖν, καὶ τὰ ὄντα τῶν ἐκ αὐτῶν ἀρθρώσων ἀφέλεσθαι. Stobæus, S. 38. τοῖς οὖσαν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ εἰς διὸς φθονεῖ, οὐκ ἐκ σεμνὰ πάντα ἐκεῖσθαι φθονον. Loeener, too, adduces examples from Philo, and refers to Broukh. on Tibull. 1. 5, 30., Moll. on Long. p. 76, and Valckm. on Eurip. Phoen. I add, Philostr. V. Ap. 8, 7. p. 331. τὰ γάρ οὐκ ὄντα, εἶναι (ποιεῖ), καὶ τὰ ὄντα ἀπεστείλαν. VOL. VI.
the abstract for the concrete. The sense, then, is:

"who was made by God the means of wisdom* being imparted to us; since by him and his doctrine alone are we enabled to contemplate God and his arcana, which even the most acute human enquirers could never have imagined."

This idiom is not altogether Hellenistical. Thus Wetstein cites from Sueton. Vit. 15. Quibusdam acclamantibus ipsum esse concordiam. And farther on: L. Antonius III. vir et Cn. Pompeius appellati sunt Pietas in numis. Terent. Adelph. 8, 3, 40. Tu quantus quantus nil nisi sapientia es. See other examples from Ælian, Soph., and Eurip., cited by Homberg, Parerg. Sacr. ad Marc. 13, 19.

30. δικαιοσύνης τε καὶ ἁγίασμός, "the cause of our justification, and the author and promoter of our sanctification, both by imparting pure doctrine, by the example of his own holy life, and especially by procuring for us the assistance of the Holy Spirit." In Rom. 6, 19, the word ἁγίασις used merely for δικαιοσύνης. Καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις, "the cause of our redemption, of the remission of our sins."

The above, which is founded on the best modern Commentators, appears to be the true construction and sense of the verse, and is confirmed by the authority of the Greek Commentators,† and also of the Rabbinical writers. See Schoettg. H. H.

* Namely, (as Rosenm. remarks,) true wisdom, and such as is worthy of the name.

† Thus Theophyl. 174. paraphrases. Τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐγένεσθε, καὶ ἔξω τοῦ έστε. Then he explains ὅς ἐγενήθη σοφία, &c. by σοφόν ἡμᾶς καὶ δικαίους καὶ ἁγίους καὶ ἐλευθέρους εἰρηγάσατο. The Apostle, he thinks, used the idiom to show the τὸ δάπεδο τῆς δωρᾶς. Finally, he notices the order in which these benefits are mentioned (p. 175. med.) Πρῶτον σοφόν ἐποίησεν, ἀπαλλάξας τῆς πλάνης, καὶ θεογνωσίαν διδάξας καὶ τὸν δικαίος, τὸν δικαίον τὴν ἁρεσίν διωρησάμενον εἴσα καὶ ἁγίασας διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Καὶ οὐτω τελείαν ἀπαλλάξας τῶν τῶν κακῶν χαρισμένος καὶ ἐλευθερώσας, ὥστε αὐτοῦ μόνον εἶναι ἡμᾶς, καὶ αὐτόν ἀνακεισάται.

I must not, however, omit to advert to a new construction and interpretation which was first propounded by Bos, Obs. N. T. p. 11. and afterwards adopted and supported by Noesselt and Krause.
1 CORINTHIANS, CHAP. I.

31. καθὼς γέγραται ὁ καυχόμενος, ἐν Κυρίῳ καυχάσθαι. The sense of this elliptical expression seems to be: "So that (to use the words of Scripture) he that boasteth," &c. Or, as Grotius, Hardy, and others, render, "ut flat quod scriptum est." Jaspis would supply οὕτω γένηται καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν before καθὼς, in nearly the same sense. But that ellipsis is too arbitrary to be admitted.

This is a reference to Jer. 9, 23 & 29., in which the sense rather than the words is expressed. (See Venema and Blayney in loc., and compare the Sept.) The sense is. "He who would worthily extol his dignity or felicity, let him refer all of which he boasts to God, who bestoweth all these endowments by and through Christ." It is plain from the passage of Jer. that by Κυρίῳ we are here to understand Jehovah, God. The verse is thus paraphrased by Theophyl. 175. Πάντα ταῦτα γέγονεν, ἵνα μηδεὶς ἐαυτὸν εἶναι τοῦ νομοῦ, μηδὲ ἐφ' ἐαυτῷ καυχάται. ή ἐπ' ἄλλῳ τινι, ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ τοσοῦτο χρισμαμένῳ. Ποὺς οὖν ἡμεῖς φυσιασάμεθα καὶ ἐφ' ἐαυτὸς καὶ ἐπὶ ἄνθρωποις διδασκάλους; See the admirable illustration of Chrysostom.

They put the words δι' ἐγερθῆ ὑμῖν σοφία—Θεοῦ in a parenthesis. And thus δικαιωθήνῃ, &c. will be referred to ἡμεῖς ἐστε, and be taken for δικαιώθηκες, &c.; and ἐν Χριστῷ will be for διὰ Χ., "per Jesum Christum." This construction the above Commentators say is supported by the context from ver. 26., and by a similar passage at 6, 11. ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐδικαιώθηκες ἐν ἀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, and finally by the usual loquendi of the Apostle, in which abstracts are often used for concretes; as ἡ περισσεῦσα for οἱ περιστερημένοι. But the common construction is, at least, as agreeable to the context as this. As to the passage adduced, it is not in point; and the use of abstracts for concretes is limited to certain words, and no instance can be shown of any such catachresis as the construction in question would involve, and which is, I think, totally indefensible. Nay even the daring and innovating Griesbach rejects it. As to the sense, it is nearly the same.
CHAP. II.

“Quatuor sunt istius capitis partes. In primâ ostendit, se inter Corinthios nonuisse usum excellentia sermonis, nec sapientiam mundanam illis annunciasse, quemadmodum superius docuit fieri debere, et sic thesin applicat ad hypothesin. In alterâ per occupationem quandam docet, se nihilominus summam sapientiam prædicare. In tertiâ similiter per occupationem quandam ostendit, unde sapientiam istam, quam occultam vocaverat, ipse et alii sui similes hauserint, et qui fiat ut simplici oratone utatur. In quartâ causam affert, cur quibusdam evangelica predicatio minime arrideat.” (Crellius.)

The Apostle proceeds with the subject he had commenced at 1, 17., namely, that the testimony is to be delivered in simple language, and there is no need of eloquence and subtle reasoning, which rather makes the witness suspicious. 1, 6. (Wets.)

The connection is variously traced. In this Whitby has, I think, been more successful than Doddridge; and his mode of interpretation is supported by Crellius, Wetzstein, and others. Yet the following one brought forward by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and others, deserves attention. “And not only have the disciples of the Gospel been chosen from among men of no wisdom or high birth, but I also, the preacher of the Gospel, did not come to you with prepared words and human wisdom,” &c.

Verse 1. καὶ ἔλθαν — καταγγέλλαν ὑμῖν. &c. Krause and Rosenm. would conjoin ἔλθαν with καταγγέλλαν. Which, however, seems to confuse rather than to clear the construction, and is contrary to that view of it which has been taken by Chrysostom. The sense is: “Thus when I came to you (to Corinth), I came not preaching καθ’ ὑπεροχὴν λόγου, for ἐν ὑπεροχῇ.

Rosenm. interprets the λόγου of the doctrina ipsa, ex argumento suo spectata, i. e. sublimity of doctrine: and he takes ὑπεροχὴν σοφίας to denote erudition, especially philosophical, which was by the Corinthians thought the only true wisdom. (See Dodd.)

1. τῷ μαθητῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. There is here a var. lect. which merits some attention. Several excellent MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, read μουση-ρίου, which is preferred by Locke, Pearce, and others; and indeed it is somewhat confirmed by ver. 7. and the word is often used by the Apostle; but for this
very reason, and considering how similar the two words are in MS. letters, I cannot but suspect that it arose from accident. It might, too, be introduced from *emendation*; for it seems to yield a stronger sense. It is, however, unnecessary. Μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which is a periphrasis for the *Gospel*, the *Christian doctrine*, is sufficiently apt; and is supported by other passages of the New Testament; as 1 Cor. 1, 6. τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2 Tim. 1, 8. τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Κυρίου. Schleus., too (I perceive) regards μυστήριον as a gloss: and he refers the origin of this signification to the Hebrew, in which יֵדַע and יְדַע is often used both of the Divine laws and of the Jewish doctrine; as 2 Kings 11, 12. Ps. 132, 12. Is. 8, 20.

2. οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα τοῦ εἰδέναι—ἐσταυρωμένον. Since a principal part of the Apostolic office consisted in preaching the doctrine and the saving death of Christ, hence St. Paul says it was his grand object to fulfil this duty: that the praise of other things was indifferent to him, nor had he come forward with, or made any show to the Corinthians of philosophical science, or the arts of oratory and eloquence. (Krause.)

2. οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα τοῦ εἰδέναι, i.e. either, "I thought it not worth while to know" (as it is understood by Theophyl., Erasmus, and Justin), or, "I determined not to know:" but the latter interpretation is the more suitable to what follows. Krause refers to 5, 3. 7, 35. Acts 20, 16. 27, 1. Rom. 14, 18. 2 Cor. 2, 2. Tit. 3, 12. Polyb. 4, 66.

In οὐκ εἰδέναι there is an idiomatical, and, as I suspect, a *popular* form of expression. On the sense of the words Commentators are not agreed. The best founded opinion seems to be that they signify: "I resolved to profess or show no knowledge, but to so carry myself as to seem to know nothing but," &c. And so Sclater, Estius, Menoch., Teren., Wolf, Calsaub, Rosenm., Krause, and Justinian (cited by Pole), which last Commentator compares the Latin,
"Nescias quod scis, si sapis," i.e. vide ne cuiquam dixeris, ita te gere ac si prorsus nescires.*

Rosenm. observes that the Apostle purposely abstained from exhibiting the vast stores of knowledge and erudition which he undoubtedly possessed. The reason is stated at 3, 1. seqq., namely, that the Corinthians were yet ἐφαρμοσμένοι, tiros, who could not comprehend higher doctrines, as is rightly remarked by Orig. c. Cels. p. 101.

At Ἰησοῦν Χ. καὶ τῶν ἐσταυρωμένων, the καὶ has, I think, the sense of praesertim; and the expression signifies, "to preach and commemorate the whole history of Jesus Christ, his origin, birth, life, doctrine, and especially his death and the important doctrines connected with it." (Compare 15, 1—4.) Which is always the sense of the formula. Thus to preach Christ is of yet more comprehensive signification.

Griesbach omits the τῶι: which, Mr. Slade thinks, makes the construction clear. Yet the other is a common Scriptural idiom, and I suspect the τῶι was thrown out ex emendatione.

3. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ ἐν φόβῳ — υμᾶς. Thus far the Apostle has spoken of the subject of his teaching, and has averred that he preached not to them human wisdom. He now proceeds to instruct them concerning the method which at Corinth he had pursued in the promulgation of the divine doctrine, and the communicating it to his hearers. (Rosenm.) Thus these words would seem to be illustrative of the preceding.

* Wets. also compares the two following Classical passages. Ariost. Epict. 2, 1. δόξαν δὲ μηδείς εἶναι, καὶ εἰδέκα μηδὲν μόνον τούτου φαίνειν, τῶι μὴ ἀποτέλεσθαι τότε, μήτε περιπέτειαν ἀλλοι μελέτωσιν δίκαι, ἀλλοι προβλήματα ἄλλοι συλλογισμοῖς συν ἀποθέσεις, σὺ δεδέσθαι, σὺ στρεφλοῦσαι, σὺ ἐξορίζεσαι & 18. εἰ προκάλεται θέλεις, ὑπομείνων ἄκεκτοι τῶι ἄνω δόξαι καὶ πλῆθος μηδὲν βοῶν δοκεῖν ἐπιστῆσαι, εἰν δόξας τοῖν εἶναι τις, ἀπιστεῖν σέπερ. The former of these passages is so similar, both in sentiment and phraseology, that I cannot but suspect the Philosopher (who, as I have on other occasions observed, appears to have read the New Testament) had this passage of St. Paul in view.
3. ἐγενόμην πεθαίνων ὑπάρχον. Rosenm. renders: "I carried myself among you as weak (unlearned) and very modest." Or ἄσθος may, he thinks, denote timidity. The following words φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ, he maintains, must mean modesty and bashfulness. Yet they are otherwise explained by Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators. (See Chrys. and Theophyl.) Storr refers the ἄσθος to Paul's imbecility of body, mentioned at 2 Cor. 10, 10., i.e. a thin weak voice, and a hesitation in pronunciation. Yet the ἄσθος may refer also to the extreme smallness of stature, stooping, &c., which are ascribed to the Apostle. And of this opinion is Schoettg. Indeed it is not improbable that the ἄσθενεια here, and the ἄσθενες in 2 Cor. 10, 10. refer to the same infirmities or disadvantages as the thorn in the flesh mentioned at 2 Cor. 12, 7. Then ἐν ἄσθενεια will refer to the fear justly excited by his persecutors, and the ἐν φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ, to his modesty and bashfulness.* After all, however, I grant that there is much to be said in defence of other interpretations, and it is very difficult to exactly determine the Apostle's meaning.

4. καὶ ὁ λόγος - δυνάμεως. The Apostle adds that the mode of bringing forward the doctrine delivered by him, was not guided by the precepts of human art. (Rosenm.)

In λόγος and κύριονμα there is, I think, an hendiadis. So Teren., Estius, and Menoch., who render: "oratio quâ utebar in praedicando Evangelio."

4. οὐκ ἐν πειθῶ καθαρκτίας σοφίας λόγοις, "not in the persuasive words of human wisdom." Rosenm. refers the λόγοις σοφίας to choice, collection, and connection in composition, or to oratorical elocution. Πειθῶς, if it be genuine, is a word of the same form with φειδὼς and μυθ. It is, however, so unusual (or rather occurs no where else), that many conjectures

* To which purpose Wets. compares 4, 10. 2 Cor. 11, 6 & 3. 13, 4 & 9., and says it is there opposed to the arrogance of a false Apostle. And so Mr. Locke.
have been hazarded, the most probable of which is, πιθοῦς for πιθανοῖς, from a MS. abbreviation. But this is precarious. As to the common reading, if the form can be proved to be analogical, no exception ought to be taken at the rarity of the word. Now this has been done by Salmas, and Kypke. So that if the MSS. agreed on the reading, no reasonable doubt could be entertained of its genuineness. But there is such a farrago of Var. Lect. as cannot but lead one to suspect a corruption. (See Wets. and Griesb.) Into a question merely critical I cannot enter at large, and I will only observe, that as ἀνθρωπίνης is omitted in very many MSS., it may be suspected to come from the margin; and as the reading πειθοὶ is supported by some MSS. and also by Euseb., Zonaras, and others, I think (with Wets., Semler, Schleus., and Krause), that it ought to be adopted.* But I cannot agree with them in cancelling λόγοις. It may be sufficient to point thus: ἐν πειθοὶ σοφίας, λόγοις, or read ἐν πειθοὶ σοφίας λόγον. At all events, the sense of the Apostle is clear.

Here Krause compares a similar sentiment of Max. Tyr. Diss. 15. p. 148. Οὐ κατὰ τοὺς τῶν πολλῶν λογισμοὺς· ἀποχὴ πρὸς ἐπαινῶν λόγου, γλαυτὰ ἐστοχοῖς· ἡ ἐνομία τῶν δρόμων, ἡ βίβλιον Αττικὴ· ἡ περιοδοῦ εὐκαμ- πεῖα, ἡ ἀμοινία ὑγρα· ταῦτα ἐὰν πάντα κατὰ τῶν ἐν διονύσων ποιήσης, ἐπιφύλαξει καὶ σταμάτησα, χειλιδίων μουσεῖα, λαβέν ἒ τε τεχνῆς.

4. ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀποδεῖξει πνεύματος καὶ δυναμεῶς. Most recent Commentators explain away the force of these words, which (notwithstanding what they say) must be referred to the operations of the Holy Spirit,

* Nothing is easier than to see the origin of the error. The σ (as in a thousand other instances) was generated by the σ following. The examples adduced by Wets. sufficiently prove the correctness of the phrase; yet none of them have λόγῳ in the genitive, but only as a separate noun, by a sort of hendiadis. The most apposite example is Heracl. Pont. ἡ διὰ τοῦ λόγου πειθῳ. Wets., indeed, observes that Plato, Ep. 6. distinguishes the σοφίαν τῆν ἀνθρωπίνην and the ἀναγκαῖαν. This, however, is but slight evidence in support of the common reading.
as shown both in the prophecies of the Old Testament, and in the Apostles. The δυναμ., too, must refer to the working of miracles. And this is established by the next verse, and is confirmed by the authority of the Fathers and ancient Commentators, and all the earlier modern ones.

5. Ἰνα ἔστις ὑμῶν μη ἦ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων, ἡ ἡ δ. Θ. The sense of these words is apparent from that of the preceding. The Ἰνα is by some thought to have the eventual sense; the thing being, as Rosenm. says, a consequence of the preceding.

6. σοφίαν δε λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις. Here we have the second head of the Chapter (see the Introd.), in which Paul shows that if human wisdom be wanting to his preaching, it is not devoid of true and solid, even divine, wisdom.

Ἀλαλοῦμεν, "we do speak, we have to speak wisdom, but it is among the τελείου, or auditors far advanced in spiritual knowledge, not the σαρκικοί or φησιοί, but the πνευμάτικοι. (See 3, 1. and Heb. 5, 14. 6, 1.) This interpretation is supported by the most eminent modern Commentators. (See Whitby.) It is observed by Schleus., that at 1 Paral. 25, 8. Sept. the οἱ μαθήματεσ are opposed τοῖς τελείοις, where the Vulg. renders the former indicost; the latter, doctos. Rosenm., however, thinks that the τελείοι may mean Christians generally, as opposed to Heathens and Jews. And this interpretation, he thinks, is supported by the following words, in which σοφία is commended, and is proposed not to the further advanced only, but to all Christians, though unknown to others who are not Christians."

6. σοφίαν δε οὐ τῶν αἰώνος τούτου. "Here (observes Rosenm.) the Apostle proceeds to show the great difference between Christian wisdom and that of the Greeks and Jews." The sense is: "But we do not speak the wisdom of this age;" q. d. this enlightened age, an age which boasted of its progress in philosophy.
6. οὖς τῶν ἄρχων τῶν αἰώνων τούτων. This is thought, by Semler and Rosenm., to have reference to the Jewish rulers; as appears, they think, from ver. 8. That, however, is not quite decisive. The Greek Commentators refer it to principal and influential persons among the Heathens, in station or talents. I see no reason why we may not refer it to both. Certain it is the term καταφρομένους is as applicable to one as to the other: though in a somewhat different sense. Schleusner renders it: “qui tamen in hac re nihil valent, nullius pretii sunt.”

7. ἀλλὰ καλοῖς ὑποίπτυμον Θεόν ἐν μυστηρίῳ. Krause here compares Ephes. 3, 8, 6, 19 & 20. Col. 1, 26 & 27. 2, 1—8. 3, 4. Of this sentence the phraseology is elliptical and popular. Commentators in general either supply τότε εὐθαν (which seems the more correct mode), or, with Grot., regard the words as put, by an inverse phrase, for τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην ἐν μυστηρίῳ. So Ephes. 3, 9. μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, “known to God alone.” See also 15, 15. Sir. 22, 22. 2 Macc. 15, 21. By ἀποκεκρυμμένη is meant σατιγμένη, Rom. 16, 15.

The Apostle has here especially in view the all-wise counsel of God for the salvation of men by Jesus Christ, in the writings of the Old Testament only obscurely signified, and to the generality of men utterly unknown. Col. 1, 26. Eph. 1, 9. 10, 3, 5, 9. (Krause and Rosenm.) (See more in Mackn.)

7. ἦν προοίμισεν ὁ Θεός πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων. Here we must subaudâ ἀποκαλύπτειν. The sense, then, is: “which God, from everlasting, had planned and purposed to reveal.” The πρὸ in προοίμισεν is thought to be pleonastic; but it has, at least, an intensive force; and indeed it seems to be closely connected with the notion of planning, deliberating, &c. Theophyl. says the term is employed to show the love of God: since those are especially supposed to love us who have been for a long time making preparations to benefit us.” The phrase πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων is formed
on the Hebrew מַעֲלֶה, and is synonymous with πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

7. εἰς δὲ ἐκάθεν ἡμῶν. The preposition here indicates end, purpose; and δὲ is to be taken metaphorically in the sense salvation, happiness, &c. So Theophyl.: καθ’ θεοσοφοῦς ἡμᾶς τούτης ἐποίησε Δέξα γὰρ δοῦλου το κοινωνῆσαι τῷ δεσπότῃ ἀποκρύφου μυστηρίου. And so Whitby and Doddridge. Rosenm. explains: "nos enim Deus habuit dignos, quos donis supra omnes prophetas ornaret." And in nearly the same manner it is interpreted by Mackn. Mr. Slade determines, though cautiously, the former sense to be requisite, but thinks the latter need not be excluded.

8. οὐδὲς τῶν ἀρχάντων τ. α. τ. ἔγνωσεν. By the rulers must (as almost all ancient and modern Commentators agree) be understood the Jewish rulers. Their ignorance arose from their not comprehending the prophecies: and this their bitterness against Christ was engendered by his supposed disaffection to the Mosaic law. Εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, "if they had known that wisdom, those wise counsels of God revealed, though somewhat obscurely, in the prophets," &c. (Rosenm.) Theophyl. well supplies after ἔγνωσαν the words τῶν ἀποκρύμενων δέξασον καὶ τῆς θείας ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια; as, for instance, he adds, the incarnation, the crucifixion, the calling and admission of the Gentiles, the subjects of regeneration, adoption, inheritance of heaven, and all other doctrines revealed to the Apostles by the Holy Spirit."

By ἔγνωσαν we may, I think, understand thorough knowledge and conviction. For they could not but have had, at times, a sort of impression that Jesus was the Messiah. And be it remembered that such ignorance as theirs could claim no excuse. If they had not a full knowledge, it was their own fault; since they blinded their own eyes, and hardened their own hearts. (See Grot.)

8. αὐξ ἄντι τῶν Κύριων τῆς δέξεως ἐπεταίρωσαν, i. e. "procured his crucifixion by their instigations." So far
as the term ἀρχιερεῖς includes Pilate and Herod, it
must be modified. (Grot. & Rosenm.) The expres-
sion τῶν Κυρ. τῆς δόξης (on which the older Com-
mentators vainly perplex themselves and their readers)
is plainly a Hebraism, and signifies "the glorious
Lord," or "the Messiah." It is rightly supposed by
Grot. to be taken from that of "the King of glory"
in Ps. 24, 9. See the opinions of the Fathers, stated
by Suic. Thes. 2, 195.

9. ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· "Α ὕπαλημος, &c. The
sense of this formula is here, as in most other places,
"but, to apply the words of Scripture." The words
which follow are nowhere found in the Old Testa-
ment totidem verbis. Some of them occur in Is.
64, 3. 65, 17.: and, as the words are not a regular
quotation, that is sufficient. It was ill-judged in
Origen, Jerome, and others of the ancients, to sup-
pose that they existed in the lost apocryphal books
of Elijah. That would be inconsistent with the true
force of the καθὼς γέγραπται, which is only applied to
the Canonical books of Scripture. On the same
grounds must the opinion of Grot. be rejected, who
thinks that the Apostle rests on some tradition re-
ceived from the Jewish Rabbies. This is surely
ascribing far too much authority to such composi-
tions, useful as they may be in the illustration of
the sense of Scripture. The most unexceptionable
opinion is, that the Apostle here, as often, accom-
modates the words of the Prophet to his purpose.
In which case care must be taken how we apply
either the Heb. or Sept. to the interpretation of the
passage of the New Testament so accommodated.
Nor are we bound to conform exactly to the same
subject; for accommodation implies change. Here,
however, change is not necessary: and therefore Wolf
and Schoettgen, not without reason, object to the
common interpretation, which refers the subject of
these words to the happiness of a future state. The
best Interpreters, as Chrys., Theophil., &c., and, of
the moderns, Surenhus, Vitringa, Wolf, and others,
have rightly maintained that the words relate to the beatitude of the times of the Old Testament, and the mysteries of it, and are applied by the Apostle to the doctrines of the Gospel, and the benefits thereby conferred on us. As to the words ἄφθαλμος ωκ εἰδε, &c,. their sense is plainly: "such things as were unseen and unknown, unheard of, nay of which the mind of man had never formed any conception."

By ητοίμασεν is meant "has held in reserve:' and ἀγαρ. here includes the notions of worshipping and obeying. Thus our Saviour says: "He that loveth me keepeth my commandments."

I must not omit to notice the ἄ at the commence- ment of the sentence, which some would cancel as inconvenient, and others would alter. Neither course can be defended, nor is either necessary. We may, I think, regard ἄφθαλμος — ἀνεβη as an antapodoton or unfinished sentence: and hence the ἄ is, after the Hebrew manner, repeated at the next clause. Indeed the whole is an Hellenistical construction. For a Classical writer would have used ὅσα, which indeed is found in the Alexandrine MS. and some Fathers; but, I think, from emendation.

10. Here commences the third part of the Chapter, in which the Apostle shows how things so hidden and remote from all human thought have been

* The last clause of this triple parallelism contains an idiom found both in the Heb. and the Classical writers. See Jer. 65, 17. 3, 17. Hence it is not strange that it should be found in the Rabbinical writers. See Wetstein's citations, of which the most apposite is Maimonid. de fundamentis Legis 2, 14. Hac autem res non potest ore proferri, nec auribus usurpari, aut mente hominis perspicue comprehendi. Surgit eleganter, multa ipsi videmus pulchra; plura aliorum relatu vidimus; plurina nec nissa nec audita mente concipimus. From the Classical writers he compares Empedocle: οὕτως οὗτ' ἐπιδερκτα τάδ' άνθρώπων, οὗτ' ἐπακουστα, οὗτε νωμ' περιληπτα. Cic. pro Marcell. 2. quae quidem ego, nisi ita magna fatare, ut eâ via cujusquam mens aut cogitatio capere possit, amens sim. Curtius 3, 2, 12. Opulentia, quantam, qui oculis non subjicere, animis concipere non possunt.
known to himself and others, namely, by Divine revelation. (Crell.)

10. ημίν δὲ ὁ Θεός ἀπεκάλυψε δ. τ. Π. ἀ. We must here subaudit ταῦτα from the ἀ preceding. By ημίν is meant, as some think, the Apostle himself: or, as others think, himself and the rest of the Apostles: which I prefer. But I see no reason why it may not be meant, in a certain degree, for all Christians. For though, in its chief import, the revelation was, as the Apostle says, by the Spirit; yet, by means of the Spirit, we mediate (through the sacred writers of the New Testament) derive knowledge on points stretching beyond all human comprehension, or even conception.

The next words shew why we cannot know or conceive those truths. Τὸ γὰρ τινὲς οἰδεν. Now here there is the very frequent, but too often unobserved, ellipsis of: μόνον. For the Holy Spirit, it is said, alone ἐρευνᾷ, which here does not merely mean searcheth, but denotes such profound research as leads to thorough knowledge. So Theodor. τὸ ἐρευνᾷ οὐκ ἐπὶ ἀγνοεῖ τέθεικεν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γνώσεως ἀκριβεῖς. And so Theophyl. The meaning, then, is: "thoroughly knoweth and understandeth." Compare Prov. 8, 27. Rom. 8, 27. Ap. 2, 23.

10. τὰ βαθὺ τοῦ Θεοῦ, i.e. the hidden counsels of God, τὰ ἁγιωματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, or (as Hesych. explains) τὰ ἁγιωματα, τὰ ἀκοπαλλητα, such as they continued to be during the times of the Old Testament.

11. This verse is meant to show and illustrate the exact knowledge of the Spirit respecting the mysteries of God: and this is done by a popular and very forcible simile, or comparison.

11. τὸς γὰρ οἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον. Subaudit from the preceding βαθὺ, "hidden counsels, plans, and intentions." The sense, then, is: "Who knoweth the counsels hidden in the breast of another man? Who but the man himself and his own mind?"
This is appositely applied to the Spirit of God, who alone knoweth the secrets of God, and can reveal them to others. Thus without revelation, mediate or immediate, no knowledge can be attained of the counsels of God. See Chrys. and Theophyl., and also Schoettgen.


12. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ κενὸν τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν. The Apostle here rejoices at the knowledge thus divinely granted, and acquiesces in it as excellent, even though it be unaccompanied with any knowledge of human learning. (Krause.) The sense seems to be this: "But we (meaning both himself and the other Apostles) have received, not the spirit, temper, and disposition of the world, that is consistent with worldly wisdom, but divinely instilled wisdom, so that we may know and approve the benefits which are freely bestowed on us by God, and especially the wisdom communicated by the Gospel, which alone instils the true principle of virtue, and leads to real happiness.” The above (which is chiefly founded on Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators—see especially Theophyl.) I believe to be the true sense. But, from the flexible nature of the expressions employed, it is hardly possible to determine it with certainty. Hence the variety of interpretations.

13. ἀ καλ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀ. σ. ἡ. At ἀ must be repeated καθευδότα from the preceding. Λαλοῦμεν, we speak, teach. A sense frequent in Scripture, especially in the Gospel of St. John. οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς, &c., "not in the words, oratory, or argumentation suggested by human wisdom, but in those suggested by the Holy Spirit. Rosenm. remarks, that by λόγους are here meant, not only the words, but the subject, and the whole method of treating it.” On which sense see Steph. Thes. or Ernesti’s Lex. Tech. Rhet. Διδακτοῖς ἀληθείνης σοφίας, “taught by human wisdom.” This syntax (namely, the genitive of cause)
also occurs in Joh. 6, 45.; and indeed is occasionally found in such verbals in τοις, in other writers.

13. πνευματικῶν πνευματικά συγχέιοντες. On the sense of these words there has been no little difference of opinion. Almost all the recent Commentators adopt the interpretation of Pelagius, Sedulius, &c., which is also noticed by Theophyl. And they render συγχέιοντες explaining; a sense found in several passages of the Sept. where the word answers to the Heb, רַעָר. And so the simple κρίνειν in Joseph.; and διακρίνειν in Philo. (See Krebs. and Loesner. This interpretation, too, may be seen fully developed in Rosenm. and Krause.) Thus at πνευματικῶν must be supplied ἀλήθειας, which they think more agreeable to what follows. But the Apostle makes such abrupt transitions, that even that principle is sometimes scarcely applicable. Chrys. and the other Greek Commentators take the ellipsis to be πράγματα. And this is the interpretation supported by almost all the earlier modern Commentators, and ably defended by Whitby, who states it thus: "We speak these things in the words taught by the Holy Ghost, comparing the things which were written by the Spirit in the Old Testament, with what is now revealed to us by the same Spirit, and confirming our doctrines from them." So Hardy (from Grot. and others): "Exponentes ea quæ prophetæ Spiritu Dei acti dixerunt, per ea quæ Christus suo Spiritu nobis aperuit: evangelica mysteria ex typis Vet. Test. illustrantes et confirmantes." And this, upon the whole, seems the most satisfactory sense. But I see no reason why Whitby should have adhered to our common version comparing. It is evident that Chrysost., &c. took it to mean explaining: though it must be such sort of explanation as arises from a mutual comparison of any two things with each other. And this sense is rightly adopted by Doddr. and Mackn.

Wets. has here an immense farrago of passages, few of which are to the purpose. The most apposite
is Polyb. τὴν δὲ σύγκρισιν τῶν ἀψυχῶν τοῖς ἐμψυχοῖς. Indeed they are, in general, unnecessary; since they only tend to prove and illustrate the signification compare, which no one calls in question.

14. ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τ. τ. Π. Now men are called ψυχικοὶ, who follow only the impulses of nature common to the brutes; who consider only objects which strike the senses, and the things of this life. For ψυχή is that sort of instinct which men have in common with the brutes, to follow which is equivalent to following concupiscence. Thus in Judg. 19. the ψυχικός and the πνεῦμα ἐχοντες are distinguished. And in Jos. 1, 2. God is said to have instilled into Adam πνεῦμα and ψυχήν. The ψυχικοί, therefore, are those who are led merely by sensual impulses, and do not follow, as becomes rational beings, right reason; and especially do not weigh the truth and authority of religion, neither attend to the representations of others, nor use the opportunity of learning; neither examine what is offered to them for, nor make trial of what they have heard, so as to understand its value; but rashly reject what they perceive to be contrary to their own opinions, James 3, 15.

From this very cause, (namely, that they follow their own opinions,) men of this kind do not admit (οὐ δέχουσι) the more perfect doctrine of revelation, but reject and account it foolishness. (Noesselt.) So Chrysost., from whom Theophyl. explains ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος by ὁ τὸ πάν τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς λογισμοῖς δίδοσ, καὶ μὴ νομίζον δεῖσθαι τῆς ἀκολούθης δοσιδείας, μηδὲ πίστει θέλον δέχονται τι. He takes ψυχικός for φυσικός: and he adduces an apt illustration, “that as the eyes of the body, though the most beautiful and useful of its members, yet, without light, cannot see, so the ψυχή cannot discern unless enlightened by the Holy Spirit.” And so Theodoret. See also Calvin, De Dieu, and Grot., which last Commentator observes, that ψυχικός here means animal or carnal, as opposed to spiritual; men resting on their own reason only,
such as were most of the Jews, and the Philosophers of the Greeks. So Hierocles calls that the ψυχικός σώμα which he afterwards explains the τὸ σωμάτικα. The same opinion, too, is adopted by Salmasius (whom see, cited by Wolf), and also by Wets. and Doddr. De Dieu and Dickson, ap. Pole, however, take a somewhat different view of the subject; and especially Capellus ap. Crit. Sacr. He takes ψυχή to answer to the Hebr. נָא, the anima common to all men, from which proceed the motions and affections common to all, and naturally corrupt." The πνεῦμα, he says, is the Ἴη, the Holy Spirit, or the mind reformed and regenerated by its influences. And so Vitringa Obs. 163. and Schoettg. See also the learned Dissertation of Winckler ap. Wolf, whose opinion is adopted by Wolf himself, and thus briefly summed up. "Per ψυχικός h. l. non irrogenitos quosvis, quales v. c. sunt pravæ vitae homines, sed doctores Judæos ac Gentilos, iisque similes per πνευματικοῖς autem non sanctos quosvis, sed Apostolos, tanquam singularibus Spiritus S. donis extra ordinem instructos, indicari.

14. οὐ δεχεται, "admit, hear, follow." So the Hebr. יִתְנָה, Prov. 4, 10. Μαρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστι, scil. ταύτα τὰ πνευματικά, "he thinks them foolish and useless." Wetstein compares Thucyd. 5, 41. τῶν δὲ Δακεδαμωνίων τὸ μὲν πράτον ἐδόκει: μαρία εἶναι ταύτα.

14. καὶ οὐ δώοναι γνώναι, i. e. "he cannot fully understand their excellence." "And that (says Paræus) both from defect of light, and from corruption of heart."* "Οτι πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνεται, "they," i. e. the τὰ πνεύματα, "are discerned πνευματικῶς, by the mind only, and not the external senses, not ψυχικῶς, by the spiritual intellect, and by the light of faith granted by the Holy Spirit."

* For, as says Aristot. (cited by Bulkley), wickedness perverts the judgment, and makes men err with respect to practical principles; so that no one can be wise and judicious, who is not good." Bulkley also cites Porph. de Abstn. p. 38. Δίὰ τοῦ ἀλόγου ἐνεργῆν, (οὐ) οἶος τε ἐστι θεώρειν τὰ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν ἀκραυφός.
15. ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς — ἀνακρινεται. The Apostle here opposes the spiritual to the animal man, in respect to right judgment: and shews, that here the latter can stand no comparison with the former.

The antithetical and popular cast of this sentence is especially to be attended to. The πνευματικὸς, the man enlightened and guided by the Holy Spirit, the rightly instructed Christian (it is said) ἀνακρίνει μὴν πάντα, on the sense of which words Commentators are not quite agreed. Most recent ones, as Noeselt, Rosenm., and Krause, take πάντα as a masculine, and render: "The spiritual man may convince the natural man, but he himself can be convinced, or convicted, by no natural one:" understanding by ἀνακρίνειν, ἵμαρτε, δέχεσθαι, (see 14, 24.) q. d. "make him perceive his error and self-deceit, in arrogating to himself wisdom; and ascribing folly to the Christian doctrine: but he himself can be convinced, or convicted, of error, by no profane person." This, however, does not seem suitable to the preceding verse, nor does it appear to be the sense of the Apostle. Not to say that this would demand a signification of πάντα unwarranted, and require rather πάντας: and such indeed is read by Theodoret and Irenæus; but without authority. I see no reason to desert the common interpretation, which takes πάντα as the neuter plural, and ἀνακρίνειν in the sense discerneth. This is supported by Chrysost., Theoph., Theodor., &c., and by some very eminent modern Commentators, as Beza, Grot., and Wolf. On the sense of πάντα we need not too anxiously press. It must be confined to the case in hand, and mean spiritual things, and those relating to religion, and the revealed will of God.

15. αὐτὸς δὲ ὃν ὁδεγεῖ ἀνακρίνεται, "he himself is not, cannot be, discerned of any natural and animal, not spiritual, man." There may appear a slight incoherence, by the former clause of this antithetical sentence having the neuter, and the latter the masculine. And thus, Bos and Rosenm. remark, by the
lex disjunctionis, πᾶς must necessarily answer to οὐ- δείς. But both the Apostle, and indeed the Sacred writers in general, are little attentive to such petty niceties, which indeed are sometimes unobserved in the best Classical authors, in whom there is far less of regularity than in the modern writers.

A passage of very similar turn of expression is cited by Elsner from Epictet. 64. καθάπερ ἢ τῶν χρυσῶν δοκιμάζουσα λίθος, οὐκέτι καυτή πρὸς τὸ χρυσὸν δοκιμάζεται, οὕτω καὶ ὁ τὸ κριτήριον ἐχαν. Other imitations, (or rather larcenies,) of this most eloquent and learned Empiric I have elsewhere pointed out. The sense of the passage Theophyl. illustrates by the following beautiful comparison: "Ωσπέρ καὶ ὁ ὄραν, οὐ- τὸς μὲν καὶ τὰ οὐκεία βλέπει, καὶ τὰ τῶν μὴ ορατῶν· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τυφλοὶ οὕτε, οὕτε τὰ ἐαυτῶν, οὕτε τὰ ἐκεῖνου.

16. τίς γὰρ ἔχειν νοῦν Κυρίου, &c. Taken from Is. 40, 13. where the interrogation has the force of a strong negation. On the sense of the words, however, interpreters are not agreed. Rosenm., following the opinion of many recent Commentators, paraphrases thus: "No one of these men knows the mind and counsels of God, and therefore cannot judge, or decide upon those things which the Holy Spirit has taught us, and which we teach others." The subject (he adds) is of profane men, none of whom understand the mind or will of the Lord, so as to be able to teach the spiritual man." But this interpretation (especially the latter part) seems not a little strained and harsh. It is to be observed, that Rosenm., with many other Commentators, as Justinian, Vorst., Sclater, Hamm., Locke, Wells, Hardy, Pyle, and Mackn., refers αὐτῶ to the spiritual man. Which may pro-

* And for this he strongly contends, in the following words: Nam aëtas de eodem dieitur, qui v. 15. aëtus appellatus erat, de πνευματικῷ videlicet s. Christiano. Accedit, quod partes commatis 15. membris hujus commatis 16. haud dubie, quamquam inverse ordine respondent. Quosdem enim quæritur: v. 15. Cur Christianus, s. eoductus a Spiritu agnosceret errorem profanorum hominum possid respondet Paulus, v. 16. quoniam nos Christiani mentem si senten.
bably be the true mode of interpretation. The an-
tient Commentators, however, and some eminent
modern ones, as Zeger, Grot., Whitby, and Doddr.,
refer it to Κυπίου. (See the paraphrases of Whitby and
Doddr.) The sense (according to this interpreta-
tion) is well expressed by Mr. Slade in the following
paraphrase: “No man, unassisted, can know the
purposes of God, none can enter into counsel with
him; and therefore, by a necessary inference, no na-
tural man can enter into the views of one that is
spiritual, because they proceed from God, and are
unintelligible without a divine communication: But
we are not merely natural men; for we have the
mind, or spirit, of Christ, and are therefore able to
instruct others, and to understand their spiritual
concerns; though the unconverted are incapable of
appreciating our doctrine, or of forming any proper
judgment of us.”

The συμβεβαιεῖ must be interpreted according to
the view taken of αὐτῶν. If it be understood of the
spiritual man, it must signify convince; as in Acts 9,
22;* if to the Lord, it must denote teach, inform, in-
struct. Which mode of interpretation is adopted by
Schleus. Lex., who renders: “Quis enim cognovit
mentem et consilia Dei, qui instructurus sit eum,
aut, qui eum meliora docere possit?” And he refers
to a similar use in Exod. 4, 12 & 15. Levit. 10, 11.
Judg. 13, 8. Ps. 32, 8.

Dodridge observes, that this part of the Epistle
is very artificially conducted. The Apostle (says
he) is now aiming at the great point of establishing

tiam Christi tenemus. Cur contra is (abroσ) a nullo profanorum
erroris convinci potest,” v. 15. Quoniam nemo profanorum men-
tem Domini intelligit. (v. 16.)

* At least, to that passage Rosenm. appeals. But συμβ. there
signifies to establish on good grounds, shew, demonstrate, prove.
(See the note on that passage.)

Theodor. explains thus: ἵκανος ἀνεδείκνυ τῷ τῆς θελας διδακτι-
λισας ἀνενδέκτη εἰ γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀνενδέκτη τῶν δόλων Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ
ἀνέφεκτον ἔχει σοφίαν, ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν μεταβέδωκεν, οὐδὲ ἥμεις
δρα τῆς τῶν καλουμένων σοφῶν διδακτιλίας δεόμεθα.
his authority, which had been suspected, amongst them; yet he does not directly propose, but obliquely insinuate, arguments against such suspicions; arguments which might possess their minds before they were aware of what he intended to effect by them."

**CHAP. III.**

What follows closely coheres with the 18th verse of the preceding chapter. The Apostle has there said that he celebrates the benefits conferred on men by Christ, and that what is known to us by the spirit of God, respecting his counsels for the promotion of human felicity, he expounds more fully τοῖς πνευματικοῖς. He now, then, proceeds to say, καί ἡμᾶς ἄκαθον ἡμῖν αὐτὸς πνευματικός. "I could not (namely, when I was with you, to instruct you in the Christian religion) discourse with you as with far advanced and well-informed Christians." The Apostle, as it were, replies to a specious argument, which might be employed against him, namely, that the Corinthians had from him scarcely received the rudiments of the Christian religion, and that they therefore did right in adhering to, and preferring those teachers who had communicated to them the capitae rerum. The Apostle, then, now mentions the cause why he had only communicated to them the first elements. It seems, when Paul went to Corinth to instruct the infant Church, it consisted partly of Heathens, and partly of Jewish converts, somewhat backward in knowledge, and rude in civilization: therefore he could not treat them as if far advanced, or well informed; but, as was incumbent on him, he spoke to them ἀπὸ σαρκικοῖς, ἀπὸ νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ.

The term σαρκικός (from σαρξ, which signifies both the flesh, and the weakness and frailty of it) denotes weak in intellect, and spiritual comprehension,
as opposed to the πνευματικόν. The other term νήπιον ἐν Χριστῷ, signifies "infants (i. e. of infantine understanding) in Christian doctrine," these being as far inferior to the πνευματικόν as the mind of babes is to that of men. This sense of νήπιον occurs also in the Classical writers, especially the Poets, as Homer, Hesiod, and Pindar. *

2. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα. The Apostle continues the metaphor, which is taken from the custom of feeding infants with the lightest food, and that prepared for the stomach, as milk, pap, &c. Γάλα, therefore, represents the slighter, simpler, and elementary doctrines of Christianity. So Theophyl. ἄναλος ὡστε τὰ διδασκαλίαν. See 1 Pet. 2, 2. There is a sentiment of similar metaphor† in Hebr. 5, 11—14.

The βρῶμα answers to the στέρεα τρεφή at Hebr.; solid food, not comminuted and prepared for the stomach. Both these terms denote the more sublime and mysterious doctrines. Some Commentators here recognize an ellipsis of ἔσωκα. But Grot., more rightly, supposes there is a syllepsis; the ἐπότισα referring only to the γάλα, not to the βρῶμα. In πεταζεῖν, it must be observed, there is (as in some other

* For (observes Grot.) discourses delivered before all must, of course, be accommodated to the comprehension of the greater part. Now the greater part of the Corinthian Church had as yet made no great progress in the doctrine of Christ, which was spiritual; therefore they, at present, needed rather to have instilled into them the precepts of Christ, for the subduing the remaine of evil affections, than to have explained to them the figures hidden in the Old Testament history, and the things thus adumbrated of the New Covenant. The latter are proper for those who are far advanced in godliness; the former are necessary for those who are only entering upon the study of divine things."

† Of which examples are found in the Classical writers. Wetstein adduces the following from Artemid. 1, 17. ὅ δὲ τις γάλα λαμβάνει—ἀδενεῖς γὰρ εἶσιν οἳ ἐν γάλακτι παίδευσα καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ τὴν τελείαν, διὸ συνεντευκτὸς θρόφη μὴ δύναται χρησθαι, γάλακτο κρήνης. Philo 1, 301, 27. ἐπεὶ δὲ νεφεῖς μὲν ἐστι γάλα τρόφη, τελείας δὲ τὰ ἐκ πηγῶν πέμματα καὶ ἐσομίσον γαλακτωδεῖς μὲν ὡς ἐπεί τροφῆς κατὰ τὰν παιδικάν ἡμικαι τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μοναχῆς προπαῖδαμα, τελείας δὲ καὶ αὐθαράσιν εὐπρεπεῖς αἱ διὰ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης, καὶ ἀνάμιζε ἄρετής ὑφηγήσεις. See also 1, 551.
Greek verbs) a kind of *Hiphil* sense; and it is of the number of those verbs which carry two accusatives. See Matth. Gr. Gr.

2. ὅπως γὰρ ἐπώνυμε, scil. τέσσαρες, "bear, i.e. digest and turn to nutriment such solid food." Grotius remarks, that such ellipses (and he might have added, especially after verbs of ability) are frequent in Scripture. Nor are they unusual in the Classical writers.

3. ἀλλ' οὐτε ἦτι νῦν δύνασθε. These words imply more than they seem to express; q. d. "Nay, ye are not even now able (even when ye have had time to be thoroughly grounded in the faith), nor can I now expound the more recondite truths of the Gospel, with any expectation of promoting your spiritual improvement." Here Grotius aptly cites Origen c. Cels. 3. Τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν μάλιστα καλά καὶ θειά τότε τολμᾶ-μεν ἐν τοίς πρῶς τοῦ κοινὸν διαλόγιον φέρειν εἰς μέσον, ὅτε ειποροῦμεν συνετῶν ἄκρατῶν ἀποκρίτητος· ἀποκρίτητος δὲ καὶ παρασκευάζομεν τὰ βαθύτερα τοὺς συνερχόμενος καὶ δεσμεύων λόγων τραπεζῶν ὑμωραχομένων γάλα· γέγραπται γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ἡμῖν Κορινθίοις ἀποστέλλοντι, "Εἰληφή μεν, οὐ κεκαθαρμένος δὲ πω τὰ ἐθνή, Γάλα ἡμᾶς ἔτοιμος καὶ οὐ βρώμα οὕτως γὰρ ἐδύνασθε, ἀλλ' οὕτε ἦτι νῦν δύνασθε· ἦτι γὰρ σαρκικὸ ἐστε.

8. ἦτι γὰρ—διιχοστασία. The Apostle now shows the grounds on which this opinion of their inability is founded: "for ye are yet carnal," &c.

"Ὅπως has here the sense, not of where, but whereas, since, of which examples are not unfrequent in the Classical writers. (See St. Thes., Viger., Hoogeven, Matth. Gr. Gr., Krause, and Rosenm., or Schleus. Lex., to whose examples I add Thucyd. 6, 68. 2. and Plut. Rom. 25. With respect to the terms ἡλικὶ, ἐρᾶς, and διιχοστασία, they are said by Krause to be mere synonyms. And he compares Sallust Catul. 9, 2. jurgia, discordias, simulantes. I have always regarded them as forming a climax; and this opinion is supported by the authority of Grotius.* Nay

* Who observes: "Nam invidia contentionem peperant, contentia
even the words of the above cited parallel passage are such. But, to turn to the examinations of terms themselves, ἦλθε answers to the Hebr. ניר. It is, Justinian observes, a term of middle signification; and is used both in bonam partem; as in Tit. 2, 14., and in malam partem; as here and in Acts 5, 17. 7. 9. 13, 45. Rom. 13, 19. 2 Cor. 12, 20. "Ενσ answers to the Hebr. בֶּן; and δικαστασίας, to the Hebrew, "פנימית.

3. υἱὸς σαρκικοὶ ἐστε; "does not the flesh yet too much prevail; are ye not yet σαρκικο, compared to true and sincere Christians," (the πνευματικοι just mentioned.) "For (observes Pareus) the envying, strife, &c. just mentioned, are by the Apostle at Galat. 5, 20. numbered among the works of the flesh;" "reckoning among them (says Grot.) all those affections which do not wholly tend to the honour of God, and the welfare of man, but are merely directed to our own gratification."

3. καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε, "do ye not act like men; is not your conduct correspondent to the usual habits of carnal men,* who live after the flesh." The above sense of περιπατεῖν, which is formed on that of the Heb. צָרִיך, is very frequent in the New Testament. See Vorst. de Heb. N. T. 194. and Schl. Lex.

4. δειν γὰρ λέγη τις 'Εγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παῦλου — σαρκικοὶ ἐστε; It is thought by the Greek Commentators, and also Grot. and Locke, that the Apostle uses these names to hint at some persons who were heads of factions. But see the note on ver. 10.

"Thus (observes Justinian) they were not content to entertain "preference of one over another, on the score of wisdom or eloquence, but to carry their preference to the extent of quarrels, dissensions, and schisms." And Rosenm. and Noesselt remark,

scissuram." And he refers to 1, 10. 11, 18. 19. 25. So also Theophyl. 184. Πανταχοῦ δὲ τὸν ἦλθον τῷ ἔρχεται συνάντειν. Παντὶ γὰρ ὁ ἦλθον τῆς ἐπισκοπούσας γεννᾶ. * So Theophyl. σαρκικα και ἄνθρωπινα και προσφελα φρονείτε.
that the Apostle justly ascribes these dissensions and factions of the Corinthians to weakness of understanding. "For those (continue they) who called themselves Paulini or Apolloni, seem to have agreed among themselves on the chief heads of Christian doctrine, only disagreeing on the preference which the one shewed to Paul, the other to Apollo; not adverting to or understanding the essentials of Christian doctrine, on which Paul and Apollo perfectly agreed, but only what was external and necessary; admiring Apollo's eloquence, and condemning Paul's tenacity of instruction; or perhaps differing on the subjects of marriage, meats offered to idols, &c. But diversities of opinion on such points ought, surely, not to have been swelled to such importance as to occasion mutual offence and disagreement among Christians who entertained right notions as to the general principles of the religion." These reflections of the learned Commentators are, upon the whole, well founded. But I must take exception at their limitation of the term σαρκικός (though supported by Schleus.), as if it merely referred to weakness of understanding. What is imputed to these Corinthians, implies more than that: and the term has reference rather to the heart and the affections, namely, denoting carnal, sinful, corrupt, i.e. compared to what Christians should be. So Rom. 7, 14. ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικὸς εἰμι, and elsewhere. How then (it may be asked) will this consist with what is said in 1, 5. and 2 Cor. 8, 7.? But those there mentioned (as Whitby suggests) may be restricted to some few superior members who enjoyed these graces for the good of the rest, and yet they might be generally babes in Christ." Whitby, too, thinks that these gifts might be bestowed for the confirmation of the Gospel and the good of others; and yet be of small proficiency in the saving parts of that good spirit." This opinion, however, seems somewhat exceptionable. And though he urges that "these very persons are accused by the Apostle of
conceit, ostentation, and envy, yet charity may incline us to suppose those vices were not carried to a very high pitch: and it would be unreasonable to expect anything like perfection from Christian professors of any age.

5. τὶς οὖν ἐστι Παύλος — ἔδωκεν. It is rightly observed by Grot., that ἔδωκεν is here not a name of function, or office, but a general one, answering to the Heb. נביא, and suitable to all who furthered the dissemination of the Gospel; not designating Lords, to dominate over their faith, but merely persons instrumental in, and not the authors of, faith and conversion,* and who therefore could not, with propriety, be set up as heads of sects.” I cannot, however, assent to his position that the term differs materially from εὐαγγελισταί, as if the one referred to words; the other to works: for the words of an εὐαγγ. carry with them the force of works.

5. καὶ ἐκάθευ, εἰς ὣς Κύριος ἔδωκεν. Grotius and Rosenm. notice that there is here a trajectio, or inverse construction, for καὶ ὄς ἐκάθευ ὣς Κύριος ἔδωκεν. So Rom. 12, 3. and supra 2, 7. There is, too, an ellipsis of τοιοῦτος. The sense, then, is this: “even as the Lord hath given to each of them his share of spiritual gifts and evangelical success.” Doddridge refers the words to the evangelised, not the evangelisers: and Whitby makes them common to both. But this cannot be admitted on any sound Hermeneutical principles. The interpretation I have laid down is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators.

6. έγὼ ἐφόρεσα, Ἀπολλώνι ἐφότισεν, ἐκεῖ ὣς Θεὸς ἐμέευεν. Of these words the sense is obvious. (See Rosenm. or the Paraphrases.) The metaphors here employed are agricultural. ἔξορισα refers to irrigation, which was practised, wherever possible, in the parched countries of the East. Examples of the

* So Theophyl. 184. διακονεῖ εἰς ὄμοι ἄντοτε ἐκεῖ ἔστω ἀγαθῶν. Such, he observes, was Christ alone; ἔκεινον γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ τὰν τῷ παροχέων τῶν ἄγαθῶν.
metaphor are adduced by Krause, the most opposite of which is from Liban. Or. 13. p. 186. Reisch. τινῷ γὰρ καλὸν ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα, σὺ δ' ἐδρεβας. Wets. here quotes, with seeming approbation, the opinion of some Fathers, as Nyss. c. Eunom. 2., August. Ep. 48., Petilius ap. August. 3, 53., and Optatus Mil., that ἐφύτευσα refers to Paul's κατάχρησις or instruction of them; and ἐκτίσεω, to Apollos's afterwards baptizing them. This, however, is too systematical and formal. Neither does it seem founded in truth. It is pretty certain that Apollos' labours did not commence until after Paul had left Corinth: and it is not probable that he would defer the baptism of the catachumens (if they must be so called) for the space of almost a year and a half; which was the time of Paul's continuance at Corinth. See the note on 1, 14.

In τὸ δὲ, there is a use corresponding to that of the Heb. דָּעָה. See 2 Cor. 9, 10. Col. 2, 19. Krause cites a similar Hiphil use of the Latin augeo from Cato. That is, however, merely a use of the intransitive for the transitive.

7. ἄπειτο ταύτῃ ὁ φυτεύων ἐστί σοι — Θεῶς. The sense of these words is plain, and we have only to attend to the force of the idiom εἶναι τι, which is evidently elliptical, and occurs not unfrequently in the New Testament. See Acts 5, 36., and the note on Gal. 2, 6. Many examples are adduced by Krause from the Classical writers. The usual subaudition is μέγας, which most Commentators here supply. Grot., too, and others, take the expression as said comparatè; q. d. "nothing, in respect to God."

8. ὁ φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ τοσίγαυ ἐν εἰσίν. It is here only necessary to attend to the sense of ἐν εἰσίν, which signifies: "they are, as it were, one and the same in office and purpose, ministers of the same Lord; they are one, are united, by doing the same business, and being destined to forward the same doctrine; serving the Lord with conjoint honour." So Grot., Beza, Sclater, and Rosenm. The infe-
rente, left to be supplied, is this: "As, then, those who apply to the same business ought not to split into parties, so ought not you to be divided into factions; thus they do ill who oppose minister to minister." So Estius, Sclat., and Grot., who compare Joh. 10, 30. 17, 11 & 12. 1 Joh. 5, 7 & 8. Others, as Krause, lay down the following: "Whosoever discharges what is committed to him by God, is a διάκονος or συνεργός Θεοῦ: therefore neither ought any one to despise another, or be despoised for the sake of another.

8. έκαστος δὲ τῶν ἑαυτῶν μισθῶν λήφεται κ. τ. 7. k. The Greek Commentators and Crellius rightly notice that these words were added to repress sloth, as all the labourers would be on the same footing, and receive the same reward. The words therefore form an epanorthosis; q. d. "they are not so far one, but that respect will be had to each one's labour and pains, and he will receive his own reward proportionally. It is labour to which the reward is promised, not success of labour, which is not in any minister's power."

9. Θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοὶ, &c. Here we have a fuller explanation of what was said in the preceding verse. The sense is: "for we ministers and teachers are fellow-labourers with God, discharging the same office committed to us by God." Such, too, at 3 Joh. 8, are said to be συνεργοὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: and at Mark 16, 20. God is said συνεργεῖν ἀποστόλοις. Συνεργοῦς is simply for συναίτος and συμπαρατάοι. instrumental. (See the example in Munthe.) Yet there seems to be an allusion to agricultural labour, which was properly called ἔργον; as in Hesiod Op.

"Those (observes Grot.) whom he had just cast down, by comparing them with God, he now raises, by comparing them with men."

9. Θεοῦ γεγραμένον, Θεοῦ δικαίωμι ἐστε, "ye are," &c. For the pronouns in this verse are emphatical; and the people are here addressed by a double metaphor,
both agricultural and architectural. By the ἀγρὸς is meant the ager cultus. So the Sept. in Gen. 26, 14. Prov. 6, 7. 21, 30. 31, 16. (See Schl. Lex. and Philo.) There is a similar passage in Is. 61, 3. φυτεύμα Κυρίου. This metaphor, by which Christians are compared to a field sown with seed, is often employed by the sacred writers; as Matt. 13, 38. In Θεοῦ ἐκδομῇ there is an architectural metaphor, used further on, and in 2 Cor. 6, 16. and Eph. 2, 21. The sentiment may be thus expressed: "You are, as it were, the field which God cultivates, and the building which he erects; we are his labourers in both works." The above metaphors are thought, by the Greek Commentators, to inculcate the duty of Christian unity.

10. κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. The architectural metaphor is here continued, with the addition of some suitable tropes. (Krause.)

The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that by χάρις St. Paul means the office of Apostleship among the Gentiles, graciously committed to him by God. Now every builder begins with the foundation: and thus did St. Paul, like a judicious builder, commence with teaching his converts the simplest Christian truths.

Σόφος, like σοφος, signifies not only intellectual wisdom, but, in a general sense, peritia: and this not only in the Scriptural, but the Classical* writers. Then it is added, ἐπεμείνα τεθεικα, "I have laid the foundation, by communicating the first elements."

10. ἀλλος δὲ ἐκδομοῦμεν. Rosenm. (from Grot.) remarks that the metaphor is here further developed, what was before applied to Christians being now extended to the doctrines communicated to Christians." Grot., too, observes that similar transitions,

where part of the similitude is retained, and part changed, occur in Matt. 13. Mark 4. Joh. 10., and elsewhere.

10. ἐκαστὸς δὲ βλεπῶν τὸς ἐπικοινωνεῖ, "yet let every one look and mind how he forms the superstructure; with what sort of doctrines he follows up the first elements, that they may square with the former, and be suitable thereto."

11. θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδὲς δύναται θείναι τ. τ. κ. By δύναται, Grot. observes, is here meant "can, consistently with what is right, i.e. ought;" as in Matt. 9, 15. and elsewhere. Παρὰ τὸ κείμενον. This use of παρὰ for ἤ is partly derived from the Hebrew, and is thought to be Hellenistical. Yet it occasionally occurs in the Classical writers. Thus Plato. Phæd. (cited by Krause) οὐδὲ μὴν τοιεύτι οὐδὲ τὶ πάσχειν ἀλλὰ, παρὰ δὲ ἄν ἐκεῖνα ἢ ποιήσας τ. πάσχειν. To which I add Heliodor. 1, 74, 8. After τῶν κείμενων must be supplied ἵνα τῶν ἀποστολῶν, "by us Apostles, subserviently to the purposes of God."

11. ὡς ἐστιν I. τ. Χ. This is wrongly rendered by L’Enfant: "which is, that Jesus is the Christ." This is doing violence to the construction. The true sense, and that required by the construction, is, doubtless, the one commonly ascribed to the words, namely, "which is Jesus Christ:" meaning (as Grotius and others have seen) the history of Christ, comprehending the doctrines and precepts, the promises and threatenings of the Gospel. (See the note on 2, 2.) These fundamental points, the Apostle means to say, must remain undisturbed, nor ought any thing to be added but what is perfectly agreeable thereto.

12. εἰ δὲ τις ἐπικοινωνεῖ — χρυσῶν, ἀργυρίων. The Apostle here shows the reason why every one should mind what superstructure he erects. (Crellius.)

The sense of the passage is somewhat obscure, by a confusion of metaphor resulting from the high wrought mental feelings of the writer. The question seems to hinge upon this, whether the Apostle
intended to represent one, or two buildings. The former is the common opinion, and is supported by Grotius.* But this has, I think, tended more than any thing else to throw obscurity over the whole passage. The latter is, with far greater semblance of truth, maintained by Chrysost., Theophyl., and several eminent modern Commentators, as Crellius, Wets., Doddridge, Rosenm., and Macknight; and it has been recently adopted by Krause and Slade. The Apostle meant to suggest that on the foundation of those elementary principles two very different buildings might be erected; thus the metaphorical expressions are meant to designate the good and the bad superstructure. The punctuation, therefore, may be as follows: χρυσών, ἀργύριον λίθος τιμών· ξυλά, χέρτων, καλάμην — ἐκάστου. The passage is well paraphrased by Doddr. thus: "If any man build, I say, upon this foundation, let him look to the materials and nature of his work; whether he raise a stately and magnificent temple upon it, adorned, as it were, like the house of God at Jerusalem, with gold and silver, [and] large, beautiful, and costly stones: [or] a mean hovel, consisting of nothing better than planks of wood roughly put together, and thatched with hay [and] stubble; that is, let him look to it, whether he teach the substantial, vital truths which do indeed belong to Christianity, and which it was intended to support and illustrate; or set himself to propagate vain subtilties and conceits on the one hand, or legal rites and Jewish traditions on the other; which, though they do not absolutely destroy the foundation, disgrace it, as a mean edifice would do a grand and extensive foundation, laid with great pomp and solemnity."

* His words are these: "Fingit sibi ædificium Paulus partim regale, partim rusticum: quia quamquam tale fieri moris non est, tamen nature non repugnat, et id requirit ætibous. Proponit ergo nobis domum cujus parietes sunt ex marmore, columnae partim ex auro, et partim ex argento, trabes ex ligno, fastigium vero ex stramine et culmo."
And by Rosenm. thus: "As, when the foundation is laid, the superstructure may be either a royal edifice or a rustic cottage, so also to the elementary principles of Christianity, rightly laid down by me, may be superadded a fuller instruction, either true, or false, of greater or less worth and moment.

On the sense of χρυσόν, ἀργύριον, and λιθ. τιμ. it is not necessary to press; since the two former may designate either the gilded columns and beams, or the silver ornaments which were used in the construction of palaces of old, or, as the materials are afterwards said to be tried in the fire, we may suppose them solid. By the λιθ. τιμ. are not meant precious stones, i. e. gems, but precious and sumptuous marbles. On which Grotius refers to Is. 54. 11. and his note there. Wetstein, too, aptly compares Tibull. 3. 3. 16. Quidve domas prodest Phrygios innixa columnis, Aurateque trabes, marmoreumque solum? Hor. Carm. 2. 18. Non ebur, neque aureum meli renket in dono lacunar, non trabes hymetisse premunt columnas ultime recisas Africæ. Cic. Paradox. 6. 3. Illi aurata tecta in villis, et sola mormorea facienti, et signa, tabulas, supellectilem et vestem infinitè concupiscienti. The general idea, then, is that of materials precious and solid, which will aptly represent doctrines and principles, true, lasting, instructive, useful, salutary.

In the words ξυλά, χάρτον, there is an allusion to slight and temporary buildings, many of which, for various agricultural and other purposes, are in use in the East. This, again, is well illustrated by Wets. from the following passages. Petron. 135. Et paries circa palea satiatus inani, Fortuitoque luto clauos munibat agræas. Vitruv. 7. 3. Cum paries totus luto inquinatus fuerit, tunc in eo opere cannæ clavis muscaris perpetuo fixantur, deinde iterum luto inducto, ei priores transversariis ordinibus fixæ sunt, secundæ e rectis fixantur. The καλαμῆς signifies stippula, stubble, and is supposed to refer to the thatched roofing. So Seneca, Ep. 40. (cited by Wets.) Culumn liberos texit, sub marmore atque auro servitus habitat — quid ergo? non quamlibet virgaeem cratem texuerunt manu, et vili obleverunt luto, deinde stipula aliusque silvestribus operuere fastigium? And yet Wetstein seems to have thought it might refer to the walls, since he compares Herodot. 1. 179. διὰ τῶν ἱερόμον πλίθων γαρ καὶ τὰς καλάμους διαστοιβάζοντες ἐδείχθαντο."

13. εἰκάστου τοῦ ἔργου φανερῶν γενήσεται, i. e. "it will be manifest of what sort the work may be which is erected on any foundation." Ἐργον, "the edifice." In the application of the similitude, we are to under-

* But that passage is of a totally different nature; since in the most antient times stubble or straw was used to fill up the interstices of stones even of the most stupendous size; as in those used in building the Temple of Jupiter Belus at Babylon, and other Babylonian and Egyptian buildings.
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stand the edifice of the Gospel; q. d. "As the event shows which edifices are firmly, and which are weakly built, so it will, in its time, become manifest what sort of value is to be set on this or that sort of doctrine erected on the fundamental truths laid down by me." (Rosenm.) So the Latin adage, *dies docebit, et dies diem docet.* Grotius compares Soph. "Απανθ' ὁ μικρός κάναριθμητος χρόνον Φύσει τ' ἄδηλα. And Simonid. Οὐκ ἐστιν μείζων βάθανες χρόνου οὐδενός ἔργου. Krause adds Xen. Cyrt. 3. ἦδε η ἡμέρα δειξεὶ ὁν ἄξιος ἐκαστός ἐστιν. But that passage is of a different nature.

Theophyl. and some modern Commentators understand this of the day of judgment.

18. ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται. Wells, Pearce, and Slade suppose that ἀποκαλ. refers to ἡμέρα. But this is contrary to the construction of the sentence; for the words ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλασθείρεται are plainly parenthetical. I see no reason to desert the common opinion (supported by all the antient and most modern Commentators) that ἀποκαλ. is to be referred to τὸ ἔργον, the edifice before mentioned. This, indeed, is required by the following words, in which there is a repetition of the same sentiment.

18. καὶ ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὑπότιν ἐστι, τὸ πῦρ δοκιμάσει, "the fire shall try the solidity and value of the materials employed." For (as Grot. observes) Gold is insoluble by fire,* (at least such fire as it here supposed,) and silver and marble scarcely yield to it; but wood and stubble are immediately consumed. The application is obvious.†


† It is thus expressed by Rosenm. "And so, as respects religion, what is true remains, i. e. is found firm, and calculated to purify the heart, tranquilize the mind, and call forth and strengthen our patience under all the events of life. On the contrary, what, in religion, is uncertain and unprofitable, is soon cast away amidst the changes and chances of this mortal state."
14. \( \epsilonι \ \tauινος--\muισθόν \ \lambdaηψεται, \) “if any one’s edifice (which he has erected on any evangelical foundation) shall remain (uninjured in the flames), he shall receive a reward for his labour, both here, in lasting glory and honour among men, and hereafter, from his heavenly employer, who will recompense his zeal, labour, and patience.” The passage is thus paraphrased by Grotius: “Si quis Doctor præcepta specialia dederit, quæ, consideratâ re, loco, tempore, circumstantiis, conveniant cum generalibus Christi præceptis, is honorem apud Ecclesias omnes consequetur.” And he remarks: “Incendio igitur respondet lux quæ ab Ecclesiæ omnibus uni Ecclesiæ laboranti allucet. Sic Dei judicia igni comparantur Esaæ 4, 4. 66, 16. Et Spiritus Ecclesiæ primum in ignis formâ datus.”

15. \( \epsilonι \ \tauινος--\ζημιωθήσεται, \) “but if the edifice he hath erected shall yield to the flames, \( \zetaημιωθήσεται, \) i.e. literally, “he shall be mulcted * in the reward of his labour, i.e. he shall forfeit the reward of it.”

The above seems to be the only true sense, which though it was missed by most of the early Commentators, but, upon the whole, was distinctly seen by the Greek Commentators and Grotius.

Kataκαθήσεται is well explained by Theophyl. ούκ οὖσαι τῷ πυρὸς τὴν ρώμην, ἀλλ᾿ ἐλεγχθήσεται πονηρὸν ὑψ. Grotius paraphrases: “If by other churches any one’s doctrine be found repugnant to that of Christ, either directly or indirectly,” &c.

15. οὗτος δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ οἷς διὰ πυρὸς. Some of the antient Commentators, who explain the whole of this passage as belonging to Christians in general, are here put to great straits, and run into manifest

* It is well observed by Grotius, that \( \zetaημ. \) is a law term, and signifies multabitur, scil. operc suo. And so Justinian, Sclater, Lightf., Scal., Basn., and Calov., from whom Hardy paraphrases: “Si quis vero speculationes philosophicas, humanæ sapientiam ðœnum, eloquentiam, verbosæ stipulam, prædicationibus suis adjicerit; vel quodcunque aliud commentum suum addiderit, quod divini judicij sententiam ferre non poterit,” &c.
absurdity. (See ΟŒcumên. and Theoph.) But it is, I think, plain that the Apostle has only in view Christian teachers. The sense of the clause now under our consideration is somewhat obscured by a confounding of the physical and the metaphorical parts of the comparison, the first of which represents a builder, whose house is, as it were, burnt over his head, and who with difficulty escapes through the fire: the second represents a Christian teacher, the superstructure of whose doctrine does not consist with the fundamental principles of Christianity previously laid down, and accordingly is reduced to nought; thus then he loses his labour, and is saved with great difficulty. That such is the sense of this (as it seems) adagial phrase, διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς σωζόντα, * most Commentators are agreed. The passage is well paraphrased by Doddridge as follows: "He will find he has been spending his time and strength to little purpose, and has lost a great deal of that reward which he might, through Divine grace, have secured, had he applied himself with vigour and zeal to the proper labours of a Gospel minister. Yet if he be upon the whole a good man, who hath built upon Christ as the foundation, and, on the terms of the Gospel, committed his soul to him, he shall be saved, and find mercy of the Lord; though in comparison with that more abundant entrance into his kingdom which others will have, it may be said that he is saved with extreme difficulty." Schoettgen,

* Of this the Philological Illustrators adduce many examples. They confound, however, two phrases of different nature, namely, to go through fire, and to be saved through fire. Now many of their Classical citations are of the former class, and only denote danger. (And so Ps. 66, 12. Is. 43, 2.) The following passages, however, are sufficiently apposite, as denoting both difficulty and danger. Artemid. Or. 1. 50. θάττων γὰρ, καὶ ὅτε εἰπεῖν, ἐκ πυρὸς ἀπείπαξε τὰ σκέλη. Liban. Or. 1. de vita sua, p. 62. ed. Reisk. δι' ὁμοίοις ἥναγκαζε πατέρας τοὺς αὐτῶν κάλεν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὁ σκέπαν ἐκ πυρὸς. Liv. 20, 35. In Æmilium Paullum, qui — ex damnatione collegae et suo prope ambustus evaserat. And 40. Se populiare incendium—semitistum effugisse. Jud. 23. Wolf here refers to J. H. Maji. Obs. Sacr. 4. p. 133.

This language, metaphorical as it is, has been most unwarrantably applied by the Roman Catholic Commentators to prove the doctrine of Purgatory; though manifestly without a semblance of foundation in any principle of enlightened interpretation, and without any countenance from the Fathers, at least those of the earlier and best ages; and in others, not without a suspicion of interpolation. Thus in the commentary of Theodoret in h. i. they endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to foist in the words, τοῦτο τῷ πιστεύομεν καθαρτίως, ἐν οἷς καθαρίζονται αἱ ψυχαὶ ὅσον ἐν τῷ χωνευτηρίῳ. (See the note at tom. 3. p. 183, edit. Noesselt.) On Purgatory it has been well remarked by Elsner, that this fragmentum Papisticum was derived from the dregs of Rabbinical nonsense and absurdity. And he refers to Eisenmenger’s Judaismus Detectus, P. 2. C. 6. p. 337.

16. οὐκ οἴδατε οὔτε ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε. There is here (Krause remarks) a transition to what had been begun at verse 9. “from which (observes Grotius) the Apostle had digressed to other things, though nearly connected with the preceding.” Yet I assent to Crellius, that it seems to have been partly suggested by the architectural metaphor just used, which the Apostle yet continues. It is also remarked by Justinian: “Hactenus de structoribus et materiâ dixit; nunc de ipso ædificio.”

What is here said is not to be understood of individuals,* but of the whole community of Christians,

* In this view, then, the farrago of Classical citations adduced by Wets. (chiefly from Elsner,) are of little value; though, as embodying the opinions of some eminent antients on an interesting subject, they are deserving of attention. Of these I have selected the following. Ovid de Ponto 2, 1, 34. illo quae templum pectoris semper habet. And 3, 6, 26. Justitiæ—sum pridem possit mentis in æde sum. Valer. Max. 4, 7. Vires amicitiae—quibus pene tantum venerationis, quantum deorum immortalium ceremoniis debetur—ut illarum ædes sacra domicilia, ita harum fida hominum pectora quasi quodam sancto spiritu referta templâ sunt; Anton. ἐπειδὴ ἤπειρος εἰς τὸν ψυχῆς χῶρον εἰσεῖδε νοῦ Θεοῦ, παρασκευάζωμεν τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον ὡς ἐνεστὶ κάλλιστον ἄξιοχρεων ἐν—
at least at Corinth; and on this occasion the Apostle follows the mode of speaking adopted in the Old Testament, where God is said to dwell among the Jews, and they are said to be the temple and habitation of God; by which is suggested their obligation to worship him, and his gracious favour and protection of them. (Compare Levit. 26, 11 & 12. Ez. 37, 27.) This metaphor is occasionally employed by Philo and the Rabbinical writers. So Rabbi Aschek on Haggai 2. remarks that the Israelitish people are said to be the Temple of God.

Some of the Greek Commentators suppose that Paul meant by this to pave the way for his censure of the incestuous person.* But that depends on the interpretation here adopted.

16. καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you; namely (explains Rosenm.) as it did formerly dwell, first in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in Solomon’s Temple, and manifested His especial presence, so now, by the various operations of the Holy Spirit, He is present with you.” By οἰκεῖ is meant ἐστεριγμένοι: and I cannot assent to the position of many recent Commentators as (Rosenm. and Krause) that by πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ is meant the Christian religion, and the benefits and virtues attending it: which is too vague and general. The common interpretation was supported by all Commentators up to the time of Vitringa. I must also observe, that when the Apostle mentions

* And this does not materially differ from the view taken Wolf, whose words are these: “Tripclici argumento hic utitur Paulus ad Christianos a fornicatione abducendus, quod a tribus divinitatis personis ordine est repetitum. Primum desumitur a Patre, tanquam qui non minus corpora nostra aliquando, quam olim Christi corpus excitavit, in lucem sit producturus: v. 14. alterum ab arctissima unione nostrum, tanquam membrorum cum Christo: v. 15 -18. tertium ab inhabitatione Spiritus S. quem nacti simus a Deo, i. e. Patre, qui scilicet illum in nomine Mlii miserit.”
the body of Corinthians as being that wherein the Holy Spirit exerted its influence, it must be supposed that he considered at least the bulk of them to be under that Divine influence; and therefore, in that metaphorical sense, every individual so favoured might be said to be the temple or habitation of the Holy Spirit: and so far the common interpretation of the preceding clause, and that which, on the authority of several eminent Critics, I have adopted, come to the same thing.

This whole passage is well illustrated by Arrian, Epict. Diss. 2, 8. (cited by Raphel.) σὺ ἀπόστασα εἰ τῷ θεῷ, ἔχεις τι ἐν σεαυτῷ μέρος ἐκεῖνον. Τι οὗν ἀγνοεῖς σου τὴν εὐγενείαν; Τι οὗκ οἶδας πόθεν ἐλήλυθας; —θεὸν περιφέρεις πάλας, καὶ ἀγνοεῖς; —Ἐν σαυτῷ φέρεις αὐτὸν, καὶ μολύνων οὐκ αἰσθάνετι, ἀκαθάρτως μὲν διανοήμασι, ῥυπάραγε δὲ πράξεις. Καὶ ἄγαλμασ τοῦ θεοῦ πάροντος, οὐκ ἀν τολμήσαις τι τουτοὺς ποιεῖν, οὐκ ποιεῖς αὐτοῦ δ' τοῦ θεοῦ πάροντος ἐσωθεν, καὶ ἐφοραντὸς πάντα, καὶ ἐπακούωντος, οὐκ ἀληθῶς ταῦτα ἐδοκιμάσθη, καὶ ποιῶν. And Hierocll. p. 24. ψυχής καθαρὰς τῶν οἰκείων ἐπὶ γῆς θεῶς οὐκ ἔχει. Jos. Ant. 6, 8, 2. ὅ μὲν προφητεύειν ἢρξατο, τοῦ θείου πνεύματος εἰς αὐτοῦ μετεικασάμενος. I cannot but suspect that both the above Philosophers had this passage of St. Paul in mind. That they had attentively perused the New Testament I have adduced frequent proofs.

17. εἰ τῶν ναιοῦ—Θεὸς. The Apostle now directs an admonition and threatening, forewarning them against the corrupters of the Church. (Crel.) This corruption might take place, 1. by false doctrines; 2. by evil examples in morals; 3. by factions and dissentions. (Grot. Calov. and others, ap. Pole.) 

Φθείρει is for διαφθείρει, which is common in the best Greek writers.

* And especially when used of the sack and plunder of a city or country; or the corruption of female virtue, to which latter sense all Wetstein's examples tend. By which it would appear that he, in common with Locke, supposed the Apostle intended this language against the incestuous person.
Φθερεῖ, i. e. ἀπολέσει, "him will God punish most severely." So Rosenm. This, however, scarcely represents strongly enough the perdition which awaits corrupters of the Temple of God, unless they hearken to warnings, and avert it by timely repentance.

17. ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁγιὸς ἐστὶν. This clause gives a reason for the preceding: "For the Temple of God is holy." The word ἁγιὸς is emphatic, and carries with it a clause left to be supplied; viz. "and therefore not to be violated with impunity." Of this signification of ἁγιὸς, namely inviolate, Elsner (whom see) has learnedly treated, adducing examples from Strabo, Julian, and Plutarch. It may be compared with the Latin sanctus. Theophylact observes on the term Φθερεῖ, that it is not imprecatory, but only predictive.

17. ὁτίως ἐστε ὑμεῖς, "whose temple ye are." The relative, as Crelius observes, follows the number of its consequent. Hardy, too, remarks, that the relative placed between two substantives sometimes receives the gender and number of the preceding, and sometimes of the following. (See Matth. Gr. Gr.) This Doddridge rightly applies both to the body of the Corinthian Church and to the individuals who composed it.

18. The Apostle now proceeds to lay open the origin of the broils and dissensions which had harassed the Corinthian Church. (Crelius.)

18. μηδεὶς εαυτὸν ἐξαιτάτω, "let no one deceive himself," i. e. by resting on the vain opinion of his own wisdom, or of wisdom in general, which, without aids and lights, cannot but deceive. Theophyl supplies, νοητῷ οὐ άλλας ἔχει τὸ πράγμα, καὶ οὐχ οἷς εἶπον. But this seems too arbitrary an ellipsis, and the sense too limited. The question, however, is, whether the admonition is to be considered as applicable to what has been said from ver. 10. or to what follows. Some recent Interpreters prefer the former; assigning to the words this sense: "Nemo igitur se ipsum decipere et putare velit, plane idem
esse, quidquid alios docuerit, et quo animo quove consilio hoc fecerit." The latter is adopted by the antient, and almost all modern Commentators, and is especially supported by Grotius, who explains thus: "See that you do not attribute too much to your wisdom and learning, by resting on it, and thus deceive your own selves." This interpretation has, I think, all the marks of truth.

It is well observed by Grotius, that all human philosophy repugnant to the Gospel is but deceit.

18. εἰ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι, &c. Here again the interpretation is uncertain, and will depend upon the construction and punctuation. The clause εἰ τῇ αἰῶνι τοῦτο may be taken either with the preceding, or with the following words. The latter method was formerly pursued by Origen and Cyprian, and afterwards adopted by Beza, Grotius, Hammond, and Locke, and has been followed by most recent Commentators, who assign to the words this sense: "If any one of you thinks himself wise, let him not scruple to be a fool in the opinion of this age, that may be really wise." (See Rosenm. and Kраuse.) And this interpretation is thought to be confirmed by the verse following. But the first exposition is equally supported by it: and as this clause cannot, without great violence, be separated from the preceding, so that interpretation seems to deserve the preference. If I mistake not, too, it is more assimilated to the Scriptural style and manner.

Δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι. Dr. Macknight renders this, "thinketh to be wise." But this is neither English nor an accurate translation of the Greek. In δοκεῖν there is an idiom, by which it signifies "to be thought to be; to have the credit or reputation of being;"* and this whether on good grounds or not.

* As this idiom is little known or illustrated by Critics, the following examples, out of a great number which have occurred to me in my own reading, may be acceptable. Thucyd. 1, 19. ἀνὴρ ἐνεργὸς δοκῶν εἶναι αὖθισαν, "who had the reputation of being a man of sense and moderation." Dion. Hal. p. 653. τὰ πολιτεία
18. ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, i. e. "in the things of this world," and especially in learning, eloquence, philosophy, &c.

18. ροφή γενέσθαι, "let him begin to think himself ignorant (of many things)." Ἡνα γένητα σοφὸς, "in order that he may thereby become really wise; that being the likeliest mode of attaining wisdom." Wolf aptly compares a similar sentiment of Epict. Enchir. c. 18. εἰ προκύψαι θέλεις, ὑπόμεινον ἕνεκα τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀυτῶν δέξαι καὶ ηλίθεος ὑπὲρ δούλου δοκεῖν ἐπισταθαι.

19. η γὰρ—τῷ Θεῷ ἐστι, "for the wisdom of this world (only) is (but) foolishness in the estimation of God." By σοφία is meant the wisdom of men who rest on their own intellectual powers, without a reference to God; a wisdom which has no more effect in procuring salvation than folly.* Παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. This sense of παρὰ, apud, is found not only in the Scriptural and the Ecclesiastical writers, but in the Classical ones. Thus Xenoph. Mem. 1, 6, 13. (cited by Krause.) παρ’ ἡμῖν νομίζεται, τὴν ἀφαν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν. See also Acts 26, 8.

This truth the Apostle then proves and establishes from the testimony of Scripture.

19. ὁ δρασθένης τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ π. α. Taken from Job 18, where the Sept. has, ὁ καταλαμβάνων τῶν σοφῶν ἐν τῇ φρονήσει, which yields the same sense; though δρασσ. is a stronger term. It signifies properly to clench with the fist, gripe, grasp; and then to seize hold of, catch, hold fast. So Hesych.


* And on this it is well observed by Theophyl. Οὐ μόνον γὰρ φοῦνεν συνελείᾳ πρὸς τὴν ἀληθινὴν σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐμπυκάδει, ἢ ἀεὶ ὁ ὅσος ἀπαχόμενος μαθεῖκας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ἀγνοῖς εἶναι ἄκε παρακεκλίσωσα τὸν πατὴρ χρόμενον· δόθην καὶ ὦ μωροὶ ὕποσελίζοντας παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
explains δραστήριοι by κρατώντες. Numerous examples of the word are adduced by Wets.

The ἐστι is here omitted, by a Hebraism. Ποιησεν γε is, in this instance, a more exact version than προνήστη. 'Εν (answering to the Hebr. ז) is put for δι', by.

The sentiment is too obvious to need illustration. (See the Paraphrasts.) Theophyl. expresses it thus: τοῖς οἰκείοις ὑπλοῖς αὐτῶς χειροτονάτι.

20. γραφάκει τοις διαλογίσμοις τῶν σοφῶν, ὅτι εἰσὶ μάταιοι. Taken from Ps. 94, 11. where see the Commentators. Διαλογίσμοι, counsels, plans. The word is properly a vox mediae significantiæ, but is generally used by the Apostle in malum partem. See Schl. Lex. or Wahl's Clavis. Here again the sentiment is obvious. See the Paraphrasts.

21. Now comes the Epilogus, in which the Apostle returns to his former proposition. He here gives them a general admonition, not to boast of or trust in this or that teacher; for this would be absurd, since from all they might derive very considerable spiritual benefits. (Krause.)

21. μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν (σε) ἄνθρωποι, "boast on no account of men;" "as was common (says Grotius) among the Jews, who either followed Hillel or Samuel; and also among the Greeks, as the Pythagoreans, Platonists, Aristotelians, Epicureans."

The Apostle then subjoins the reason: πάντα γὰρ οὐκ ἐστὶν. Here many Commentators think the neuter is for the masculine; q. d. "all men," "all creatures." This, however, is little suitable. It rather seems to me that the neuter may refer to the qualifications and endowments of the Apostles. So Theophyl. 189. who thus paraphrases: τι οἱ δίδασκαλοι οὕτωσι ἑπαρπάζονται, καὶ οὕτως ὥσπερ ὑποκύπτει αὐτῶς καὶ ὑπηρετεῖ; μὴ γὰρ οἰκείοις τῷ έχοσιν, ἀλλὰ οὕτως εἰσὶν οἱ έχοσιν, διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν αὐτείς καὶ αὐτός, καὶ χάριν αὐτῶν μακρὸν οὕτω θείουσιν."

* And so Hardy, from the earlier Commentators: "All things
Here Wetstein compares Diog. L. 7, 1, 25. καὶ τῶν σοφῶν δὲ πάντα εἶναι. And 6, 72. τῶν θεῶν ἐστὶ πάντα, φίλοι δὲ οἱ σοφοί τοῖς θείοις, κοινὰ δὲ τῶν φίλων, πάντες ἄφα ἐστὶ τῶν σοφῶν.

22. εἶτε Παύλος, εἶτε Ἀπολλών, εἶτε Κηφᾶς. The general sense of this passage is tolerably clear; yet to adjust it to any rules of construction is by no means easy. The difficulty is occasioned chiefly by the highly elliptical cast of the sentence; and that, together with the abruptness, seems owing to the high-wrought feeling that dictated these words, which are, therefore, not to be tied down to the rules of ordinary composition. Without reason, then, was it that Markland stumbled at κόσμος. "If (says he) by κόσμος St. Paul means the whole world, as it is commonly explained, he does not usually express himself in that manner; especially as he had just before said πάντα γὰρ ύμῶν ἐστι, and then descends to particulars, one of which is κόσμος." But, apage! apage! Was ever such dry and formal criticism! The first words may be thus paraphrased: "Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, be the preachers, all their endowments are yours; all tend to your advantage; or whether the world and all the people thereof, all must, under God's direction, tend to your advantage." After κόσμος I would place a colon, thus distributing these nouns into two classes; as follows: εἶτε κόσμος, εἶτε γὰρ, εἶτε δάνατος, εἶτε ἐνεστῶτα, εἶτε μέλλοντα. These highly elliptical and obscure words seem intended to express the following sentiment; (for of their actual sense who can be positive?) "All things whether in life or death, whether in this life or the next, are yours, as meant to be subservient to your good, both in producing a peaceful and tranquil life, and a placid and resigned death." So Rom. 8, 28. "All work together for were destined by the Almighty to be subservient to your advantage and salvation; you do not exist for the sake of teachers, but they for the sake of you; God bestowed gifts on them for your advantage." See also Whitby.
good in the end to them that love God." (See Doddridge.)

23. ὑμεῖς δὲ, Χριστῶν. Χριστὸς δὲ, Θεός. Here again we can do little more than approximate to the sense. (See the Commentators.) Considering what preceded, I assent to those Interpreters who think that ὑμεῖς δὲ, Χριστῶν, is intended as a reproof for their proneness to follow different masters; q. d. "You are bound under the spiritual dominion of Christ alone, who is your only Lord."

Χριστὸς δὲ, Θεός. Hardy and Rosenm. paraphrase: "Christ is the minister of God, as far as respects his mediatorial office, and he does all things after the will of God; and, so far, he is subject, and is hislegate. Therefore ye are bound to venerate and worship God only, and Christ, as your supreme Lord, and not any man, whoever he be." The passage is well paraphrased by Whitby thus: "All things are yours by ministering to your good; Christ is God's by ministering to his glory." *

Wolf compares a similar gradation in Philemon, frag. p. 306. where a servant says: 'Ἐμῶ γὰρ κύριος μὲν εἰς ἀνήρ, Τοῦτον δὲ καὶ σοι μυρίαν τῇ ἀλλαίᾳ νόμῳ, Ἑτέραν τύχανος, τῶν τυφλοποιοῦνταν φάβος, Δοῦλοι βασιλέων εἰσίν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς, Θεός, ὁ θεὸς, ἀνάγκης.

* To the learned Commentator's arguments in refutation of the Socinian position, that Christ is here represented as inferior to the Father, I shall merely refer the reader, in order to be able to introduce the excellent illustration of Theophylact 190. which is chiefly founded on Chrysostom. ὡς ἡμεῖς, Χριστὸς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ; ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ Χριστὸς, ὡς ἔργον αὐτοῦ καὶ ποίημα, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς, τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ νόος προσώπων, καὶ ὡς αἰτίον ἐχων τὸν Πατέρα. Ὡσπερ εἰ καὶ μία ἡ λέξις, ἀλλὰ διάφορος ἐστὶν εἰς τὰ πάντα συνόντα ἡμῶν, ὡς ἡμεῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 'Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ δοῦλοι ἐσμὲν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ποίημα τὰ δὲ πάντα, οὐ δοῦλα ἡμῶν, οὐδὲ ποίημα. Ὡσπερ οὖ καλῶς ποιεῖτε, ἀνθρώποις ἐαυτοὺς προσέναι μοντεῖς, καὶ ταῦτα Χριστὸς ὄντες. "

"Doubtless, (to use the words of Mr. Slade,) in many passages, Christ, as a Mediator, is represented as coming from the Father, and taking upon himself the nature of man. Joh. 7. 16. 8. 28. 12. 49. 14. 10. 1 Cor. 11. 3. But the question is, not whether Christ is ever spoken of as man, (for no one can deny it,) but whether he is not also spoken of as God, (which is equally clear)."
This fourth chapter is made to commence at a somewhat improper place; since the six verses which commence it closely cohere with the preceding, being a sort of corollary, shewing what followed from the preceding, namely, the degree of estimation in which Christian teachers ought to be held, to whom the Corinthians had hitherto assigned either too much, or too little honour. See 1, 12. 3, 4 & 5. (Krause.) The same view is taken by Rosem., and, I think, rightly.

Verse 1. οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζόμεθα άνθρωπος, αἰς ὑπηρέταις Χριστοῦ, "let a man (ὅς, ἐκαστος or τις), or every man,* so or thus regard us," i. e. in this manner, in the following manner.† Λογιζόμεθα, reckon, think. A frequent sense in the Classical writers, who, however, do not use this syntax of the accusative of person. 'Ο ὑπηρέταις, "as servants of Christ, not Lords of your faith." (See 1 Pet. 5, 3.) 'Ὑπηρέταις is for διακόνους. Theophylact well paraphrases: Ἐπειδὴ ὑπηρέται ἐσμέν οἱ διακόνοι, τι τῶν δεσπότην ἀφέτες, ἀφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ὑπηρέτων ὀνομάζεσθε; And Theodoret thus: ὁ τιμήσας βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς, αἰς ὑπηρέταις τιμάτα, αἰς οἰκονόμους αἰδείασθα, μετείπτω τῇ φύσει τῷ γέρας.

The words ὑπηρέταις Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων Θεοῦ, Grot. observes, are meant by the Apostle to elevate those whom he might seem to have depreciated at 3, 7.; q. d. “It is a great thing to be a servant of Christ and a steward of the mysteries of God.”

1. καὶ οἰκονόμους μ. θ., “and stewards to dispose and deal out the benefits thereof.” Properly the oikonomos was the administrator or manager of do-

* This ellipsis is frequent in the best Classical writers, and especially Thucyd. See Hardy.
† Maclintock ill renders the οὕτως then.
mestic affairs (see Pignor de Sarvis 1, 326.) and thus came to mean administrator in general. It is not, however, merely synonymous with the preceding term, but a stronger and more definite one, and as suggesting a principal part of their ministerial duty. For, as Theophylact well observes, ἐδείξεν ὅτι ὁ ἀνόμοσμός τῶν λόγων χαρτήσεων, ἀλλ' ὦ οὐς δεῖ, καὶ ὅτε δεῖ, καὶ οἰς δεῖ.

By the μυστήρια (as Rosenm. remarks) are meant, not the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, but the doctrines of the Christian religion, which are called hidden, because they would have been unknown to all men, had not God revealed them. (See Rom. 16, 25.) Theophylact thinks there is here suggested another duty; namely, of not revealing these μυστήρια equally to all; which is not the part of a prudent οἰκονόμος. But perhaps this opinion is not well founded. Possibly no more is intended than simply to denote the doctrines of the Gospel as what could not have been discovered by men, but were wholly a revelation from God. So Matt. 13, 11. γνώναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν; and often elsewhere. See Eph. 6, 9.

2. ἢ δὲ λοιπὸν ἡττεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις. Ποια πιστοὶ τις εὐσεβής. It is well observed by Grotius, that the ἢ δὲ λοιπὸν is a formula, which often, as here, implies no more than λοιπὸν, i. e. etsurum: and is a mere connective.* Doddridge has very judiciously pressed on its sense. I would paraphrase: "And now (remember) it is required," &c.

Ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις. This is thought by Grotius to savour of a Latinism. But Latinisms are rarely met with in St. Paul. (See Kappe de Latinismis Nov. Test. p. 24.) It seems to me merely an Hellenistic idiom.†

* And so it is considered by the Greek Commentators, who lay no stress upon it. Our common Translators have not ill rendered it moreover. I have myself rendered it now, which, I find, is the sense assigned to it by Macknight.

† Krause indeed compares a passage of Isocrates. But that
The ἵνα is for ἵνα, "that a man approve himself faithful." The Philological Commentators, as Loesner and Krause, take εὐρύκεισθαι for εἶναι; comparing Hebr. נָצָן. But this seems poor peddling criticism. It is plain that both the εὐρύκεισθαι and the נָצָן are far stronger terms: on which point it is unnecessary for me to enlarge.

There are many points on which the duty of an οἰκὼνομος and of a minister of the Gospel may be paralleled, on which this is no place to dilate. (See the Doctrinal and Practical Commentators, and also Raphel.) There is one to which the Apostle now especially intends to advert; and this is well stated by Theophylact from Chrysostom: ἵνα μη τὰ δεσποτικὰ σφετερίζῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὁς δεσπότης τὰ πράγματα μεταχειρίζῃ, ἀλλ' ὁς ἀλλότρια καὶ δεσποτικὰ οἰκονόμων οὐκ οἴκεια λέγων εἶναι τὰ δεσποτικὰ, ἀλλὰ τούναχτιον, τὰ οἰκεία δεσποτικὰ.

3. ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἔστιν, ἵνα ὑφί ομάν ἄνακριθο. The circumstances of the Corinthian Church are here ably adverted to by Chrysostom and Theophylact from whose illustrations we are supplied with materials for showing the Apostle’s drift, and tracing the connection, which seems therefore to be this: "But whether you who sit in judgment on pious and zealous ministers will avoid me the praise of fidelity, I neither know nor care."

Εἰς ἐλάχιστον ἔστιν. This phrase, Capell and Grotius remark, is from the Hebr. הָעַבְדָל. See Job 15, 11. 2 Par. 29, 34. Hagg. 1, 9.; εἰς and ἕ being redundant. Or rather, perhaps, the sense of the preposition in that phrase had worn out. Rosenm. and Krause compare Themist. Orat. 19. φί παρ’ οὐδὲν ἵναι ἐν φαντάμ ἀνθρώπου ἀποτελεῖ κεφαλήν.

3. ἵνα ὑφί ομάν ἄνακριθο. Many Commentators, as Grot. and Rosenm., interpret ἵνα for εἰ. This, is not to the purpose, as the verb is merely in the active infinitive. Wetstein, indeed, more appositely quotes some passages from Aristid., Galen, and Sext. Emp.; but neither are those quite to the purpose.
however, seems too arbitrary. It is for δι' as just before. The sense may be thus expressed: "That I should be, as I learn I am." Ἀνακρίνειν properly denotes to examine the qualities of any thing or person; and sometimes it denotes, as here, the result of that judgment, whether for praise or blame. Now the result of the ἀνάκρισις would, in the Paul-lini, be praise; in the followers of Apollos and Cephas, blame. To soften the seeming harshness of this, the Apostle adds: η ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας, i.e. "or of any man's judgment." For ἡμέρα is, by a Hebraism, used to denote a day of judgment and simply judgment.* So the Latin dicere diem. It must be observed, too, that ἀνθρωπίνης is emphatical. So the Syriac Version: "aut ab ullo filio hominis."

In order again to soften the seeming arrogance of this, he adds: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω; which words Rosenm. paraphrases thus: "I cannot so judge myself, nor can I venture to say for a certainty, whether I am superior or inferior to those whom you think superior or inferior to me." Schoett. observes, that the Apostle ventures not to do this, since such judgment is apt to be warped by self-love.

4. οὐδ' γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα. This is well paraphrased by Grot. as follows: "For though I am not aware of having ever done any thing wrong in the ministry committed to me; yet it does not follow that I am entirely free from blame.† At οὐδὲν there is (as is usual in such phrases) an ellipsis (through delicacy) of κακὸν or φαύλον; as in the Latin nil conscire sibi: or of ἀδικῶν, which is sometimes supplied;

† So Chrysost. (cited by Grot.) καὶ τὰ δέκτορε, εἰ μηδὲν εαυτῷ σύνοιδα, οὐ δὲ δικαιώναι: οὗ συνέβαινεν ήμαρτήσαι μὲν αὐτῷ τινὰ ἄμαρτημα, μη μὴν αὐτὸν εἰδέναι ταῦτα τὰ ἄμαρτημα. And so Theophyl. οὐχ εἰμι καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας εἰκοσ γὰρ ἡμαρτήσαι μὲν μοι τινὰ, ἐμὲ δὲ ἄγνοεν ταῦτα. There is a similar sentiment in James 3, 2. "In many things we offend all." And also one in Clem. Alex. Βρακτὴς ἀκούσαι µηδαµῶς πόθῳ φύγῃ, µηδὲν συνειδῶς αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, δέσποτα.
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as in the passages of Heliodor. Aristoph., and Plato, cited by Wets., who has copiously illustrated the use of the word, both in construction and sense. In the best Greek writers the verb takes an accusative of the thing, and a dative of the person; though sometimes the accusative is omitted, from ellipsis; as in Simplic. on Epict. 276. (cited by Wets.), which passage I introduce on account of the sentiment: ὅ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἡμεῖς, καὶ μὴ τῷ ἐαυτῷ συνειδώτι ἄρχομενος, καὶ τῇ κρίσει του πάσης εἰδότος θεοῦ, δήλως ἐστιν ἀρίσκειν ἀνθρώποις βασιλέως.

4. ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ διδακτασθαι, “it does not, however, follow that I am justified, and free from all blame.” So ἐν τούτῳ in 2 Cor. 3, 2. And so δικ. in Acts 12, 39. and Rom. 6, 7.

4. ὅ δὲ ἀξίωμα με, Κύριος ἡστιν, “but whether I deserve praise, or blame, that must be decided by another being. He that judgeth me is the Lord.* My only judge, or he alone that hath a right to judge me, is the Lord.”

The above appears to be the true sense of this most difficult passage, on which Commentators, both ancient and modern, are little agreed. Chrys., Theophyl., Grot., and Macknight, have egregiously failed in their endeavours to trace the sense.

The words are thus ably paraphrased by Theodoret: Τί γὰρ λέγω τούς ἀνθρώπους; ἐγώ τά κατ’ ἐμον ἀκριβεῖς ἐπιστάμενος καὶ τῷ παράσυρον εὑρὼν ἐμοί τῷ οὐδέν ἐμοί ἀκριβεῖς συνειδᾶς, οὔτε ἐκεῖν ἐμοί δηλοῦμαι ἀκριβῶς ἐπειδὴ ἐπεὶ Κύριος ἡστιν, ἀλλὰ ἄκριτος συμβαίνει γὰρ πολλάκις καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἀκριβώς, ἵστοι εἰναι τούτῳ καὶ δικαιοῦν ἡγουμένῳ· ἀλλ’ ἐνεργεῖ ἀρετή τούτῳ ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός.

5. αἰσθεῖτε μὴ πρὸ καλόφως τι κρίνετε. The Apostle takes

* Grotius paraphrases it: “It is, qui detectis non actibus tantum, sed et cogitationibus exactissimum, et de zae et de alia judiciiim feret.” So Theophyl. ὅ δὲ Κύριος μόνος ἡστιν, ὁ ἀκριβῶς καὶ ἄσφαλῶς κρίνων.
this opportunity to inculcate on them an important lesson. "Pass no judgment or decided opinion before the time of judgment, namely, the great day (as is explained by the words following, ἐκεῖς ἐξάληθι ὁ Κύ-ριος), namely, the Lord's second advent to judge the world."

Κρίνειν is here used for ἀνακρίνειν.

Most Commentators apply the words solely to the case of judgment as to preference respecting teachers. But the Apostle, doubtless, intended to couch under it an admonition of universal application.

5. ὃς καὶ φωτίσει — καρδίαν. Φωτίσειν here signi-
fi es to bring to light, i.e. in a popular sense, i.e. to make known (as Suidas explains). By τὰ κρυπτά τοῦ
σκύλως are meant things hidden in the heart; as is
explained by the next clause, which is explanatory of
the preceding: τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν. The sense
of the passage is admirably illustrated by Chrysost. and Theophyl.

Rosenm. thinks that the Apostle hints at some evil counsels and plans of innovations in the Corinthian church which had not yet come to light. But this seems precarious and doubtful.

5. καὶ τίτου ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκαστοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.
The word ἔπαινος is here (and occasionally elsewhere)
used with a reference to its primary sense, which, as
it is a word of middle signification, is simply any one's character, what he is thought of, whether for

* Or we may supply βουλεύματα. The complete phrase occurs in Dionys. Hal. 10, 10. ἤ δὲ τοῦ διαμονόλοτο — τὰ κεκρυμμένα βου-
λεύματα εἰς φῶς ἔγει.

The phraseology is illustrated by Wets, from many Classical pas-
sages; as Athen. 599. ἔξων σωπόνες, καὶ σωπός κρύπτεις τάδε. Dio-
ἀληθείᾳ φωτίσατε καὶ εἰς πάντας αὐθρόπους εξεγυμνοῦντας. To which I add Dionys. Hal. 390, 24. ἔξωθεν εἰς φῶς τὰ κρυτά. Liban. de
ulc. nec Jul. 15. μέχρις ἐν εἰς φῶς ἐλθεῖ τὰ κεκρυμμένα. Eschyl.
Ch. 811. (of Mercury) πολλὰ δ' ἄλλα φανεὶ χρόνος (si velit) Soph.
Aj. 546. "Ἀπελευθερωθῆναι δ' ἀναθέματα κανάρισματος κρόνος φαίνει κρυπτ' δ' ἀδικλα, καὶ φάνεντα κρυπτεται.

x 2
good or evil;* and also, by an hypallage, what is said or pronounced upon his actions. So Hesych. 
ἐπαινεῖν τὰς κρίσεις. The Commentators compare a similar use of the Latin elogium, and, indeed, most languages have many such words. Theophyl. (I think, from Chrysost.) has, with great taste, pointed out why the Apostle used this idiom,† namely, through delicacy, εἰς τὸ εὐφημότερον ἀπέθετο τὸν λόγον. This idiom being admitted by the best Commentators, both ancient and modern, it is strange that Drs. Wells and Dodd. should have adopted the vulgar and uncritical notion that it signifies: "every man shall receive praise (namely, that which he deserves.)"

None of the Commentators, I think, remark the force of the article, which here, as often, stands for the pronoun possessive: "his ἐπαινοῦ, the ἐπαινοῦ which falls to him."

6. τοῦτα—μεταχειρισμα εἰς ἐμαυτόν, "these things (namely, "which I have now written, on the authority of teachers," § § seqq.), I have in figure applied to myself and Apollos, for your sakes, for your instruction;" q. d. "I have brought forward this in my own person, and that of Apollos, as if what was said of others whom I, out of delicacy, forbear to mention, were applicable to us." So the Syriac version: "Hæc posui de personâ meâ et Apolline." And so Theophyl. and Theodoret. Such, too, is the interpretation adopted by Grot., who paraphrases: "Quia hi vestri Doctores meo etiam et Apollo nomine abutuntur, in nostrâ persona ipsis

* With which may be compared from Theoph. Sim. 106 n. ἐς τὸ φανερῶν τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιβολὰς οὐ παρεδείχθησα, where for ἐπιβολάς I would read ἐπίβολας.

† And this from its origin aivos per aŭo, audio, to be spoken of; which I am surprised the Etymologists should not have seen. Lennep has here, as often, reached the very acme of absurdity.

Among these words of middle signification may be reckoned ποιή; as in Pind. Nem. 1, 107, where it is said that ἰσορρία is the καμάτων μεγάλων ποιή.
osténdi, quàm modestè de se ac de aliis judicare debeant: quantamque curam gerere-vestri et pacis."

And by Wets., who paraphrases: "Hæc quæ de auctoritate doctorum modo scripsi, ad me et Apollo transtuli, quos doctores primos habuistis (supra 3, 5 & 6. et comm. 1. ημας) non ut vos docerem, quomodo nos gesserimus, id enim omnibus notum est; sed ut nostro exemplo compararetis arrogantiam pseudo-postolorum, qui se falsò jactant meos vel Apollo discipulos esse, et intelligeretis, quantum mores illorum a nostris discrepent. 3, 19 & 20. 2 Macc. 9, 12.

Others, referring to 1, 8., pursue another mode of interpretation, and maintain that the Apostle means to say, that he himself brought forward the disensions and schisms in the Corinthian church, so that it might seem that he and Apollos were the authors of them, although they were the farthest removed from any such character. But this seems very harsh. (See the note supra 1, 12.) Μετασχηματίζειν signifies properly to change the σχήμα or habit* (as 1 Sam. 28, 8. and Phil. 3, 21. and elsewhere); and it seems here metaphorically applied to changing the form of speech, which is also called by the Rhetoricians σχήμα. See Ernesti Lex. Tech. Rhet.

'Απολλόω. The old form of the accusative for 'Απολλόνα, on which see Matth. Gr. Gr.

6. ἦν δὲ, χαίνοι μάθητε τὸ μη ὑπέρ δὲ γέγραπται φρονεῖν. In the interpretation of these words Commentators vary in opinion. Most ancient and modern ones take them to mean "being wise above what is written,"† viz. in Scripture, in which are so many ad-


† To which purpose the following passages are very apposite:
monitions and exhortations to humility. And they remark that γέραται is often so used by the sacred writers. (See Grot.) This, however, has been by others thought harsh: and they take the διεραται to mean, "what has been written in this Epistle." So Crell., Just., Vorst., Menoch., and Semler. And this opinion has been ably defended by Elsner, Heuman, Wolf, and others, and is adopted by Doddre., Macknight, and most recent Interpreters; and, upon the whole, seems to be the best founded. The ancient Fathers and Greek Commentators, too, may be considered as favourable to it, since they lay no stress on γέραται, which they certainly would have done, had they adopted the other interpretation.

With respect to the προς, those who adopt this latter interpretation assign to it the sense tumidus esse, to be puffed up; in which sense the word has often after it an ὑπερ. See the numerous examples cited by Elsner and Wets.

6. ἴσα μὴ εἰς ὑπερ τοῦ ἐνεκτεμωθε κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου. This clause is expressed in a somewhat unusual manner. Hence on its meaning Interpreters differ. It may be translated: "that no one may be puffed up, or proud of, or on account of, any one teacher to the prejudice of another." (See Rosenm. and Krause.) This syntax (namely the Indicative for the Subjunctive) is very rare: yet it is defended by Kypke and others; though perhaps on insufficient grounds: as there is reason to suspect many of the passages cited to be corrupt. (See Michael. Intr. T. Ch. 4. §. 12.) In fact, in such slight matters, MSS. are very inconclusive evidence; and the best Critics for the last half century have thought that in such minutiae the analogy of the language is of far greater weight than MSS.

6. κατὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου, "to the prejudice or injury of the other teacher, who is thereby depreciated." On

this signification of κατὰ, Krause refers to Zewn. on Viger. p. 611. On the above sense of φυσικοθεαί and of ἀνθρωπίνωσθαι, in the Latin, the philological illustrators have much dilated. (See Wets., Loesner, and Krause.)

7. τίς γὰρ σε διακρίνει; The Apostle here apostrophizes an inflated teacher, designating under that character all who so acted.

The words τίς γὰρ, &c. literally signify: "who hath separated thee from the common herd;* who hath made thee superior to others." This use of διακρίνει the Commentators compare with the Latin secernere. No apt example, however, from any Greek Classical writer, has been yet adduced.

7. τί δὲ ἔχεις, i.e. what hast thou, in the way of learning and knowledge, that thou didst not receive," viz. either from us Apostles, or especially from God. So Hom. II a. 178. (cited by Wets.) εἰ μάλα καρπῶς ἔσοι, θεὸς που σοι τὸν ἐδακεν.

7. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔλαβες, τι καυχάσαι οὐς μὴ λαβὼν ; This is expressed popularly and colloquially, but is strongly put. "If thou didst even (καὶ) receive this knowledge, why dost thou boast, as though thou hadst received it not, but had derived it from thy own genius." It is rightly observed by Mr. Slade, that the Apostle is speaking of spiritual gifts bestowed on teachers, and does not mean to disparage human exertion. Theodoret, too, well remarks: Οὐδὲς εὗρε ἀλλοτρίαις παρακολούθηκας μηγας φρώρνη ἐπαγγελματε ὅταν τῶν ὑπερ φιλάχθη τῷ δεδωκέντι.

The whole passage is admirably illustrated by Chrysost. and Theophyl., whom see.

8. ἃδη κεκορεσμένοι ὦστε, ἃδη ἐπλουτήσατε.

A bitter irony and indignant sarcasm;† directed chiefly (we may suppose) against the conceited teachers, Paul's adversaries; q.d. "I see ye are like persons who are satiated at a feast; ye think ye have all, and need no more teaching or knowledge."

"Ἐπλουτήσατε — ἐβασιλεύσατε. By these expressions the Apostle merely places the same idea in different lights, by varying the meta-

* So the Horatian secernere populo.
† So Theophyl. observes: Βασιλεύσατε ὦστε τα βήματα.
phor thrice. It may be observed, too, that there is a climax. The first metaphor is taken from persons filled with food, so as neither to need nor desire more. The second, from persons so rich as to have no want of, or desire for more. The third and highest degree of the climax, is derived from one who, from being a private person, is raised to the throne, and, having therefore attained the highest step in the ladder, has nothing further to wish.

Χωρίς ἡμῶν, “without us,” i.e. “through the means of other teachers.”

The above mode of interpretation is founded on the view of the sense which was taken by the ancient Commentators, and has been adopted by many eminent modern ones, especially Grot.,* and almost all recent Interpreters. And this seems the only interpretation that will bear examination. For as to the opinion of those who take ἔβασιλ. in its physical sense, and refer it (as does Macknight) to the domineering of a false teacher or teachers, it is too strained and harsh. And the same may be said of interpreting κεκρ. and ἄξιον, in the natural sense. Whitby, oddly enough, minglest, or jumbles together the natural and metaphorical sense in ἐπλούσιες. Lastly, I must remark, that I know not why our English Translators should render: “ye have reigned.” Why not, “now ye reign, like princes.” For they had rightly rendered ἐπλούσιες “ye are rich.” These Aorists, indeed, must all be taken as presents; than which nothing is more common: and this is required by the next words.†

8. καὶ ὡσεῖν γε ἔβασιλεύσατε, “I would to God ye did reign.” Here again the Commentators above mentioned take ἔβασιλ. in the physical sense, and render the words thus: “I wish ye had the authority of princes, that ye might afford shelter and protection in our persecution and troubles:” or (as Macknight explains) “reign over the Church with you.” It is strange that some Commentators of eminence, as Grot., Whitby, Locke, and Rosenm., should have embraced so absurd an interpretation; insomuch, that even Dodd., who explains the other

* Who compares similar sentiments in Hos. 13, 8, Is. 47, 7 & 8. See also Wets., who has given many examples of a similar metaphor in the Latin regnare; as Hor. Ep. 1, 10, 8. Quid quieris? vivo ac regno, simul ista reliqui.

† The passage is admirably paraphrased by Theophyl. as follows, ὃθεν ταχὺ οὐδενὸς ἔστε ἐν χρήσι; ἀλλ’ ἢ δὴ ἐκορεσθήτε, ὅποιος ἀληθῆς ἦν ὁ στεφάνος τῶν τελευταίων, καὶ τῶν εὐγενῶν τοῦ πάπατος τῆς τελείωτης καὶ τῶν χαρισμάτων αἰτήσεως; κατοίκηθεν εἰς τὸ μέλλον χρῆς ὑμᾶς, ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶ τὸ τελευταῖον ἐκεῖν, ἐκεῖνος, ἐκεῖνο τὸ γὰρ καθῆκε τοῦτο δηλοὶ, ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸν ἐφθάσατε τὴν τελείωτητα.
words in the natural sense, here cannot digest such a sense of ἐβασιλ. "For (observes he gravely) one can hardly think the Apostle did indeed wish each of them a prince, or the civil power in their hands." No, truly!

The Greek Commentators have here, as in most other occasions, seized on the right interpretation. (See Chrysost., Theophyl., ÓEcumen., & Theodor.) They notice (which is the only true clue to the sense) that here the irony is dropped, and the sentiment is:

"I wish from my heart that ye were so abundant in all spiritual improvements: for then I might partake of your prosperity, in the credit and honour which I should enjoy from having converted and taught you; since the fame of the pupil tends to the honour of the teacher." So Theophyl. 194. Ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν δέξα ἐμν ἐστιν ἐπελ καὶ παντὶ διδασκάλῳ, ἢ τῶν μαθητῶν τελεότης ἐπιτύθης.

Among the few modern Commentators who have seen the true sense, are Calvin, Light., Tiron., Menoch., and Krause. Dodd., in his paraphrase, absurdly makes it a reference to Christians being "Kings and Priests, a royal priesthood. An idea not applicable here; though it seems to have entered into the mind of Theodoret, and confused his perceptions of the truth.

9. διόκει γὰρ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἡ. τ. ἄ. ὁ. ᾐ. ἄ. ἐ. &c. Theophyl. well remarks, that these are the words λυπουμένου, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐντρέποντος; or, as ÓEcumen. says, καταυγώντως. On their scope and force Chrysost. has treated with his usual ability and taste. He remarks, that the words are written μετὰ τέλενος βαρθυμίλας. And he notices the strong emphasis in ἐμνάς.

As a preface to a brief philological analysis of this passage (which is obscure from the high-wrought feeling of the writer) I will lay before my readers the excellent paraphrase of Theophyl. (founded chiefly on Chrysost.) : Ὡς ὁρεῖ γὰρ, ἐξ ὑμῶν ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε, ὑμεῖς οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἔσχατοι πάντων παρὰ Θεοῦ ἀπεδειχθήμεν καὶ ἐπίθανάτιοι, πεύκετε, καταδίκη, πρὸς Ἰδ ἡματούργθαι
παρερευσασμένον· εἰ δὲν γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἤδη, ἐθαυμάζετε, στοχάζετε τι λοιπὸν ὑμεῖς κατακερκυρέθα ἐσχάτος εἶναι, καὶ εἰς κατάθυσιν ὑμεῖς εἰ ἀποστολοί, τῶν' ἐστιν, εἰ τῶν· ὁμία ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ περιπέμεν·

It must be observed, with Chrysost., that the turn of the whole passage is ironical; and the force of the irony (as Grot. has rightly noticed) chiefly rests with ὡς, which is used, like the Latin credo, parenthetically. In fact, it has nearly the same sense with ὡς δοκεῖ; and thus we may render, "God has, it seems," &c. Grot. well paraphrases: "If, at least, as you seem to think, God's favour may be inferred from success," &c.

9. ἡμῖν τὸς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτων ἄρει... has set us, the Apostles, in the last place." This sense of ἀποστόλους (by which it signifies to show any one his place, set him there, appoint, &c.) is frequent both in the Scriptures and the Classical writers; and examples are adduced by Krebs and Raphel.

'Εσχάτων, "lowest, last, of the most inferior condition." It literally signifies the lowest of any row, and it is used in the same manner as the Latin extremus and postremus, of which Krause gives examples from Cicero and Apuleius. It may be sufficient to consult Faciol. Lex.

9. ὡς ἐπιθανατίος. This is commonly interpreted bestiarios, or those exposed to wild beasts. So Tertull., and, of the modern Commentators, Scaliger, Grot., Calvin, Estius, Beza, Elaener, and others. But it has been justly doubted whether this signification of the term can be established. At all events, it would here be harsh. There is, surely, no necessity to desert the signification suggested by the nature of the word itself, and assigned to it by Chrysost., namely, "men condemned to death." The word is, indeed, rare; yet is has been adduced, and in this very sense, from Dionys. Hal. Ant. 57. where it is said of the Tarpeian rock: ἔστι δὲ τὸ χάριον κρησίος ἐξαλος, ἴδεν αὐτὸς ὡς βάλλειν τῶν ἐπιθανατίων. Other examples from Ælian and Demosth. may be
seen in Schl. Lex. The word is also found in Suidas and Hesych. Here, therefore, it is to be taken, in a metaphorical sense, for the most abject and exposed to derision,* which signification has been adopted by most recent Commentators, including Schleus. Lex. To the same metaphor, Kypke thinks, κολαφι-ζεωμαι at ver. 11. and λυσθείονται at ver. 12. are to be referred. But this seems too formal and hypothetically.

The words following, ἦν θεάτρον ἐγενόμενον τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἄγγελοι κ. α., involve no little difficulty. It is the opinion of most recent Commentators, that the Apostle here continues the metaphorical and ironical representation commenced in the verses preceding. And to the objection, how angels can be thought appropriate to a spectacle? they answer that the expressions, κόσμως καὶ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἀνθρώποι, are meant, by a μερισμὸς often used by St. Paul, to denote the whole universe. (See Eph. 1, 10. Rom. 8, 38 & 39. Matt. 5, 10. 11, 25.) And they compare Cic. Ep. ad Fam. 1, 9. neque solum dixi, sed etiam sepe facio, Diis hominibusque approbantibus. Krause, who adopts this interpretation, renders thus (after Rosenm.): “Nos Apostoli tanquam ti, qui ignominiae suppliciique causā in theatro producuntur, fœdè atque miserè tractamur, in conspectu omnium.” And he compares Sallust. Jugurth. 17: At ego infelix in tantâ malâ praecipitatus—rerum humanorum spectaculum praebeo.

This, however, seems too bold, and taking an unwarrantable liberty with the sacred text. I am therefore inclined to think (though it seems not to have occurred to any of the Commentators) that there ought to be a colon or a period at εἰρήναριφως, and that the Apostle, after having before spoken figuratively and ironically, suddenly makes a transition to the serious and the literal; though the idea con-

* For criminals used, previous to execution, to be led about the town, that this ignominy might be increased.
tained in these words was suggested by the preceding metaphor. The sentence may, then, be thus paraphrased: "and in one point of resemblance, we may truly be called ἐπιθανάτιοι for we, like them, are become a sight and gazing stock to the whole universe, both to angels and to men." For the Apostle's toils and sufferings were (as Chrys. says) παλαίσματα καὶ τῆς ἀγγελλικῆς θεωρίας ἀξία. And that great master of Scripture seems to have been not unaware of the transition just mentioned. For, with his usual acuteness and fine taste, he remarks: "Οὐχ ἄφι ἡμῶν ἐξευτελίζεται, πῶς τὰλην μέγαν δείκνυσιν ἄφι ἄδε ἐκείνω μεγάλοι φρονοῦσιν, πῶς αὐτοὺς εὐτελείς ἀποφαίνεις: ἐπεὶ δὲ γὰρ τὸ μαρτύριον εἶναι τῶν φρονίμων φαίνεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπεια εἶναι τοῦ ισχυροῦ γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὸ ἄτιμος εἶναι τοῦ ἐνδόξου καὶ περιφανείς εὐτελέστερον εἶναι εὐδόκει, καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰκόνις μελλεῖ προσφέρειν, τὰ δὲ αὐτὸς κατεδέξατο δείκνυσιν ὑπὲρ ταύτα ἐκεῖνον ἀμέτρως, ἐγεῖ διὰ ταύτα μὴ μόνον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν δήμων πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν ἐπέστρεψε τὴν ἑαυτῶν.

With respect to θέατρον, many eminent Commentators (as Grot. and Kypke) have rightly noticed that it is to be taken figuratively for θεάμα, a sight, or gazing stock;* as in Arrian. Epict. 8, 22. (cited by Krause,) ὡς γε ἐνεκαλλαπὶζε ταῖς περιστάσεις, καὶ θεάμα εἶναι ἢξίου τῶν παρώντων. There is the very same thing expressed in a kindred passage of Hebr. 10, 33. φαντασθεὶσει πολλῆς ἀθλησιν ὑπεμενατε παθημάτων—οὐδεισιμοὶς τε καὶ διήλθαι θεοτρισμοίς. It is therefore a frivolous question which has been asked, whether by angels are to be understood good or bad angels. We may, of course, understand both, so far as God may have seen fit to permit this, with respect to the latter.

10. ἤμεισ μαρτι διὰ Χριστόν, ἤμεισ δὲ φόνιμον ἐν Χριστῷ. The Apostle, some think, again returns to the ironical; and

* So Theophyl. p. 194. οὐκ ἐν γωνίᾳ μαθεῖ πάσχομεν, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ γίγνεται ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἀνθρωποί μόνοι (οὐ γὰρ οὕτως εὐτελῆ τὰ γυνώμενα) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγγελοί.
they render: "We (i. e., Barnabas, Sosthenes, and Timotheus,)* are fools, διά Χριστὸν, i. e., quod attinet ad Christum, with respect to (as Rom. 3, 27, 8, 10,) Christ and his Gospel, or the knowledge and communication of his Religion." Thus διά Χριστὸν will be synonymous with ἐν Χριστῷ in the antithetical clause; and the following clauses will be, in some measure, exegetical of the preceding.

But to the supposing an irony in the first clause it has been objected, that the following ones by no means admit of it. Most Commentators indeed think there is no irony at all. And they interpret thus: "We have become, or we make ourselves, fools for Christ's sake and for the furtherance of the Gospel, by the abandonment of all aims at eloquence, even encountering the charge of being illiterate." The ἀθενεῖς will thus have the same sense as at c. 2, 3. (where see the note.) But, upon mature consideration, I cannot accede to this latter view of the sense. The first clause, ἡμεῖς μυρόν διά Χριστὸν cannot but be ironical, since the antithetical one, ἡμεῖς δὲ φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ scarcely admits of any other interpretation; and if this be the case, the following ones too, which form part of the same cluster, (namely, ἡμεῖς ἀθενεῖς—ἀτιμοι) must also be so understood.

The right clue to the Apostle's meaning has alone been seized by the antient Commentators, especially Ὅεκumen., who says, that up to the words ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀτιμοὶ the irony extends, and there ceases. The same view of the subject is taken by Chrysost. and Theophyl., the latter of whom (chiefly from Chrysost.), among much other paraphrastical matter, has the following: Πῶς δυνατόν τὰ ἐναντία συνελθεῖν ἐν τοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν; Ὁμοῦν ἀνάγκη ἡ ἡμᾶς μὴ κατὰ Χριστὸν φρονεῖν, ἡ ἡμᾶς ἀλλὰ μὴν ἀνάλοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ κατὰ Χριστὸν φρονεῖν ἡμεῖς ἄρα έστε οἱ σφαλλόμενοι. And the words ἡμεῖς ἀθενεῖς—ἄτιμοι he explains: ἡμεῖς ἐκαθοριζόμεθα, διωκόμεθα, ἵματι δὲ ἀδειας ἀκολαύτες. ἡμεῖς μὲν ἐνδοκοί, καὶ εὐγενείς—ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν ἀτιμῖς. Finally, he lays down the following as the general sense: Πῶς εἰκὸς ἡμᾶς μὲν κατοικεῖν, μαῖας δὲ ἀπο- λαύνειν ἄδειας, καὶ ἐν ἀγαθοὶς εἶναι; Ἡμεῖς προδολοὶ, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἀγα- θοῖς ἔστε, ἀλλὰ νῦν μᾶλλον κακῶς καὶ φαβίως τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔστε. Οὐκ ἄρα ὑμεῖς ἐκαθοριζεῖτε ἐκ τούτου. And so Atto Vercellensis, referred to by Semler. The passage is thus paraphrased by Rosenm. "Vos in honore estis apud vestros, nos autem ob nostra studia in commendanda et propagandâ religione Christiana non honore, sed contemptâ afficimur." (Cf. supra 2, 2 & 3, 1, 23.) Abstinebant illi doctores, ut vōd similē est, a doctrinā de morte et cruce Christi, ne Judaeos et Philosophos offenderent, idque sibi laudì ducens; Paulum vero stultè agere putabant, quod tradendo doctrinam de cruce Christi se et religionem Christianam ludibrio exponeret et calamita- tibus." He observes, that the false teachers in question probably abstained from inculcating the doctrine of the death and crucifixion of Christ, lest they should throw a stumbling block in the way of the Jews and the enlightened heathens; and of this management prided themselves, imputing folly to Paul, for exposing the Christian religion to ridicule by needless disclosures.

* Or rather it should be I am.
11. αὐτῷ τῇ όριστῇ φρεσκ. &c. The Apostle now drops the irony. "Nay (not to mention past afflictions) up to this present day we suffer hunger and thirst, and are in want of necessary clothing." For this is the sense of γυμνηθέωμεν. And so the word is used by Basil (cited by St. Thes. 3085.), ὁ πείνων τήκεται, ὁ γυμνηθέων πειράματα, is starved. So the Gloss. Sim nudus. The word signifies properly to be lightly clothed, like the γυμνός, or light infantry: and hence, by catachresis, it was used to denote being ill clothed. Thus it is not necessary (with many Commentators) to resort to that hyperbolical sense of γύμνος, by which it signifies ill clothed, or of γυμνότης in Rom. 8, 35. and 2 Cor. 11, 27.

On the thing itself Doddridge finely remarks: "Surely one cannot imagine any more glorious triumph of the truth than what it gained in these circumstances, when St. Paul, with an impediment in his speech, and a personage rather contemptible than graceful, appeared in a mean, and sometimes tattered dress, before persons of the highest rank, and yet commanded such attention, and made such impressions."

11. καὶ κολαφίζωμεν. This is, by almost all the modern Commentators, explained as said, by a synecdoche of species for genus, to denote any harsh or ignominious treatment; as 2 Cor. 12, 7, "buffets, insult." But I see no reason why it may not be taken in the physical sense, (as in Matt. 26, 20. καὶ κολαφίσατι αὐτῷ, and 1 Pet. 2, 20; though the latter passage is by Schleus. placed under the metaphorical head; and one may also add 2 Cor. 11, 23.) at least, this must be included, and personal ill treatment must be understood.

11. καὶ ἀντατούμεν, "and have no fixed or stated abode;" which was perpetually the case with our Apostle, throughout the whole of his life from his conversion. The Greek Commentators render it ἐλαυνόμενα, φεύγομεν. But this seems wandering too far.
12. καὶ κοιμῶμεν, ἐγγαίρομεν τ. i. χ. The words may be thus paraphrased: “And yet, far from gaining any thing by these trials, we earn our own subsistence in the most laborious manner, by the labour of our hands.” See Acts 18, 23. On ἰδ., as often, no stress to be laid.

12. λοιποῖοι, εὐλογοῦμεν. These words up to ἂς ἐρτι appear to me an independent cluster of antithetical clausulas, and ought, in the punctuation, to be so expressed. They are, indeed, introduced somewhat abruptly; and Theophyl. well supplies: “and what is more, we do not bear this indignantly or impatiently. Nay we even to those who treat us ill return good.” Λοις, εὐλογ. may be rendered: “being insulted and reviled, we give good words.” So Theophyl. εὐλογοῦμεν. And so Gloss. Albert. καλελογοῦμεν. All modern Commentators render εὐλογ. bless, on which Krause makes a very pompous, but needless display of Classical references.

In this elegant accumulation of antithetical clauses there appears to be a climax.

13. διακόμει, ἀνεχόμεθα. The word διακόμει is properly a forensic term signifying to prosecute: but it is popularly used in the sense of persecute; which imports provocations and harassing treatment of every kind. (See Schl. Lex.) Ἀνεχόμεθα, “we bear it (patiently).” The word is very rarely used thus absolutely; and therefore the citations of the Commentators are little to the purpose. I am surprised they did not remember the ἀνεχόμεθα, ἀνεχόμεθα of Epicurus, who, indeed, seems to have been indebted for the maxim to Scripture, and possibly to this very passage.

13. βλασφημοῦμεν, παρακαλῶμεν. This elliptical sentence has not been very well understood by the modern Commentators. Some supply Θεῷ, i.e. “we pray to God for them.” But this neither the syntax nor the true sense of παρακ. will permit. Others paraphrase: “we gently deny the charge brought against us.” But this sense cannot well be elicited
from the word. It is, I think, best rendered by Theophyl. πρατέως λόγως, καὶ μαλακτικῶς ἀμειβόμεθα. He observes, too, that the βλασφημία is the τραχυτέρα ὑβρις; and the παράκλησις, the πραύνωσις διάλεξις.

As to the reading δυσφημομέθα, which is, by Griesbach, put on a footing with the text, it is mere gloss. We now arrive at the highest* step of the climax, αἷς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενόθημεν. On the sense of περικαθάρματα Commentators are not quite agreed. Most of the more eminent modern ones take it to be a sacrificial term, and containing an allusion to the expiatory sacrifices among the Greeks and Romans, offered up for the people, and which, being selected from the very vilest and refuse of the populace, were called by that name. But to this I cannot assent. Such persons were almost always called καθάρματα with reference to the purification or expiation, which can have no place here. There can only be a reference to the abject vileness of the victim; which would be too remote; nor are such allusions to heathen rites common in St. Paul's writings. I grant, indeed, that Floder, in a Dissertation on this passage (Upsal 1764.), referred to by Schl. Lex., cites two examples of this word from Diog. Laert. 6, 82. fin., and Arrian Ep. 3, 22., where περικαθάρμα is used in this sense: but I suspect the reading to be corrupt. Therefore in the present passage I would, (notwithstanding what Wets. urges for ᾧς περικαθάρματα,) retain the common reading, which is defended by almost all the MSS. and other authorities; and is supported by the antithesis. For the reasons above mentioned, I must also reject the interpretation of περικαθάρματα, adopted by most recent Commentators. It is not necessary to suppose so remote an allusion. A very good sense is made by advertimg to another, and indeed the primitive, sense of the

* So Chrys., who observes that the Apostle strikes the hardest blow at the end (namely of the climax).
word, which has been well illustrated by Theophyl. He explains it by ἀποκεφάλισμα, i. e. the dirt or filth proceeding from any thing on being scoured about. He also observes that περίψημα has the same signification. He then lays down the following as the sense: ἀποφθέγγονται ἀξίων ἐσμέν ὡς βδέλυγμα λογίζεσθαι.

It is plain that πάντων περίψημα is a parallelism corresponding to περίψημα τοῦ κόσμου; and that ἡς ἀρτι has the same sense as ἄχι τῆς ἀρτι χειρας at ver. 11., which is the complete phrase. Ἐγενήθησεν signifies: "we have been and are."

Finally, the passage has been imitated by Barnabas (cited by Wets.) ἔγο Περίψημα τῆς ἄγαπῆς ύμῶν and Ignat. on Ephes. 8. περίψημα ύμων ἐγο. 14. οἰκ ἔντρέψων ύμᾶς — νουθετῶ. The Apostle here turns the discourse from the teachers to the Corinthian Christians in general; and, in order to somewhat soften the seeming harshness of the preceding expressions, says: "I write not thus to you," as ἔντρέψων, "as shaming you (for ἔντρέψων)," "with a view to shame you, in your own eyes and those of others." This sense of ἔντρέψων is found in the best Classical writers; as Plut. Vit. Hom. 14. ἀλλὰ — νουθετῶ, "but I admonish, warn, counsel you." The word νουθετῶ properly signifies to instil wisdom, suggest counsel to the mind, and it occurs frequently in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Theophyl. well paraphrases: "I say not these things out of hatred, or in a rebuking spirit. Therefore forgive me any thing harsh. It is from love. I address these remonstrances to you as a father to his beloved children: and who would not attend to representations from such a quarter?" He remarks that the Apostle calls them sons, as having spiritually begotten them.

* Viz. "to put to shame," σμα, to bash. The word properly signifies to make any one turn away his eyes for shame, by looking him full in the face.

VOL. VI. Y
15. εὖ γὰρ μακάριος παιδαγωγὸς ἔχете ἐν Χ., &c., “for though ye have numerous instructors, yet ye have not many fathers.” These words are parenthetical, and seem to have been suggested by the τέκνα preceding, which they are meant to explain. Or, as Crellius suggests, this may be meant to meet an objection: such as: “we have many instructors and spiritual fathers;” To which the answer is: “If (as it seems) ye have μακάριος παιδαγωγὸς, numerous instructors,” &c. This use of a certain for an uncertain, but larger number, is very frequent both in Greek, Latin, and English. See Krause’s examples.

Παιδαγωγὸς signifies properly the grave, elderly personage who conducted children to and from school, and who superintended their behaviour out of school hours. (See Pignor. de Servis p. 233 & 234., and Schoettg. on Gal. 3, 24., and especially Wetstein’s examples on this passage.) Afterwards, however, it came to designate the informator, the instructor, or teacher.

15. ἐν Χριστῷ, “in the Christian doctrine.” 'Αλλ', attamen, yet. This use of the conjunction is chiefly found after particles of concession, as εὖ εἰ, &c.; of which Kypke gives many examples. I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen that after πατέρας is to be repeated from the context ἐν Χριστῷ, q. d. “ye have many spiritual instructors, but not many spiritual fathers.”* In οὐ πολλὰς there is a delicate meiosis for ένα μόνον. The words following, ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς εἰκόνα are exegetical. Their general sense, indeed, is plain; but on the exact force of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ

* This metaphorical sense of πατήρ, by which it signifies the author of any thing, he who originates it, and thus here, “he who first instructs any one in the Gospel,” is not merely an Orientalism, though frequently occurring in the Scriptures, but is also found in the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Krause. It may, however, be doubted whether this sense be here applicable. The term may here denote one who is parentis in loco, by having the authority of a parent, &c. See Schl. Lex.
Commentators are not agreed. Rosenm. takes it to mean, "by the doctrine of Christ; and regards the following phrase διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου as explanatory of it. It seems not necessary, however, to resort to this uncommon sense of ἐν. I prefer, with others, to regard ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. as signifying, "in the things pertaining to Christ."

15. διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα, "I begot you by means of the Gospel," i. e. (as most recent Commentators explain) "I first taught you the Gospel." So αὐδεῖν, Gal. 4, 19. Philem. v. 10. And so Sanhedr. fol. 19, 2. (cited by Wets.) Quicunque filium socii sui docet legem, ad eum scriptura refert, tanquam si eum genuisset. Dodd. explains: "I was the means of your spiritual birth." If this be the sense of the passage, it strongly supports the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

The ἐγὼ is emphatic.

16. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς μιμητὰς μου γίνεσθε. Most Commentators here seem to too much limit the sense. Some think the Apostle means by μιμητ. imitators of the modesty he had previously shewn in this Epistle. Others take μου to be emphatic, and suppose the Apostle means: "be imitators of me, and not of the false teachers in question, and thus preserve the unity of the Church." But it seems simply the Apostle's intention to deduce from his spiritual paternity the inference, that they should be imitators of him; just as parents and teachers are to their children the exemplar by which they are to model their character. The imitation, therefore, in question, is to be extended to every branch of Christian doctrine and duty. So Theophyl.: Μιμηταθεῖ ἐν πᾶσιν ἔμε. And this interpretation is confirmed by the words following.

Wets. here aptly compares Herodian 6, 8. ὁς μὴ μαθητὰς εἶναι μόνον, ἀλλὰ ἡματικὰς, καὶ μιμητὰς τῆς ἐκείνου ἀνδρείας.

17. διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιμάχα — Χριστῷ, "for which reason," i. e. "that ye may be the better able to trace
my exemplar in doctrine and duty. 'Os ἐστι, &c., "who is my well-beloved and faithful trusty son in the Lord, convert. The construction is: ὃς ἐστι τέκνος μου ἁγιασθὼν ἐν Κυρίῳ καὶ πιστῶν (ἐμοί). See 2 Tim. 2, 2. And this is adopted by the best Commentators. Others, indeed, join πιστῶν with Κυρίῳ: but the former method is best supported by the usual loquendi of Scripture, and is more agreeable to the words following, ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ε. X., "and who may therefore be relied on in his representations, and who will remind you," &c.

The words τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐν Χριστῷ might refer to conduct and mode of action or conversation in general,* but here they are limited by the context, and especially by the following words, which seem exegetical, to denote "my methods of Christian instruction." So Theophyl. τὰς ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι οἰκονομίας, τοὺς κανόνας, τὰ ἔρημα, τοὺς νόμους τοὺς βέλους. And so Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators, as also Rosenm. and Krause. In the same manner ἁγιασθῇ is used, 2 Tim. 3, 10. Acts 24, 14 & 22.

The Greek Commentators notice the delicacy with which the Apostle says remind, not teach; as Timothy was but a young man. I, however, apprehend that the Apostle rather means to hint that they have not well remembered his doctrines. A yet greater delicacy may be noticed in 2 Pet. 1, 2. "I put you in remembrance of these things, though ye know them," &c.

17. καθὼς πανταχεῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω. These words are exegetical of the preceding, and moreover (as the Greek Commentators observe) are meant to suggest that these are no new, or special injunctions, but such as are common to all the Churches, and therefore what they ought to be ashamed to have deviated from.

18, 19. ὅς μὴ ἐρχομένου δὲ μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐκπαιδευθησόμεν τίνες. There is something of the idiomatic

* And so Piscat. Cam., Est., and Menoch., who also subjoin: "and how it fares with me," &c. This, however, is too restricted a sense.
or popular style in this sentence; as in ἐπιστήσασθαι for ἑλευθερώμενον (though we use the same idiom), which literally signifies: “as I am not coming to you;” also in ἐπωμάδησον, which is a vox prægnans, and signifies: “some, puffed up with a vain confidence, are so bold as to say,” &c.

The Apostle had been hitherto prevented, by his continual journeys, from visiting his converts at Corinth; and now some fancied he would not dare to encounter so formidable an opposition as he would there find. In order to preclude the suspicion that by this Epistle, and the mission of Timothy, he only meant to previously try how they were disposed, before he ventured to come to them, the Apostle boldly adds: (“But they are mistaken): for (by God's permission) I will quickly come unto you.” *

He then subjoins a sentence (καὶ γνῶσμαι οὐ τῶν λόγων, &c.) which cannot, I think, in nerve and vigour, or dignity, and composed confidence, be easily paralleled, even in Demosthenes himself. In the interpretation of it the Commentators are at issue. Most recent ones, as Semler, Rosenm., and Krause, and, of the ancient ones, Cæcumen. and Theodoret, take τὴν δύναμιν to denote power of performance, and good works, as opposed to mere words. But this is exceedingly harsh, both here and in the next verse. Chrysost., I think, has rightly explained it of the power of working miracles. And so Theophylact, who well observes: Ἐστι δὲ τῇ εὐγενείᾳ τῶν ἐν εὐγενείᾳ Παύλου, ἥν παραρένει σεμνώς, ὡς ἐφανερώθη εἰς τὴν εὐγενείαν τῆς ἁγιασμοῦ. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ λόγου κόμμου ἐκπρόξῃ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐβεβαιώθη, ἀλλὰ διὰ σημεῖα τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Πνεύματος γινομένων. This in-

* He had before intended this; but was compelled to delay the journey longer than he had foreseen; so that before his visit there was an interval in which he thought fit to write another Epistle. See 2 Cor. 1, 23. The Apostle is supposed to have at length reached Corinth, at the expiration of a year after the period when he wrote this Epistle. (Rosenm.)
terpretation, too, is adopted by Crellius, Grotius, Whitby, and Locke. Others, indeed, take it of the power of the Holy Spirit, as shown either in preaching with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, 2, 4. (as is the opinion of Calvin), or (as Vorst.) in its efficacy on the doctrine and life. But both these expositions are too limited. The expression evidently refers to the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, as shewn both in miracles and in irresistible power of preaching, as well as unerring soundness of doctrine.

Macknight, absurdly, interprets it of the power to defend themselves from the punishment of the Apostle.

Γνώσκομαι. A vox praegnans, signifying: "I shall try and put to the proof, and thereby know." For, according to Glass's Canon (Phil. Sacr. 828.) verbs of knowledge often denote, not knowledge alone, but certain motions, affections, and effects, which are conjoined therewith. See his examples, among which is the passage in question.

Ἀν οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ—δύναμι. Here again Commentators are not quite agreed on the sense. One thing is certain, and ought never to have been questioned, namely, that these words have reference only to teachers, not to Christians in general. By βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ is evidently meant the promulgation of the Christian religion. And there is here an ellipsis of ἐστὶ, in the sense consist. As to the ellipsis proposed by Mosheim, ὁκαθομεθαι, it is too arbitrary. Most recent Commentators assign to the passage this sense: "In the propagation of the Christian religion we are not so much to consider the words, promises, boasts of the teacher, as what he can do and show." But thus the words would be applicable to all teachers of every age: whereas they can only be meant to apply to those under the miraculous dispensation of the primitive and Apostolic age: and therefore Chrysost. and most modern Commentators, rightly understand power to work miracles. Thus,
for instance, (and these certainly not chargeable with superstition,) Grotius renders: “Vi miraculorum, qualia ab humanâ ope proficeri nequeunt:” and Locke, “consists in the miraculous operations of the Holy Spirit.” This interpretation is also adopted by Crellius. See Semler, who perversely rather than ignorantly confounds the present times and the primitive ages.

21. τί βέλετε; ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἠλῳ. Τί is for τί πότερον. The ἐν is for σῶ, after the Hebrew usage. The above was, if I mistake not, a proverbial expression, and Schoettgen rightly thinks there was reference to the discipline of the Jewish church, of which he gives an example from R. Elijah. “Castigant eum primo verbis, deinde virgâ, quia scriptum est Deuter. 21, 18. וְרָאָנ (et castigabant eum). At si nihilominus pergat, redeatque ad ingenium, lapidandum tradunt.” With respect to its sense here, the Greek Commentators, and many modern ones, as Grotius, understand it of the power to strike with death, or disease (as blindness); and they advert to the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, and Elymas. But such punishments were very rare, and had been only once employed by St. Paul; nor would they have been suitable to the faults of which the Corinthians are accused. I therefore assent to Chrysost. and Theophylact, that the term only means ἐν κολάσει in a general way, and, as Theodoret well remarks, designates the παιδευτικήν ἐνεγείαιν, referring to ecclesiastical chastisements and censures of every kind.

In the expressions ἐν ἀγάπῃ, πνεύματι τε πρᾶγματος, there is, I think, an hendiadis: or the latter may have been added by way of explication. Not but that the other course might be (as Chrysostom observes) ἐν ἀγάπῃ, i. e. well meant correction, but this would be also ἐν πνεύματι πρᾶγματος.*

* Of this remark John Calvin has availed himself in the following well-expressed sentiment: “Etiam virga ex charitate proficiscitur, cui tamen hic opponitur, quia occultatur charitas ista severitate, vultus tristitiae et verborum asperitate.” One might, however,
CHAP. V.

The Apostle now proceeds to lay to their charge something more serious than schism, sectarism, spiritual pride, &c. even gross immorality.

Verse 1. ἐν ὕμων πορείᾳ. The phraseology is here altogether idiotical, or popular. Nothing like it is, I think, found in the Classical style. For as to the passages of Heraclides cited by Wets., they only contain examples of ἐν in the sense omnino. The force of the idiom hinges on the ellipsis of εἰσ and the use of ἀνεπιστευα in the sense be reported. Wetstein paraphrases: "nihil aliud auditur." Rosenm. renders: "fama fert inter vos esse hominem scortationi palam adhuc deditum." But it is not quite certain from the Apostle's words whether he does not first advert, in a general way, to the existence of fornication among them, and then specify one case as a flagrant instance of this.

καὶ τοιαύτη πορεία ἦτο ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς θυεται ὑπομακαται, &c. Whatever may have been the immorality which prevailed among the Greeks and Romans (who are here especially meant), it must be acknowledged that no such connections as those here adverted to were permitted among them; and indeed almost all that we Christians regard as forbidden, were by them always admitted to be unlawful. In proof of this the Philological Commentators adduce a great variety of evidence.* It is true that their practice did not always correspond to their principles: yet the few instances adduced (some three or four) are chiefly of royal personages (see Plut. Deetr., 90. and Justin. 8, 3.) whose high situation afforded a licence to enormities of every kind, and at a time when private morals were at the lowest ebb. As to the custom mentioned by Sext.

* Ask our modern Austin whether his roasting of Servetus proceeded from the virga ex charitate? Did he not rather act upon the Popish doctrine of burning the body to save the soul! Pudet haec opprobria dicit, et non potuisse refellir.
Eelp. (cited by Elsner) as prevailing among the Persians, μαραγας γεμετριν, the thing would not be credible even on higher authority. Then as to the story of Procop. Bell. Gall. 10, 4, "Varia novelia esse licebat," it is of precarious authority, and has not much bearing on the words of the Apostle, who did not intend them to be applied to every savage tribe of barbarians.* Whether it were customary among the Egyptians (except among royal personages), is not certain. Other examples, though of no more weight, may be seen in Spanh. Numism. p. 994, or Malt Obs. 146.

The question, however, is, how we are to justify the Apostle's words, which, it must be granted, cannot be defended as they are rendered in our Common Version. One cannot suppose that this and such like incestuous connections, were not named among Heathens, or that they should not be named among Christians. Under this difficulty, many Critics (as Bp. Pearce) would render the ὄνομαζεται repeated, or said to be. And Rosenm. "vix reperitur." These, however, in general, (as Bp. Pearce, Hammen, Grot., Salmas., and Slade,) would cancel the ὄνομαζεται, on the authority of about eight MSS., the Vulg., and some Versions dependent upon it, as also a few Latin Fathers. Hence it is thrown out of the text by Krause. But this seems very rash, since the common reading is supported by the authority of hundreds of MSS., the Syr. and other Versions, and the Greek Fathers and Commentators, especially Chrysost. (who interprets the words in a manner accordant with our Common Version); and a very good reason can be offered for their omission, namely, the fear of some over timid persons that the expression could not be justified. Since, then, it must be retained, what sense is to be assigned to it? As to the interpretations adopted by Bp. Pearce and Rosenm. they too much confine the meaning. Elsner renders: "cum laude commemoratur." But the Classical authorities on which he builds this interpretation are chiefly poetical, or prose that is of a poetical cast, as Isocrates. The Scriptural examples (as Rom. 15, 20. ὅσον ὄνομαζεται Χριστός) prove nothing. Besides, how could it be supposed that the Gentiles should mention with praise such enormities.

The above interpretations, however, in some degree merge into each other. But I beg to suggest another, which will, perhaps, be thought better founded than any one of them. May it not be supposed that the Apostle (whose Greek is Hellenistical, and in many respects deviating from the Classical standard,) has here, by a very slight lapse, used ὄνομαζεται for ὑπομικτήσεται, † ισαρπαν, to be approved by law and custom, &c.; examples of which signification are frequent in the best writers; as Thucyd. 2, 15. ἐκ ἄλλα τῶν ἰερῶν ὑπομικτήσεται τῷ ὀδαίς κρατοῦσα. And Plut. above referred to.

* So Hammond and Estius: "Non loquitur de gentibus in universum, sed de gentibus moratius, et tunc notius, quae ut plurimum Romanis regebantur legibus, apud quos praeceps illae barbarorum consuetudines vel moribus, vel legibus, correetum erant."

† The sense and propriety of which term, in this connection, will be instantly seen and acknowledged by every Classical scholar.
So that, upon the whole, the sense has been very well represented by Dr. Wells, who renders: "such uncleanness as is not practised, or allowed even among the Heathens." As to what is said by Whitby, on the authority of Maimonides, that the Jews, though strict enough in forbidding such enormities, yet made an exception in favour of proselytes to their religion, who were accounted to have lost kindred, and to be at liberty to marry their mothers or sisters, the thing would not be credible on much higher testimony, and still less ought it to be believed (as it is by many Commentators) to have been so common as to have afforded occasion for Tacitus, Hist. 5. init., to say of the Jews, "Concessa apud illos, quam nobis incesta." There is no reason to press on the sense of incesta; and our limited information of the actual customs of the Jews of that day, and the ignorance of the Historian on every point respecting them, leaves us not the πῶς στό τό on which to form any decided opinion.

It is still more improbable that (as Whitby conjectures) the Niccolaitans and Carpocratians derived their licentious doctrines on the community of all women from Chrysippus. And as it has never been satisfactorily proved that these had yet any existence as a society, it is very unlikely that (as Mr. Slade thinks) "the enormity complained of by St. Paul, as well as the toleration of it, is to be ascribed to their principles and doctrines."

There is another point to which I must advert, (though without more information than we possess concerning the circumstances of the cases in point, it scarcely admits of any determination,) namely, whether the mother-in-law of the person in question lived with him as a wife, or concubine. Commentators take different sides. The antient, and many modern ones (as Mede, Vorst., J. Capell., Tirin., Lightf., Hamm., Pearce, &c. and most for the last century) adopt the latter opinion; and they marshal up Classical passages exemplifying the sense ἔγειρω de re venerå; as in the joke of Aristippus: ἔγειρω Δαίδα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔγειροι. Such an euphemism in ἔγειρω and habeo is indeed common in the Classical writers; but there is scarcely one authentic example of it in the Scriptural ones. I am therefore inclined to adopt (with the Syr., Grot., Crelt., Wolf, and Doddtr.) the former interpretation. The father, it is probable, (and such is the opinion of Semler,) had repudiated the woman, or, the woman the father; and then the son had married her. That the father was yet alive is probable from 2 Cor. 7, 12.

"It is not (observes Creltius) credible that the Corinthian congregation would have endured that one of their body should live with a harto, especially his mother-in-law. But because this illicit connection had been palliated by the name of matrimony, therefore the Corinthians might converse at it, especially if there were any who were the man's zealous friends, and endeavoured to soften the

* So Sanhedrim 7, 4. (cited by Wets.) "Isti sunt lapidandii, qui coit cum matre suæ — et qui coit cum uxore patris sui, quia uxor patris est, et quia uxor alterius, sive vivus sit pater, sive mortuus."

† Which it is certain that by the laws of Corinth she could do.
basseness of the thing." To which I would add, that the person in
question is supposed to have been rich and powerful, and therefore
would not want such friends; and there might be some who under-
took, upon principle, to defend such a connection. Had it, on the
contrary, been concubinage, it is not probable that any would have
attempted his defence. It is, indeed, urged on the contrary side,
that the Gentile laws did not permit such a marriage. But this is
of little weight; since marriages within the degrees forbidden by
the Scripture are in this Kingdom, indeed, forbidden by the laws,
but are perpetually entered into. For, as the Poet says, Quid leges
sine moribus vane proficiunt. Now the corruption of morals in
Greece is undeniable, and, as far as regards Corinth, was prover-
bial. Hence Kopriνθiάζειν was as proverbial for lewdness as Grecis-
sare for drunkenness. It is urged, 2dly, that no Christian could
have entered into such a matrimonial connection. But this is
begging the question. 3dly, that it is here called πορνεία. True;
but πορνεία is a general term to denote all illicit venereal
connection. And moreover, there is the same use of the word in Matt. 5,
32. "whosoever marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." See

2. καὶ ὑμεῖς περισσωμένοι ἐστε. Here the general
sense is plain; but the phraseology is so elliptical as
to require rather a paraphrase than a translation.
The following will, I think, represent the Apostle's
meaning: "And yet, while such enormities are
committed in your society, ye are yet puffed up with
spiritual pride, as if all things were right among you,
and do not (as ye ought) rather mourn over this
fall and your disgrace, and take measures that he
who hath done this deed should be removed from
your society."

Kai is here for καίτων, and yet. The ellipsis at
οἱ Χριστοί μᾶλλον is sometimes found both in the Scriptural
(see Rom. 3, 8.) and the Classical writers. The
ὑμεῖς is by some referred to the teachers of the con-
gregation: by others, to the congregation itself;
which is far more probable. The reading εἰκόνα for
for ἑτοῦ is, I think, a gloss. And the examples cited
by the Commentators of the compound rather than
the simple in this sense, only confirm the suspicion,
which is further increased by one of the antient MSS.
being the interpolated and emended Cod. Cantab.
The reading πρᾶξας for πολυγonas is, doubtless, also
a gloss. The common reading is supported by 2
Sam. 12, 5. ὁ δὲ ἡμῶν τοῦτο: which passage seems to have been in the mind of the Apostle.

With respect to ἐγγού, it is not necessary to press on its sense, which is simply, "this deed," i. e. marriage; or, according to the other interpretation (see note on ver. 1.) concubinage.*

The ἐπεθύσατε must be understood of that formal mourning over the scandal drawn to the whole body, which accompanied the excommunication of any member. Hence under the idea of mourning is also couched that of excommunication. So Grot. "Lugere dicitur pro excommunicare, per meton. adjuncti, quia Ecclesia, cum aliquem esset a suo consortio exclusura, lugentium sumebat habitum, eumque ut mortuum lugebat, ait Origines, c. Cels. 3." On this figure of speech, by which one verb stands for two, see Glass. Phil. Sacr. and Gatak. Adv. 31 & 329.

This custom, of accompanying excommunication with solemn mourning was, together with many others, borrowed from the Synagogue, and, as we find from ecclesiastical history, (see Grot.) long re-

* Krause, however, with a judgment unworthy of a Critic, takes it to denote the opus venerenum, and, with an indelicacy disgraceful to a Commentator of Scripture, seeks occasion to drag forward perhaps the most filthy passage to be found in that sink of impurity, Ovid. Amor. This, indeed, is a fault into which almost all the German Sacred Commentators run. Indeed I scarcely know any who in their works evince an adequate impression of reverence for the Sacred Volume except the venerable Dr. Tittmann. Writing, as I do, chiefly for Students, and the younger part of the Ministry, it cannot be improper for me to touch on this subject; but my limits will only permit me to advert to a sentiment of that most eminent and Orthodox Theologian and Orientalist, Pareau, in his excellent work, entitled, Institutio Interp. Vet. Test., where, in a highly important chapter (c. 11.) de præcipuis animi virtutibus que decent Veteris Testamenti interpretatores, he commences thus: "Primum igitur animi virtutem, bono Veteris Testamenti interpreti utilissimam, immo necessariam, justam esse arbitramur librorum, qui sacro hoc codice continentur, venerationem." This position he establishes and illustrates from p. 147—150, to which I must refer my readers, at the same time respectfully recommending the work to the perusal of all those who cultivate the study of the Hebrew language.
tain in the Church. See Vitrunga de Synag. L. 3. p. 737.

3. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ὁσ ἄρεν τῷ σώματι, &c. The γὰρ is here a mere particle of transition, and may be rendered then. The μὲν answers to the δὲ following. The sense is: “I, then, as absent indeed ἐν σώματι, in person, but present ἐν πνεύματι, in heart, mind, thought, affections,” namely, in solicitude and care.* So (among the Classical passages adduced by Wetstein) Ovid, Leand. Heroni 18, 30. Et quo non possum corpore, mente seror. And Plut. 2. p. 797 A. κἀν μὴ παραγένηται τῷ σώματι, παράντα τῇ γνώμῃ. I add D. Hal. 1, 207, B. and Theophr. Sim. 105 D. ταῦτα ἐγώ, ὁσ παρὼν, γραφῶν, προσφέρογ- γομαι.

The ὁσ is omitted in some seven or eight MSS. and a few Versions and Fathers, and is rejected by almost all Critics. But the authority for its omission is very slight; and be it remembered, more is necessary for the omission than the insertion of a word. As to the Versions, they are in such a case of little weight. And if it were, what the Critics tell us, pleonastic, that would be no reason why it should be cancelled. For the redundancy usually implies no more than a non correspondence to any foreign language in some expression. But, in fact, ὁσ is here not redundant. It rather is elliptical for ὁσ ἐγώ; q. d. “Being (as I am) absent in person.

3. ἢδη κέκρικα, “I have decided, do hereby decide and determine.” So Menoch. “statuo et impero.” Theophr. paraphrases: ἢδη ἐὰς νεγκα τὴν ἀσέφαις, καὶ σφέν ἑτερον δεῖ γενέσθαι.” Wets. here adduces several examples, not quite, however, to the purpose, the word there signifying, “I am resolved; am determined.”

This is not to be regarded as a sentence of excommunication, but only an intimation that if they are

* The Greek Commentators, indeed, and Grotius, think it implies a supernatural knowledge of their actions; as when Elisha said to Gehazi: “Went not mine heart with thee, when the man turned to meet thee.” But this seems to be more than the Apostle meant to express.
not wanting in their duty they will use this his Apostolical authority, to take the measures necessary for separating the noxious member from their body. Then are suggested the steps to be taken.

3. οὕτω τῷτο. Here there may seem to be a pleonasm, and some MSS. and Versions omit οὕτω; but not, I think, on good grounds: for, as the early modern Commentators observe, it seems to advert to some circumstances accompanying the action, as its having been done openly, impudently, perseveringly. One may compare 2 Sam. 12, 6, “the man that hath done this thing shall surely die.”

Κατεγρ., perpetrated. For the word is generally used in sensu deteriori, especially when united with ἔργων. So (among the examples cited by Wetstein) Soph. Antig. 389. ὡς ἐστὶ εἰμενὶ τοῦ ἔργου ἡ εἰργασμένη. Pausan. Attic. 23. Πέρσεα τὸ εἰς Μεδοὺσαν ἔργον εἰργασμένον.

4. ἐν τῷ ἐνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ., &c. On the construction of this whole sentence Commentators are not quite agreed. That part of the words are parenthetical is obvious; but how far the parenthesis ought to extend is not so certain. Chrysostom and some others include ἐν τῷ ἐνόματι — πνεύματος. Others, and indeed the most eminent Commentators, only take συναχθέντων — πνεύματος. And this latter seems the true mode. The whole sentence, ἐν τῷ ἐνόματι — Ἰησοῦ, indeed, depends upon the former. The vinculum seems to be an ὀστε, or εἰς τὸ omitted; so that εἰς τὸ παρα. may be rendered, “in order to your delivering him,” “that ye deliver him,” &c. The passage, then, may be rendered thus: “That ye (being assembled together, and I being spiritually, mentally, virtually * present with you, by the signification of this my opinion) do ἐν τῷ ἐνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ., in the name, and in behalf, of our Lord Jesus Christ, σὺν τῷ δυνάμει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., and withal acting by the power of

* So Liv. 10, 397. (cited by Wets.) Absentis collegae consilia omnibus gerendis interrerant rebus.
our Lord Jesus Christ, do deliver, τὸν τοιοῦτον, the
person so described, &c.*
5. παραδοῦναι τ. τ. τῷ Σατανᾷ, &c. On the true
meaning and the exact force of these words Com-
mentators vary. Beza and others (from Austin and
some other Latin Fathers) maintain that the words
are only a periphrastic expression of excommunica-
tion. "As," say they, (for so Macknight states their
reasoning,) "there are only two families or kingdoms
in the moral world, the kingdom of God and the
kingdom of the Devil, the expelling of a person from
the family or kingdom of God is a virtual delivering
of him into the hands of Satan, to share in all the
miseries resulting from his usurped dominion, and a
depriving him of all those advantages which God
hath provided in his church, for defending men
against the snares of the Devil, and the machina-
tions of his instruments." They moreover take εἰς
δέλερον τῆς σαρκὸς metaphorically for the suppression
or destruction thereby of pride, lust, and other
fleshly passions, which they think would be mortified
by the evils it was supposed to bring with it, namely,
when he found himself despised and shunned by all.
But this interpretation seems not a little harsh; nor
is the word ever so used by the Apostle.

Others, as Lightfoot and Slade, think that the
present passage has no reference to excommunica-
tion at all. Yet excommunication is plainly alluded
to at ver. 2.; and here are suggested the measures
for carrying it into execution.

Upon the whole, I think the opinion of the Greek
Fathers and Commentators, which is also confirmed by
Grotius, Newcome, Pearce, Crelius, Locke, Hardy,
Whitby, Rosenm., Mackn., Pyle, Schles., Jaspis,
Maltby (Serm. 2, 574.), and other eminent Com-
mentators, is the only defensible one. They recog-
nize in the passage a formal excommunication (which

* For Piscator and Crelius rightly remark, that this is an epa-
nalepsis for τὸν εὖτε τοῦτο κατεργησάμενον. Yet I agree with Beza
that it also suggests the enormity of the man's offence.
is comprehended in παραδοσία τῷ Σατάνῃ) and also, a punishment of the flesh, which is evidently implied in the words εἰς ἔλεσθον τῆς παραδοσίας. That the Apostles had the power, and were authorised to punish notorious offenders with death and disease in a supernatural manner, few will deny. (See Joh. 20, 23. Acts 13, 11. and infra, 11, 21.) And if so, may we not (asks Mackn.) believe, that the command which the Apostle on this occasion gave to the Corinthians, to deliver the incestuous person to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, was an exertion of that power? especially as it was to be done, not by their own authority, but by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Spirit who inspired Paul to give the command."

Again, as this is plainly implied, we are warranted in supposing (as do the Greek Fathers and Commentators) that the offender was visited with some painful and wasting disease. Those who maintain the contrary opinion indeed urge, that no mention is made of the removal of any bodily malady, when the Corinthians were ordered to forgive and re-admit him into the Church. But that will not prove that no such was ever inflicted. He might then have recovered of it. For the Apostle's intention was only, by the infliction of some disease immediately and suddenly consequent upon the act of excommunication, to shew the reality of the power committed to him and the other Apostles by Jesus Christ, (which would evince the divine nature of their mission), and thus strike an awe into the hearts of all reflecting persons.

Crellius has here a long and masterly annotation, in which the view of the sense above adopted is ably illustrated. * Rosenm. judiciously comments on

* He says (inter alia) that Satan is here compared to an executioner, or tormentor, into whose hands a criminal is delivered for punishment. "So (continues he) Job was delivered to Satan, though not for punishment, but for a trial of his faith and patience. And in 2 Tim. 1, 20. Phygellus and Hermogenes are by St. Paul
the passage thus: "Affirmat igitur Paulus, se affecturum esse incestum laetali morbo in ipso Christianorum conventu, cui animo interfuturus erat juvante Christi virtute, quae miraculum non modo effectura, sed ita etiam patratura erat, ut morbum sceleratus homo in ipsâ concione nancisceretur, eumque igitur ob morbum, in quem subito ceciderit, ex consilio suo removere cogerentur, qui propter scelus expellere noluissent."

5. ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθ. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, "that his soul, corrected, humbled, and reformed by these sufferings, may be saved at the day when Christ shall come to judge the world." See Dr. Hamm. ap. D'Oyley and Mant.

6. οὗ καλὸν τὸ κακόν ποιών. Some Commentators, as Locke, Grot., Whitby, and Mackn., refer this to the individual in question; q. d. "your glorying in such a teacher is not well founded." And this is partly supported by the Greek Commentators, who take it to mean, "your glorying is not good for him, by preventing his repentance." But αὐτῷ would thus be required. As to the former interpretation, it is a very strained one, notwithstanding what Mr. Locke urges, that if their leader had not been guilty of this miscarriage, it had been out of St. Paul's way to have reproved them for glorying in him." Which seems somewhat sophistical.

I rather assent to Bp. Hall, Menoch., Hardy, Rosenm., Krause, and Jaspis, that it is a general objurgation; (as at ver. 2. ὑμεῖς πεφυσιομένοι ἐστε) q. d. "ye have no cause for boasting, while such foul sins are committed among you."

6. οὐκ ὅδετε δὲ μικρὰ γὰρ ἡμη, δ. τ. ὡς. A proverbial delivered to Satan, i. e. to be chastised and afflicted." I would add, that a similar metaphor occurs in Pind. Pyth. 3, 63, 6.

Εὐκακίν τρέφαι εἰδαμά-
Σαρό ἐνυ. Καὶ γειτόνων Πολλοί ἐπαύρον, ἀμα
Δι' ἐφθαρεν, πολλάν τ' ὀρει πῦρ εξ ἐνός
Σπείρατος ἐνθορόν ἀπετῶσει θλαν.

Abp. Newcome very properly remarks that this mode of punishment was to be confined to the age of miracles.
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saying, found also at Gal. 5, 9. By ἡμι the Hebrews metaphorically understood whatever has the power of corrupting, whether doctrine, example, or any thing else. So Neve Schalom. fol. 191, 2. (cited by Wets.) Rabbini nostri vocant concupiscientiam malam fermentum in massā : quod sicuti paululum fermenti fermentat totam massam magnam et corruptit: sic corruptit totum hominem. Nor was this confined to the Jews. In Plut. Quæst. Rom. 2, 289 e. (cited by Wets.) it is asked: διατε τὸ ἱερεῖ τὸν Δίον, ἐν Φλάμμιν δἰὰ λιν καλότιν, οὐκ ἔξεν ὁγνεὶ—ἡμι—ἡ ἡμι καὶ γέγονεν ἐκ φθορᾶς αὐτῆς, καὶ σατέρει τὸ φύραμα μιγνυμένη, γίνεται γὰρ ἄτονον καὶ ἄθροισίς, καὶ ὅλως οὐκ οἶκε στῆσι ἡ μισοσ εἰλαι. τὴν εἰσοδάσασα γοῦν ἄποζύνει παντάτασι, καὶ σατέρει τὸ ἄλειφον.

The ἡμι has an especial reference to the incest committed: but the Apostle may also intend to hint, that one vice, like πορεία, draws many others after it. Theophyl. well paraphrases: "Ὥσσρ γάρ ἡ ἡμι μικρὰ ὡσα, τὸ φύραμα πᾶν ἡμῖν καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν μετάβαλλεν· ὡτω καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτία πρὸς ἑαυτὴν πολλοὺς ἑπιστάσεται.

The reading δοῦλοι, though supported by the Cod. Cant., the Vulg., and almost all the Latin Fathers, is a manifest gloss.

7. ἐκκαθάρατε οὖν τὴν παλαιὰν ἡμῖν. The Apostle takes occasion from the above similitude to exhort the Corinthians (under a new allegory, derived from the Jewish custom of putting away leaven at the Passover,) to forsake vice, and, besides vice, vicious men; since vice will never be banished from the Church, unless those who will not abstain from it are banished with it. (Crel.)

The Apostle has in view not only the person above mentioned, but all sinners like him; as appears from ver. 11. (Rosenm.)

7. ἢνα ἢτε νέον φύραμα, "that ye may be, like unto a recent φύραμα before the leaven is put to it." In ἐκκαθάρατε the ἐκ is intensive. Doddridge, however, pushes the principle too far.

7. καθὼς ἐστε ἡμῖν, "as ye are, or by your Chris-
tian profession are bound to be, unleavened, and to abstain from vice and vicious persons." So Chrysost. καθὼς πρέπει εἶναι ύμᾶς.

7. καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα χοῦν ἦν ἡ X. By the πάσχα is meant (by metonymy) the paschal lamb; q. d. "We Christians have also a paschal lamb, even Christ, who died for the expiation of our sins: which sacrifice obliges us to greater purity of life than the Jews were bound to observe." There is evidently an allusion to the whole work of atonement and expiation accomplished by Jesus Christ: and the late learned, able, and judicious defender of that fundamental doctrine (Abp. Magee) has, in his invaluable work on the Atonement, excellently treated on this passage. In his Illustr. No. 35. he has (I think) satisfactorily proved that the Passover was a sacrifice, as possessing all the essential characteristics of a sacrifice.*

For ἔσοδον the true reading is ἔσοδη, which, indeed, is not found in some of the best MSS., but is required by analogy. (See Matth. Gr. Gr.) Wets. here cites two eloquent passages from that most spiritual and enlightened Jew, Philo de Sacrific. Abelis et Caini, t. 1. p. 177, 38. & 184, 24.

8. ἀστε ἐφραζόμενος, &c., "thus (therefore) let us

* His words are these: It was a corban, or offering, brought to the tabernacle, or temple, Deut. 16, 2, 5, 6, 2 Chron. 35, 5, 6, 10, 11. 2. The paschal lamb was slain in the temple; its blood was poured out, sprinkled, and offered at the altar by the priests, in like manner as the blood of the victims usually slain in sacrifice, as appears from Exod. 23, 18, 34, 25. 2 Chron. 30, 15, 16. 35, 11. And in this sprinkling of the blood consisted, as we are told by the Jewish doctors, the very essence of a sacrifice. See Cudworth's "True Notion of the Lord's Supper." ch. 11, 3. The fat and entrails were burnt upon the altar, as may be collected from the passages above referred to, as also from the declaration of the Jewish doctors, the descriptions of the Paschal Sacrifice in the Misna of the Talmud, and the testimony of the Karaites, who are known to reject all the Talmudical traditions not founded on Scripture. Cudw. ut supra, Beausob. Introd. pp. 134, 135. ed. 1790. and Sykes's Essay on Sacrifices, p. 41. See also Pol. Syn. and Bp. Patrick on Exod. 12, 27. ἔμεθα (he passed) of the Hebrew is written מנה in the Chaldee, from which the Greek πάσχα has immediately flowed."
keep our feast, (namely) not,” &c. The Apostle still continues in the metaphor taken from the Pass-over.

’Εορτάζειν, which properly signifies to celebrate a feast, is applied to denote worship in general; and because the celebration of feasts involves the idea of rejoicing, the word also signifies “to be occupied, with great delight, in the worship of God, and endeavour after virtue and holiness of life;” or “to be as willingly occupied in these as in keeping feasts on holy days,” (Loesner.*)

8. μοι δὲ ἐν δὲ σύρνη παλαιά, “not with the leaven yet remaining in you;” whether of the incestuous person, or of fornicators, or of any immoral and sensual persons, all of whom seem included in the words κακίας καὶ πονηρίας.

8. ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀγίῳ εἰλικρινείᾳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, “but in the society of persons who are studious of integrity and true virtue.” Εἰλικρ. signifies integrity in general. The word indeed, by its etymology,† signifies virtue that will bear the closest examination: but in use εἰλικρινὴς referred rather to what is pure, unmixed. (See Suid., Hesych., and Etym. Mag.) And so Basil Mag. (cited by Rosenm.) εἰλικρινὲς λογίζομαι εἶναι τὰ ἁμαρτ., καὶ ἁρμομ. κεκαθαρισμένοι ἀπὸ ταύτας ἐκατόνως. And in this light the Apostle evidently views the word; since he alludes to the dough when mixed with leaven or ferment. It therefore signifies generally integrity, probity.

* The learned Philologist has illustrated the metaphor by a kindred passage of Philo 477 D. ψυχής ἐορτή, ζῆλος, ὁ τῶν ἀριστῶν καὶ τελεφορομένων τῶν. Wets., too, appositely cites Philo 1, 185, 6 ἐορτὴ γὰρ ψυχής ἐν ἀρατίᾳ εὐφροσύνῃ τελείᾳ. Τελείαι δὲ αἱ εὐλόγιοι ἀμύνοι, δια τὸ ἀνθρώπινου γένους χωρεῖ, μόνας δὲ ἐορτάζει τῶν τοιεύσθων ἐορτήν ὁ σῶφος, τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὐδεὶς. I add Thucyd. 1, 70. (speaking of the Athenians) t. 1. 128. Βαυ. Καὶ ἀπολαβοῦσιν ἐλάχιστα τῶν ἐπαρχόντων, διὰ τὸ ἄει κτάσθαι, καὶ μὴν ἐορτὴν ἄλλῳ τι ἡγεῖσθαι ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πράξαι.

† From εἰλίκη and κρίνω: so that ἐἰλικρίνης properly signifies (as Longin. de Subl., referred to by Schleus. Lex., suggest) one whose purity will bear the closest examination, like that of an article examined by the full light of the sun.
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'Αληθεία denotes true virtue: a use of the word borrowed from the Hebr. מופס, (see Gesen. Lex. Hebr.), and found in Joh. 3, 21. οτι διων την ἀληθειαν, (where see the note,) and Rom. 1, 18. and 2, 8. where ἡ άληθεία is opposed to δικαια. (See the note there.)

Some Commentators, as Mackn., rightly (I think) conclude from this and 16, 8. that when the Epistle was written the Jewish Passover was at hand. "And if so (continues Mackn.) this verse makes it probable, that the disciples of Christ began very early to celebrate the Lord's Supper with peculiar solemnity, annually on the day on which he suffered, which was the day of the Jewish Passover, called in modern language, Easter.

9. ἔγραψα ὡμιν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, μὴ συναμίγνυσθαι πόνηροι.

Having expressed his wonder that they had not expelled from their society a noxious member, whose example could only serve to encourage immorality, the Apostle again adverts to the subject of ἐπιστολα generally, (on which he had touched at ver. 2. and hinted at ver. 6.) in order that he may give them some further admonitions, and especially remove what might have been made a difficulty; the expression ἀειφοι seeming to imply that they were to have no connection with the immoral.

The above is, I conceive, the true scope of the Apostle in the remaining portion of the Chapter. Yet on this point Commentators are by no means agreed. The decision of the question depends indeed much on the interpretation of the words ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, which almost all modern Commentators unite in rendering "an epistle," "an earlier epistle:" and they suppose it to have reference to some former Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians; though no such has come down to us, nor has the existence of any such been on any credible evidence of Ecclesiastical antiquity. Indeed, this hypothesis involves much difficulty, and is liable to many objections. Why (for example) should it not have been preserved as well as the later ones. Now, those who dress up the above-mentioned nation in its most specious shape, tell us, that the Epistle in question was a very brief one, and just sent off, when the messengers from the Corinthians arrived. All this, however, is gratis dictum. There is not a particle of evidence in support of it. For, as to the words themselves, they can by no means be tortured to signify any such thing, even by implication. To admit this interpretation, something ought to have been before said of this Epistle, which, as they pretend, almost passed the messengers on the road, and of which, had there been such an Epistle so written and so sent, the Apostle could not but
directly have made mention. Besides, who can tolerate such a licentious use of the article, which would be unparalleled in irregularity.

For the above reasons I must accede to the opinion of the mino-

rity, though numerous, namely, the Greek Commentators, most Latin

ones, and, of the moderns, Glass, Terin., Est., Vorat., Hamma., Wolf,

and most of the Dutch Divines, Fabricius, Gothofred, Olearius, Lar-

der, Pyle, Hardy, Mackn., Bps. Tomline and Middleton, and Mr. Slade,

that ῥαυξ is for ῥαυξ; as in kindred passages at Rom. 16, 2. 2 Thess.

3, 4. Col. 4, 66. 1 Thess. 5, 27. And many other examples of this

idiom are adduced by Glass Phil. S. p. 131—133. and Mackn. Prel.

Diss. § 71. "Εγραψα, "I have (already, or just,) written to you," namely, at ver. 2 & 7. of this chapter. That ἐγραψα may have this

signification none can doubt who know the force of the Αorist ; and

so it occurs in 9, 15. 1 Job. 2, 12, 14. Otherwise, as Bp. Middleton

observes, the sentence at ver. 11. νυνι δὲ ἐγραψα would have been

νυνι δὲ γράψω. And though in 2 Cor. 7, 8. ῥαυξ ἐκπαντολεγεται has re-

ference to the former Epistle, yet there the Epistle had been men-

tioned. Mr. Slade (after Bp. Middleton) renders ἐγραψα, "I have

been writing to you;" which comes to much the same sense.

The chief difficulty in the last-mentioned interpretation is in-

volved in νυνι, which Middleton and Slade elude by rendering:

"But on the present occasion I have been writing to you;" or, "my

purpose in writing to you in this." There is, however, something

so languid in this signification of νυνι, and so arbitrary in the sense

thus elicited from ἐγραψα νυνι, that it is utterly inadmissible. In-

deed, it cannot be true. For it was not the main purpose of St.

Paul in writing this Epistle to forbid Christians from associating with

immoral brethren. (See the introduction of Krause & Mackn. to this

Epistle.) I prefer to adopt the opinion of Wolf, that the νυνι is not

opposed to the preceding phrase ἐγραψα ῥαυξ ἐκπαντολεγεται, but is rather

explicatory of it; or (as Olearius says) propriis designationis.

Fabricius ap. Wolf has briefly, but not unfaithfully, rendered the

passage thus: "Scirpae vobis hac presente epistolae, propteram ne

fornicarius communicens. Non loquor de Ethnicis, qui ferendi vo-

bis sunt: verum scripsa ista, ne tanquam fratrem communicetis, qui

est fornicarius." And so Mackn.: "but now more particularly I

wrote, or I have thought proper to write." So also Theodoret.

Having enlarged so much on the sense of this passage, which, in

certain a point of view, is very important, I can do no more than

refer my readers to the masterly exposition of Chrysost. and the

Scholia of Ὠcumen., Phot., and Theodoret. I am not aware that any of the ancient Fathers ever referred the words of any other Epis-
tle than the present; yet Theodoret seems not to have been igno-

rant of the opinion; for he says, εν πολη εκπαντολεγε; εν αὑρανυξ δανυξ.

And he then observes, that the whole passage is explanatory of

what was meant in the preceding one.

9. συναναγνωσει, "to mingle in familiar society with." The verb is often used by the Sept. (See Schl. Lex.) Krause compares Ἔρμοσθ. συμμίξας.
πόρνοις ἀνθρωποῖς. And he refers to Plotin. Thesp. 29., and observes, that the word often occurs in Herodot. (See Ernesti on Callim. H. in Jov. 13. p. 8.) The word πόρνος in the Classical writers usually signifies a catamite: but in the Scriptures it has a more extensive sense, and denotes chiefly a whoremonger, or, in a general way, a lewd person. And in this sense I agree with Doddre. it ought here to be taken, though (as he remarks) “the Apostle’s argument concludes yet more strongly against some other species of lewdness than what is called simple fornication, detestable as that is.” Rosenm. and Krause, following Semler, think it is plain that the word was meant to have reference to persons of both sexes. Now, I think the very contrary is apparent. In all the other passages where the Apostle uses the word, it is evidently applied to males: and at ver. 11. we have εἰς τις ἀδελφὸς. Indeed, to have applied it to females would have been irrelevant. For, from the restraints of Grecian society, females had very little intercourse beyond the society of their family and near friends. Neither was it necessary; since the Apostle’s admonition would apply à fortiori to females.

Krause here compares Xen. Hierom. 4. who mentions a similar law among certain states: πεποίηται τολαι νόμον πιὸ μιαμφόφρ μηδὲ τὸν νόμον συνόντα καθαρέων.

10. The Apostle now explains his meaning. Καὶ οἱ (scil. λέγει), “I mean or meant not that ye should have no connection with immoral persons.” Τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, “of the Gentiles.” For that is a periphrasis of Gentile, or Non-Christian. (See Joh. 15, 19. and 17, 14.) The same expression must be understood with each of the following terms.

The sentiment intended by the Apostle is well expressed by Xen. Ages. 11, 4.

10. ἦ τοῖς πλεονεκταῖσ, &c. “or (for instance) the covetous, extortioners.” For these are given as examples of the vices which chiefly stained the Hea-
thens. On each of these terms the early modern Commentators have written copiously. It may suffice for the student to consult Schl. Lex. and Steph. Thes. 

'Ἀρκ. is a stronger term than the former, and denotes rapacity.

10. ἐπεὶ ἐφείλετε, “since, (otherwise),” &c. This ellipsis of ἀλλας is not unfrequent after ἐπεὶ; as Rom. 3, 6. 11, 6 & 22. where see the notes. The words ἐπεὶ ἐφείλετε—ἐξειδεῖν have the air of a proverbial dict, in which, of course, ὧδε is not to be pressed upon, but has the same signification as in 7, 36. Hebr. 2, 17, 5, 3. Luke 17, 10. Chrys. explains it: ἐτέραν εἰκομένην ἐδει ἔχειν. I must observe that Aristid. 1, 175. elegantly expresses this by ἔξωικεῖν τῆς εἰκομένης. The Apostle, then, means to say, that it would be absurd to expect this, and wicked to wish it, since it would involve the neglect of the social duties. It is evident how powerful an argument may hence be drawn against monastic institutions, except under such regulations as should permit none to retire until a period of life when they might be presumed to have discharged the most important duties of life.

11. ὅπδι ἐγραψα ὢμίν μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι. On the sense of this clause see the note supra, ver. 9. Συναναμίγνυσθαι, εὰν τις ἀ. ὀ. ἀ. This is an Hellenistic phrase, importing, “associate with any brother Christian who is,” &c. By ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος some think is meant no more than ἀδελφ. ὢν. And indeed this sense of ὀνομ. does sometimes occur; but here the context may induce one to suppose that the Apostle intended a stress to be laid upon the word; and therefore I assent to the Greek Commentators and the early modern ones, that it signifies one who makes a profession of Christianity, is a Christian, at least in name. For, as Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) observes: ὁνομα μόνον ἀδελφῶν ἔχει, ὅκ ἐστι δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τάς ἐς τοῖς ἀπρίμητοις ἔνεχος.

In enumerating the vices on account of which any Christian brother ought to be avoided, the Apostle,
it may be observed, does not strictly follow the former list of the heathen vices, because far more is required in a Christian. Thus he omits ἀρτ., as supposing that no such Christian would be retained in the society. And, as to εἰδολ., that must be accommodated to the nature of the case, and denote that kind of idolatry in which some, though retained in Christian societies, indulged themselves, namely, in frequenting the idol feasts, or so eating of the meat provided there as to offend weak brethren. (See the Epistle to the Romans.) The Apostle inserts λοίδος and μέθυρος, though not found in the heathen list, for the reason above suggested. The former term is explained ὑβριστής, κακολογος. It, however, answers to our blackguard, and, as it is associated with μέθυρος, it can require no explanation. Krause absurdly supposes that it implies gluttony as well as drunkenness.

With respect to ἀρτάξ., I strongly suspect that it has crept in from the former list, especially as it is out of place.

Here Grot. aptly cites from Charonidas: ἀδίκος ἄνδρι καὶ γυναικὶ μὴ ὁμιλεῖν μηδένα, καὶ ὑπερήφανοι αἰσ ὄντα ὀμοίουν.

11. τῷ τωιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθείν, "with such a sort of person, no, not to eat," i.e. (as some explain) "not use their familiar intercourse." But the μηδὲ will not permit this: for that the Apostle could not have been expected to allow, and it fell under the former συναναμιγνωσθαι. And moreover, the Apostle is here bringing forward some new direction. The sense is, I think, rightly pointed out by Grot., who renders: "with such an one, no, not to eat at the same table;" which is, he observes, the lowest sort of connection, or intercourse; as Gal. 2, 12. Here Wets. compares Seneca Ep. 19. Epicuri—ante, inquit, circumspeiciendum est, cum quibus edas ac bibas, quàm quid edas et bibas.

12. τί γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν. There is, in this sentence somewhat of abruptness, arising from the
omission of a clause, which depends upon γὰρ, and assigns the reason why he does not advert to sinners of the heathen. The interrogative, too, involves a strong negation. Τί γὰρ μοι, scil. μέλει or προσῆκει. Krause compares Arrian. Epict. 4, 6. τί γὰρ σοι καὶ τὸῦτο εἶπεῖν. Many examples of this ellipsis are cited by Wets.

Κρίνειν signifies to judge, pass sentence on. The τῶς ἔξω and the τοὺς ἔσω are those within, and without the pale of Christianity, Christians, and Non-Christians. (See Schoettg.) Kypke compares Joseph. Ant. 4, 13. where the Jews, οἱ αἰκεῖοι, are opposed τοὺς ἔξωθεν. This, Krause observes, the Apostle proceeds to illustrate by an example drawn from common life. And he renders: "nonne vos (in causis forensibus) modo judicātis de intraneis, i.e. civibus vestris?" So Schulz ap. Rosenm.: "Nonne vos etiam in communi vitā sic agitis, ut in eos tantum animadvertatis, qui ad forum vestrum pertinent?" And so Jaspis. Others, as Crell. and Mackn., render: "do ye not possess a right to judge those that are within the Church?" Many Commentators, as Pyle and Rosenm., adopt the punctuation and interpretation of Theophyl., as follows: "Have I any thing to do to judge those that are without? No. Judge ye them that are within (but those that are without God judgeth), and ye shall take away the evil from among you." Other conjectures and interpretations may be seen in Bowyer.

But, after all, I see no reason to desert the common punctuation and interpretation, which is confirmed by Chrysost., Theodoret, and Photius ap. Οἰκομεν. 462. ἤμεῖς δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διαρθοῦμεθα, ἐν τῷ κρίνειν καὶ ἀνακρίνειν αὐτῶν τῶν βιῶν ἐπὶ διορθάσει, εἴ ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἐξωρίσθησαν. Τοὺς δὲ ἔξω ὦ Θεὸς κρίνει. The sense is well expressed by Mr. Slade, as follows: "What have I to do with Heathens? (And how could I give directions respecting your judgment of them?) Is it not your exclusive concern to judge those that are within? The heathens God will judge (but
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exercise the judgment that belongs to you), and cut off that wicked person from your community."

13. καὶ ἐξαρείτε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐ. Ἰ. α. Future for Imperative. There is a reference to Deut. 24, 7. καὶ ἐξαρείς τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. The sense is: "excommunicate him, expel him from your society." Many copies omit the καὶ, which is cancelled by some Critics, but not on good grounds. It is equivalent to "and (so)," i. e. as you have the power; this confirms the common interpretation at ver. 12. Let it be remembered, too, that though it is omitted in some dozen MSS., yet their authority, in such a case, is of little weight: for who would have thought of inserting a καὶ? whereas, as there is some harshness and difficulty connected with it, that would cause the corrector of the Cod. Cant., and some other such bold emendators, to cancel it.

CHAP. VI.

1. τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν, πράγμα ἔχων π. τ. ἡ. The Apostle now proceeds to quite another subject, and connected with what he had written in the preceding Chapter only by the association of ideas. (Krause.) The vinculum may perhaps be the κρίνειν at ver. 12., which suggested to the Apostle the idea of that litigious spirit which he well knew existed among the Corinthians.

1. τολμᾷ. There is no reason, with the old Commentators, to press upon the sense of this word, which, as in Rom. 5, 7. and 2 Cor. 10, 12., denotes: "sustinet, in animum inducit," "can any one bring himself." (See the note on Rom.) The above sense was first seen by Erasmus, who adduces examples of this signification of sustineo, as does Krause of τολμᾶω. (See Bp. Pearce.)

1. πράγμα, like negotium, is a forensic term, signifying the lis, controversia, suit. It must here mean such a charge as would afford grounds for a suit at law. Krause compares Lys. p. 109. πράγμα ἔχειν
and Plato Gorg. ἄλλα δέι καὶ πράγματα καὶ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἡδάνος, καὶ λυπᾶς φεῦγειν, καὶ διακεῖν, καὶ ὑπομένωνα καρτερεῖν ὅπως δέι.

1. πρὸς τὸν ἔτερον. For κατὰ τοῦ ἔτερου, Matt. 5, 23. Estius observes, that the Apostle's censure is directed against the plaintiff, not the defendant; and that for an obvious reason.

1. κρίνεσθαι ἐν τῶν ἁδικῶν. Κρίνεσθαι, like the Heb. הַנָּת, signifies litigare, to move a suit, as in Matt. 5, 39. 'Ἐν', sub, coram, under the jurisdiction of. Of this sense Wets. adduces several Classical examples. Τῶν ἁδικῶν, "the heathens;" as opposed to ἐν τῶν ἅγιοι just after. (See Acts 25, 9, 10, 1. Tim. 6, 13.) That this merely denotes profane judges is plain, notwithstanding what Paulus and Krause have urged to the contrary. The best Commentators admit that by ἁδικοῖ are meant ἀνιστόλοι, as opposed to the οἱ ἅγιοι, or Christians. Now these are so called, not (as Rosenm. supposes) because unbelievers do not pay what they owe to God (which would be very frigid), but from their being generally ἁδικοὶ (just as they are sometimes called ἀμαρτωλοί), though many of them were by no means such, but (especially in their judicial capacity) of approved integrity. (See Mackn. and Bp. Pearce.) So Theophyl. Ἅγιοι δὲ τῶν πιστῶν φησιν, ἔξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἁμαρτών δεικνύς τὴν διαφοράν οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἁδικοὶ εἰσίν, οἱ δὲ ἅγιοι. Rosenm. thinks there is a paronomasia between the names here given them, and that which they usually bore, οἱ δικασταί. And he appeals to Max. Tyr. 9, 4. (cited by Wets.) But the remark seems ill founded. That eloquent sophist abounds in such concetti as are not found in our Apostle.

In illustration of the thing, it is observed by the Commentators, and especially Rosenm., that as the Jews had permission from the Romans to hold courts for the decision of the suits at law of their brethren, so this privilege had been granted to the Christians, especially the Jewish Christians: but that some Corinthian Christians, despising the Chris-
tian Judges, had recourse to the Heathen ones, from some false notions respecting Christian liberty, and that they might not assimilate themselves with Jews." In which view Wetstein (among other Rabbinical passages) cites Tanchuma, fol. 92, 2. Statutum est, ad quod omnes Israelitae obligantur, eum qui litem cum alio habet, non debere eum tractare coram gentilibus. All this, however, seems to be too hypothetical. The persons addressed were few of them Jewish Christians: nor is it likely that any such permission as that in question would be granted to the Gentile Christians by the Romans, or be accepted by them: since this would effectually assimilate them with Jews; which they would have many reasons to deprecate.

It would appear that by ἐξὶ τῶν ἄγιων are meant, not Christian Judges authorized to finally decide suits, but private arbitrators,* by whose decision they were not obliged to abide, and often did not abide, but brought their suits before the Roman Judges.

2. οὐκ οἴδατε ἐξὶ, &c. This formula is of frequent occurrence, and chiefly serves to strengthen an asseveration, and rouse attention.

On the sense of the present passage various have been the opinions of the Commentators. The generally received one, and that supported by some few Latin Fathers, as Cyprian, and, of the moderns, Beza, Calvin, Erasmus, Justinian, Cassaubon, Estius, Selden, Wolf, Doddridge, and Pearce, is, that that is meant of the Christians being assembled round the tribunal of Christ at the last day; and thus taking a part in the judgment to be pronounced on the unbelieving world—"tanquam adsumos Christi." To which interpretation strong objections are made by Lightfoot, Macknight, and others. "It is repugnant (says Mackn.) to all the accounts given of the general judgment; and particularly to our Lord's own account of that great event, Matt. 25., where the righteous are represented as all standing before his tribunal, along with the wicked, and as receiving their sentence at the same time with them. Be-

* And so Theophyl. 904. ἀνείδη ὁ πιοτα οὐκ ἔσται ὅτι καὶ οὐκ ἀδίκων ἴδοκεν πρὸς τὸ τεμένιν ἰνθέσου, &c. So also Wet.: "Quis autem judices ex gentibus adestis, eligite litium vestrarum arbitros ex sœtu vestro, vel illos, quos ad iudicandum inptissimos existimatis." And he refers to Cor. 11, 23. James 5, 1 Sam. 8, 7. Dan. 4, 14. 2 Cor. 9, 5. Mark 12, 10. Joh. 5, 26.
sides, for what purpose are the saints to be Christ's assessors at the judgment? Is it to give him counsel, or only to assent to the sentence he will pass on the wicked? To found a doctrine of this magnitude merely on two obscure passages of Scripture, which can easily admit of a different and better interpretation, seems not a little rash." To the above objections it is replied by Mr. Slade, that it appears from Matt. 25, 33., that the saints shall be judged first, and we find from 1 Thess. 4, 16., that "the dead in Christ shall rise first; and therefore there is no contradiction in supposing that, after the sentence of blessedness has been passed upon them, they may join the attendant angels round the throne of judgment, and thus bear a part in that great transaction." "And though (continues he) Christ alone is the Judge, and needs no assistants, still it is for him to prescribe what forms of judicature he may think best; and there is no reason why he should not be surrounded with glorified saints, as well as with angels." But this, however ably put, is no sufficient answer. We admit that there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition: but how can the fact be proved from the words of the Apostle. And when it is said, it is for Christ to prescribe what forms of judicature he may think best, &c., that is begging the question. Such a sense cannot, I think, be elicited from the words. How harsh to interpret κρίνονει merely of assistance and approbation, standing by, and bearing a part in; and this is yet harsher, when applied, as it must be, to the words of ver. 3. "Ye shall judge angels."

2. Others, as Lightfoot, Vitringa, Amelius, Whitby, and Bengel, suppose it to be an allusion to Christian magistrates being governors, and so judges of the world. But on the time when this will take place they are not agreed. Most understand it of the dominion of Christian princes and judges, at the demolition of Pagan superstition. But this is making the passage prophetic; thus it has been, by the Popish Commentators, pressed into the service in order to defend their hierarchy; on which Semler has a very spirited and not ill-founded tirade.

Others, as Wetsius, refer it to the Millenium. But how angels are to be judged by the Christians of the Millenium, is more than we can comprehend.

3. Whitby and Mackn. take it to mean: "they shall judge and condemn the world, by the faith preached for a testimony unto them; as did Noah, Heb. 11, 7. See Joh. 16, 8, 12, 31. Mac-knight, however, would read κρίνονει, in the present tense, with this sense: "Do ye not know that the inspired teachers among you judge the world by the laws of the Gospel which they promulgate." But both these interpretations are harsh and strained, and cannot be applied to the judgment of angels without involving manifest absurdity. Semler, indeed, had before devised the conjecture κρι-νονει (which must, however, require κρίνονευν at ver. 3.): but he (as usual) explains away the sense.

The most favourite interpretation for the last half century has been that to be found in Noesselt, Rosenm., Krause, Jaspis, and (as it seems) Slade, who interpret it: "Christians can rightly judge
of heathens." i.e. perceive their errors in things pertaining to religion. See 2, 15. & 7, 16. Slade proposes to read ἐρωτεύω, and interpret: "the saints have power to discern, and authority to pass judgment on, the actions of mankind." But this sense cannot, I think, be elicited from the words on any correct Hermeneutical principles. In this respect the two last interpretations are liable to far greater objection than the first mentioned one; since it is certain, from ver. 3., that the judgment mentioned must be the final judgment. Now this interpretation has found an able defender where one should least expect it, namely, in Crelius. But he is compelled to maintain it by reasonings extremely sophistical. He thinks the passage is parallel to Matt. 19, 28., where it is said that the twelve Apostles shall sit on twelve thrones, to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Yet he admits that there are propria quasdam ac peculiaria Apostolis. And so also both the expressions have been explained by Cameron. But though that interpretation may be admitted at Matt. 19, 28. (where see the note), yet here it is inconsistent with the adjuncts, as judging angels, &c.

I shall now proceed to detail another interpretation, which, as it is the most ancient, will, after all (I think) be found the truest. It is that of the Greek Fathers and Commentators, and nearly all the Latin ones, though countenanced by scarcely any modern Commentator, except Semler. This is ably supported by Chrysost., Theophyl., Theodoret, and Photius. They take ἐρωτεύω (as often) for κατακρίνοω, condemn; and explain: "will affed matter for their condemnation (namely by the comparison);" "shall be the means of increasing their condemnation:" δὲν γὰρ (says Chrys.) τὸν ἥλιον ὀρνητεῖ, καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μετέχοντες κάντων, ἡμεῖς μὲν εὑρήκαμεν πιστεύοντες, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἤκακτοι, οὐ δυνάμοναι εἰς ἄγνοιαν καταφιγνεῖν κατηγορήσαμεν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτῶν, οὐ εὑρήκαμεν καὶ τολλὰ τοιαύτα εὑρήσει τις εἰκος κρίτηρα. Or, as Theophylact expresses it: "Οταν γὰρ ὄμοιοτάτες ὄντες, εὑρήσωμεν αὐτοὶ μὲν πιστεύοντες, οὐ κατακρίνει τούτο τῶν ἀπιστῶν;" Finally, Photius ap. Ἐκκομέν. 463 b. δὲν αὐτοῖς ἂν ὄμοιοι ὄντες ὄμοιοτατές ἡμῖν καὶ ἐπίστευον, καὶ κριτερίων ἐπεδείξατο πολλεῖς τῶν μη τοιούτων γνομένων ἱκάνη ἐσονται κατηγοροι; διελέγοντο γὰρ ἡμῖν, ὅτι οὐ κατὰ ἄθετειαν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ βαθμίν ἡμαρθήσαμεν. Chrysost. aptly compares Matt. 12, 41. "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it, because they repented at the preaching of Jonas:" & ver. 42. "The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it; for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon." And he might have added, Matt. 12, 29., "therefore shall they be your judges."

I see not what objection can be made to the above interpretation, when properly understood; and one advantage is, that it enables us to give the only interpretation at all satisfactory of the perplexing words of ver. 12., "judge the angels."

Yet to this the modern Commentators have paid little attention, only slightly objecting that this is no more than may be said of the
wicked; as in the case of the Ninevites, and the Queen of the South. Chrysost., however, adduces those passages in proof of the interpretation; and very rightly. For how can those persons be reckoned among the wicked, of the former of whom it is said that they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and of the latter, that she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the preaching of Solomon; which necessarily carries with it the idea of her embracing the true faith. Selden, indeed, objects that there is required something more appropriate and peculiar to the saints. But by ἄγιοι are only meant all true Christians: and we see with what ill success that "something more appropriate" has been aimed at. Thus it is, and ever will be, when men attempt "to be wise above what is written." Let us, then, leave to the Apostle his own modes of argument and illustration. In this view it is very well observed by Crellius: "Etiam si vero haec judicandi ratio sit improperia, nihilominus tamen ex ea argumentum ducere potuit Paulum." Macknight, indeed, boldly asserts that this sense has no relation to the Apostle's argument. But that depends upon the sense assigned to the words following. Surely Chrysost. was a far better judge of the scope of the Apostle than Macknight, or perhaps any other modern Theologian whatsoever.

After all, it is not necessary to too anxiously press on the inference couched in the following words, εἰς εἰς υἱὸν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος, ἀνάλοι τον κριταρίους κλασισθον, such being (more Judaico) somewhat tortuous, though popular, and therefore suitable to the purpose. It is well remarked by the Greek Commentators, that we have ἐν υἱὸν, not ἐν υἱῶν, i.e. (as Theophyl. explains) ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μὲν κρίνεται, ἐν υἱῶν δὲ κακὰ κρίνεται, viz. "by the example you believers have set them." The κρίνεται must be taken populariter, "is to be condemned," "will be condemned." So Crellius. "Verbum actum designans, pro facultate et jure, seu potestate accipitur." And he renders: "If ye are to be judges of the world (i.e. the unbelievers), are ye unworthy (i.e. unfit) for deciding in the smallest matters." So our common version. But I apprehend that κλασισθον has not here the superlative force, but merely denotes things of exceedingly small moment, i.e. (as the Apostle just after explains) βιωτεύον, things of this life only, and therefore comparatively inconsiderable; namely, of disputed claims, inheritances, &c. ὅταν here signifies the lo, controprosia; though it usually denotes the place of judgment. The argument, then, may be thus stated: "If you have shown such judgment as to appreciate and embrace the Christian faith, and such integrity and probity as it enjoins, and thereby will put to shame, and condemn by comparison, those of greater talents, learning, and acquirements, are you unfit to exercise judicial and arbitrary functions on petty matters."

In ver. 5 there is a sort of climax. The Apostle (Crellius observes), "assurgit in ostendendâ Christianorum dignitâtæ." On the words therein contained, Krause remarks that, owing to the extreme brevity of the Apostle in speaking his mind, they are so obscure, that on their sense nothing certain can be determined." And so D'Onay and Mant: "What particular judgment is here meant.
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it is not easy to assign or determine." But, though I deny not, nimirum esse brevitatem, the obscurity seems chiefly to have originated in the false views which the modern Commentators have taken of ver. 1., and which cannot very well be imputed to the interpretation I have adopted. Thus some interpret the verse of the Christians (or rather the Apostles and ministers of the Gospel) prevailing over evil spirits in this life, and depriving them of their dominion; or, by ἀγγέλους, they understand "crafty and powerful men," as resembling evil angels, or assisted by demoniacal influence. Schulz, yet more unwarrantably, wraps all up by observing, that in these words there is no more than universality expressed.* By which notable device he silences, and in effect cancels, the troublesome word. It is evident how this is to be applied to angels (by whom must be understood bad angels, as, in the former step of the climax, bad men), namely, to use the words of Chrysost. 342, 40. ήταν γάρ αἱ ἀσώματοι διάνομεις αὑτοί θανάτου ἡμῶν εὐφραίνοντες ἔχουσι τῶν σώρων περιβεβλημένων, χαλαστάρεις ἰδέας διην. So Theoph. Ἀγγέλους τοὺς δαίμονες φης καὶ τούτους ὧν κατακράτων, ήταν οἱ ἐν υἱοί ἡμών τῶν ἀσώματων αὐτῶν πλεον εὐφραίνοντες ἔχοντες. And so Theodoret: κατακράτοι δὲ αὐτοῦς οἱ ἄγιοι, δι' αὐτῶν περιβεβλημένοι τῆς θείου θεραπείας ἐφραίσαν, ἐκείνων ἐν ἀσώματι φύσει τοῦ πονηρῶν ἀσκασμένοι. Photius ap. Ecumen. has an elaborate disquisition on this subject, to which I can only refer my learned readers.

4. ἐνιαυτικὸ μὲν ὀν κριτήρια — καλίβετε. This sentence is susceptible of more than one sense, according as the verb be taken in the indicative or the imperative. The former mode is adopted by most modern Commentators, as Luther, Cameron, Vorst., Castello, and almost all the Commentators of the last century, as Wolf, Whitby, Wells, Dodridge, Hardy, and Elsner. Thus a mark of interrogation is placed at the end of the sentence, and by τῶν ἐξουθενυμένων are understood Heathen magistrates; which is supposed to be most agreeable to the words following. And this may possibly be the true interpretation: yet it is liable to some objections. Do interrogative sentences often commence with μενό; I think not. Is it not harsh to consider the Gentile Judges as ἐξουθενυμένοι by the Christians; (which is contrary to the Apostle's maxim, "Honour to

* I had occasion to repudiate a similar false interpretation, supra 4, 9., "a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men (where see the note)."
whom honour is due?) and does it not violate purity of language to say, that they were ἐξουθ. ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, for ὅπο τῆς ἐκκλησίας? And then (as Kypke suggests) how can καδιγέτε be suitable to the Corinthian Christians, who did not appoint the Gentile Judges, but might appoint and choose arbiters and referees.

I therefore greatly prefer the common interpretation, by which καδ. is taken in the imperative: and this is confirmed by the Syr., Vulg., and some other antient Versions, as also by the Greek Fathers and Commentators and most of the Latin ones, and, of the modern Commentators, by Calvin, Beza, Grot., Drus., Est., De Dieu, Crell., Hamm., Pearce, Wets., Kypke, Mackn., Pyle, Storr, Schleus., and several others.

By τοὺς ἐξουθ. is meant, “even the least esteemed amongst you,” i. e. “if ye have not wise and prudent men, or if they be otherwise occupied.”

Some Commentators, as Knatchbull, have fancied a harshness in the pleonasm of τούτων. But others, more properly, regard it as emphatic. In τοὺς ἐξουθ. Lightfoot and Locke recognize an allusion to a sort of petty court of referees, not formally appointed by the Sanhedrim, but acting as arbitrators. This, however, seems too hypothetical. It appears, indeed, from the Rabbinical passages cited by the former,

* So Chrysost. 343. Μεθ' ἀπερβολή ήμισ διδάξει βουλόμενο, ὅτι οὐδὰν ὑποτοῦ, τοῖς ἐξωθηνείς εαυτῶν διδάσκει. τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι ἀντίθεν κινέσεις, προηγουμένης ταύτην ἐκκλησίαν, ὃ γὰρ λέγει τοιούτων ἐστιν ὅσω ἐρεί τις, διτ οὐδεὶς ἐν ὑμῖν σώφος, οὐδὲ ικανὸς διακρίνει, εἰκαστρόφητοι τάντας. Καὶ τοῖς τούτων, κἂν γὰρ μηδεὶς ἂν σοφός, φησί, τοῖς ἑλάχιστοις ἐπιτρέπετε. And Theophyl. 205. Ἐκ περιουσίας βουλόμενος ἀποστῆσαι αὐτοὺς τῶν ἔως δικαστηρίων, φησίν, ὅτι τοις ἐν τοῖς ἄν, διτ οὐκ ἐνο ἑπί τις ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, διακρίνει δυνάμενος. Ἐι γὰρ κατὰ τῶν ὑμῶν λόγων διε τὸν σοφός, τοὺς ἐξουθηνείνους μᾶλλον δικαστὰς καθιζέτε, ἡ τοῖς ἀποστῆσαι. “The Apostle does not (says Theodoret) bid them choose the least esteemed, but only take those rather than the Heathen Judges.” So that there is no difficulty, except in the omission of the words, “if there be no wise man among you.” But such ellipses are frequent in St. Paul.
and from what De Dieu has brought forward, that it was usual for causes of property to be referred to three lay arbitrators, called ἔντροπαι, from the Greek word ἔντροπος. So Sanhedrim, fol. 3, 1. Judicia pecunia per tres judices idiotas, judicia rapinarum et læsionis per probatos. IV. 2. omnes idonei sunt, ut judicent lites pecuniarias.

The word καθίζειν is properly used of judges (on which see Kypke); but it is equally applicable to arbitrators who exercise a judicial function.

5. τοὺς ἐντροποὺς ὡμῶν λέγω. It is rightly remarked by Chrysostom, that this is ἐλέγχοντος τούτων ἀντίθεσι, ὡς σκηνὴν ὥσπερ περίττην. The sense is: “I say, or have said, this (namely, supposing* you have not an highly-esteemed man among you) to your shame;” i. e. “what I have said of you tends to your shame.”

So 4, 14. ἐντρέτων ὡμᾶς γράφω.

5. οὗτος ὦ καὶ ἔστιν, &c. “but is it really so; is there not one man of wisdom and judgment among you, (not one) who shall be able διακρίναι ἀνά μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. This use of οὗτος for itane? siccine? always imports wonder mixed with indignation or reprobation. Compare Mark 7, 18. Gal. 3, 3. In the repetition of the negative and the dialysis οὐδὲ ἐσ for οὐδεῖς there is an intensive force.

Σοφός, prudent, of sound judgment (not, as Vitringa supposes, a doctor of law, δικαστής). The words following are, in some measure, exegetical of the preceding: so that there is no occasion to render διακρίναι vacat, as do Grotius and Hardy: though the word sometimes denotes the having leisure as well as skill to do a thing.

5. διακρίναι ἀνά μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ; As two persons must be supposed, between whom the referee would have to decide, many stumble at the use of the singular, and some, as Beza and Rosenm., would read ἀδελφῶν (from Ambrose); and others,

* That is, (as Theophylact paraphrases,) οὐντρέχων ἥπειρει προφασεὶ ὡμῶν.
with the Syr. and Arab., ἀδελφός καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. But the authorities in both cases are of no weight, since in points of idiom (and this is one) Translators use too great license to enable us to judge of the words of their original. With respect to the sense, Ambrose has correctly represented it by rendering, “inter fratres.” And so our Common Translators and Macknight: “between his brethren.”* As to the reading of the Syr., it only shews that the Translator recognized an ellipsis, which he has well filled up, as appears from the following verse: but the genius of the Western languages scarcely tolerates this. There is, in fact (as Glass and Estius have seen) a Hebraism.

On the cause of this indisposition to settle such matters among them, it is sensibly observed by Rosenm. (partly from Storr.) “Ceterum hoc malum, ut Corinthii coram judicibus ethicis ligicare incipiemur, inde fluxisse videtur, quod inter diversarum partium Christianos facilè et ererò lites furent. In his autem litibus vix erant in ecclesia, qui talum apud litigantes fidem habarent, ut dirimere possent controversias inter fratres, quia neutra pars litigans alteri satis fidebat, sed eos, quos forte una pars arbitros dari vellent, altera continuo tanquam adversariorum factioni addictos, et in alienæ sectæ hominum iniquiores futuros, perhorrescebat.”

6. ἀλλά ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται. Κρίν. here signifies ligicare; as supra ver. 1. (where see the note.) Καὶ τούτο ἐπὶ ἀφίστων. Wolf rightly supplies γίνεται. This ellipsis also has place in ταῦτα. And so the Latin idque. In both languages the idiom has, I think, almost always an intensive force: and such is here ascribed to it by Chrysostom and the other Greek Commentators, and, of the moderns, by Crellius and Raphael. But it is not clear to me that the Apostle intended any great stress to be laid upon it.

* Doddridge, scrupulously adhering to the original, renders, “his brother;” which is absurd.
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In some MSS. there is added, καὶ οὐκ ἐὰν ἅγιον.
On this sense of ἐὰν, coram, Krause refers to Dorville on Charit. p. 642. and Wess. on Diod. Sic. 16, 93.
It is rightly remarked by Theodoret, that this is not at variance with the injunction in Romans, "not to resist magistrates." The Apostle only bids the injured not to have recourse to them: for that depended upon themselves.

7. ἦδη μὲν οὖν ἁλῶς ἠττημα ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν. The Apostle now proceeds to a more general censure of their disposition, which seems to have been too litigious and grasping.

On ἦδη Krause remarks: "Adhibetur orationi, in quâ id quod minus est pontium, ut majus ex eo colligatur." "Οὐκος, "upon the whole," generally speaking, (though there may be exceptions,) there is an ἠττημα among you, ἐν ὑμῖν. ἠττημα signifies generally a diminution, defect, &c., and also an inferiority of condition, like ἐλάττωμα; as in Chrysost. (cited by Grot.) Δίκαιος ἐστιν, ἐλαφρῶς ἐστιν, φιλάπτωχος ἐστιν ἄλλ' ἔχει τι ἐλάττωμα. This use is not easily paralleled either in the Scriptural or the Classical writers. The sense may be thus expressed: "Ye are, in this respect, inferior in Christian dispositions to that which the Gospel requires." "Ὅτι, "namely that." Κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. Here κρίμα evidently signifies lis, suit; like the κρίματα at ver. 4. All this was at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, which inculcates forbearance. See Matt. 5, 40.

7. διατὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἄδικεσθαι—ἄκροτερεσθαι. This use of these two verbs, namely, bear to be injured, &c. (viz. rather than resort to Heathen judges,) somewhat varies from the common one. Grotius thinks that ἄδικ. relates to general and personal in-

* Many MSS. and Fathers omit the ἐν; perhaps ex emendatione; for the common reading savours more of the Hellenistical style.
† Grotius remarks, that such is the use of ἄδικεσθαι in Plato and Menander, from the latter of whom Krause cites: Οὐκος κρα-
sult and injury; ἀποστ., to injury in property. Perhaps, however, they both refer chiefly to the latter, and there is perhaps a climax: or the latter may be added exegetically.

Here Grotius compares Lysias Adv. Diag. Εἰδὼς δὲ οἱ μόνον οἱ ἀδικούοντες χείρως ὑμῖν εἶναι δοκοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τινες ἐν ἑλαττων ὑπὸ τῶν προσεχόντων ἔχοντες, ἀνέχεσθαι μὴ δύνανται.* And Schulz. cites Joseph. Ant. 15, 5, 3. Ἔξιον μὲν ἦν—οὐδὲ τοὺς Ἀραβας—ἀδίκειν ὑμᾶς ἀποστεροῦντας, καὶ πάντα οὐ πολεμίους ὄντας, ἀλλὰ φίλους. To which I add Arist. Ethic. 5, 10. (where he thus describes the ἐπιεικὴ) ὁ μὴ ἀκριβοδικαῖος ἐπὶ τὸ χείρων ἀλλὰ ἑλαττωτικός, καίτερ ἐξον νῦν ἥμοι βοηθῶν.

8. ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε, &c. “non modo fertis, sed ipsi infectis injuriam,” as Grotius paraphrases it. Καὶ ταύτα, for καὶ μάλιστα, “and that,” idque. Of this idiom numerous examples are adduced by Wetstein and Krause. It has usually an intensive and emphatic force.

9. Ἦ όμως οἴδατε δέ. A frequent formula for “ye ought to know.” Ὄτι ἀδικοὶ βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι; Here ἀδικοὶ is for οἱ ἀδικοὶ, i.e. such sort of persons as those just mentioned. It is not necessary, with Grotius and Rosenm., to assign to it the latiorem significacionem, flagitious, with reference to the vices which the Apostle proceeds to enumerate. It rather seems, that he proceeds to lay down a more general position, which he introduces with the formula μὴ πλανάσθε.

As to the words βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι, they cannot have the sense ascribed to them by some recent Interpreters, “must not be admitted into the Christian society.” For they are said with reference to those who were already Christians, and the context shews that they must be understood of the happiness obtained for men by Jesus Christ,

---

* It may be observed, that what Lysias says of relations Paul says of Christian brethren.
which, according to the custom of the writers of the New Testament, is represented as an inheritance, in order to indicate (it should seem) the certainty thereof to those who observe the conditions of the Christian covenant.

9. μὴ πλανᾶσθε. These words, some think, are a general admonition to abstain from sin, or avoid evil example, or beware of being deceived by the impunity extended by the magistrate to some of the following sins. All these subauditions, however, are too arbitrary. It is a formula, the force of which Grotius has well illustrated thus: "Solet hac Prae- fatione uti Christus, ut Luc. 21, 8. et Paulus, ut infra 15, 33. Gal. 6, 7. Jacobus quoque 1, 16. quoties aliquid dicturi sunt quod ignorantum aut non observatum maximo stabit malo." Krause aptly compares Philemon: Μηδὲν πλανήθης ἐσται κἂν "Αδων κρίσις ἤντερ ποιήσει θέδο, δ ἡ πάντων δεσπότης."

9, 10. On the sins which the Apostle now proceeds to enumerate, it is remarked by Grotius, that "they are of such a sort as not to be understood of habit of action, but of some single act, unless washed away by repentance and reformation." "Thus (adds he) in law we call him an adulterer or a thief who has committed only one act of adultery or theft." Such sins are finely termed by Augustin peccata vastantia conscientiam, mortifera, quæ uno ictu permunt. Yet of these there were certain ones on which some doubt might exist. For simple fornication was by the Heathens scarcely accounted a sin; and, as to idolatry, in the sense which must here be ascribed to it, viz. participation in idol-feasts, (see the note on 5, 11.) some might and did think it no sin. Therefore the Apostle rightly prefaces his enumeration of the sins with the caution μὴ πλανᾶσθε.

On the terms which express these sins it will not be necessary for me to enlarge, since they are, in general, sufficiently well understood, or, if not, Schleus. Lex. may be consulted.

Πέροι, fornicators, whoremongers. See the note
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on 5, 10. Εἴδας. I have already explained. Ἔρωτες, ἀδουλειερεῖς. Μαλακί, Such as were called by the Latins the molles,* the cineedi, pathics, or catamites; as is clear from D. Hal. 7. Thus Chrysost. rightly explains it by ἡςαυρζότες, and Theophyl. σιγχεταοτεῖν. So that there is no reason, with the Syriac Translator and some modern Commentators, to understand it of self pollution: indeed the former interpretation is confirmed by the following word, ἀρσενοκοίται, with which is coupled what is admitted by all to denote the χεδεραστες, the σιγχεταοτεῖν.

These sins, I must observe, seem to be classed by the Apostle, and thrown into groups: as πορνη and εἰδαθολάτραι—μοῖχοι, μαλακι, ἀρσενοκοίται—κλέκται, πλεονέκται—μέθυσοι,† λοίδαραι, ἄρταγες. On the term πλεονέκται I have before treated. As to the three last, namely, μέθυσοι, λοίδαραι, and ἄρταγες, they may perhaps be paralleled by our drunkards, brawlers, blackguards, and ruffians. Some think it strange that the drunkard and the brawler should be put on the same footing with those guilty of much greater crimes, as the ἀφροτοῖ. But as vices go in clusters, it is rare to find drunkenness unattended with vices of uncleanness, brutality, and violence; nay, even extortion and rapacity are often united. Thus Sallust describes Catiline as both profuse and rapacious. Besides, as Chrysostom remarks, the Apostle is here only speaking of those who will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven, not of punishment. "Whether (adds he) there will be any difference in hell we are here not concerned to enquire." On which point see Paley’s Moral Philosophy.

11. καὶ ταῦτα τινες Ἰτε. Here we have, as not unfrequently, the neuter for the masculine. There is, indeed, a reference to those vices considered as things. Of this idiom Kypke adduces examples, the

* Which force of the word is illustrated with needless minuteness, and with too little regard to decorum, by Grotius and Wetstein.
† This word is, by an unpardonable carelessness, omitted in the text of Krause.
most apposite of which is from Aristoph. Nub. where Strepsiades, on reckoning up the many criminal charges that might be made against him, adds: τοιαύτα εί με λέγουσιν ἄταντοντες, &c.

11. ἄλλα ἀξελώσασθε, ἄλλα ἡγιάσθητε, ἄλλα ἐκκαίωσθε. The first of these words is too much explained away by our recent Commentators. Thus, for instance, Rosenm. renders: "Ye have obtained pardon of your sins by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Divine religion:" for so he interprets εὐ τῶν σωτέρων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν; which is doing manifest violence to the words, and is contrary to the view taken by all Interpreters for nearly seventeen centuries. This mode of explanation had, indeed, been proposed by Vorst., but was well refuted by Whitby. Nor can there, I think (notwithstanding what some may urge), be any question but that these words have a direct reference to baptism. This, indeed, is plain from the turn of expression, which alludes to the form of baptism; though from the other terms, ἡγιάσθητε and ἐκκαίωσθε, which are subjoined, it should seem that the effects of baptism are designated. For I cannot assent to several Commentators, (as Vorstius,) that the terms are synonymous; though they all have reference to the gratuitous remission of sins and free justification obtained by Christ. Thus they are, very properly, kept distinct by Chrysost. 344, 30. Σφοδρά ἐντερπτικες ἐπηγαγαν λέγων, ἐνοχίσατε θλίκοι συμαξειλετο κακών θεος, δειν ὑμῖν φιλανθρωπίας παρέχεσατε πειραν καλ ἀποδειξίνι και ουδε μέχρι τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τῆς ἀντιθεωμ ἔδωκας, ἄλλως ἐκ τολὶ τῆς εὐφροσυνῆς προήγαγε καλ γὰρ καθαρόν ἐποιήσαντε ἃ πρὸ ὁδ τοῦτο μόνον; ὑπακοίας, ἄλλως καὶ ἡγιάσαν ἄλλως ουδὲ τοῦτο μόνον ἄλλως καὶ ἐκκαιώσας. And so Theophylact, Theodoret, and Oecumenius, and, indeed, the Greek and Latin Fathers in general.*

* In accordance with those venerable Interpreters, the great Bp. Bulli, in Harm. Apost. 1. eh. 1. § 3. thus distinguishes the terms: "La quantit signifit primam à vitis per Baptismum purationem;
Griesbach and most recent Commentators interpret: "Sed baptismo suscepto purificati, et sanctorum justorumque cœtui aggregati estis." They regard the terms as synonymous, and the whole as importing neither pardon of sin nor reformation of heart and life, but merely their being separated from the herd of Heathens, and received, by baptism, into the visible Church. But this is manifestly explaining away the strong phraseology of the Apostle. Be it remembered, that it is not necessary to suppose the words strictly applicable to every member of the congregation; it signifies, "ye are all, or ought to be," &c. It is frivolous to dwell upon the verbs being all put in past tenses, since the recently past and the present so unite themselves, especially in the aorist, that either or both might be applicable.

Εἰς τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ Θεοῦ must mean: "by the Holy Spirit proceeding from and imparted to us by God the Father." It is well remarked by Theophyl., that there is an allusion to the three persons of the Sacred Trinity.

12. The Apostle now makes a transition to another class of vices which had arisen among the Corinthians from the abuse of their Christian liberty. (Rosenm.) The transition has been thought abrupt; but the ratio of it is thus ably traced by Krause (from Crellius): "Contra ea quæ Paulus hactenus

sanctificatio preparationem et quasi formationem hominis per gratiam Spiritus Divini, ad opera bona facienda, vitamque sanctam degendam; justificatio denique amorem illum Dei, quo jam sanctam vitam degentes complexitur, eosque in Christo vita æterna premio dignos consenùt." And so Dr. Isaac Barrow, cited by D'Oyley, "Here having been washed in Christ's name doth, in congruity with what is said in other places, denote baptism in his name; being justified and sanctified do express the first benefits accompanying that baptism. And, indeed, wherever a general remission of sins, or a full sanctification, or consecration, and justification of men's persons in God's sight, are mentioned, that remission of sins, that separation, or dedication unto God's service, that reception into grace, which are consigned in baptism, are, I conceive, understood; there being no other reason or occasion wherein ordinarily and visibly God doth exhibit those benefits."
vehementi objurgatione, de causis forensibus deque alis rebus admonuerat, poterat quis doctrina de libertate Christiana, quam Apostoli pro tempore illorum ratione diligenter commendare coacti erant, abuti (cf. Pom. 8, 2. Galat. 5, 1. 1 Petr. 2, 16. al.) et objicere: πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, omnia, scil. quae sunt ἀδιαφόρα, mihi lícita sunt. Ad speciosam hanc objectionem respondet: ἀλλ' ou πάντα συμφέρει, at non omnia prosum; rectè quidem ad libertatem christianam provocas, sed hæc libertas abusu nocere potest: tenendum igitur in rebus omnibus est modus, ne ex abusu detrimentum oriatur et tibi et aliis."

By the πάντα are evidently meant "all things here treated of," i.e. all things ἀδιαφόρα, media, or indifferent, especially meaning all meats.*. It is rightly remarked by Grotius, that these are supposed to be the words used by those Corinthians who anxiously sought admittance to the tables of the rich, and, to indulge sensuality, used to visit the idol-feasts. To this the answer (couched in ἀλλ') is: "True; all things are given us to enjoy, but, &c. ἀλλ' ou πάντα συμφέρει. Examples of ἀλλ' in the sense yes, but, may be seen in Devar. and Hoogew. de Particulis.

* Many eminent early Commentators, (especially Crellius and Locke,) and most recent ones, suppose that the Apostle had here fornication particularly in view, and means to argue, that its lawfulness can never be put on a footing with the lawfulness to eat of all wholesome food. But this seems a very strained interpretation. Mr. Slade unites both: It appears (says he) that the false teachers had allured their disciples to sensual and lustful practices, by affirming that they were as requisite for the body as meat; and that, as all meats were sent and allowed for the use of nature, so were sensual indulgences, on the same grounds." The antient Commentators, however, and almost all the early modern ones, more rightly maintain, that the Apostle has here reference only to meat; though from sensuality the Apostle quickly passes to the kindred vice of lewdness. So Theophyl. 207. (from Chrysost.) Εκείνη καὶ εἶναι περὶ τοῦ πεπορνωνυκτός, καὶ ἀδιαφόρος μὲνεὶν περὶ αὐτοῦ, παρεμβάλλει λοιπὸν καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς γαστρομαγίας λόγον. Ἐκ γὰρ ταύτης οὐ ἐπιτυχολοῦ τῇ τῆς πορνείας πάθος. Φησίν οὖν, ὃι ἔξεστι μοι φαγεῖν καὶ ποιεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ συμφέρει μετὰ ἁμερίας ταύτα ποιεῖν. Of the modern Commentators see especially Grotius.
12. ὃ πάντα συμφέρει, "all things (in themselves indifferent) are not expedient." Grotius paraphrases: "Adhibendum modum: Non enim omnem usum talium conducere aut valetudini, quae sapienti negligenda non est, aut recto usui rationis. Nam—Corpus onustum Hesternis vitii animum quoque degravat." Hardy (from the early Commentators) thus: "If they throw a stumbling-block in the way of others; if they give occasion for wounding the conscience; if they hinder others in the course of piety; then, though they may be in themselves lawful, yet they are to be abstained from by good and pious men; for Christian liberty is to be measured by the rules of edification and charity." This Rosenm. exemplifies from the case of Paul himself.

12. πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. The Apostle repeats the objection (a method often occurring in Seneca and the best writers), in order to answer it the more effectually. (Grot. and Rosenm.)

12. ἄλλ' οίκ ἐγὼ ἔξωσιασθήσομαι ὑπὲ τίνος. Many suppose a paronomasia between ἔξεστι and ἔξουσιος. This, however, seems to be too fanciful. The Commentators seem not to perceive the popular idiom which prevails in this sentence: for it is equivalent to "I must not," i.e. we must not, &c. Here there is especial reference to sensuality in eating and drinking, by which he who yields to such temptations, loses that power over himself which was committed to him by God, and becomes the basest of slaves. This obvious truth is unnecessarily enlarged on both by the ancient and modern Commentators.

Τίνος is not masculine (as some take it), but neuter, i.e. "any such thing (namely, as food or drink).

13. τὰ βραδύτατα τῇ κοιλίᾳ, καὶ η κοιλίᾳ τοῖς βραδύταις. This verse contains a further explanation and illustration of the sentiment before expressed. The Apostle here circumscribes the liberty with which he had granted that Christians were free, and illus-
trates his meaning from the different parts of the body, and their functions.

In the first clause there is an ellipsis of ἐστὶ, which may be taken populariter for ἄνεκε, "are destined for." The dative (as Grot. observes) answers to the Heb. 7. The sense, then, is: "All aliments are destined to the sustenance of the body, and the body is likewise adapted to the reception and digestion of such foods. Eating and drinking are actions both natural and necessary to the support of the body." The κειλιά evidently denotes the stomach; as in Matt. 15, 17. Mark 7, 19. Luke 15, 16., and also Thucyd. 2, 49. In the same manner the passage is taken by Theodoret, Grotius, Wolf, and others. Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators (together with some modern ones) take κειλιά figuratively for γαστρομαγγία, gula. But this throws an obscurity over the whole sentence. Rosenm. well supplies, after the first clause: "In se itaque indifferens est, sive edas sive non edas hoc vel illud ciborum genus." Then the Apostle subjoins per oppositionem: "but God will (soon) destroy both the one and the other," i.e. will soon destroy the body, and thereby the use and the need of food will cease. It is rightly remarked by Grot., that the purpose of the words is to excite us to take thought rather for things eternal, than for what would so soon perish and come to nought."

19. τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὗ τῇ τορνεῖα — σῶματι. The δὲ

* So Rosenm.: "Post hanc mortalem vitam nec cibis nec ventriculo amplius opus erit; Quaeris his rebus non multum est tribuendum; et graviter peceant, qui tantillae rei causa, quae in hanc humilium duntaxat mortalemque conditionem cadit, infirmioribus docent."

"What is said (observes Grot.) of God's causing the belly to cease, some understand of the use of the belly. But from the writings of the ancients on this passage it appears, that they believed men would indeed recover their bodies; or that it does not follow that there will be in that body parts whose offices are then to cease. To which purpose Phutareh Conv. Sep. says: "Αρ’ οὖν ἄξιον συνεκτεινών τῇ ἀδίκῃ κειλιάν καὶ στόμαχον καὶ ἱππαρ, ἄ καλον οὐδένος αἰσθητιν."
expresses opposition; q. d. "On the contrary, the body is not destined for fornication, but is meant to be consecrated to the service of the Lord." Here it is well remarked by Crellius: "His verbis docet, longè aliam esse scortationis, quam ciborum prömiscui usus rationem. Hunc quidem suaper naturæ liberum esse; illam vero omnium minime esse." And so Grotius: "Lest any one should apply what had been said of meats, to fornication likewise, as if its use were permitted, together with that of meats (as some persons, rather Philosophers than Christians, maintained), the Apostle opposes himself to this error, and shows that the same reasoning is not applicable to both." Theophyl. observes, that one should have expected, not πορνεία, but οὐτοὺς βραδεμάτων, οὐδὲ τῇ κοίλῳ: but πορνεία is put, in order to show that it is the ἀποτέλεσμα τροφῆς.

By τῷ Κύριῳ is meant, "destined to serve him," viz. (says Grot.) per continentiam aut conjugium. This, however, is too arbitrary a subaudition. I would state the argument thus: "To serve him implies obedience to his will. Now the will of God is our sanctification, that we should abstain from fornication."

13. καὶ ὁ Κύριος τῷ σώματι. There are several ways in which the Lord may be considered as being τῷ σώματι, for the body. It may be, for raising and glorifying it; as most modern Commentators (so Whitby) interpret: or, as the Greek Commentators explain, as being the head of the body, namely, the Church. So Theophyl., who paraphrases the whole sentence thus: Τὸ σῶμα οὐ διὰ τούτο πέπλασται, ἵνα τροφῆς καὶ εἰς πορνείαν ἐμπύτητο ἄλλο ἵνα τῷ Χριστῷ ἀκολουθῆ ὡς κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸ ὁ Κύριος ὡς κεφαλὴ ἐπικάθηται αὐτῷ. And so Mr. Locke.

14. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ τῶν Κύριων ἔγειρεν, καὶ ημᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ, "and (accordingly) God will raise up," &c. (Whitby.) "And (thus this scheme shall be effected) for God shall," &c. (Dodd.) In either of these two ways the connection may be traced. The sense is: "As
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God hath, by his power, raised up and exalted Christ, so will he raise us up, and reward us."

15. οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι τὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν μ. Χ. ε. The Apostle returns again to the admonition before brought forward respecting fornication. (Theophyl.) And now he uses another and most powerful (nay even awful) argument against it.

It is rightly remarked by Vorstius and Rosenm., that by τὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν is meant yourselves, i.e. "the whole of you, both body and soul:" since both together constitute the Christian person, who is considered as a member of Christ's mystical body, namely the Church, of which he is head, and the rest, members inserted by baptism, and consecrated to him."

15. ἀρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χ., ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη; "shall I take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot. That would be contrary to our most sacred duty." These words admit of being taken in two senses: 1st, literally: and then they will require no explanation: 2dly, metaphorically; q. d. "for in fornication the members are, as it were, made subservient to the lust of the πόρνη, and thus cease to be the Lord's; since they cease to be devoted to his service." Krause remarks on the pleonasm of ἀρας. But it is not, properly speaking, a pleonasm: and as to the examples he adduces, namely ἀρας ἔβαδισεν and ἀραντες ἠλαυνον, they are of quite another kind.

16, 17. οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ὁ κολλαμένος τ. π. This passage is meant for the confirmation and illustration of the preceding. It is not, I think, necessary, with many eminent Interpreters, to take κολλ. strictly in the physical sense: for the word is often used in a metaphorical sense; as we say "to be attached to:" and in the passage of Genes. 2, 24. the metaphorical sense can alone have been intended. So Ovid says (Trist. 4, 4.) "Qui duo corporibus mentibus unus erat." Grotius has here illustrated the force of the term from two not very decorous passages of Latin
writers. The following illustrations, from the best Greek writers, will be more apt. Plut. de Legg. 5. p. 569. τοις δὲ προκολλαθησι, διώκεται κατὰ τὰς ἐν-
ται καὶ γείτοις, παθικεύονται. Plut. Anton. 66. ἀλλ' ὅσπερ τις
παῖξον εἰς, τὴν ψυχήν τοῦ ἐρωτοῦ ἐν ἄλλοτρο πάθοις εἶναι, ἐλκόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς, ὅσπερ συμπεψυκτικὸς καὶ
συμπεξιμερθέντως. Aristot. de Republ. 2. καθένας ἐν
τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς ἑομεν λέοντα τῶν Ἀριστοφάνη, αὐτῶν ἐρωτημάτων γενόμενος, καὶ γενέσθαι ἐκ 
τῶν δύο ὄντων ἀμφότεροι ἀνα. Athen. 
258 B. προκολλαθήσει, ταῖς ἀμηλίαις. So also Liv.
23, 18. scortis impliciti.

17. ὁ δὲ κολλόμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμα ἔστι, "he
who adheres obediently and devotedly to the will
of the Lord, is united in spirit and disposition." A
metonymy; as when friends are said to be ψυχὴ μία.
There is a beauty and propriety in this elegantly
antithetical passage not inferior to the finest ex-
amples of it to be found in the best Greek writers.
The inferences and application, in both members, are
too obvious to need suggestion.

18. τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ὁ ἐὰν ποιήσῃ — εἰς τὸ λίθον σῶμα
ἀμαρτάνει. In the interpretation of this sentence it
is necessary to advert to a certain idiom, by which
things are expressed generally, which require a more
exact definition, or when all is put for many; or
when an action is meant to be predicated κατ' ἐξοχήν,
and comparatē. Bengel has here well observed:
"Tales sententiae morales non morose urgendo sunt,
nec secundum summam ἀκριβεία. And in this
view Krause refers to Heyn Præf. ad Glandorfi
Poet. Gnom. p. 17. note. Thus, when it is said that
every sin committed is ἐκτὸς τῶν σαμαρτωτως, i.e. does
not belong to, or affect the body; but he who, &c.,
this is to be understood comparatē; and thus it is
meant that ὁ πορεύεται especially sinnet his body;
q. d. "Other sins may be said comparatively to not
affect the body, but he that committeth fornication
especially, and beyond all others sineth against, disgraceth, and injureth his own body,** viz. by using it for purposes not intended by its Maker, and such purposes as are highly injurious to its well-being. So that, after all, there is not much to deduct from the general position; for, doubtless, there is no other sin by which (considering all the consequences, immediate and remote, which usually follow it) the body is so much injured. So the proverb, λυσμελεῖς Ἀφροδίτη.

With the phrase ἀμαρτ. εἰς τὸν ὄνομ σῶμα, Wets. compares passages from Demosth., Ἀσchin., and Isocrates,† where ἐξαμαρτάνειν εἰς σῶμα is said of sodomy (which is, perhaps, included by the Apostle under the term πορνεία).

On the general statement Wets. has aptly compared Xen. Mem. 1., where, speaking of intemperance generally, he says: καὶ γὰρ ὅνω ὀστέρ οἱ πλεονέκται τῶν ἄλλων ἀφαιροῦμεν χρήματα ἑαυτοῦ δοκοῦσι πλουτίζειν οὕτως ὁ ἀκρατὴς τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις βλαβερὸς, ἑαυτῷ δὲ ὀφέλιμος ἀλλὰ κακοῦργος μὲν τῶν ἄλλων, ἑαυτοῦ δὲ πολὺ κακοῦργότερος εἰγε κακοῦργοτατον ἐστὶ μὴ μόνον τῶν ὀκῶν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φθείρειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχήν.

** "Every other sin (to use the words of Slade) however injurious to the body, does not so immediately dishonour and disgrace it, does not so directly destroy its union with the holy body of Christ. And, moreover, the body of the fornicator is peculiarly concerned in ministering to its own pollution and disgrace."

† To which I add Pollux 6, 127. αἰσχύνον τὸ σῶμα, τὸ σῶμα ἐκδεδωκόν εἰς αἰσχύνην. Musonius ap. Stob. Serm. 83, 14 seqq. ἐγώ δὲ ἔχω μὲν λέγειν, ὅτι πᾶς δὲ τὸ αμαρτάνει, καὶ ἀδικεῖ εὐθὺς, εἰ καὶ μηδεὶς τῶν πέλας, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν γε πάντως χειρον ἀποφαίνων καὶ ἀγιοτέρον, ὁ γὰρ ἀμαρτάνων, παρ' ὅσον ἀμαρτάνει, χείρων καὶ ἁρμότερον ἵνα οὖν ἐν τῷ ἄδικαν, ἀλλ' ἀκολούθαν γε πᾶσαν ἀνάγκην πάντως προσέσθη τῷ ἡττωμένῳ αἰσχρᾷς ἡδονῇ, καὶ χαίροντι τῷ μολυνθείς ὁστερ αἰ ἓν. Isseus, p. 33. (speaking of those who are seduced to marry harlots) ἀκατάτητος ἐχοντες αὐτῶν ἐκπληθησαν ἵν' ἄνοιας εἰς αὑτοὺς τὸ ἐξαμαρτανεῖν.

The phrase sinning against one's own body, in the sense of injuring one's body, is seldom found in the Classical writers, and seems to be an Oriental idiom. Thus it occurs in a passage of Midrasch, cited by Schoettgen on Luke 10, 30. p. 279.

VOL. VI.
19. The Apostle here lays down *two arguments* by which Christians ought to be led to the practice of chastity; 1. ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ζωῆς τοῦ ἐν ζωή ἁγίου Πνεύματος,* "ye are enlightened by the influence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore have a complete knowledge of right and wrong." 2. "Christ hath laid down his life to procure your salvation; and therefore ye are bound, as servants bought with a price, to glorify God in your lives, by moral obedience, both in soul and body, which are God’s."

19. ὃ ἔχετε ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, for ἰν, "which spirit ye have from God, and owe to him." Hardy subjoins: "To God therefore ye would be ungrateful and injurious, if, by fornication, ye expelled from you the Holy Spirit; guilty, too, of sacrilege would ye be, to put a thing consecrated to God to an impure use." See the excellent note of Dr. Whitby.

19. καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ ἐαυτῶν. A popular mode of expression for: "Ye are not at your own discretion." (See Rom. 14, 7 & 8.) Piscator supplies, per antithesis: "but Christ’s and God’s." And he subjoins: "So that to defile the body by fornication is to abuse what is not your own."

20. ἡγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμὴσ, "for ye have been redeemed and freed from sin and sorrow at a price." The τιμὴσ is not a mere Hebrew pleonasm, as Grot. thinks, but has great emphasis,† namely, as denoting *that* of the only begotten and well beloved Son of God, sent by the Father into the world for the very purpose of procuring human salvation. The sentiment may be thus expressed: "Ye are therefore bound to his service, as a bought slave to that of his purchaser." Grot. observes, that the Apostle omits the

---

* This the Apostle had before (3, 17.) said of the *whole man*; but now he limits it to the *body*, as being more accommodated to the present case.

† Thus the Latins said, "*pretio emere*;" of which Wets. cites several examples, wherein the word *pretio* is thought by the old Scholiasts to be emphatical, for *pretio magno*. It would appear, then, that the *magno* added in the Vulg. is derived from the margin.
right from creation, because the other was more recent and special.” A remark which seems not characterized by the usual ability of the great Commentator. Surely the other benefit lays us under very far greater obligations, as being infinitely more precious. Indeed, creation without redemption would have been rather an evil.

20. δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν Θεόν ἐν τῷ σώματί σοι, “make your body subservient to the glory of God, and let your life tend to his honour,” Rom. 12, 1. For, according to the usus loquendi of the writers of the New Testament, those are said δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν, who do what is agreeable to the will and counsels of God. Compare Rom. 4, 10. Acts 13, 48. 1 Pet. 4, 16. Joh. 17, 4. (Krause.) Theophyl. well explains, τὰς ἁγιὰς πράξεις διὰ τοῦ σώματος τελοῦντες, καὶ ἄγιον αὐτὸ τηροῦντες, καὶ καθαροῦν. Δοξάζεται γὰρ ὁ Θεός, τὰ καλὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν ὑποντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσ κοι τοῦτον αὐτῶν.

The last words of the verse, καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ὑμῶν, ἀτιμὰ ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, are thrown out of the text by Krause and Griesbach (and had been rejected by Mill and Bengel); but, I think, on insufficient grounds. They are omitted only in eleven MSS. (and those not of the most ancient), some Versions, as the Vulg., Ital., Copt., and Æthiop., and some Latin Fathers. But they are defended not only by an immensely greater number of MSS., but by both the Syriac Versions, by Chrysost., and the other Greek Fathers, and all the Greek Commentators. Indeed, the clause seems required to complete the antithesis; ἀτιμὰ ἐστὶ τοῦ corresponding to ἡγοράσατε γὰρ τιμῆς. Of its genuineness Wets. (an excellent judge of such matters) seems to have entertained no doubt. The nature of my plan forbids me to enlarge further on this question; otherwise it would not be difficult for me to satisfactorily account for the omission of the words in some MSS. and Versions.

With respect to the sense of the words, it is not very well expressed by our modern Commentators.
Thus, for instance. Dodd r. and Mackn. make it too general. The Apostle doubtless intended what he says to be applied to the case of fornication just mentioned. See the excellent exposition of Chrys., from whom Theophyl. 211. gives the following Scholium. "Δεικνύσω ὅτι οὐ σάµατι μόνον χρῆ φεύγειν τὴν πορνείαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχῆ, τῷ μηδὲ κατὰ διανοίαν μολύνεσθαι. Πνεῦμα γὰρ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐκάλεσε· καὶ ἡ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ γὰρ μοιχεία ἐν εὐαγγελίοις ἀπηγορεύται.

The words ἀτινὰ εστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ are an antithetical repetition of the former καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ ἐαυτῶν.

CHAP. VII.

From the words which commence this chapter it is plain that the Corinthians (perhaps those of the Paulinian and Apollonian parties) had written a letter to the Apostle, in which they had consulted him on various matters. He now, then, proceeds to answer the various questions, 1. concerning matrimony, on which, as appears from his answer, there had arisen at Corinth a controversy. What were the different opinions of the Corinthians on this subject, is not clear. There were perhaps some among the Jewish Christians who too much extolled matrimony and its necessity. For to this day the Jews hold the opinion, that he who, at the age of twenty years, without being prevented by natural defect, or profound study of the Law, has not entered into wedlock, sins against the Divine precept. See Iken, Antiq. Judais. p. 3. c. 1. § 2. But, even among the Philosophers, it had been a question often agitated, whether wise men ought to marry. Those who considered how untractable the tempers of women often are, how troublesome, and how fraught with danger is the education of children, counselled an abstinenec from marriage. And this side of the question was taken by Lycurg., Thales, Antiphanes, Socrates, and others. Those, on the other hand, who considered public utility, maintained that the procreation and education of children was a debt which, like other tributa, was due, and should be paid to the public. This side of the question is ably supported by some dicta illustrata of Musonius and Hierocles. So Menand. says: Γαρ μὲν ἐὰν τις τὴν ἀληθείαν κακὸν μὲν ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ ἀναγκαῖον κακὸν. And Metellus Num., in an oration which he held as censor: "Si sine uxoré possemus, Quirites, esse, omnes eam molestiā careremus. Sed quoniam ita natura tradidit, ut nec cum illis satis commode, nec sine illis ullo modo, vivi posit, salutī perpetuā potius quàm brevi voluptāti consulendum." (Grot. and Rosenm.)

On the party from whence the questions were proposed, the Commentators are not quite agreed. Grot. thinks the Epistle was occasioned by some Gentile converts who discussed this controverted point more like Philosophers than Christians: at which some well-meaning persons taking offence, addressed the Apostle on this sub-
ject. In his answer, it may be observed, the Apostle, considering spiritual things and the Christian Church rather than political society, gives such an answer as particularly had in view the good of the former, and was especially suited to the then situation of Christian professors.

Others, as Rosenm. and Krause, think the discussion had arisen from the Jewish Christians, Pseudo-apostles, who, over-rating the excellence and necessity of matrimony, recommended it from the examples of St. Peter and St. James, and that, with a tacit censure of the celibacy of St. Paul. Hence the party zeal of the Paulini would easily drive them into the contrary extreme."

Of these hypotheses neither rises beyond probability, and both are plainly incapable of proof. For I am not aware that the annals of Ecclesiastical History supply any certain information on the subject. Chrysostom, in his Homily on this subject, does not enter into the question; but he seems to think that the queries arose from the congregation generally, which is, perhaps, the safest opinion.

Verse 1. περὶ δὲ αὐτὸ γεγραμμένοι, "as to what you wrote to me about." In this sense, Krause remarks, περὶ is frequently used in this Epistle; as ver. 25. 8, 1. 12, 1. 16, 1. And he adduces examples of this use from Xen. de Repub. Ath. init. and Diod. Sic. 245. περὶ δὲ τίς χάρις, ἢν ἐπικρήσῃ δαίσειν, δότι πάλιν ἐστιν τῆς Ἑλλησπον, ἤδε διὰ κακίαν, ἄλλα δὲ ἀφετήρ καθαύναι χαράν in which passage, as in the present one, there is an ellipsis of ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Krause also subjoins examples of a similar use of the de in the Latin Classics.

1. καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικῶς μὴ ἀπετιθῆται. On the sense of καλὸν the Commentators are not agreed. Some interpret it honorificum, res praecella et eximia, a sense chiefly supported by the Roman Catholic Commentators. The most eminent Interpreters, more rightly, assign the sense συμφέρον, commodum, * utile; which may include the notion of melius. Or perhaps the Apostle only answers the question with reference to the words thereof, ἀπέκρισθαι γυναικῶς θειᾶν ἐστι; to which the reply is, καλῶν ἐστι, "it is not only lawful, but expedient." That such is the Apostle's meaning, Krause thinks is plain from ver. 26, 28, 32. seq. & 35. And from these also it is evident that

* In illustration of which Krause cites Xen. Mem. Socr. 4. τὸ χρησιμὸν ἥρα καλὸν ἐστι, πρὸς δὲ τὸν τὴν χρησιμόν.
the present passage is not to be considered as containing a moral precept, but, as it were, the counsel of a friend suited to those times; and that it is to be understood not so much as treating the question generally, as specially, with a view to which condition, under the existing circumstances of the Gospel, was easier and more suitable.

On the sense of ἀντεσθαι the Commentators vary in opinion. Some take it to mean marry: and this interpretation is pertinaciously maintained by Krause, but on very insufficient grounds. It does not follow, because the verb is sometimes used in the sense exordiri, tentare, amplexi, that this use can here apply. The best Commentators rightly (I think) regard it as intended by the Apostle for an euphemism, the force of which Grot., Wets., Kypke, and others, have illustrated with altogether unnecessary minuteness. The term must undoubtedly denote all sexual intercourse with a woman, whether in marriage, or out of it. And the reason why the Apostle chose the word seems to have been, (though none of the Commentators appear to observe it) that his admonition might apply not to marriage only, but also to concubinage, and all those illicit connections which too frequently stood in the place of matrimony, such as were then common both in Greece and every part of the civilized world.

The use here of ἄνθρωπος for ἄνὴρ is found in Matt. 19, 3. and sometimes in the Classical writers. Many Interpreters, as Beza, Casaub., and Drus., rightly (I think) suppose that in one sex the other is included. If so, this may account for the general term ἄνθρωπος being used by the Apostle.

2. διὰ δὲ τὰς πορείας. Some MSS. for τὰς πορείας, have τὴν πορείαν. But this is evidently a glossed, or ex emendatione.

The Apostle is thought to have reference to the various kinds of impurity mentioned at 5, 9. But there may possibly be reference to the two sexes here adverted to.
2. ἐκαστὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχεται, καὶ ἔτι ἑ. Examples of ἔχειν in the sense to have in matrimony* are frequent. The term is used of both sexes. On the sentiment Grot. cites Lactant.: Quisquis affectus illos frenare non potest, cohibeat intra prescrip-tum legitimi tori. And Chrytost.: Γάμος, ἀσφαλέως σωφροσύνης. And Wets. compares Dionys. Hal. Ars Rhet. 2, 4. ὁ γὰρ γάμος εὐθὺς καὶ σωφροσύνης δύξαι περιτίθητι τοῖς ἀνδραῖοις, καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοι δοκεῖν τῇς μὲν ἀτάκτου μίξεως ἀπηλλάξαι, πρὸς δὲ μίαν ἀφοραῖν μόνον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκαστὸς γυναίκα.

Ἐχωτόπ and ἱδίον are synonymous terms, and indicate property; which involves the reciprocal duty of fidelity: and by the terms γυναῖκα and ἀνδρα are excluded and forbidden polygamy and concubinage. The whole is by some, wrongly, I think, regarded as a permission to marry: for this was certainly not necessary, marriage being of Divine appointment, and sanctioned by Christ. It is only an admonition, and is merely meant for those who cannot lead a life of virtuous celibacy.

3. τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἄνδρας τὴν ὀφειλόμενην εὖνιαν ἀποδίδοτω, “let the husband render to the wife the sexual kindness which is her due.” That such is the mode in which the εὖνιας is to be interpreted, is plain from the next verse. One cannot but admire the delicacy which the Apostle shows on this as on all similar points, and at the same time be disgusted at the want of it in most of our Commentators, who on such occasions take an opportunity to overwhelm us with filth raked together from the grossest impurities of the antient world. In one thing, however, they have done rightly, namely, in noticing similar euphemisms; as in Homer: φιλότης Plut. φιλοφροσύνη and in other writers χάρις.† They also notice a law of Solon: τιμὴ τις ἀνδρὸς αὐτῇ πέρι σωφρονα γυναίκα καὶ φιλοφροσύνη. Schoettgen remarks the use of the

* Which, notwithstanding the refinements of some Critics, is all that is here meant.
† I add Herodot. 5, 40. πάντα δσα νῦν παρέχεις παρέχε.
similar term ᾧρηστιν, which signifies both concubitus and officium. He refers for examples to Buxtorf's Lex. and Selden Uxor. Hebr. To which may be added something more apposite from Jambl. Vit. Pyth., where it is mentioned that Pythagoras declared that when admitted to view the infernal regions, he saw there husbands punished τοὺς μὴ θελόντας οὐκ εἰσεῖνα ταῖς αὐτῶν γυναιξὶν.

There is here a somewhat remarkable various reading. About twelve MSS., the Vulg. and Æthiop. Versions, Clem., Orig., and some Latin Fathers, read ὕφειλην instead of ὕφειλομένην εὐνοιαν. And this reading was preferred by Grot., Mill, and Bengel, and has been received by Krause and Griesbach; but, I think, on insufficient grounds. The chief argument they use is, that the old reading seems to be a gloss of ὕφειλην. But if a reading supported by such slender authorities is to be preferred on that principle, the fact ought surely to be made clear. Now this I apprehend is here not the case: for ὕφειλην so closely corresponds to the well-known expression debitum conjugale, that it appears to be itself a gloss, proceeding from some to whom the Latin phrase was familiar. We find it, too, especially in such MSS. as have been tampered with by Correctors; and certainly τὴν ὕφειλην is a much neater phrase. The frequency of the expression debitum conjugale in Latin must weaken the authority of the Vulg. and the Latin Fathers, who chiefly followed it. I must, moreover, correct a misstatement which has been made by Krause in summing up the evidence for ὕφειλην. He says, that Chrysost. so reads in his Commentary (meaning his Homily): which is not true. If Krause had examined the words themselves, p. 358, 8. he would have seen that the word ὕφειλην only occurs in his Paraphrase, viz. διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ὕφειλην τὸ πρᾶγμα ἕκαλεσαν, ἵνα δείξῃ μηδένα κύριον ἐντα ἐαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἀλλήλων δουλοὺς.* Which therefore

* So Theophyl. 212. Ὅτι ὕφειλη καὶ χρέος ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλων εὐνοια, νῦν δεικνύειν.
strongly confirms my suspicion, that it is but a gloss. That Chrysost. did not read ὀφειλὴν is certain, from the commencing words of his exposition, where it is plain that he did read ὀφειλομένη τιμήν, which might be defended, were it necessary. Under these circumstances, the few authorities in favour of the new reading will be of little weight, and the old one must be restored. Indeed, it is supported by internal as well as external evidence, since in its simple and unaffected delicacy it must be thought strongly characteristic of the Apostle. There are, moreover, numerous Classical passages adduced by Wets., all which, more or less, confirm or illustrate this reading.* That Wets. himself decidedly gave it the preference, is plain. Semler, too, after weighing the evidence on both sides, determines in its favour. It is (he says) undoubtedly the more antient reading.

ἀ. ἡ γυνὴ—ἐξουσιάζει. These words are evidently exegetical of the former. Ἐξουσιάζει signifies to have power, by which (Grot. says) is meant complete power or right; since (adds the great Civilian) "in sociali nemo sociorum jus plenum habet," viz. of abstaining from the conjugal embrace.† This is all that can need explanation; though Commentators, especially Augustin, Estius, and Mneau., are unnecessarily, and offensively, minute. Bp. Pearce's insertion of the words only and also is quite unnecessary.

* Thus Joseph. Ant. 16, 7, 3. ὅβε τὴν ἐστίς θυγατέρα συνοικώ-σαν Ἀλεξανδρινὴ θατέρω τῶν νεανίσκων εἰς τὴν γάμου πρὸς ἐκεί-

νον εὔνοια χρῄζαται. & 7, 19, 4. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔγγικε λήθην ποιήσωμαι εὐνοιας τῆς σῆς. Dio Chrysost. 3. p. 59 D. καὶ τῷ ἀφρόδιτῳ ταῦτα ἡδίστα καὶ ἀνυμβριστῆσα, δει γίνεται μετὰ φίλίας τῶν συνέντων, καὶ δει μαστεύσων εὔνοιαν ἀνθρώποις ἐπηλθέν.

† This right, or duty, be it remembered, is one resulting from the terms of the marriage covenant, and is founded on one of the chief purposes which marriage was intended to serve, and to which the Apostle himself adverted. Mackn., too, truly remarks, that the right of the wife to her husband's body is a perfect right, being founded on the ends of marriage, namely, the procreation of children, their proper education, and the prevention of fornication. But these ends would in a great measure be frustrated if the wife had not an exclusive right to her husband's person."
(See ÓEcumen.) A very similar expression to the one in question is used by Eurip. Med. 290. where a husband is called δεσπότης τοῦ σώματος. To which may be added Philostr. Ap. 7, 42. p. 321. τοῦ δ' ἐμὸν σώματος ἐγὼ δεσπότης, καὶ Φυλάξω αὐτὸν ἄσυλον. The sentiment seems to be borrowed from the Apostle here and at 6, 19. Schoettg. compares the use of ἦσσα for the conjugal right.

Theodoret prettily observes, that the wife is mentioned first, since the virtue of continence is more expected in her than in the husband.*

Whitby remarks, that from hence we may prove the unlawfulness of polygamy. (See his note, for the substance of which he was indebted to Crellius.) And so Mackn. But it was quite needless to employ any long-drawn arguments on such a point, since the Apostle, following the example of his Divine Master, every where recognizes only a single wife.

5. The Apostle here again enforces the injunction at ver. 8., but with the limitation, that the ἀποστέγησις be by mutual consent.

5. ἡ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους. Here the Apostle modestly omits what easily be supplied. (See the Commentators.) The sense, which is obvious, is well explained by Chrysost. and Theophyl., the former of whom truly remarks: "Οἱ μεγάλα ἐκ τῆς ἐγκρατείας ταύτης ξικτεται κακά. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ μοιχείαι, καὶ τορνεῖαι, καὶ ἅκων ἀνατροπή πολλάκις ἐνείθεν ἐγένοτο."

In the expression εἰ μὴ ἐκ συμφώνου there is an ellipsis of the verb substantive. The τι (on which the Commentators say nothing) is for κατὰ τι, quodammodo. "Εκ συμφώνου, "by agreement." This word,

* In which view the following passage is aptly cited by Wetst. from Plutarch. Pra. Conj. 140 c. Λάκαινα παίδιση (a young married woman) πυρυθυνεῖν τινος, εἰ ἤδη ἄνδρι προσελήνην; οἷς ἤγγυς, εἰς τα, ἀλλ' ἐμὸι ἑκεῖνοι οὕτος ὁ τρόπος οἷμαι οἰκοδεσποτης, μὴ τε φέυγων, μὴ τε δισερήνων τί τοιμαίτα, τοῦ ἄνδρος ἀρχομένου. μὴ τε αὐτὴν κατάρχεσθαι το μὲν γὰρ ἐγκαταλέληκαν καὶ ἔταμον, το δὲ ὑπερήφανον καὶ ἀφιλόστορον.
and also τὸ σῴμαφανον, is found in the later Greek writers; as Plut., Arrian, and Polyb. So also the Sept. in Cohel 7, 15. καὶ γε τὸῦτο σῷμαφανον τοῦτο ἐκτελησεν ὁ Θεὸς: where I would read τὸῦτο τὸ σῷμαφανον. The τὸ was absorbed by the τὸ preceding.

"By consent (says Grot.) the abstinence might be perpetual; for volenti non fit injuria." And that such abstinence was practised by the early Christians, is plain from the Ecclesiastical writers. Yet it appears that the Apostle did not think this expedient in the case of the Corinthians, since he adds the injunction, that this be done πρὸς καιρὸν, "for a season (only)." Paræus regards καιρὸν as implying far less than χρόνον: and rightly, since in the phrase πρὸς καιρὸν it is always implied that the time in question be short. Indeed, as to πρὸς χρόνον, I am not aware that it ever occurs. Of πρὸς there is the use in πρὸς ἀφαν. 2 Cor. 7, 8. Gal. 2, 5. &c.

Σκολάζειν τινι signifies vacare, operam dare alicui rei, to devote one's time and attention. It is used by the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wets. and Schl. Lex. There is here much propriety and force in the term, which Wets. has well illustrated from Plut. Num. p. 69 c. οὕτος ἀπετέλεσεν ὁ Νομᾶς χρῆναι τοὺς τολίτας μὴ ἀκούειν τι τῶν θείων μήτε οὖν εἰ παρέρρησε καὶ ἀμελῶς, ἀλλὰ σκολίων ἀγωνιας ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ προσέχειν τὴν διάνοιαν, ὡς πράξει μεγίστη τῇ περὶ τὴν εὐσεβείαν.

The Commentators remark, that this sort of abstinence was much practised by the Jews, on preparation for solemn festivals, and at other times when they wished to devote themselves to religious duties, on which occasions fasting, too, was usually enjoined. (See Fabr. Bibl. Ant. 584., Dought. Anal. Sacr., and other writers referred to by Wolf.) The different Schools of the Rabbins recommended various periods for such vows of abstinence: the Schammæi, a fortnight; the Hilleliani, a week. (See Light., Wets., and Grot.) Nor was this custom unknown to the Heathens; as the copious Classical citations of Wet-
stein will abundantly testify. Thus strict venereal abstinence was enjoined during the annual feast of Ceres, called the Cerealia, which continued for nine days.*

5. τῇ νυστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ. The words τῇ νυστείᾳ καὶ are omitted in six uncial and some other MSS., and also several Fathers.† They were rejected by Mill and Bengel, and have been thrown out of the text by Krause and Griesbach; but, I think, on insufficient grounds. Internal evidence is strongly in favour of the common reading; since we know that in that age fasting usually, if not always, accompanied a more than ordinary attention to prayer and other religious duties. But how shall we account for the omission? Partly, I think, from the homoiooteleuton, and partly (as I conceive in the case of the Cod. Cantab.) from a para diothosis proceeding from doctrinal misapprehension of the common reading. One should, indeed, have expected the νυστείᾳ to come after προσευχῇ: but in a writer so little regular as St. Paul this may easily be tolerated. Here it is sensibly remarked by Theophyl.: 'Ως ἀν οὖν ἡ εὐχή σπουδαοτέρα γένηται, ἀπέκεισθε, φησίν, ἁλλὰ λαμ, οἷς τῆς μίξεως ἀσχολίαν, οὐχ ἀκαθαρσίαν, ποιώσας.

5. καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ συνέρχεσθε, “again come together to the same place,” i.e. the same bed, viz. ad coitum. This sense of the word συνέρχεσθαι occurs also in Matt. 1, 18., and is found in the Classical writers, from whom examples may be seen in Wets. N. T. 1, 238. Griesbach may seem to have done well in putting ἦτε in the place of συνεχεῖ; for συνέρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ has the air of a pleonasm, and


† Chrysostom’s authority is adduced against the words. But they are found in his text, and there is no proof that he did not read them, except the negative one, that he does not touch upon them, which in a Commentator has little weight.
savours of a gloss on ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἡτε. St. Paul, however, and the writers of the New Testament, frequently use such pleonasms, and the common reading is confirmed by 1 Cor. 11, 20. συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ. & 14, 23. and Acts 2, 1.; as also Josh. 9, 2. καὶ συνήλθον ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐς τὸ πολεμήσαι. So Thucyd. 5. (cited by Wets.) συνήλθον ἐς τὸ αὐτὸ' and Plato de Repub. 1. πολλάκις γὰρ συνερχόμεθα τινὲς ἐς ταύτα παραπλησίαν ἡλικίαν ἔχοντες.* A similar use of οὕτω and convenire is noticed by the Critics. See Schl. Lex.

5. ἵνα μὴ πειράξῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατάνας διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν, "lest Satan (the author of evil) tempt you," viz. to commit the sin in question, adultery. Διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν. I cannot think that ἀκρασία is well rendered incontinence, or intemperantia; though this sense is defended by Krause, who refers to Salmas. praef. ad Ceb. Tab. 4., Perizon. ad Ἑλιαν V. H. 2, 21., and Fabr. Obs. p. 344. So also Schl. in his Lex. renders: "per vitam vestram incontinentem." I am more inclined to agree with Grot., who observes that in Aristot. those are said to be ἀκρατεῖς, who do not remain constant in a good resolution, but succumb to the allurements of vice. Thus he renders ἀκρασίαν infirmitatem, i.e. "by means of your not being able to contain yourselves." One should, indeed, rather have expected ἀκρασίαν or ἀκρατείαν: but the words are often confounded in MSS., and by the best writers were used indiscriminately. Of this Wets. adduces many examples from Plutarch, Philo, and Aristotle.

On the sentiment Rosenm. compares Catullus:

---

"Nupta tu quoque, quae tuus vir petet, cave, ne neges: ne petitum aliunde eat." And so Jalkut Simeoni (cited by Wets.) "Qui sine uxore habitat — concupiscens prava ipsum vincit, egrediturque cum ipso in plateam, Satan stat, ipsumque e mundo perdere cupit."

6. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην, οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν.
It is not very clear whether the τοῦτο is to be referred to what precedes, or to what follows. The latter opinion is maintained by J. Capell., and many recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Krause, and Macknight, who refer to ver. 25., and adduce a similar mode of expression from Joel 1, 2. Ps. 49, 2. 1 Cor. 10, 28. And undoubtedly this use is frequent in the Classical writers. But the context alone can determine our choice. Now, in all cases, it is more natural to refer it to the preceding, and here the use of the δὲ, and of the γὰρ in the next sentence, seems to require it. Yet it should not, I think, be referred to the immediately preceding (though this is done by many Commentators), but, with Calvin and Vorstius, to the more remote; as ver. 1., where the Apostle counsels them not to marry, unless διὰ τὴν ἀκρατείαν. Thus it will not be necessary to read δὲ for γὰρ; which is found in some four or five MSS. and Fathers, and appears to be a paradiorthosis.

6. κατὰ συγγνώμην. On the sense of συγγνώμην there exists some difference of opinion among Commentators. Beza, Grotius, Hamm., Bengel, Mackn., Rosenm., and Schleusner, take it to be nearly equivalent to γνωμη, monitum. Grotius renders: "id quod dixi, Habeat quisque suum, aut suam, conjugem, non praecepit, sed suasi." And he observes: "Præcepta omnes tangunt, monita dantur prout cuique expedit." Beza, too, remarks that Aristot. Eth. 6. defines συγγνώμην "commodam dicti interpretationem, habita boni et æqui ratione." Thus the κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν will refer, not to Christ, but to the
Apostle himself. So Schleusner: "Hoc quod dixi suadere tantum volui, salvo judicio vestro, non praecipere."*

Krause renders κατὰ συγγνωμήν, "with indulgence;" q. d: "dico animo cedente, non jubente." But I see not how this version can be defended with any regard to the propriety and usage of the language.

After all, the common interpretation, which refers both the συγγνωμὴν and the ἔπιταγὴν to the Lord, may be defended; and seems very agreeable to the Scriptural writers and the usus loquendi (see Schl. Lex.), and, moreover, somewhat confirmed by ver. 10 & 12., and 25. περὶ δὲ παρθένων ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω. But see the note there.

Carefully, then, must he that divideth the word of truth distinguish between the letter and the spirit of divine injunction, between counsels (as they have been called by the acute Montesquieu), which relate only to the time when the Apostles lived, and laws, which are of perpetual and universal obligation; and discriminate between such precepts as were local, and such as were meant to be general.† On which subject I would refer the reader to Rosenm. on Matt. 23, 8. T. 1, 450. and my note on Matt. 18, 17., and especially to Nitch. Comment. de judicandis morum praeceptis in N. T. a communi omnium hominum ac temporum non alienis p. 101 & 165., also an admirable essay of Lord Clarendon on the reverence due to antiquity, vol. 2, 76—138.

7. θέλω γὰρ πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι αῖς καὶ ἐμαυτῶν. Grot., Vorst., and other eminent Commentators, re-

* The Apostle (Rosenm. remarks), distinguishes his own opinion from the precepts of Christ.

† And to this purpose it is justly remarked by Burke (Works, vol. 10. p. 21.): "We must sort out what is intended for example, what only as narrative, what to be understood literally, what figuratively, where one precept is to be controlled and modified by another; what is used directly, and what only as an argument ad hominem, what is temporary, and what of perpetual obligation; what appropriated to one state and to one set, and what the general duty of all Christians."
mark, that the ἀρρένω is to be interpreted "non abso-
lutæ voluntatis, sed optativæ." Thus the best Trans-
lators render it, velim, vellem. So Grotius.

The expression εἶπεν οἷς καὶ ἐμαυτόν (to be as my-
self) cannot refer to the celibacy of the Apostle; for
(as Doddr. remarks) it would be a flagrant absurdity
to suppose that St. Paul wished marriage might en-
tirely cease; * but is only to be interpreted of his
wish, that all men had the same dominion over their
passions and appetites that he had, so that they
might be able to lead a life of celibacy whenever
it was required by circumstances. It is remarked
by Theophyl., that when the Apostle exhorts to
any thing difficult, he usually adduces his own ex-
ample. This, Rosenmuller thinks, has reference
only to widows and widowers; since the Apostle
gives directions to virgins, infr. 25 seqq. But there
is not, in the composition of St. Paul, sufficient re-
gularity to enable us to pronounce, with certainty,
in such a case.

The καὶ is said to be pleonastic. And Krause
adduces examples from the Scriptural and Classical
writers, in both which such pleonasm are frequent.
But it rather seems to be emphatic, in the sense
even; and with οἷς may be rendered even as. So our
Common Version.

7. ἀλλ' ἐκάσως τοις χάρισμα ἔχει ἐκ Θεοῦ, &c.,
"each hath its own proper gift." The Commentators
seem, however, not to discern the admirable modesty
with which this is said. The Apostle does not claim a
merit in this mastery over his passions, but calls his
continence the gift of God. This was, Chrysost.

* The same excellent Commentator subjoins the reflection, that
"this shows how unfair and improper it is, in various cases, to
strain the Apostle's words to the utmost rigour, as if he perpetually
used the most critical exactness; but, indeed, 9, 22., is so full an
instance to the contrary, that it is not necessary to multiply re-
marks of this kind." This, indeed, is a very just remark, and such
as might be expected from his good sense and correct taste. It were,
however, to be wished that he had himself more frequently acted on
the principle which he here so judiciously lays down.
and Theophyl. remark, meant to console those who, from incontinency, were obliged to marry: and yet (as Theophyl. observes) τῆς μητέρας δεῖται στοιχεῖ τὸ πράγμα. And, in the same view, Grotius remarks, that not only the gifts of the Spirit, which are obtained by no exertion, may be termed χάρισματα, but also those which are attained by much labour.” See James 1, 17. How continence is a gift, see on Matt. 19, 11. and the note there.

8. λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἀγάμοις καὶ τοῖς χήραις, &c. It is rightly remarked by Crellius, that the Apostle here reduces into a compendium what he had hitherto said.

On the exact sense of ἀγάμος there has been no little discussion among Commentators. According to its literal and primitive meaning, it signifies one unmarried, without determining whether he has ever been before married, or not. Many eminent Commentators, as Grot. and Rosenm., contend that the term here denotes widowers: and the former observes, that as the usage of language did not permit the Apostle to write χήρας, so he employed the general term in a special application.* This, however, seems to be gratis dictum. The case of those who have never married is (they say) entered upon at ver. 25. But, as Mr. Slade truly remarks, “the Apostle does not always attend to such a nicety of distinction and arrangement,” e. g. the argument in ver. 32—34. is equally applicable to all who are married. Besides, there is plainly an opposition between the ἀγάμος and the τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι at ver. 10.: and so in ver. 32 & 33. ὁ ἄγαμος and ὁ γαμήσας are opposed. It should, then, seem that τοῖς ἀγάμοις denotes unmarried persons in general.† Then καλῶν is to be interpreted as at ver. 1.

* They, moreover, reason from the Apostle being himself then a widower. But to this it is replied by Macknight, that the advice being given to widows as well as widowers, the phrase, as I do, no more implies that the Apostle was a widower than he was a widow.” This, however, seems not very solid reasoning.

† To which purpose Schleusner cites Anthol. 1, 13, 12, τοῖς δ’ ἀγάμοις ἀφρονίς ἀι δι βίος.
9. εἰ δὲ οὖκ ἑγκρατεῖονται. This is rendered by many: "non continent:" by others, "non continere possunt;" which seems preferable. Paræus says, it is used potentialiter. The truth is, the potentiality is inherent in the very nature of the word. For ἑκατῆς signifies one who is ἐν κράτει, in possession of power. Thus εἰ οὖκ ἑγκρατεῖονται signifies: "if they are not in possession of power (namely, to abstain)." So the term comes to be synonymous with ἄνεξεσθαι; and Grot. remarks that both words answer to the Heb. יִּתָּן.

9. γαμφθάσωσαν, "let them marry." This term, like our marry, is appropriate to both sexes: though the Latin nubere is properly applicable only to females.

9. κεῖσον γὰρ ἐστὶ γαμήσαι ἐν πυρῷσθαι. The force of this metaphor in πυρῷσθαι and the cognate terms in the Greek and Latin, the Commentators have illustrated with indefatigable, but misplaced, diligence. It is needless to remark that desire is, in all languages, compared to a fire. So Virg. Æn, 4, 68. uritur infelix Dido. Πυρῷσθαι, indeed, does not necessarily indicate that any one shall be so burnt up as to yield to carnal appetites: yet it implies (i.e. in the case of some persons) such great proneness to evil as may require to be remedied in the way suggested by the Apostle, namely, by marriage.

On the sense of καλὸν the old Commentators trifle egregiously. Some recognize in it a catachresis. But it is to be taken in the plain and popular acceptation. I know not whether the sense can be better expressed than in the following paraphrase of Sclater: "Etsi utile dico coelibem agere propter præsentem necessitatem, et sollicitudines mundanas, commodius tamen est nubere quam uri; etsi enim matrimonium (non quidem naturâ suâ, sed ex accidente peccato hominis), mala aliqua et incommoda secum trahat, plura tamen et graviora adfert libido, reatum scil. æternæ mortis. Bulkley here aptly cites Maxim. Tyr. Diss. 41. p. 498.
On the sentiment I would refer the reader to Nicostr. ap. Stob. Serm. 446, 9 et seqq. It has been very sensibly observed by Macknight, that marriage being an affair of the greatest importance to society, it was absolutely necessary that its obligation and duties should be declared by inspiration in the Scriptures. This passage, therefore, of the word of God ought to be read with due reverence, both because it was dictated by the Holy Spirit, and because, throughout the whole of his discourse, the Apostle has used the greatest delicacy of expression."

10, 11. The Apostle now proceeds to consider the case of Christian married persons, and the continuation, or dissolution of that tie.

10. τοῖς δὲ γεγαμήκοσι παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἔγω, ἀλλ' ὁ Κύριος, "not I only, but the Lord saith; not so much I as the Lord." The Apostle, doubtless, adverts to the precepts recorded in Matt. 5, 32. & 19, 3—10., where Christ lays down the law of marriage and of divorce. On the levity with which writings of divorce were often given, Krause refers to Joseph. Ant. 4, 8, 28. γυναικὸς τῆς συνοικούσης βουλόμενος διαζευγάθαι καθ' ἀς ἰδιοτοῦ αἰτίας, πολλαὶ δὲ ἀν τοῖς ἀνδραποῖς τοιαύτα τινὰ γίνομεν γεύμασι μὲν περὶ τοῦ μηδέποτε συνέλθειν ἵνα μηδεμιᾶς τὰς ἀλλὰς ἢ γὰρ ἐπὶ σου ἐξουσίας συνοικίαν ἐτέρω, πρότερον γὰρ ἄφεσιν.

10. μὴ χωρισθῆναι, scil. δει. The Infinitive is here used for the Imperative. Grotius and Krause remark that χωρισθῆναι and ἀφεῖναι are appropriate terms; the former relating to the wife deserting or separating herself from her husband (for the passive is here, as often, used for the reciprocal; see Matt. 5, 32. 19, 4—9; and so Justin. Apol. 1, says of a woman ἐχωρισθη, discessit, divertit): the latter to the husband putting away his wife. See Joseph. ubi supra, and Strabo, p. 428. χηρᾶς ἀφέννας τὰς γυναίκας. Grotius parallels the use of ἀποτέμπειν and ἀπολεῖπειν among the Athenians.
It is, moreover, the opinion of several Commentators, as Selden, Grot., Vorst., Hardy, and Rosenm., that the Apostle is here speaking not of formal divorces effected before a magistrate, but only of such voluntary separations as often took place from disagreement between married persons. The law of Moses (Rosenm. observes) did not give the wife the power of legally separating herself from her husband. And that the first sort of separation is not here meant, is plain, Sclater thinks, from the words τῷ ἄνδρὶ καταλλαγῆτε which occur just after. "Now the Greek and Roman laws (says Rosenm.) did indeed permit the wife to separate from her husband; but the present precept respects couples both of whom were Christians." Yet I see not how that would destroy the right of the wife, unless on the principle that no right was to be sought by restoring to the Heathen Judges; which could not be meant; since the Apostle seems only to have had in view such matters (chiefly pecuniary) as could be settled by arbitration: and this was not one of those.

11. τῷ ἄνδρὶ καταλλαγὴτε, “let her be reconciled to her husband. Καταλλαγή is synonymous with διαλεγμα. Both words frequently occur in the best Greek writers; examples of which are adduced by Krause.

12. τῶς δὲ λοιπῶν ἔγω λέγω, ὥς ὁ Κύριος. The best Commentators, both ancient and modern, are agreed that τῶς λοιπῶν must have reference to marriages where one party is Christian, and the other unbelieving. In which case it was a question much debated, whether conscience did not require the believing party to separate from the unbelieving; and whether all such marriages ought not to be dissolved. This the Apostle decides in the negative; prefacing his answer with ἔγω λέγω, ὥς ὁ Κύριος, the force of which words is not, I think, correctly represented by many of our recent Commentators. They make it equivalent to: “This is only my private opinion; is not founded upon any revelation from Christ, and forms no part of his doctrine delivered personally
while he was on earth." (See, besides other Commentators, Whitby, Rosenm., and Krause, and an able note of Mackn.) To this, however, strong objections have been raised. "Certainly (says Mr. Slade) the Apostles, though they wrote the commandments of the Lord, 14, 37., did not deliver every sentiment by immediate revelation; and whether St. Paul so delivered these matrimonial directions, may depend, in a great measure, on the sense of ἐξειν, ver. 40., which see. There could be no difference, in point of authority, between the commandments uttered by Christ, and those suggested by the Spirit; the origin of both being divine."

"At the same time, however (adds he), the injunctions which were laid down by our Lord on this subject, might enable the Apostle more assuredly to declare, that he was speaking immediately and expressly by divine command." Of such marriages as these Christ had said nothing, nor, indeed, without anticipating the designs of the Deity, could he.

*Απιστον, i.e. non Christian; as perpetually in the New Testament. ἐνδόκει, thinks good, thinks well, consents, approves. This appears to be an idiomatic use of the word; though found also in Diod. Sic., cited by Munth in loc. It signifies, generally, "to unite in approbation of any thing;" also "to unite in any thing," whether good or evil. οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτῶν, i.e. συνοικεῖν; as it is expressed by the Classical writers.

19. καὶ γυνῆ, subaud ἀδελφή, taken out of the preceding ἀδελφὸς. By ἀνδρα ἀπιστον is meant, Rosenm. says, non Christianum, i.e. whether Jew or Heathen. But it may be doubted whether the Apostle had Jews in view.

19. μὴ ἁφιέτω αὐτῶν. By using the same term as in the case of the husband putting away his wife, it is plain that the Apostle considered the wife as having the power of divorce, which, indeed, as being a Greek or Roman, she would have. Whitby remarks, that many Christian women thought it an impious
thing to cohabit with a Heathen, especially if he were addicted to unnatural lusts, since they might partake in his iniquity and idolatry, as being “joined in one body.” “Hence (adds he) Justin Martyr gives an instance (with seeming approbation) of one of those Christian women who separated herself from her husband.” But let it be remembered, that the being addicted to unnatural lusts alters the case; that being a sort of adultery which might legally dissolve the marriage contract. If such were the case in the instance mentioned by Justin, he did right in approving it; for the woman did not separate herself from her husband for unbelief, but for unfaithfulness to her bed.

14. The Apostle now adds a reason why diversity of religion ought not to be a cause of divorce. (Krause.) And this by a sort of pre-occupation of the objection, “Shall I not be polluted by such close union with a profane and polluted person?” To which the answer is: “No; the believing wife is not polluted by the unbelieving husband, but rather the unbelieving is sanctified by the believing.” (Crellius.)

On the sense of this passage, and especially of ἠγαθαρταί, there have been numerous opinions, all of which I cannot be expected to detail and review; especially as there are scarcely more than two that have any semblance of truth.

The opinion of most recent Interpreters, as Krause, Rosenm., and Schleus. (and formerly Est., Menoch., and Tirin.) is, that the sense is: “may easily be consecrated; is, in some measure, consecrated and numbered with Christians, and has an easier access to the jus Christianum, because of his believing wife.” For examples of which sense of ἠγαθαρταί, Schleus. refers to Acts 20, 32. 26, 18. Heb. 10, 14. 1 Cor. 1, 2. Jud. ver. 1. And, indeed, this interpretation deserves the praise of simplicity; but it is defective in critical proof. For where is ἠγαθαρταί ever used in this limited sense? Besides, how can it
apply to the antithetical clause? And thus the words εἰς τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτα ἐστί would be, I think, irrelevant.

Some others adopt the interpretation of Semler (which had been before brought forward by Hamm.), and take the ἄγιος in a future sense, and thus modified: "will gradually become holy, by feeling more favourably inclined to Christianity.” But this is doing great violence to the words, and can by no means be admitted. Besides, that argument is touched on at v. 10.* Neither can I approve of Whitby’s version: “hath been sanctified.” Other Commentators, more rightly, regard the preterite as put for the present. The truth is, that in this idiom the preterite has an aorist sense, and denotes what is usual or accustomed; i. e. what has been, is, and will be.

Upon the whole, the best founded opinion seems to be that of Crellius, Sclater, Camer., Beza, Calvin, almost all the Dutch Commentators, Whitby, Wolf, and Bengel, and which is partly confirmed by Chrys., namely, that this sanctification is not to be extended beyond what the subject matter requires, i. e. sanctification quatenus illi matrimonio uti fus est. So Crellius. Or, as it is more familiarly expressed by Whitby: “He is to be reputed as sanctified, because he is one flesh with her who is holy.” Beza renders, “Pietas uxoris plus valet ut conjugium illud sanctum et purum habeatur, quàm mariti infidelitas ut profanetur, vel ut uxor boná conscientiá

* This interpretation, however, is in some measure supported by Theodoret, who paraphrases the words by: εἴξει σωτηρίας ἔλειδα. He further observes, that the Apostle has expressed the sentiment hyperbolically, with a view to persuade the believing party not to break the bond of wedlock.” A somewhat dangerous and unsound principle.

It is also supported by Phot. ap. Óecumen. 479 c., who, after observing that the unbelieving party, being swayed by the dutiful kindness shown by the believing one, and endeared thereby, is induced to feel strong conjugal affection, and to think more favourably of the Gospel: ὅτε καὶ ταῦτα ἐγγὺς ἦστι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀγάπης δίδα τῆς συνοικίας τοῦ πιστοῦ. Yet this, I think, is too far-fetched.
marito uti non possit." The sense is well expressed by Doddr. thus: "The one is so sanctified by the other, that their matrimonial converse is as lawful as if they were both of the same faith.* See Dieteric Antiq. Bibl. 27., cited by Wolf, who himself remarks: Paulus nempe indicat, conjugium ejusmodi impar ob conjugem alterutrum fidelem Deo placere. Hoc vero ad Scopum Pauli sufficiebat, qui eo spectabat, ut doceret, conjugem fidelem matrimonium, cum infidelis susceptum, solvere non debere." In the same view, Mr. Slade thinks that by the infidel party being sanctified, the Apostle might mean the marriage itself being so sanctified, as to be entitled to all the advantages of a complete Christian marriage, particularly as to the state of the children, who would be considered as Christians, and become admissible to the right of baptism; which would not have been the case, had both the parents been heathen and unclean."

As to the Baptist interpretation, it has, undoubtedly, not a foot to stand on. But I must hesitate whether to adopt the last detailed interpretation. Perhaps, however, it may be engrafted upon the one which precedes it.

14. ἐκεῖ ἂν τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτα ἐστὶ, νῦν, &c. Many Commentators render ἂν aliquin. But it rather seems to have the sense of profecto, sani, and there appears to be an ellipsis of ἀλλὰς, which is not unfrequently found after certain conjunctions, and among the rest ἐκεῖ. (See Rom. 11, 6. and the note there, and also consult Wets.) The sense, then, seems to be this: "For otherwise (namely, if one party be not sanctified) your children are considered impure and profane. (See 2 Cor. 6, 17. Acts 10, 28.) But now (i. e. in this case) they are holy," i. e. form part of God's people. So Hardy (from

* The above interpretation, Macknight strongly contends, cannot be admitted. But his objections seem very far from conclusive, and his own interpretation surpasses in absurdity any one yet proposed.
1 CORINTHIANS, CHAP. VII. 398

Par.) “Fœedere comprehensi, et membra ecclesiae reputantur, et baptismi capaces, vigore promissionis illius, Ero Deus tuus, et seminis tui.” It is obvious how strongly this supports the doctrine of Infant Baptism.*

15. ei de & αἵρεσις καθηγεται, καθηγέον, “but if the unbelieving party will separate himself from the believing, let him be separate.” The meaning of the Apostle in these words is not very clear; which has led some to suppose that the Apostle meant all such marriages were, by the desertion of the unbelieving party, ipso facto annulled: so that a new one might take place. But this sense cannot fairly be elicited from the words ὁ δὲ διωκόματα, which admit of a very different interpretation. Nay such an opinion would be at variance with both the letter and spirit of our Lord’s decision, and indeed of the Apostle’s himself in this very chapter: and such a material change in the law cannot well be

* On which Doddridge has the following excellent annotation: “Nothing can be more apparent than that the word holy signifies persons who might be admitted to partake of the distinguishing rites of God’s people. Compare Exod. 19, 6. Deut. 7, 6. 14, 2. 26, 19. 30, 3. Ezra 9, 3. with Isa. 35, 8; 3, 1. Acts 10, 28, &c. And as for the interpretation which so many of our brethren, the Baptists, have contended for, that holy signifies legitimate, and unclean, illegitimate, (not to urge that this seems an unscriptural sense of the word,) nothing can be more evident than that the argument will by no means bear it; for it would be proving a thing by itself, idem per idem, to argue that the converse of the parents was lawful because the children were not bastards; whereas all who thought the converse of the parents unlawful, must of course think that the children were illegitimate.” See also Mr. Slade’s judicious remarks on this subject, and especially the annotation of Grotius on this whole passage, who, inter alia, observes: ἀκάθαρτα et ἄγια (quae hic opponuntur, quomodo apud Judæos ἱνατικαὶ ἄγια, non illegitimationem et legitimationem denotant, sed Ethnicismum et Christianismum. Questio hic non erat an proles legitima esset sed an Christiana: quo sensu παῦρι ocurrit apud Talmudicos. Eodem sensu hic sancti, i.e. in sanctitate geniti, dieuntur, b. l. intra Christianismum, si vel pater vel mater sit Christianus.” See Capell. in loc. and Wets., the latter of whom cites Plut. Is. et Osir. p. 364 σε τινα μάλλον ἢ σε γυνώσκειν, ὥς κλα, δι κρατήρον ἐστι—τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καθωσιομέμην ἵπποις ἀπὸ πατρός καὶ μητρός;
imagined, since it would render the abrogation of a marriage dependent on the will of the separating party; which would destroy all security in the marriage bonds. This side of the question is ably defended by Wolf, whom see.

The contrary opinion, namely, that the believing party was free to form another marriage, is maintained by several eminent Commentators, as Grotius and others ap. Pole; * as also by most of the recent ones. It is also imputed by Whitby to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Photius, &c. But perhaps their expressions are only to be taken in a popular acceptance, namely, that the believing party is free from obligation to cohabit with the other. See Sclater ap. Pole, and especially Whitby. Upon the whole, Hammond seems to have correctly represented the sense thus: "If the infidel will not live with the believer, unless she will forsake her religion, she is not then so enslaved or subjected that she may do acts prejudicial to her religion, and to the betraying thereof, in order that she may continue with her husband; but she is blameless if she remain separate from him, upon such his desertion."†

The ὑστερον καταστρατα is well explained by Theophylact, "is not bound to bear with him in such a point," (i.e. when he quarrels with her on the score of religion.)

15. ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ κέκλεικα ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός. It has been (I think) rightly noticed by Piscator, Paræus, Sclater, and Crellius, that the Apostle here limits the liberty in question, lest it should run into license; q. d. "God, however, hath called us (Christians) to

* Thus Paræus, Calvin, and Estius: "Liber est non solum a toro et mensa, sed etiam a vinculo deserentis. Non obligatur vel summa cum molestia invito cohabitet, vel ut caelebs maneat, et reconciliationem expectet ac procuret."

† So Wetstein: "Si deserit uxorem, quia illa Christo nomen dedit; non adeo alligata est marito, ut ejus gratia debeat Christum deserere. Thus Let him go will be taken in a popular acceptance, i.e. "bring no action to recover your matrimonial rights; much less sacrifice your Christian faith for such a purpose."
the cultivation of peace; and therefore the believing
must not afford the unbelieving party any cause for
separation by an unyielding spirit and over precise
scruples; nor, after separation, compel him or her
to return, and thus hazard the breach of peace.”

16. τι γὰρ οἶδας, γύναι, εἰ τῶν ἄλλων σώσεις; The
Apostle here assigns the reason why the believing
party should not promote needless separation, but
in every way cultivate peace; namely, since by this
conduct the other party may probably be gained
over to the Christian faith: for that is here the sense
of σωζέων, on which term see the note on Matt. 2,
21. Rosenm. observes, that the word was also used
in this metaphorical sense by the Pythagoreans.
And he refers to Jambl. de V. P. C. 9. So κερδάων,

Here Wetstein aptly cites Bereschith R. 17, 12.
“Factum piii, qui duxerat uxor um pianm, et non pro-
crearunt liberos. Dixerunt. Deo nihil prosumus.
Steterunt et fecerunt divortium. I vit ille, duxit im-
piam, quae illum impium fecit. Illa nupsit impio,
quem pium fecit. Ecce omnia esse ex uxor en.” And
Krause cites Clem. Alex. Strom. 4. ἐλοί αὐν οὖν ἡ
σωφρόν, πρῶτον μὲν πειθεὶν τῶν ἄνδρων κοίμασιν αὐτῇ
γίνεσθαι τῶν πρὸς εὐδαίμονίαν φερόντων. Εἰ δὲ ἄνωναῖς
ἐχοι, μονὴ σπευδότατο ἐπ’ ἀρετήν, πάντα μὲν τῶν ἄνδρων
πειθομένη, οὐς μοῦδὲν ἄκοντος ἐκείνου πρόξειν πότε. θλη
δοσα ἐπ’ ἀρετήν τε καὶ συμπάθεια διαφέρειν νομίζεται.

Many Commentators join the εἰ μή of the follow-
ing verse to the end of the present one. So ΟΕcu-
menius, and, of the moderns, Hammond, Krause,
and others. But for this there is, I think, very
little authority; nor can it be defended on critical
grounds; for the ἡ μή is evidently the easier read-
ing. Theophylact remarks that some copies had
ἡ μή, but that Chrysostom read and explained εἰ μή,
connecting it with the next verse; which, he says, is
far better. And he thus explains the sentence: οἱ
γίνεται ὁ χαρισμὸς διὰ τὴν ἀκιστίαν, εἰ μὴ ἐκάστος, ἀντὶ
17. ei μὴ ἐκάστῳ ὁς ἐμέρισεν ὁ Θεὸς — περίπατείσθω.

Here ei μὴ is for ἀλλᾶ, only, at least, at all events: a sense found both in the Scriptural (as Gal. 1, 7, 2, 17. Rom. 14, 14.) and in the Classical writers. Thus the Commentators cite Arist. Eq. 1103. μηδὲν ἀλλ' ei μὴ ἔσθιε. And so nisi in Plaut. and Cicero. (See Drak. on Liv. 24, 20.)

On the scope of this and the following verse Krause (from Rosenm.) pertinently remarks: "Pau- lus, quod sæpius facere solet, quædam a proposito suo non planè aliena, interjicit et ex occasione eor- rum, quæ de conjigio dispari disseruerat, locum de variis vitæ ingreditur conditionibus, easque in ipsâ re, et in religionis exercitio nihil mutare docet."

But to advert to the construction of the present verse, Grotius has rightly remarked that in ὅσ there is a double transition; as at 3, 5. Rom. 12, 13. An idiom which, I must observe, occurs more than once in Thucydides. The sense is, "according as God hath assigned, apportioned to each his situation in life." Μερίζεω answers to the Hebr. יָּֽקְרַי, to divide, apportion. Doddridge paraphrases, "according as God hath cast their parts." Indeed it is a dramatic metaphor, which will bring to the mind of most of my readers a celebrated passage of Shakspeare's Hamlet. Grotius thinks that the Apostle has added the clause ἐκαστῷ ὁς κέκληκεν ὁ Κύριος, to explain and illustrate the former; as if κέκληκεν signified no more than "called thee into the situation thou holdest." So Paræus, who regards it as equivalent to, "distributed thy condition or calling." And thus Krause, and indeed most recent Commentators. Yet in κέκληκεν there is surely an allusion to the Christian calling. The two senses may, indeed, be thus united (as is done by Rosenm.) "Prout fuit externa conditio, in qua quemque Deus ad Christia- nam religionem perduxit."
The sentiment is repeated at ver. 20 & 24.

17. οὕτω περιτατείω, "so let him live." Here Grotius and Krause aptly compare the Horatian: "Quam tibi sortem Šeu ratio dederit, seu sors objecerit, illâ contentus vivas."

17. καὶ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις διατάσσομαι. The words may be thus paraphrased: "Nor is this admonition meant for you only; since it is my strict injunction to all the Churches which I superintend; namely, that the Christian religion does not interfere with or disturb the relations of civil polity." Διατάσσει. is properly a military term, and signifies, "to place or dispose in order of battle;" (whence τάγματα, regiments;) but it also signifies, in a general way, to arrange, order, enjoin, &c.; as in Acts 20, 13. and sometimes in the later Classical writers.

The reading of some MSS., διδάσκω, is evidently a gloss.

18. περιτετμημένος τις ἐκλήθη; μὴ ἐπιστάσθω. "has any one been converted, who had before been circumcised, or from being a Jew," &c. Μὴ ἐπιστάσθω. This is by our common Translators rendered: "Let him not become uncircumcised;" which, as a popular, and especially as a decorous version, may be tolerated. But, in fact, uncircumcised no one ever could become. The term in question refers to certain means which were taken to remove the marks of circumcision. This (as the term suggests) was by drawing down the prepuce with certain surgical instruments. On which the Commentators refer to Cels. de Med. 7, 25. where the whole process is described. This passage is cited by Wetstein, together with numerous others illustrative of this subject; as Martial 7, 30, 6. 9, 57, 4. 7, 82. Diosc. 2, 101. & 4, 157. and especially Epiph. de Metris 16. καὶ ἀπὸ περιτομῆς ἀκροβοστοι γίνονται τέχνη τιν τις ιατρική διὰ τοῦ καλαμιένου σταθμήρος τῆς τῶν μελών υποδέρματος υποσταθέντας, ραφήνες τε καὶ κολλητικοῖς περισεθέντες ἀκροβοστάναι οὕτως αὐτήν ἀποτελοῦσιν. The practice is often alluded to by the Rabbinical writers.
(See Wetstein's examples.) That ἐκπαρσθαί was the term appropriated thereto, appears from Joseph. de Macc. 5. (cited by Wets.) τρωκαίοντας γέ τοι μετά τῶν συνέδρων ο Τύραννος Ἀντίοχος ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλοῦ τόπου —παρακελευσεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα ἑκάστον τῶν Ἑβραίων ἐπιστάσθαί, καὶ κρεῶν ἀείων καὶ εἰδωλοθάτων ἀνακαζεῖν ἀπογείεσθαι.* The tool with which this operation was performed was called στασθηρὸς, spaster. See Steph. Thes., Buxtorf's Lex. Talm. p. 1274., Fabr, Bibl. Antiq. 282. and other writers referred to by Wolf, Hamm. in loc., and especially the learned and elaborate Dissert. of Groddeck on this subject, reprinted in Schoetttg. Hor. Hebr.

On the word ἀκροβυστία (which is here understood) see Rom. 2, 27, 30. and the notes.

On the circumstances which had led the Apostle to advert to this subject, Rosenm. well remarks: "Videntur in eorum numero, qui Paulum amarent, et de variis rebus consuluisset, Exjudæi nonnulli fuisset, qui per Pseudapostolorum, circumcisione sua gloriantium, et Corinthiorum, hujus forte laudis æmulorum, despicientiam et odium de ipso circumcisionis vestigio delendo cogitassent; quum contra Exgentiles nonnulli, Pseudapostolorum auctoritate commoti, circumcisci vellent. Utrumque errorem jam corrigit Apostolus."

19. ἡ περίτομη οὐδὲν ἔστι — Θεοῦ. The expression οὐδὲν ἔστι is a popular one, signifying to be of no moment,† "perinde est." See Plut. de Excit. (cited by Wets.) τὸ δὲ σε μὴ κατοίκεῖν Σαφεῖς οὐδὲν ἔστιν. And Eurip. Iph. A. 968.

19. ἀλλὰ τίγγες ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ. Supply τι ἔστι, "is something of moment;" "it is the keeping the commandments of God that is of importance." Gro-

* Yet the writers of 1 Macc. 1, 17. seems to have been unacquainted with it; for speaking of the sons of Tobias, he simply says, ἐκπαρσθεν εἰσαετοίς ἀκροβυστίαιν.

† Viz. in the business of salvation; since it is abolished, the chief purpose of its institution being already fulfilled. See Rom. 4, 11. (Hardy.)
tius observes, that from this passage, compared with Gal. 5, 6, and 6, 15. we learn, that it comes to the same thing whether we speak of the obedience to God's precepts in the Gospel, or faith which worketh by love, or the being a new creature: for the first denotes the thing; the second assigns to it parts; and the third indicates the primary cause." So also Crellius, who adds, that it is clear from hence that the observance of God's precepts, which Christ requires of us, is both not impossible, and is the causa sine qua non of our salvation." See also Vorst in loc. Yet it is not, I think, quite fair to aim at determining any doctrines that may be in dispute from passages like the present, which are expressed populariter.

Theophylact has here very soundly and judiciously expounded thus: Πανταχού τοῦτο ἐπιτείται, μετὰ τῆς πλοτεως ἢ ἐγγυσία τῆς ἀρετῆς τᾶλα δὲ, ἢ θητω, ἢ σωμάτως.

20, 21. The Apostle again lays down a general precept, and to that subjoins another special one. (Crellius.)

Grotius and Rosenm. remark on the paronomasia in κλησει ἢ ἐκλησθη; since κλησει denotes condition, state of life, (so Theophyl. βιὸς ταγματι;) as we say calling; whereas ἐκλησθη signifies, "was called to be a converted Christian; and especially as to the two great distinctions of bond and free. Grotius also refers to a similar use of the Hebr. נֶפֶשׁ.

21. δοῦλος ἐκλησθης; μη σοι μελέτω. The sense of these words is not very clear. Hence they have been variously understood. Chrysostom and all the Greek Commentators take the μη σοι μελέτω—χρησαί to signify: "You need care so little, that if even you can gain your freedom, prefer your servitude, as a greater trial of Christian patience." And so Camerar., Schmidt, Starch, Estius, De Dieu, and the Syr. Translator. And this sense, they think, is confirmed by the following consolatory words: "For he," &c. The interpretation is also ably de-
fended by De Dieu and Wolf. And Theodoret remarks: Ταύτην δὲ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν οὐχ ἄφλας τέθηκεν, ἀλλὰ πείθαν μὴ φυγεῖν τὴν δουλείαν προφάσει θεοσεβείας προσφέρει δὲ καὶ ἑτέρων παράφυσιν. But (as I observed at ver. 14.) this principle, namely, of hyperbole, as employed for such a purpose, is precarious and unsound: and, notwithstanding that the above interpretation may be defended, and is supported by high authorities, yet I must doubt whether it be the true one. There is a certain harshness about it to which nothing but necessity would reconcile me, and which I find nowhere else in our Apostle. Crellius has, I think, rightly remarked, that the Apostle did not mean to say, “Remain a slave,” since slavery is a thing in its own nature bad, and in common life the two things are very different. And he might have added, that what is detrimental to human happiness cannot be promotive of virtue. Considering, then, the admirable good sense, and knowledge of the human heart shewn by the Apostle, I must regard that as the true interpretation which is supported by Beza, Grotius, Hamm., and most Interpreters since their time, indeed almost all recent Commentators. This I shall explain farther in detail.

The words μὴ σαὶ μελέτω (on which see Eurip. Hel. 134. and the Commentators) must not be too much pressed.* It signifies, “Do not feel a too great trouble on that account, (μὴ ὑπερβολή, as Theophylact explains,) as if it could materially affect your acceptance with God, and salvation; and as if that were a condition unworthy of a Christian.” Theodoret paraphrases: “Grace knows no distinctions of freedom or servitude; therefore bear it patiently.”† Grotius adds: “And, above all, let it

* As is done by Drs. Goodwin and Dodridge.
† So of Epict., Grotius tells us, it is said: Δοῦλος Ἐκείνῃς γενόμην, καὶ σώματι πρὸς καὶ πενίαν ἱποῖο, καὶ φίλος ἀθανάτος. It must, however, be observed, that the condition of slaves in Greece was little inferior to that of the lower orders of freemen. So
not drive you to seek your freedom by unjustifiable means.” And he remarks, that a misunderstanding of the nature of Christian liberty had made many Christian slaves not only murmur at their situation, but seek to throw off all bondage; just as (he adds) the misunderstanding of some doctrines of Stoicism (that the wise man was a king) made some persons arrogant and turbulent; as we find from Tacitus, Annal. L. 14.

21. ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ — ἄρετος, “but if thou hast the power of obtaining freedom, choose that state in preference.” At ἄρετος subaud ἐλευθερίαν, which is included in ἐλευθέρως γένεσθαι. This subaudition is far less harsh than that which is required by the first-mentioned interpretation. ἄρετος here signifies take, choose: a sense found in the best Classical writers. Μᾶλλον may be well rendered the rather: which sense occurs in Polyæn. 1, 38. ὁ δὲ περιτειχισμὸς αἱθέρετο καὶ μᾶλλον, where Casaub. remarks: “Hoc est juicit vel maxime: id est enim καὶ μᾶλλον; ut alibi docuimus.” And. Onosand. p. 16. πατέρα δὲ προύχρινα μᾶλλον, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀπαιδα παραιτούρενος.

22. ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυριῳ, &c. If the second interpretation of the preceding verse be adopted, these words must be referred, not to what immediately preceded, but to the more remote μὴ σοι μελέτω, and are meant to console such as could not obtain freedom. (See Sclater.) The sense is: “The Christian slave is a freeman of the Lord.” Almost all recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Krause, and Jaspis, take this to mean: “He who being, in a civil sense, a slave, has become a Christian, is, in a moral sense, free:” and vice versa. But the Greek Commentators, and of the moderns Locke, (rightly I think) suppose that

Eurip. Ion. 854. ἐν γὰρ τί τοι δοῦλοισιν αἰσχύνην φέρει Τούνομα. τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐλευθέρων Οὐδεὶς κακῶς δοῦλος δοσίς εὐθελίᾳ ἕτοι. That they were allowed in Greece, at the time of Euripides, to possess property, is plain from a passage of his Andromeda, preserved by Stob. Tit. 81. χρυσὸν μάλιστα δοῦλοι ἐν δόρου ἔχειν. Καὶ δοῦλοι ἐν γὰρ τίμιοι πλουτῶν ἄνηφ.
by ἀκελευθέρος there is not only an allusion to the slavery unto sin under which they formerly lived, but to the liberty, freely and graciously conferred upon them by their Lord and Master. (See Chrys. and Ο€cumen.)

Grotius remarks, that there is a combination of the antithesis and the oxymoron; as in Rom. 2, 20. And he adds: "Vide quam brevi argumentatione Paulus servos liberos äequaverit."† Krause compares the expression ἀκελευθέρος Κύριον with one in Eph. 2, 12. ξένοι τῶν διαθήκης, "strangers as far as regards the covenant."

By δούλος Χριστοῦ is meant one who is bound to obey the precepts of Christ, whether of faith or of practice. Krause refers to Eph. 6, 6. and cites Philo, 1122 a. καὶ ἑστὶ τὸ δουλεύων τῷ Θεῷ πάντων ἀριστῶ. I add Arrian 4, 7. p. 402. (cited by Kuin. on Joh. 8, 32.) εἰς ἑμὲ οὐδές ἐξωσιὰν ἑξει, ἐλευθεραμαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἦργα αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐστολὰς, εὐκτεί οὐδές δουλαγωγησία με δώναται.

23. Some, as Hamm., Knatchbull, Hardy, and Whitby, read this sentence interrogatively, and sup-

* So Theophyl. 218. 'Ἀκελευθέρος λέγεται, ὁ ἀπὸ δουλείας ἐλευθερωθεῖς. Φθειάν ὡν, διὰ τοῦ ἐν δουλεία πιστεύει, ἀκελευθέρος εἰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλευθερώσε γὰρ σε καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἔλεγχεν δὲ ταύτῃ δουλείᾳ, εἰ καὶ δουλὸς εἰ διαν γὰρ τις παθῶν ἐνθλακται, καὶ εὐγενὴν ἐχει γυμνίν, ἐκ τοῦ δειοῦ κάν δοκι. Πάνω, ἂλλος ἐλευθερὸς ἦν, ἐκ μὴν της πίστεως, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ ἦστιν. "Ὅτε εἰ τὸ άνομα τῆς δουλείας δισεβεὶ τὸν δοῦλον, ἐννοεῖτο διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐλευθερώτατον καὶ πολλῷ μειῶν ἐστι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἐλευθερίας. ἄλλος δὲ, εἰ τὸ άνομα τῆς ἐλευθερίας, ἐπαιρεῖ τὸν ἐλευθερὸν, ἐννοεῖτο, διὰ δουλὸς ἐστι χριστόν, καὶ συνελεύθησα, ὡς ὑπὸ δεσπότης τήλεω- τόν ὡς, καὶ αὐτῷ ἄρέσκειν ἂφελείς. 'Ορῶς σοφίαν, τῶν ἀμφοτέρων τοῖς μέρεις τὰ προσάκτοντα παρακινεῖ;"

† He then cites Ignat. Eis δόξαν, &c. "Ad Dei gloriam magis serviant, ut meliorem libertatem a Deo consequatur." Tertullian de coronâ: "Si libertas videtur, sed et servitus videbatur, Omnia imaginaria in seculo et nihil veri. Nam et tunc liber hominis erat redemptus a Christo, et nunc servus es Christi, licet manumissus ab homine." Krause compares a similar sentiment of Apulej. 2. "Da nomen huic sacris militibus — teque jam nunc obsequio religioni nostrae dedica, et ministerii jugum subi voluntarium. Nam clem coperis deo servire, senties fructum tuos libertatis."
pose that there is an allusion to some of the converts having been literally redeemed from slavery. Thus Whitby remarks, that we find from the Apologies of Justin and Tertullian, that the sacramental offerings were, amongst others, dedicated by the Christians to the purpose of buying their brethren out of slavery. But it is improbable that that had become the practice at so early a period. As to the other arguments employed by Whitby for the establishment of this hypothesis, they are of little weight. And it is justly objected by Mr. Slade: “1. It appears, from the change of number, as if all Christians were here addressed. 2. ἀνθρώπων seems to be opposed, by implication, to Χριστοῦ understood after ἔγραψατε. 3. It was not likely that the converts, after their escape from the miseries of slavery, should be desirous of returning to it.” Doddridge, too, truly remarks, that the advice is unnecessarily restrained thereby to those slaves who had been redeemed; which plainly as well suited those who had their freedom given them, and indeed suited all Christians who never had been at all slaves, and who might more easily have been prevailed upon, by their poverty, to bring themselves into a condition the evils and inconveniences of which they did not thoroughly know.” In fact, not only is this interpretation unsupported by any eminent Biblical Critics of modern times, but it was (as far as I can learn) utterly unknown to the antients, who all plainly inculcate that the admonition is general. So Theophyl. § 19. thus excellently paraphrases: ὃς πρὸς αὐτῶν μόνον τοῦτο φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ἐλευθέρους, παραίνειν τῶι τοῖς Ἱησοῦς μὴ πρὸς ἀφεσκειαν ἀνθρώπων ποιεῖν τι, μηδὲ ὑπείκειν αὐτοῖς παράνομα ἐπιτάγματι. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι δουλεύειν ἀνθρώπωι. See also the admirable exposition of Theodoret.

On the τὰς ἔγγ. see the note on the parallel sentiment at 6. 20. Both passages plainly allude to the redemption by the blood of Christ from that servi-
tude to sin which brings with it ignorance, superstition, and evil habits of every kind.

28. μὴ γίνεσθαι δούλος ἀνθρώπων. These words may be taken either in a natural, or a metaphorical sense. The former mode is adopted by Hamm., Knatchbull, and others, who also contend that the sentence is to be read interrogatively; nay, by many who reject that punctuation, as Salmiasi, Wolf, and Dodridge. This, however, is supported by few eminent Critics, and no trace of it can I find in the Fathers and antient Commentators, who take the words in a metaphorical sense. So Theophyl. μὴ πρὸς ἀφεσκείαν, ἀνθρώπου τοιεί τι, μηδὲ ὑπελείψαν αὐτοῖς παράμορφα ἐπιτάχτωσι. See also Phot. ap. Æcumen. 483 Ῥ. and especially Chrys. in loc. And so, of the moderns, Lightfoot, Paræus, and others. It is thought by Piscator, Vorstius, Beza, Grotius, Calvin, and most of the more recent Commentators, that the Apostle has an especial reference to the false teachers, whether Judaizers or others; and means to caution the Corinthians against putting on their necks an unnecessary yoke, by subjecting their consciences to such dogmatical directors. And even Wolf thinks that this interpretation may be admitted, by accommodation, namely, by considering this, as a recommendation to liberty of conscience. For my own part, I consider the interpretation of Chrysost. as by far the soundest.

24. ἐκαστὸς—παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. To the above special example the Apostle again subjoins the general injunction, that each should remain in that state in which it had pleased God that he should be called, and become a Christian. (Crellius.) Theodoret, too, remarks that the Apostle makes this injunction the proemium and the epilogus of his admonition; and then passes to another subject.

This confirms the interpretation which I have adopted of the preceding verse.

On the last words, παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, Commentators are not agreed. The early modern ones, as Camer,
Beza, Grotius, and others, take them to be equivalent to the Hebr. ראה ונה, *in the sight of God,* "as if in his presence, and conscious of his omniscience." The Greek Commentators take it to be equivalent to "conformably to the will of God." In fact, the two significations may be said to merge into each other. Theophylact well details the scope of the passage thus: Ἀμφοτέρων γὰρ προφασται (scil. Apostolus), τοῦ μήτε τῶν σωματικῶν δεσπότων ἀφίστασθαι προφασεί τοῦ Θεοῦ μήτε πάλιν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποστασθεῖν, ὑπείκουσα ὑπὲρ τὸ δεόν τοῖς δεσπόταις.

25. περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων ἐπιταγήν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχει. The Apostle now returns to the subject from which he had diverged; and, having treated of married and widowed persons, he now adverts to the παρθένοι.

Περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων, "As to the virgins (of whom ye consult me)." For the air of the Apostle's words seems to indicate that some question had been proposed to him concerning them; namely, whether they should continue in celibacy? With respect to the word itself, the most eminent modern Commentators are agreed that it must refer to both sexes, and thus be equivalent to our single persons; a sense not only recognized by the antient Lexicographers, but occurring in the Classical writers. Krause refers to Gaulman de Vitâ Mosis, p. 223. and Lampe's Proleg. on Joh. p. 14: and Schleus. to Le Moyne's Var. Sacr. 589. and other Philological works. *

Concerning these, then, the Apostle adds; ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχει, on the interpretation of which words there has been a similar diversity of opinion to that which subsists at ver. 6 & 10. (where see the note, and Slade on those passages, and the present one.) After carefully examining the arguments on

* It is not a little surprising that the Philologists should have overlooked the following examples, which I have noted in my reading. Eurip. Ion. 270. Beck. εἰς παρθένων χειρας. Hipp. 1006. Beck. παρθ. ψυγχήν. Pausan. L. 1. The word is properly an adjective; as in the above passages, and Eurip. Phoen. 852.
both sides; I am inclined to agree with those who interpret the words ἐπιταχθήνε Κύριοι ὧν ἔχω of a direct command issued by Christ while on earth. The turn of the sentence seems indeed to be popular, and may very well bear the sense, "I have no commandment of the Lord to urge;" and is not irreconcilable with the parallel passages supra 6 & 10. This mode of interpretation, too, besides being supported by many eminent modern Commentators, as Grotius, Piscator, Sclater, Pareus, Cajetan, Justin, and Whitby, is confirmed by the authority of the Greek Fathers and Commentators, (see Chrysostom, &c.) and especially Theophyl. 219, who thus explains: φυσικά ὃτι ἐν Κύριω μᾶν ὡς ἐνθάληταιν, οὐκ ἐπεταχθεῖ τι περὶ ταύτης ἄλλα ἔτην. "Ο δινάμενος γὰρ ἐν τοιμασίᾳ καρδίαν. Οὐκ ἐν παρθένῳ ὡς ἐν τοιμασίᾳ ἐπιτάχθη. And yet more decidedly by Theodoret. So also Ecumen. and Photius. And the same view of the sense is taken by most recent Commentators, including Macknight, viz. "I have no special precept common to all, either in the old Law, or in the Gospel of Christ." There seems no reason, however, to suppose, with Whitby, that the latter clause asserts a Divine inspiration.

26. γνώμην δὲ δίκαια, "I give you my opinion." * Grotius and Roseam. supply, "which if you follow, I shall praise, but if you do not, I shall not condemn you." This, however, seems too arbitrary and licentious a paraphrase. The sense appears to be more correctly represented in that of Estius; "I say what I think, and judge best for you." Beza and Calvin render; "Ex temporis, loci et circumstantiis tradum quid expediat, ac voluntati Dei congruat." That such is the sense, appears, I think, from the words following, αἰς αἰκλημένος, which, without pressing on them, must imply (as Mr. Slade observes) that his judgment, even without a special revelation,

* Here Wetstein compares Dio 56. γνώμην αὐτῶν ἔδωκε. And what is more apposite, Dio, p. 386. αὐτὶ γνώμην δεῖ τινα σχέσιν ἔχει. Kypke, too, cites Dio, Sic. 804. and Dion. Hal. 600.
is entitled, from his character and office as an inspired Apostle, to peculiar attention and regard. The phrase ὅσα ἡλεύμενος ὑπὸ Κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι is manifestly Hellenistical. Ἐκείνῳ is regarded by the best Interpreters as equivalent to "obtain a benefit." And so Hardy: κεχαριτωμένος. The force of the expression in question can only be well represented in a paraphrase; and the following seems to be its real sense: "as one who hath been so graciously dealt with by the Lord, as to be entrusted by him with the office of teaching his religion." Πιστὸς here signifies trust-worthy; as in 1 Thess. 2, 4. and 1 Tim. 1, 12. ὢτε πιστῶν με ἐγνήσατο δέμενος εἰς διακονίαν which is altogether a kindred passage. Thus Theophyl. explains πιστῶς by δείξας πιστεῦσαί. And Theodoret judiciously remarks: Μετὰ τῆς συνήθους μετριότητος τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἄξιαν ὑπέδειξεν δείξαγεν εἰμὶ συμβουλᾶς φιλό, διὰ μὲν τὸν πολὺ τοῦ Δεσπότου κληθὲς ἠλεόν, πιστεῦσας δὲ τὸ κόρμυλα.

Of the modern Commentators few have discerned the full force of the expressions in this beautiful sentence.

26. νουμηλῶς οὖν τἀτο καλῶν. The Roman Catholic Commentators press on the sense of νομηλῶς, and make it equivalent to, "I am very sure," imputing it to Paul's modesty. But for this there is no warrant. Thus Theophyl. 219. explains: ὅσοι καὶ ἑαυτῷ γνῶμης. It is well observed by Mr. Slade, that νουμηλῶς seldom, if ever, denotes in Scripture an absolute authority or decree, but a matter of opinion, or private judgment, Matt. 5, 17. 10, 34. 20, 10. Luke 2, 44. 1 Tim. 6, 5. &c.; not, however, that any doubt is implied in the truth or wisdom of that judgment."

26. διὰ τῆς ἐνεργοτάτης ἀνάγκης. The word ἀνάγκη, like the Hebr. נָא, is used of afflictions and calamities in general, not only in the Scriptural (see Schl. Lex.), but in the Classical writers; as Plato 10. p. 38. (cited by Krause) τῇ δ' αὐτῇ διανοίᾳ κατηγόρων εῖς Ἐφεσίας εἰς Μαραθώνα, ὡς ἔτοιμον σφίσιν δν. καὶ Ἀθή-
ναίον, εν τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ ἀνάγκῃ γεύσαντας Ἠρεμιῶν ἄγγελον καὶ Ἰωσήφ. Ant. 2, 9, 3. τραφεῖς παραδεξόμενος τὸ Ἐβραΐκον γένος τῆς παρ᾽ Αἰγύπτ. ἀνάγκης ἀπολύει. In Thucyd., too, it is frequently so used; especially 4, 98 & 120. and 4, 87. κατὰ δοῦ ἀνάγκας, "on two urgent necessities." Some recent Commentators understand by the term the difficulties of life, and the inconveniences of matrimony. But this seems very harsh, and leaves no tolerable reason to be given why ἆνετρ. should have been said. So Whitby: "It cannot signify the troubles common to this life, for they are not always instant or present." Theophyl. interprets: δυσκολίας τᾶς ἐν γαμίᾳ καὶ τὰ τῶν γαμοῦ ἔχασα. But this is, I conceive, a mere Popish perversion. And it is in vain to attempt to change this from a special to a general admonition. The only interpretation that can be considered the true one, is that (supported by the most eminent Commentators) which refers ἀναγγελλεῖν to some persecutions that had begun to take place:* though it must, I think, also comprehend the peculiar difficulties in which a religion (so much at variance with the customs of the world) would involve its professors, and which would fall more severely on the married. Rosenm. thinks that the reverse of fortune which was coming on the Jews would affect the Christians, with whom they often intermarried, or with whom they might very well be confounded." (This, however, seems somewhat sophistical.) "Be that as it may, however (adds he) the Apostle does not recommend abstinence from marriage on account of any greater perfection in celibacy." Theoph., too, observes that the Apostle does not impute it to any ἀκαθαρσίαν.

26. ἢ τί καλὸν, "it seems to me, I repeat, good, or better," &c. This repetition is not to be considered

* And this interpretation is confirmed by ver. 29. seq. and the Scholiast on Cod. A.: διὰ τὴν ἐνέστωσαν ἡτοι διὰ τὴν τῶν ἔκκειμον διώχμον καὶ τὰς βλάψεις ἐνέγκειοι, μόνος ὅν κάθ᾽ ἐκάστῳ, ἡ γυναικεῖα καὶ τέκνα συνέκα γῆς καὶ τοῖς τούτων πάθεις συμπεριέχομεν. (See Dods.)
a mere pleonasm. It is emphatic, and intensive. Τὸ ὀμάς εἶναι. This seems to be an idiomatic or popular phrase, which is found also in our own language, to be as they are, viz. virgins, unmarried. The ἄνδρες is intended to comprehend both sexes; and therefore should be rendered, not man, but person.

27. δέσσεαι—γυναῖκα. This sense of δέσσεαι, which is found also in Rom. 7, 2., occurs likewise in the Classical writers: as Jambl: V. P. 11, 56. τὴν πρὸς ἄνδρα δεδεμένην. Ach. Tat. p. 41. ἀλλ' γὰρ δεδεμένη παρθένος. (Krause.) Theophyl. moreover well observes, that the term δέσσεαι is meant to suggest κάοσιν. And he explains λόγων by τὴν παράλόγων διά. ζευζίν. He concludes by remarking, ὅρα δὲ πῶς λα- λήσατες εἰς τὴν παρθέναν εἰσαθεί, but this savours strongly of Popish prejudice. It is true indeed that the Apostle does indirectly recommend celibacy to them: but he assuredly did not mean advice given on a special occasion to be interpreted as if general, and common to all times.

27. λόγων, separation, or divorce, according as it might be.

27. λέσσεαι ἀπὸ γυναικὸς; μὴ γήτει γυναῖκα. Mackni. renders, μὴ γήτει γυναίκα, "seek not a second wife." That, however, depends upon the sense given to λέ. σσεαι ἀπὸ γυναικός, which, if strictly pressed, will compel us to interpret μ. γ. of deuterogamy; and indeed Ecumen. notices, that λέσσεαι may be taken in two ways, either ὅτι ἄντω ὅλος ἐδέθης, οὐ ὅτι λαβεῖς ἄφ' ὧν ἐδέθης δεσμοῦ. But, considering the nature of the context, and the force of the antithetical clause, it must, I think, be taken in the former and more general sense, as applicable to single persons. So Grot. and most recent Commentators, who remark, that passives are often, in Hebrew and Greek, used as neutrals. Of this sense of λέ. Schleus. cites an example from Xen. Venat. 1, 17. Thus it appears that our English Translators have done wrong in rendering it loosed from. It should rather be, free from. The words freed and free (like fitted and fi,
&c.) will express the two senses of which αἰσχρός is susceptible.

Here I would compare a passage of similar cast in Hipparchus ap. Stob. Serm. 575, 13. παραξενεῖς γεέως; αведущεκαῖρε, “play well the shipwrecked mariner:” πείνης οἰκίστρω; (art thou poor after being rich?) αἷν πνεύμα. So also Plut. de Vit. Αξο. Αλ. § 6. ἤξεις; μη ἔμεινεν εἰς ἤξεις; μη βασίλευς.

28. εἴς δὲ καὶ γῆς, εἰς ξηρὰς, “if, however, thou shouldst marry, thou wilt not have sinned,” viz. (as Clem. Alex. explains it) against the Christian covenant. From these words the Commentators rightly infer that there were among the Corinthians persons, like those elsewhere mentioned by the Apostle, (1 Tim. 4, 3.) forbidding marriage, as if marriage were sinful: and therefore the Apostle meant to correct this error.

28. θλίψιν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ζησομεν οἱ τεσσαρεις. The modern Commentators rightly remark, that by σαρκὶ is meant (as the Hebr. קֶסֶף) the outward circumstances of man; and therefore θλίψ. εἰ σαρκὶ will denote fleshly and outward distress and affliction, arising from poverty, distress, flight, persecution, &c., which would be far more severe on the married. Fleshly troubles here seem tacitly opposed to those spiritual consolations which the Christian religion brings. See Schoettg. Hor. Heb.

28. εἴσδε υἱῶν φεδομαι. These words are somewhat indeterminate in their sense, and admit of more than one interpretation. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) explains: υἱῶν φεδομαι οἷς τέκνων, καὶ βασιλείαν υἱῶν ἐλευθέρας εἶναι καὶ εἰλήφωσι. And so Grot.: “vestrum miseratione ducor.” (Acts 20, 29.) And the same view of the sense is taken by almost all modern Commentators. And so Schleus. Lex.; “ego vero

* There is a similar passage in Diog. Laert. 5, 29. τῇ ποιεῖν τοὺς μελλόντας γαμήσει, καὶ μὴ γαμούτας, καὶ τοὺς μελλόντας ευσεβεῖν, καὶ μὴ κατακλείνεις, καὶ τοὺς μελλόντας πολεμεῖσθε, καὶ μὴ πολεμοφόβοιν, καὶ τοὺς παιδοφόβους, καὶ μὴ παιδοφόβους, καὶ τοὺς ἑλευθερανομένους ευμαινὶ τοῖς δυναστῖς, καὶ μὴ προσέλθεσι.
lubentissimè tutos ac immunes præstarem ab his calamitatisbus." Yet such a subaudition is, I think, too harsh to be admitted without necessity; and I am not aware that any such here exists. I had myself supposed it to be a popular idiom for, "I spare you (the pain of dilating on these evils);" and I find that this interpretation is supported by Estius, from Augustine and other Latin Fathers, and also by Wells and Mackn. Hardy skilfully unites both, rendering: "Haec nimis strictè urgere, vel pluribus conjugii incommoda commemorare nolim; opto autem vos calamitatum expertes esse, atque ideo continentiam suadeo." There is a parallel expression in 2 Cor. 12, 6. φείδωμεν δὲ: where a similar ellipsis has place: and where Schl. Lex. explains, "abstineo (ab illarum rerum commemoratione)." The latter interpretation, too, seems confirmed by the words following, τῶτο δὲ φης.

τῶτο δὲ φης, ὁδεγοῦ, ἀ πάρκη συνεσταλμένης. This sentence is by the modern Commentators variously interpreted. Many recent ones, as Rosenm. (whom see), interpret συνεσταλμένος, "tristia ac turbulenta tempora tempora futura sunt;" and so Schl. Nor is this sense destitute of authority from the Greek Translators of the Old Testament, and even from the Classical writers. But it seems not a little harsh. The most simple and natural interpretation appears to be that of the Greek Commentators, the Syr. and Vulg. Translators, and the early modern ones, who take συνεσταλμένος in the sense of contracted, short, &c.

With respect to the words τῶτο δὲ φης, their sense has escaped most of the Commentators. It has been best seen by Theodoret, who says they are a formula tending to corroboration. Crell., too, has well remarked: "Novo hic utitur argumento Paulus, quod ex abrupto quodammodo proponit: quemadmodum facere solemus, cum omissis, quæ attulimus, argumentia, ut potè de quibus multum litigare nolimus, id in quo praecipuum robur collocamus, proponimus:"
quasi dicat, mittam id quod dixi, sed hoc imprimiturgeo." The connexion and sense is well laid down by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) as follows: Ἐπειδὴ εἶπεν, ὅτι θλίψιν ἔξωσε τῇ σαρκί, ἵνα μήτις εἴπη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠδονὴν ὑποτέμει τὰ τῆς ἠδονῆς, ἐκ τοῦ τὸ καιρὸν ἑως ἐσταλμένου εἰσαγαγέν ἐπὶ λόγῳ γὰρ ἐπείγονται τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡγείμεν η βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ λοιπὸν ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ἀποδημεῖν ὑφεῖλομεν. "Ὅστε καὶ εἰ ἠδονή τις ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ βραχεῖα αὐτη, καὶ ἑλιγχρώνιος καὶ τούτο δὲ αὐτὸ δῆλον.


On the construction of τὸ λοιπὸν Commentators are not agreed. Some take it with the following words, thus: τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστὶ, ἵνα καὶ ἐξανείπον, "It remaineth that those," &c. And thus there will be an ellipsis in the first clause. But this seems a very forced construction. It is more natural to connect it (as most Commentators antient and modern suggest) with the preceding, and assign to it the sense posthaec. Thus the ἵνα will signify so that, or when; and the sense be this: "so that, or when, those who have wives must be as those that have them not." If, however, the τὸ λοιπὸν be taken with the following words, the sense will not be materially different. Only in the former case the time in question will be, as the antient Commentators explain, the time of the world's continuance; in the latter it will signify the time, or duration, of our mortal existence; both of which senses are sufficiently apt, but the former one would seem to be the more suitable to the Apostle's argument; though, in a certain sense, the two interpretations merge into each other.

Some recent Interpreters understand by καπὶς "tempus quietum." But this is too arbitrary a subaudition.

The sense of συντ., like that of the Latin contrac-
tum tempus, is very frequent. (See the numerous examples of Krause.)

Krause illustrates the sentiment from Arrian Diss. Epict. 4, 7. where the Galilæans, i. e. the Christians, are said to be πρὸς τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, ὡστ' ἐν μηδεν ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ἔχειν ταῦτα ἢ μὴ ἔχειν.

30. καὶ ὁ κλαίοντες, αὐτὶ μὴ κλαίοντες. Most recent Commentators, as Krause and Rosenm., render: “And those who are afflicted with adversity, will be equal to those who have enjoyed prosperity.” But this is a kind of argument which, however common, was not likely to have been used by the Apostle. Besides, the usus loquendi will not permit it. For that sense would require ὁ κλαίοντες ὁ μὴ κλαίοντες, &c. And, what is more, this method cannot be applied to the last clause of the sentence, ὁ χράμενοι τ. κ. τ., unless καταχραμένοι be taken for χράμενοι; which destroys the antithesis. Finally, this interpretation is not agreeable to what follows, παράγει γάρ. The scope of the Apostle (which was well discerned by the antient Commentators) is, to inculcate a sitting loose to the things of this world, great moderation, temperance, and self-command, for the reason which is subjoined by way of explanation to the impressive and elegant passage now under our consideration.

31. παράγει γάρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. This sentiment is well expressed by Whitby as follows: “To have and to use these things, as if we had them not, or did not use them, is to be moderate in the enjoyment of them; not to be much affected with them when we have, or much afflicted when we want or lose them.” And especially by Chrysost. (whom see) and Theophyl. who rightly explains the ἔχωσιν by ὀφείλοντις εἶναι; and the ὁ μὴ ἔχοντες by ὁ ὑποσολαμάλενοι, or ὑποσκαλαμάλενοι. He then paraphrases thus: ἀνθιστέας οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἡ λυπηρόν, ἡ τερπνον ἡ τῶν συναλλαχμάτων, ὀφείλει τις πάντως φοβοδότερον στοιδάζειν. So also Οἰκουμ., and, in a mere general way, Theodoret. 'Αλλοτριά, φήσιν, ἢμῶν τὰ πα-
It is obvious that by weeping and rejoicing is meant, (by a common Hebraism,) sorrow and joy, prosperity and adversity. One thing must be observed (though it has been little attended to by the Commentators, which has led to much mistake), that the Apostle gradually deserts the construction employed at the commencement of the sentence, until at length the second participle is used like a verb. Thus the two last clauses καὶ οἱ ἀγοραζόντες, &c., and καὶ οἱ χρησμοί, &c. are of the same cast with the former ones, but are to be thus expounded: "Let those that buy (and sell and get gain, be, i.e. act) as those that are not long to retain their gains and possessions, but are (as Menoch. explains) usu fructuarii ad vitam, only for their own use and that of their family and neighbours." If, however. κατέχοντες be interpreted, with the Vulg. and most modern Commentators, possessing (as in 2 Cor. 6, 12.), there will be no irregularity in the clause. But why, then, should not the Apostle have said ἔχοντες? The case is different in the passage of 2 Cor. ὁς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες, since there there is a sort of antithesis. The next clause καὶ οἱ καταχραίμενοι, &c. must, at all events, be taken in the way above suggested. In this there is evidently a paronomasia, and therefore the mode of interpretation adopted by many modern Commentators, who would shape this clause to a conformity with the preceding, is unnecessary; though that κατεχρ. is sometimes so used cannot be denied. But, I repeat, the paronomasia is evident, and the Apostle clearly intends a more direct and pointed admonition than the interpretation in question affords. Examples of the same paronomasia are adduced by Wets.; as Philo 2, 61, 44. χρησιμος, μη παρακραήμενος. Sopater (speaking of a treasure): κέχρησι
corintians, chap. vii.

I am not aware that any thing further needs be said, except that Hardy well explains μη καταχράσειν: "non nimiá sollicitudine et adhæsione affectuum, sed obiter tantum utentes, et tanquam in transcurso quantum fert necessitas." And by Theophyl.: προσέχειν αὐτῷ μετὰ πάσης σκοπωθῆς, καὶ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν προσκαβείας. Κατάχρησις γὰρ ἡ περιττὴ χρήσις, καὶ πλείων τοῦ δέοντος.

The observations of the Commentators are very copious, but they are, for the most part, either trivial, or obvious, or are formed on mistaken views of the scope of the passage.

31. παράγει γάρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον. Now comes the reason why this moderation should be used.

Here I cannot assent to the opinion of most modern Commentators, as Krebs, Rosenm., and Schl.; that σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον is simply for κόσμος. The word σχῆμα seems to have great force, and suggests a particular mode in which the world may be considered as passing away. As to the similar passage of 1 Joh. 2, 17. ὁ κόσμος παράγεται, cited in support of that notion, it will only show that St. John used the idea in a general way: but this will be no reason why St. Paul should not have further unfolded the thought. Theophyl. has well pointed out the force of σχῆμα thus: Σχῆμα δὲ ἐκάλεσεν, ἐμφανίσας ἐτι ἄριστος ὄψεως εἰς τὰ τοῦ παρόντος κόσμου, καὶ ἐπιτόλαια, μηδὲν βεβηκὸς καὶ οὐσιωδὲς ἔχοντες. See also ÒEcumen. The sentence is also excellently paraphrased by Theodoret as follows: οὐκέτι γάρ γεωργία καὶ ναυτιλία, οὐκέτι βασιλεία καὶ στρατηγικαί, οὐκέτι

* The reading of some MSS. ἔργα, may seem to be confirmed by this passage and that of Philo; but it is evidently a gloss.
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δουλεία καὶ δεσποτεία, οὕτως τέχναι καὶ ἐπίστημαι, οὕτως τεχνές καὶ πλούσιες ἐκ γὰρ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁ παράνικος σωμάτων. He then refers to Is. 24, 2, and then adds; ἄλλως γὰρ ὁ μέλλων βίος ἔχει πραγμάτων διαφοράς. Grot. rightly notices that there is in σχῆμα a metaphor taken from the Drama, where the expression παράγειν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς σκηνῆς was used of the shifting of the scenes. It may be observed, too, that the Apostle very appropriately uses agonistic and dramatic metaphors when addressing those who, like the Corinthians, were accustomed to grand spectacles, both scenic, and agonistic.* The force of the metaphor has been distinctly seen and well expressed by Doddridge. To the other examples of it I add one more apposite from Artemid. Or. 1, 26. p. 42. διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ὄμματα, μητρὶ περίελκοντο οὗτος σχημάτων, οὗτος χρώματων. And especially Philostr. Vit. Ap. 8, 7. καὶ τοῖς σχηματωσι κόσμου τοῦ, which I think an evident imitation of the present passage.

32. ἐπεί γὰρ ἀμερίμνους ἔναι. The ἐπεί is not adversative, but has here the sense of autem, or purro, preterea.

The Apostle recommends celibacy to them by another argument: and ἐπεί here, as often, signifies, not volo, but velim, vellem; q. d. "I would wish you to be ἀμερίμνους," which (as Grot. observes) is to be understood comparatè, viz. as much as the state of

* On this subject I may be permitted to introduce an appropriate observation from a Visitatin Sermon delivered before the Bishop of Peterborough and the Clergy of Rutlandshire ten years ago: (p. 16.) "Is not our faith confirmed, while our taste is gratified, when St. Paul, addressing the Ephesians, seizes their attention and captivates their fancy by reiterated and splendid allusions to that temple which was the glory of their city." (See Ephes. 2, 21. 3, 17., where we have an accumulation of architectural terms.) And p. 17. "Surely it is the province of the scholar to point out to his hearers the skillful and impressive manner in which St. Paul, after the enumeration of many interesting particulars, closes the two foregoing passages (Eph. 2, 21. & 3, 17.) by a term borrowed from architecture, and therefore striking to the imagination of an Ephesian reader. Such is also the peculiar beauty which characterizes many passages in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians."
their temporal concerns permitted.* 'Αμερίμνοι may be rendered "undisturbed by cares." Sclater has well paraphrased thus: "Quæ dico eo pertinent, quod cupiam vos quam minimum destineri curis mundanis."

The words following, ὁ ἁγιός μεριμνά, &c., are illustrative of the Apostle's meaning; and, moreover, there is a clause omitted, which Theophyl. thus expresses: Πῶς δ' ἄν εἶμην ἀμέριμνοι: Εἰ ἁγιόι ἀμην. The sense, then, is: "The unmarried person, for instance," &c. Now the context shows that μεριμνά must be taken emphatically: q. d. "He especially, and κατ' εἴσοχον, careth for, employs his thoughts upon," &c. The present tense here, as often, expresses what is usual, and any other than this sense cannot be here intended. Grot., Vorst., and others, indeed, render it: "may, or can, care:" but this is wandering too far. Πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ κ., "how he may so act as to please the Lord." The turn of the sentence is idiomatic and popular; and seems to be thus expressed in conformity to the antithetical clause τῶς ἀρέσει τῇ γυναικί. (See Crellius.)

33. δ' δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνά τῷ τῷ κ., "the married man has to devote his attention to worldly cares, and especially to the support and comfort of his wife (and family)." So Crellius: "ut sic uxorí placeat, dum scilicet et illi, et liberis, et toto familíæ rectè prospicit." Such appears to be the Apostle's meaning, which is, however, expressed very briefly, in order, it should seem, to preserve the antithesis in the following clause, τῶς ἀρέσει τῷ ἄνδρι, more distinct. Here Schoettgen cites a passage of similar

* Here the unmarried person has the advantage; whereas, the cares that overwhelm the married one are, in a manner, proverbial. Thus Wets., in illustration of the expression and the sentiment, aptly cites Anthol. 1, 13, 12. τοῖς δ' ἁγιόνοι ἀφροτίς ἐκεί βίος & S. ἔχεις γάμον; ὅπε ἀμέριμνοι ἐσεάς & 19, 1. Οὐδ' δ' Ζεὺς ἀμέριμνος ἔχει χρυσότροπον Ἡρην. Menander. αρ/Stob. τῷ γυναίκι ἔχειν, εἰρεῖ τῇ παίδειν, Παρμένος, πατέρα μέριμνα τῷ βίῳ πολλάς φέρει. Ter. Adelph. 5, 4, 13. Duxì uxorem quam ibi miseriam vidi nati filii alla cura.
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turn from Sohar Chadasch, fol. 7, 4. "Non potest operam dare servitio creatoris sui, sed tantum servitio uxoris sua."

On the various readings of this verse (which are numerous, but unimportant) I must refer my readers to Wetstein, or Griesb., or Vater, and also Rosenm.

34. μεμέρισται ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος. On the sense of μερ. Commentators are not agreed. Several of the early modern, and of the more recent ones, as Wets., Kypke, Noesselt, and Rosenm., adverting to the μεριμνα which occurs both before and after, and to the etymology of the word μερ., explain it: "is distracted by cares;" q. d. "both the wife and virgin are distracted with cares; each has her cares, though different." But this seems not a little harsh, is by no means agreeable to the context, and destroys the regularity of the whole passage, the plan of which may be thus laid down. The Apostle first describes the situation, in this respect, of the married, and of the unmarried man; and then proceeding to draw a similar comparison of the case of the married, and of the unmarried female, he introduces it with the expression: καὶ (deinde, on the other hand) μεμέρισται ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος. It is evident, then, that the true sense of the word μερ. is that laid down by the Greek Commentators, and, of the modern ones, by Grot., Beza, and Casaub., including Schleus. Lex. Chrysost. well explains it diastē̂̃kastin αλλήλων: and Theophyl. διαφέρουσιν αλλήλων.

34. ἡ ἅγαμος μεριμνά τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἢν ἡ ἅγια καὶ σῶματι κ. π., "but she who is unmarried especially careth for the things of the Lord," &c. The Apostle’s meaning is further unfolded by the words, ἢν ἡ ἅγια καὶ σῶματι καὶ πνεύματι, "that she may not only be holy, and without blemish, in body, but in spirit, mind, and heart." The force of these words (which is not sufficiently attended to by the modern Commentators) is well pointed out by Theophyl. 222. οὐκ ἀρκεῖ σῶματι ἐναι ἅγιαν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ πνεύματι τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ ἅληθὶς παρθένια, ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς καθαρότης: ἐπεὶ πολλὰ τὸ σῶμα ἅγια καὶ ἀμολύντων υόσαν, καταστι-
λαμέ νει εἰς τὴν ψυχήν. This purity of heart the Apostle evidently considers as more in the power of the virgin than the married woman. Here it is sensibly remarked by Theophyl., that when we see such an one making profession of virginity, and having her heart devoted to the world, she is no true virgin. "For," adds he (from Chrysost.) (and let those that calumniate marriage consider it) the Apostle has set bounds to each, by which they may be known, not marriage, and abstinence from marriage, but πολυπραγμοσύνη and ἀγαθία.* It is plain, therefore, that the Apostle did not consider marriage on the score of purity, or impurity, but solely with reference to the cares inseparable from it.

Of the married woman it is said: μεριμνά τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσει τὸ ἀνδρὶ, which words Grot. paraphrases: comit se oculis mariti, ac mores suos accommodat. And on this point many Commentators dilate. Yet it is not, I think, what the Apostle had principally in view. It should rather seem that these words are explanatory of the preceding. Into that error Grot. seems to have been led by Theoph., who explains: τυχὼν μὲν καὶ κάλλους ἐπιμελομένην. But then he adds: τυχὼν δὲ διὰ τὸ οἰκουμένων δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀγαθὴν: which last point the Apostle seems chiefly to have had in view; since a devoted attention to domestic cares would much more draw her mind from religion than the other. Crellius, judiciously, unites both, explaining: "the married woman is obliged to devote much time and attention to the things of this life, to her family, children, domestic concerns, and lastly her person, that by all this she may please her husband."


* For, adds Chrysost. (which Theophyl. ought not to have suppressed) οὐ γὰρ ἡ μίξις πονηρόν, ἄλλα τὸ ἐπικοίνων, ἐπὶ πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν.
749. Galei. ἀφεσίκεν τῷ αὐτῆς ἄνδρι, ἐσπελέασ ποιεῶν τὰς ἐκείνης θελήμας.

This also is the view taken by Doddre. "The Apostle, says he, in this text, and the counterpart to it, seems to declare that single persons of either sex have generally opportunities for devotion beyond those that are married, even in the most peaceful times of the church; and that a diversity of humours, both in men and women, makes it difficult for them to please each other so thoroughly as is necessary, in order to make a married life delightful. So that it intimates a counsel to single people to value and improve their advantages, and to married people to watch against those things that would ensnare them, and injure their mutual peace and comfort." See also the excellent annotations of Mackn. and Slade respecting the advantages and disadvantages of marriage and celibacy.

35. τοῦτο δὲ—λέγω, "I give you this counsel for your good, both temporal and spiritual." See ver. 26, 28 & 32.

35. οὐχ ἵνα βρόχον ἐμοὶ ἐπιβάλλω. The Apostle here shows the purpose for which he has given this admonition: using an elegant metaphor, not unfrequent either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. This some Commentators, as Wets. and Krause, suppose to be a continuation of that at ver 27.: but without reason. The main question here is, whether the Apostle means by βροχ. a rope, i.e. snare, or a yoke or bond. The former opinion is supported by Vat., Pisc., Erasm., Menoch., Beza, Kypke, Loesner, Rosenm., and Krause, who take it for παγίς, a snare: a metaphor derived, they say, from bird-snaring or beast-catching.* But this seems little to the purpose. Greatly preferable is the opinion of the Greek Commentators, and some of the most eminent mo-

* So Eurip. H. F. 153. Plut. 757. It was sometimes used in war. Thus Joseph. B. 7, 29. βρόχον αὑτῆς τὶς πάροιρον περιβαλλων. See Æneas Pol. 39. p. 1714. and Potter on Lys. 155. The learned Philologists have omitted what is perhaps the most important passage on this subject, namely, Thucyd. 2, 76. βρόχους τε περιβαλλοντες ἀνέκλαν (i.e. the battering-ram.)
dern ones, as Vorst., Grot., Piscat., Locke, and most recent Interpreters, that it signifies a yoke, or restraint, and is put for ἢγον:* as in Acts 15, 10. ἐνθείειν ἢγον ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων τῶν μαθητῶν, & 15, 28. and Matt. 23, 4. And certainly a cord may be thrown over any one for coercively dragging him any where, as well as for binding him. Grot. compares the Hebr. וְּכָ. And he well observes: "Näm de re aliquà ut illicità hominem pressum, adstrictum et quasi illaqueatum tenet. Cf. Prov. 6, 2." The sense, then, is: "My meaning is not to lay any unnecessary restraint upon you." So Theophyl. 222. explains: οὐχ ἵνα ἀναγκασῶ υμᾶς, καὶ μὴ ἥκιστρα, παρθενέως. And he observes: θρίαν γὰρ τὴν ἀνάγκην αὐτομασθεν. 88. ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ εὐρεχθιμὸν καὶ εὐπρόσεδρον τ. Κ. α. This is expressed populariter: "for your more decorous and assiduous service on the Lord," i. e. "that ye may assiduously serve him." The υμῶν is omitted, as being easily supplied, and the neuter adjectives are (as often), for substantives. The τὸ εὐρεχθιμόν signifies decorum. With respect to εὐπρόσεδρον, instead of it many. MSS. and Fathers read εὐπράδερως, which has been introduced by Krause and Griesbach; but not, I think, on sufficient grounds. The MSS. which support this new reading are few in number, and many of them such as are filled with glosses. And the Fathers are here not direct evidence, since they often cite from memory, and such glosses would readily occur to them. Thus the authority of Chrysost. on Matt. is adduced in favour of the new reading; yet here, in his Commentary, he reads εὐπρόσεδρον. Theophyl., too, is quoted in support of εὐπαρ.; yet some MSS. read εὐπροσ. And were I to examine closely the other authorities alleged from the Fathers, I should probably find much of the evidence equally inconclusive. There can be little question, then, but that the new reading is a gloss. It is undoubtedly more Classical, as may be seen by consulting Steph. Thes. on that word, and

* And be it remembered that the ancient yokes were often made of cord.
the cognate terms: whereas εὐπροσ. is a term not only found in the later Greek and Hellenistical writers; and though it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, yet the cognate terms do; as in 1 Cor. 9, 13. οἱ τῶν θυσιαστηρίων προσεδρεύοντες where a very few MSS. (mostly the corrected MSS. I before mentioned) read παρεδρεύοντες. But for this no one has ventured to plead. Wets., too, as he was a far more learned Critic, &c. so he is, in general, a much safer guide than Griesbach, here retains εὐπροσ. rightly observing, that it is “vox multo modestior et aptior.” He also cites as examples of προσεδρεύω, Joseph. c. Ap. 1, 7. τῇ θεραπείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσεδρεύοντας and (to omit many others) Schol. on Soph. Ed. Tyr. άφιηται δ’ ἐκ μετα- φορᾶς τῶν ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς βομμῶν, εἰς ὅς, ὅτε συμμορφᾶ κατα- λάβη, προσεδρεύοντες ἀνδράσι τὸ δεῖ ν ἐξελεύντο. See other examples in Kypke on 1 Cor. 9, 13.

The Commentators observe that τῷ Κυρίῳ depends on the preposition in composition.

35. ἀπεριστάτως. This is well explained by Hesych. ἀμερίμνος, ἀφρονίστως, ἵσυχως. Examples of the word, and also of ἀπεριστάτως, are cited by Raphel, Wets., and Bos. I shall only introduce one, and that from the similarity of sentiment: Arrian. Epict. 3, 22. (cited by Wets. and Krause,) μῆπορ’ ἀπεριστάτων εἶναι δε τῶν κυκλῶν διὸν πρὸς τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ; — οὐ προσδεδεμένον καθήκουσιν ἰδιωτικῶς, οὐ τοιούτως καθηγοῦσιν. 36. εἰ δὲ τίς ἄσκησιν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένου αὐτοῦ νυμῆι, &c. The Apostle now subjoins directions to parents in giving their daughters in marriage. (Krause.)

On the sense of ἄσκησις. Commentators are divided in opinion. Some render it, “acts unbecomingly.” And in this sense the word occurs in 1 Cor. 13, 4. (See Whitby, Wells, and Doddr.) But this seems not a little harsh. Greatly preferable is the interpretation of the Greek Commentators and many eminent modern ones, as Grot., and indeed almost all recent Interpreters, viz. “if he think he incurs shame,” i.e. “if he feels a sensation of shame ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένου αὖ-
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τῶν, with respect to his virgin daughter." Of this sense of ἀσχημ. examples are cited by the Philologists from Ezek. 16, 84. Eurip. Hec. 407. where the Schol. explains ἀσχημονήσαι by ἀτμασθήσαι. Numerous other examples may be seen in Wetstein and Kypke. 'Erz, in the sense on account of, is frequent in the best writers. See Steph. Thes., Matth. Gr. Gr., and Schleus. Lex. I see no reason to take ἀσχημονεῖν, with most recent Commentators, for ἀσχημονήσειν.* For, as Grot. rightly observes, the disgrace (which, according to the opinions of the East, female celibacy involved) extended from the virgin to her father. So Ecclesiastic. 42, 9. "The father waketh for the daughter, when no man knoweth; and the care for her taketh away sleep; when she is young, lest she pass away the flower of her age; and being married, lest," &c. "So far (says Grot.) did the Jews carry their ideas of the expediency of parents marrying their daughters as quickly as possible, that the Rabbins tells us it was a saying, 'If your daughter be past a marriageable age, manumit your slave, to give him to her as a husband."

That τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ be interpreted, "his virgin daughter," is required by the context; and this sense is confirmed by Eurip. Iph. A. 714. ἐμεῖν' ἀπάξεξο σὴν ἐμὴν τε παρθένον. Soph. Οἰ. Τιτ. ταύτις ἀδιάλειπον οἰκτροίς τε παρθενῶν ἐμαίν. Corn. Nep. S. Virgo amici nubilis. (all cited by Krause.) This being the case, it is astonishing that some Commentators, as Locke, Whitby, and Hardy, should interpret τὴν παρθένον "thy virginity;" a sense for which there is no authority, and which is at variance with the context. This was, I suppose, to avoid the abruptness of the transition from the unmarried persons to the parents. But such things are common in our Apostle.

By ἐὰν ἡ ὑπέρακμος is meant, "if she be past a marriageable age."* So (among the numerous ex-

---

* So Theophyl. 228. εἶτε νομίζει ἀσχημον εἶναι τὸ παρθένον ἐχεῖν θυγατέρα· καὶ ταῦτα, ὑπέρακμον οὖσαν.
† Drus. renders the word "puella pilosa," a stale virgin. And Strigil: "qui properat ad senium;" and this he endeavours to prove
amples cited by Wets.) Anthol. S, 12, 10. and Dionys. Hal. εν ἀκρῇ γάμου γενομένη.

36. καὶ (subaud è αὐτοῦ ὁφείλει γίνεσθαι. This is a popular expression, equivalent to our “if it must be so;” and will include reasons of all sorts, both on the side of the parent and the daughter. Ὁ θέλει, ποιεῖται. This (as Grot. remarks) supposes the authority on this point to be solely with the father, according to the custom which prevailed both in Judea and in Greece. So Eurip. Τῶν δὲ ἐμῶν νυμφῶν Πατέρι μελήσει.

36. ὅις ἀμαρτάνει, “he may do it without sin.” Γαμεῖταιςαυτών, “let them marry,” i.e. “the maid and her suitor.” So Grot., Erasm., Beza, and Menoch., who remark on the change of number: which, however, is quite agreeable to the popular style. Whitby and Doddrt. take they to mean “all virgins so situated.” But this would render the change in number yet harsher.

37. ὅσ δὲ ἐστικεν ἐδραῖος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. The subject in this sentence must, by all the rules of composition, be that of the last, namely, the father of the virgin; and on this nearly all the most eminent Commentators are agreed. Some, however, as Locke, Whitby, and Hardy, understand a bachelor, or unmarried person: but this would be very harsh. The best Commentators unite in referring it to the parent. Yet there is, I grant, something in the words which would, at first, lead one to suppose that they referred to a bachelor; and we do not perceive their relation to the parent without some reflection.

"Ος δὲ ἐστικεν ἐδραῖος ἐ. τ. κ. “continues steadfast in his purpose,” is tenax propositi."* So Col. 1, 23. ἐπὶ-

from the five ages of Hippocrates! All which is truly ludicrous. The Apostle supposes the damsel past the age for marriage, in order to prevent their marrying their daughters before that age. This seems more natural than the reason assigned by Grot., that then they ὄργωται, and shew their disposition and temperament: which he illustrates by a no very decorous passage of a Latin Poet.

* This is a stronger expression than ἐδραῖος γίνεται would be, which occurs in 1 Cor. 15, 58. Some recognise it in an agonistical metaphor. But there seems rather an allusion to a statue standing
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The words following, μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, seem introduced to shew on what this steadfast purpose is founded: and I assent to those Commentators who think that the necessity is to be understood with reference both to the temper and inclinations* of the daughter, and to the domestic circumstances of both father and daughter.

The following words are, by Grot. and Rosenm., regarded as a repetition of the same sentiment, such as, in earnest admonition, is very natural. Some Commentators, however, as Crellius, fancy in them a further explanation of the preceding. (See more on the sense in Camerar.) Certainly τὸ τοῦτο κέκρικεν is a very strong term (in which the force of the preterite is to be attended to), and was used to express unalterable determination. On ἐξουσία see Krause's classical citations. Ἱπεῖν τὸν παρθένον is a popular expression, signifying: "to keep her with him; not wed her." To the above interpretation of the passage Whitby indeed makes objections; but all these proceed on a wrong view of the force of the idiomatic and somewhat harsh phraseology of the original.

firm on its pedestal: (so Stob. Serm. 1, 4. (cited by Krause) ἀνδριας μὲν ἐτη βάσεως, στοιχαίως δὲ ἐντε ἐπὶ κάλη προαρέσεως εἰς τὸς ἀμφιποτῆς ὀψείλης εἰναι;) or from a pillar, or column, standing firm on its base (so 2 Tim. 2, 19. ὁ στερεός θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστεκεν, standeth sure); as in the celebrated words of Dr. Young: "On reason build resolve, that column of true majesty in man."

* To which purpose Wets. cites Ερυμενα Κερεία. Intacta dura est custodia pubis; nec patitur formosa moras. & Aeschyl. Suppl. 1006. τερην ὅπωρα δ' εὐφύλαιτος οὐδαμῶς.
Certainly the Doctor's interpretation involves much greater difficulties than any it removes. Insomuch that Doddr., who had formerly (like myself) embraced that interpretation, was obliged to abandon it, from the violence it does to the original. For ἐκγαμη. cannot be taken for γαμεῖν, nor πάρθενος for παρθενία: and even if γαμη. were read in both the clauses (as Doddr. seems to have wished) it would make no difference, since γαμη. can only signify to give in marriage. (See Steph., Thes., and Schleus. Lex. in voc.) Had that been the sense, it might have been paralleled by a similar expression in Eurip. frag. 50. Μακάριος, δότις εὐτυχεὶ γάμον λαβὼν 'Εσθέλε γυναῖκος, εὐτυχεὶ δ’ ὁ μὴ λαβὼν (sicl. γάμον).

39. The Apostle now offers a concluding admonition respecting widows, tending to check their hastiness in forming second marriages. This is, with reason, supposed to be an answer to some inquiry on that head.

39. γυνὴ δέδεται νόμῳ, "is bound by the law (viz. of God, respecting matrimony)." See Theophyl. and Rom. 8, 2. The νόμῳ is thrown out of the text by Griesbach, on the authority of about six MSS., and some Versions and Fathers; which I can scarcely approve of. It seems to have been cancelled by some correctors, as in the Cod. Cantab. On the sense of δέδεται here, see ver. 10. & 11. 27., and the notes.

Κομψῆ. An euphemism for die, common in Scripture. See Schl. Lex. Ἐνεργεῖα ἐστὶ — γαμηθήσαι, This is (I conceive) a popular construction, exactly similar to one in our own language. Classical examples of it are adduced by Wets.

39. μονόν ἐν Κυρίῳ, "only (let her marry) in the Lord." On the meaning of οὐΚυρίῳ the modern Commentators are not agreed. Most of them take it to signify: "to one within the Church." And so Grot., Vat., Menoch., Tirimus, and Estius, and the greater part of the Latin Fathers. Others regard this as too confined a sense, and explain: "remaining a Christian; or, "so as not to violate the law of God by fornication." But these two last interpretations are
quite wide of the mark. And the first interpretation seems to be too limited: yet as the expression can only mean "with a proper attention to her duties and obligations as a Christian," it must have been most incumbent on her to avoid marrying an unbeliever. Besides, in his second Epistle, 6, 14., the Apostle expressly forbids them to marry unbelievers. Upon the whole, the sense has been most satisfactorily and briefly expressed by Theod. in four words: ἔμποιστα, εὐσεβεῖ, σωφρόνως, ἐνόμως. Theoph. well expresses the second part of the duty thus: μετὰ σωφροσύνης, μετὰ κοσμικῆτος, ἐπὶ παιδοστὶ καὶ προστασία, μὴ ἐπιταθεῖα ἐπιθυμίας.

40. μακαριστέρα δὲ ἐστιν εὰν οὕτω μείνῃ. The expression μακαριστέρα ἐστιν is a popular one for "it will be better for her (as ver. 38.);" and that in the respects, and for the reasons above suggested. Ἐάν οὕτω μείνῃ. This expression is similar to the καλὴν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι at ver. 26., signifying: "to be or keep as she is, remain unmarried:" it being, however, supposed (as Grot. suggests) that she can preserve herself pure.

40. κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ πνεύμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν. It is the almost universal opinion of Commentators that the term δοκῶ ἔχειν is an emphatic meiosis expressive of full persuasion and certainty.* So Grot., Sclater, Beza, Wolf, Whitby, Pyle, Doddr., and Mackn., who adduce several examples of this sense, both from the Scriptural and the Classical writers. But I assent to Slade, that "the sense of δοκεῖν does not, in any of these instances, so clearly denote a certainty, as to make them matter of indisputable authority." "But even if it were so (observes he), there is yet a question whether the context leads us to the same interpretation of it here: and, notwithstanding the great weight of opinion in favour of this sense, it is proper to consider what

* Nay Theodoret goes so far as to say that the words import: "These are not my words, but proceed from the grace of the Holy Spirit, whose organ I am."
may be urged against it. The words κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην do not suggest any idea of absolute, infallible assurance; and if the Apostle had wished his decision to rest upon such ground, by an appeal to the certain operation of the Spirit, it appears unlikely that he would have expressed it by the ambiguous phrase δοκῶ ἔχειν. St. Paul, indeed, though he had no doubt of his determinations and directions being conformable to the will of God, yet might not be enabled unequivocally to declare that he was speaking from immediate inspiration. The whole subject, indeed, appears to be treated rather in the language of private judgment, than of divine authority; see especially ver. 6, 10, 25, 35,, with the notes upon them. The present clause may be rendered: “And I trust that I also (or, even I) have the spirit of God.” I entirely agree with this judicious Commentator on the general force of the expression, which seems to have been similarly understood by Theophyl., also by our venerable English Translators, and Dr. Hammond. And so it is taken by Rosenm. Indeed, the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην ought to have prevented any misapprehension of the Apostle’s meaning, since it is, as Palairet truly remarks, “formula modesti interpretantis suum de aliquā re judicium;” of which several examples are given by the philological Commentators.*

* In reference to this phrase, Krause has the following sensible remarks: “In the most ancient times, those who endeavoured to defend celibacy and monkery (compare Jerome c. Jov. Opp. T. 3. Ed. Erasm. and Tertull. de Monogam. c. 3.), made this Chapter their grand fortress, not considering that the particular times in which all this was written must be had in view, and that the Apostle here does not so much give general precepts pertaining to the doctrine of Christ (compare 1 Tim. 4.), as rather, on account of the calamities which impended, offer friendly advice, so, however, that every one should be at liberty either to follow it, or not.”

Thus also Jaspis paraphrases: “Est hæc quidem mera mea sententia, sed ne repudietis sententiam viri, qui satis amplam habet scientiam, et auxilio divino gaudet.”
CHAP. VIII.

VERSE 1. περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν.

The δὲ is transitive, and has the sense of ceterum. From the turn of the expression περὶ, &c. (see note on 7, 1.), it should seem that the Corinthians had, in their letter, consulted the Apostle on the subject of Idolothya. On the sense of this word I have treated in the note on Acts 5, 20., to which I add (from Krause), that “it was customary among the Gentiles to have sacrificial feasts in the temples themselves, in honour of the Gods. So Herodot. 1, 31. ὡς ἔθοσαν τε καὶ εἰρωκηθήσαν ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ ἱερῷ. Heliodor. 4. p. 190. Virg. Æn. 7, 174. (speaking of the ancient kings of Latium) : Hoc illis curia templum, Hæc sacris sedes epulis, hic ariste cæso Perpetuis soliti patres considere mensis. Gell. Noct. Attic. 12, 8. Spon. Miscell. ervdit. Antiquit. p. 62. Ut Sacrificium facerent an FARRIET LIBO, ET IN TEMPORE MORE EPULARENTUR. And in Judg. 9, 27. it is said of the Shechemites; that they “went into the house of their god, and did eat and drink.”

See more on this subject in the Tract on the Lord’s Supper, subjoined to Cudworth’s Intell. System.

That idol feasts were held in the temples to which the Heathens invited their friends, we find from ver. 10 & 10, 20 & 21. To these, it seems, Christians were invited, some of whom attended, desirous, as Mackn. observes, of preserving the friendship of their neighbours, and, perhaps, at the persuasion of the false teachers, who called it an innocent method of avoiding persecution.” Now this would, in common acceptation, have seemed to imply approbation of idolatry. But it appears that some persons skilled in the dialectical subtleties of Greek philosophy, attempted to justify this participation, on the ground that the idol was not a God, but a mere stock or stone, and that if this their opinion of the idol was well understood, their partaking of food in the temple consecrated to its worship, could not involve any acknowledgment of its godhead, and therefore could be no sin, being regarded only as a common meal. Such, we have reason to think from what is written in this and the next Chapter, were the arguments commonly used, and perhaps propounded by the Corinthians in their letter to Paul. Now these the Apostle confutes. See the illustrations of this Chapter by Storr, from whom Rosenm. quotes the following remark with approbation. “Fortassis ea pars Corinthiorum, quae Paulo et Apolloni adhaerebat, per ipsum veritatis tuendae studium, vel per affectuum intertemperantium, ut in allis, sic in eo etiam deflexit, ut hujus partis exgentiles plures, Pauli exemplo noti non modo victimarum idolis maecataturn reliquis vene libus, vel multis ethnicorum dumi vesce solerent, sed sacrificis etiam epulis in idoli cujusdam delubro interesse non dubitarent.”

In order, however, to fully understand the origin of this controversy on the Idolositya, it will be proper to make more profound researches into Jewish Antiquities than the Commentators have any of them done. Here the learned labours of Schoettg. in his Hor.
Heb. come seasonably to our aid, but to which I can only refer my readers.

From these, Schoettgen thinks, will appear the reason why the Apostle has treated so largely of Idololoyths, namely, because of the over scrupulousness of the Jewish Christians, and the excessive licence claimed by Gentile Christians, who would not fail to be very offensive to the former, and cause disputes among them.

Finally, in order to the full comprehension of this difficult subject, it is desirable to know the opinions of the antients. Those of the Greek Fathers may be found in Suiicer's Thees, and of the Latin ones in Petavius’s Theol. Dogm. And here I must especially notice a long and masterly introduction to the Homily on this first verse by Chrysostom, to which I can only refer the reader. The following observations from Theophylact are, however, chiefly founded upon it, and deserve attention. Ἡσαν τινες παρὰ τοῖς Κορινθίοις τέλειοι, καὶ εἰδότες ὅτι τὰ εἰσερχόμενα οὐ κοινοὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὅτι τὰ εἰδωλ., ἐύκα καὶ λιτός εἰσι, καὶ οὐ δυνατόν βλάψει, ἀδιστόρως εἰσέβαλαν εἰς τὰ εἰδωλεία, καὶ τῶν εἰδωλοθυών ἐνεσφοροῦντο. Ὁμώτεροι δὲ τοῖς ἐπεροτελέστεροι, εἰσέβαλαν καὶ αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ εἰδωλεία, καὶ εἰδωλοθύτων, οὐ μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης, ἀλλ’ ὡς τῶν εἰδώλων τιμῶν ὄντων, καὶ ἄξιον θυσίας δέχεσθαι. Τούτῳ εἰς ἐκείνου τῶν Παύλου, ἢτα καὶ ἀμφότεροι βλάπτον τοὺς τε τελείους, ὡς δαιμονίων ἀπαλάντως τραπέζων καὶ τοὺς ἄτελεισ ὡς ἐκεὶ εἰδωλοτυρίαν συνανθούμενον. Ξενάγεει τοῖς διορθώσασθαι τούτοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς τελείους διαλέγεται, ἀφεὶς τοὺς ἀτελεστέρους, διὰ τὸ δοῦμα αὐτῆς.

1. οἴδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχωμεν. There has been some discussion raised as to the interpretation of these words, and the construction and punctuation of the first four verses of this chapter. I must not omit to advert to an hypothesis brought forward by several modern Commentators, which professes to remove the difficulty and obscurity in which this passage is involved. Abp. Tillotson, Bp. Pearce, Wets., Saur., Mark., Noess., Rosen., Krause, and most recent Interpreters, consider the words of ver. 1. οἴδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχωμεν, as an extract from the letter of the Corinthians, to which the Apostle answers in the following words: Ὅ γνῶσις, &c. And so again at ver. 4—6. οἴδαμεν ὅτι—δι' αὐτοῦ, to which the Apostle answers: ἀλλ' ἡμῖν, &c. And again at ver. 8. βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παρίστησι τῷ Θεῷ—ὑπερθεούμεθα. To which the Apostle answers: βλέπετε δὲ μὴν, &c. “And so also (adds Markland) at C. 6, 12 & 15. 7, 1. 10, 23, in all which the words
of the Corinthians seem to be remarked upon.”  
(But see the notes there.)

Thus they make the former part of the chapter a kind of dialogue between the Corinthians and St. Paul (not much unlike that between the Melians and Athenians in the fifth Book of Thucydides). Now this hypothesis deserves the praise of ingenuity, and is ably supported by the above distinguished Critics: but I find nothing to countenance it in the ancient Commentators; and, upon the whole, it seems too bold to be safely adopted, and indeed it leads to more difficulties than it removes; as my notes will shew. Neither is it necessary. There are many similarly constructed passages in the Epistle to the Romans, which some visionary Interpreters throw into the form of dialogue: though by the more judicious this plan is almost invariably rejected.

In the words now before us we have only to avoid pressing on the signification of οἴδαμεν, on which little stress is laid by the Greek Commentators. ÓEcumenius, indeed, passes it over altogether. To me it seems equivalent to, “it is certain and indisputable;” “it is an acknowledged truth.” With respect to the πάντες, it is by Chrysostom rightly considered as emphatical; q. d. “we have all this knowledge (of the nullity of idols, &c.), and not you the τελεῖοι only.” (So Theophylact and ÓEcumenius.) He remarks, too, on the address shown by the Apostle, who does not say, “I have this knowledge in common with you;” but “we all have;” meaning the generality of Christians, not literally all.

By γνώσις is meant a knowledge of the matters in question.*

* Dr. Macknight, however, thinks that this γνώσις was the grand secret, of the knowledge of which the initiated in the Heathen mysteries were exceedingly vain, and which they carefully concealed from the middle and lower ranks of mankind. Many Corinthians, therefore, puffed up with that knowledge, embraced every opportunity of shewing it, and of expressing their contempt of idols.
No Commentator has, I think, expressed the import of the sentence so correctly as Crellius, thus: "Quod attinet ad idolothyta eorumque esum, nihil est necesse ut vos doceam, quid hac de re sentiendum sit; an nimirum per se sit licitus, an illicitus. Novimus enim nos omnes ejus rei sat gnaros esse."

This was, as Chrysostom observes, meant to humble them. And this the Apostle follows up with the weighty gnome, ἡ γνῶσις φυσιῶν, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη όικοδομεῖ, introduced (it should seem for greater effect) without an ἀλλὰ, or any similar particle.* Theophylact supplies πλὴν. By ἡ γνῶσις (I am surprized the Commentators should not have seen) is meant, not knowledge in general, but the kind of knowledge just spoken of; at least this is especially meant.† Rosenm. observe, that ἡ γνῶσις is for οὕτω γνῶσις. "Now this knowledge, the Apostle says, φυσιῶν, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη όικοδομεῖ. On which Æcumen. remarks: οὐ μόνον, Φθόγγον, ἡ γνῶσις κοινὴ ἐστι καὶ φυσιῶν ἀγάπης οὕτω χωρίς, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τελείᾳ ἐστι καθὼς εἶναι δεῖ. Here it has been well noticed by Beza, that there is an architectural metaphor; the knowledge in question being compared to a mere pasteboard fabric, the other to a real and solid building. This metaphor, indeed, is very frequent in our Apostle, and I shall treat on it at large in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

* Those who have read Longinus, will remember that he treats more than once on the powerful effect produced by this abruptness, which he terms the ἀνωθέντων. (On which see Ernesti, Techn. Rhet.) In no author are instances of this figure more frequent (except Apollon. Tyn., who much affects it), than in Thucydides: which (I remember) his Zoilus, or μαρτίς, Dionys. Hal., often and bitterly censures.

† It may seem strange that the Apostle should not have expressed himself more distinctly. Now Crellius is the only Commentator who has perceived the reason. His words are these; "De industriā videtur Apostolus non statim expressisse id, quâ in re scientia circa idolothyta consistert, quemadmodum vers. 4. rem propositam resumens facit; sed simpliciter tantum scientiam illius in rebus tribuisse; ut hac occasione, quid scientia, si charitatem adjunctam non habeat, facile pariat, brevi quadam digressuuncula doceret, et sic tacitè moneret, ne sola scientia infendentur."
The application is obvious; and on this the modern Commentators have unnecessarily dilated.*

2. εἰ δὲ τις δικαὶ εἰδέως τι, οὐδέως, &c. In the interpretation of these words the antient Commentators have not been so successful as usual; and, of the modern ones, most take unwarrantable liberties with them. I know not any one who has distinctly seen the scope and connection, which appears to be as follows. The Apostle had in the preceding verse interwoven a general gnome, or maxim, together with the particular person he especially meant to lay down. So here he seems to have intended to follow up the latter by inculcating another moral maxim, which, however, being (as such are usually done) expressed very generally, must be defined and limited in the explanation. The knowledge spoken of is human knowledge generally, and even that of religion, as far as it is a branch of science, and considered as a matter of speculation only. The τις, therefore, has no reference to Peter, Paul, or any other Apostle (as Chrysostom supposes), but is said generally of all human beings, as far as it applies.

By τι is meant “any branch of science;” and by δικαίος εἰδέως, “supposes himself to thoroughly understand.” Of him it is said, οὐδέως, &c. that “he yet knoweth neither that nor any thing else, καθὼς δέ, as he ought to know it, as it ought to be known, i. e. perfectly, completely.”† Such appears to be the true sense of this gnome generalis;‡ on which no

* None of them, I think, have expressed so much in so short a compass as Theophyl. (from Chrysos.) as follows. Ἡ γνώσις οὐ μόνον οὐδέν ἄφελεν ἄλλα μᾶλλον καὶ βλάπτει, φωσιόσα καὶ ἄγνωστα τῶν ἔχοντα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποσχίζουσα αὐτὸν τοῦ πλησίον μᾶλλον, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἔχῃ μὲν αὐτῷ ἢ ἀγάπη τοῦτον ἀντίκειται ἀνεορμεῖν δύναται: ὥσα γὰρ ἡ χρῆσις ἀγάπης γνώσει κάθαρσι, ῥαστά ἡ ἀγάπη λαβεῖται καὶ σωστόν, κάτω ἀπ' τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ πνεύματος.

† So Theodoret: Πολλῆς ἢ μὲν δεί γνώσεως, καὶ ταθην λαβεῖν ἐνειάν εἰς τὸν καφεντί βίον τῶν ἀδικότατον.

‡ With this one may parallel several pronounced by the antient
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refinements are to be sought, nor petty exceptions taken. At the same time, the gnome has a spiritual application; in laying down which, however, we must keep as close as possible to the natural sense. It is therefore unwarrantable to supply, with some, "and hath not charity." We may understand the person in question to be a ἓνθευσιοφός, who is vain and proud of his knowledge, and rests in it, without applying it to practice, by the discharge of his duties to God and man, and who therefore knows nothing perfectly or practically. This, indeed, is suggested by the antithetical clause εἰ δὲ τίς, &c.

3. εἰ δὲ τίς ἀγαπᾷ τὸν Θεόν, οὐτος ἐγνῶσται ὑπ' αὐτῶν. The sense of this clause, which is somewhat vague, is best determined by the preceding one, to which it answers. Commentators, however, are not agreed as to what that sense is. Most modern ones, as Grotius, Crellius, Gataker, and Le Clerc, and also some Greek Fathers, ap. Suic. 1, 762. and Theodoret, suppose an ant-anacasis in ἐγνωσται, and interpret it, "is acknowledged, approved of, beloved, and favoured by him;" as Matt. 7, 27. "I never knew ye;" and often. And so Schleus. Lex. in v.

sages, some of which may have been in the mind of the Apostle. Wetstein here adduces numerous passages from the Classical writers; as Plaut. Trinum. 1, 2, 163. Cic. Acad. Q. 1, 6. "Hic in omnibus sīre sermonibus, qui ab iis, qui illum audierunt, perscripti variē copiosè sunt, its disputat, ut nihil adīrmet ipsa, refellat alias; nihil se scire dicat, nisi id ipsum; eoque praestare castris, quod illi, quae nesciant, scire se putent, ipsa, se nihil scire, id unum sciat; ob eamque rem se arbitari ab Apolline omnium sapientissimum esse dictum, quod haec esset una sapientia, non arbitari scire quod nesciat. Quae cūm diceret constanter, et in ea sententia permaneret, omnis ejus oratio tum in virtute laudanda, et in omnibus hominibus ad virtutis studium cohortandis consumebatur, ut e Socraticorum libris, maximè Platonis, intelligi potest." Isocr. Panath. τῶν ἀγαλαίων σοφίστων, καὶ πάντα φασόκτων εἰδέναι. Dio Chrysost. Or. 395. πάντα εἰδέναι φασίν. Epict. 72. σημεία προκοπώτας' οὐδὲν περὶ δαυνοῦ λέγειν, ὡς ὅταν τινὰ, καὶ εἰδότος τι. Lucian (of Isocrates); καὶ πάντα ἐγνωκέναι καὶ ταῦτα, δεῖ γὰρ αἷμα στ' ἀλήθεις λέγειν, οὐδὲν εἰδότα. Plato de Legg. 5. οὐκ εἰδότας, ὡς ἔτοι εἰσεῖν, οἷομενα ὑπ' πάντα εἰδέναι. Themist. 13. p. 161. Aristid. Ἡ, 364. Theogn. 231.
§ 17. But there is something very harsh in this interpretation, and little agreeable to the context. It makes the Apostle's words too much of an enigma. Besides, ἀγαπᾷ, to which it may be thought to refer, does not so much signify love, as serve, obey (thus, "He that loveth me, keepeth my commandments; and he that keepeth my commandments, he it is that loveth me"); which obedience includes love and service to our neighbour, for God's sake. What, then, is the sense of εὐνωσται? That is not easy to say, or, at least, to prove. I formerly thought the difficulty might be successfully removed by supposing the ὁσα to relate to God; q. d. "If any man loveth God, by him God is known or understood." Which would require an emphasis to be laid upon αὐτοῦ, and εὐνωσται to be interpreted, "by him (only) is God thoroughly known, or to any purpose." This mode of interpretation (which has been also adopted by Pearce, Doddridge, and Pyle) certainly gives a very good sense; but whether it be the sense intended by the Apostle may be doubted. Indeed it requires too much subaudition, and does too much violence to the construction: for (as any one versed in Greek literature will perceive) ὅσα must be referred to the subject of the preceding clause, τις. I must, therefore, acquiesce in an interpretation which, though apparently more difficult, has the merit of greater regularity, and is more agreeable to the context, namely, that of Augustin, Beza, Wolf, Paresus, Flacius, Glass, Schmidt, Locke, Schoettgen, Schulz, Rosenm., Macknight, Noesselt, Slade, and Krause, who assign to εὐνωσται, by a Hebraism, a Hiphil sense, viz. is made to know by him: is taught by him; (as 1 Cor. 13, 12. Gal. 4, 9.) i. e. θεοδιδακτος ἐστιν. This is not only confirmed by an antient Scholiast ap. Matthiae, but, in some measure, by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Ecumen. An

* He explains: γνωστὸς αὐτῷ καὶ οἰκεῖος καθίσταται: γνωστὸς δὲ γενόμενος τῷ Θεῷ, γνωσίν παρ' αὐτῷ λαμβάνειν. Thus we see he
example of this use of ἔγνωσμένος is adduced by Krause (or rather Schmidt) from Demosth. de Cor. ἐκ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῶν τε παραδείγματος ὁμολογηθεὶς νυν ὅμως ὑπάρχειν ἔγνωσμένον. The passage in 303, 27. of Reiske's Edition is by him explained as put for ἐγνωκότας.

That the above interpretation is most agreeable to the context is certain; since the words plainly answer to καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι. Now the former never knows God and his religion as he ought, serviceably to himself and others: the latter is truly taught of God, has learned God's religion aright, since he has so learned it as to produce the fruits of that knowledge, in love and service both to God and man.

6. ἐν τῇ διάσεως αὐτῶν τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν. It is here well observed by Vorst. "Epanalepsis est sententiae ante propositionem, una cum concessione." And by Grotius: "Generalia quaedam praefatus, redivit praef. τὸ εἰδικὸν κεφάλαιον. The force of the αὐτῶν epanaleptic is illustrated by Raphel from Herodotus.

The Apostle now refutes two arguments by which the Corinthians defended their opinion as to the right, or excused the custom, of eating idol-meats: the first, ver. 4—7; the second, ver. 8 seqq. I. that the Heathen Gods are no Gods, i. e. do not exist. This the Apostle concedes and confirms, 4—6.; but he shows that the conclusion drawn from this true proposition is false, v. 7.

4. εἰδαμέν—κόσμῳ. Here εἰδαμέν must not have any emphasis, but be understood as at ver. 1. (where see the note.) By εἰδωλον, as Crellius observes, is here not meant the image itself of the God worshipped under the image. Wolf refers to Voss. de Orig. et Progr. Idol. 1, 3.

4. ρωδέν ἐν κόσμῳ, scil. ἐστι. On this many Commentators dilate to little purpose. It is best con-

comes at the truth, though in a somewhat circuitous manner. In fact, he makes two strides for one, treating it as a sort of verbum prægnans; as also does Vitringa on 1s. 11, 2. who explains; "he knows God, and is known by him." But this is too harsh.
considered as a popular phrase*, to which we have one exactly corresponding in our own language. Chrysostom rightly explains it: οὐκ ἔχει τινα ἀγων. And so Theophylact, who adds: οὐδὲ Ὁσοὶ εἰσι ἄλλα λίθοι καὶ δαίμονες. We may render, "they are nothing in the world but stocks and stones." "Thus (observes Rosenm.) they were called ἡθικαὶ or ἐθνικαὶ, ματαία, vanities, emptinesses. For Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and the rest, were but human beings who had long perished." The οὐδὲν ἐστί is well explained by Le Moyne, Var. Sacr. 117, who appositely compares Is. 41, 24. "Behold ye (i. e. idols) are from nothing, and your works are nothing." Elsner has a long note on ἔθωλον; but little to the purpose. In the passages he adduces the word only means a shadow.

4. καὶ δεῖ οὐδὲς Θεὸς ἐτέρος, εἰ μὴ εἰς, "there is no God except the ONE, the Creator and Governor of all things." So Joseph. 8, 8, 16. (cited by Krause.) προσεκουρὸν ἔνα Θεὸν, καὶ μεγιστὸν καὶ ἀληθῆ μονὸν ἀποκαλούντες, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἐνόματα ὄντα φαῦλον καὶ ἄνοητου δόξης πετοιμένα. See Lactant. 2, 14. From this mode of speaking doubtless came the Mahomedan confession: "There is no God but one, and Mohammed is his Prophet."

5. This is meant to explain the preceding, and anticipate an objection; q. d. "For though there be those who are styled Gods, and have the name of ἡθικαὶ," &c. By οἱ λεγόμενοι is meant, "who are only called, νομίζομεν, accounted so, are not really so," i. e. (as Gal. 4, 8.) are μὴ φόβει Θεοί. Here in a few MSS. is added καὶ κύριοι. But this seems a gloss. The whole passage is well illustrated by Philo 122 B. (cited by Loesner.) Οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι δεσπόται δέξῃ μόνον οὐ πρὸς ἀλλήλων νομίζονται ἀνάγκη.

* Of this Krause adduces examples from Arrian, Diss. 2, 20. τὸς ἡ δικαιοσύνης οὐδὲν ἐστι; τὸς ἡ αἰδῶς μορία ἐστι; τὸς τάγηρ οὐδὲν ἐστι; τὸς φῶς οὐδὲν ἐστι; And Wets. cites several Rabbinical writers; as Sanhedrin, fol. 63, 2. "November utique Israelita, idolum nihil esse." Many others, too, are cited by Schoettgen.

On this passage Theophylact has a very instructive remark. After observing that the οἱ λεγόμενοι Θεοὶ were but stocks and stones, or demons, he shows that it was the Apostle's intent to adapt these two clauses to the two classes of persons among the Greeks. The first is meant for the Ιδιωται; the second for the σαφῶν; of whom the former οὐδὲν ἔδεσαν πλέον τῶν λιθών, the latter, δυνάμεις θεῖας αὐτῶς ἐνοικεῖν ἐδοξάζον, οὐς (I conjecture ὅσι) καὶ Θεοὺς ἐκάλουν. This last error, then, as well as the first, the Apostle refutes; and says there were no Gods, whether in Heaven, as the sun, moon, and stars, or on earth, as the deified mortals.

"There were many (observes Rosenm.) who, by the custom of the Heathens, were called κύριοι and θεοί, ὅμως. In Syria there were almost as many of the Baalim as of regions, nay almost cities." In time, however, the title, which at first was appropriated to the Demigods, and tutelary deities of cities, was at length ascribed to men; as Hercules, Corcebus, &c.; and was at length extended to kings, princes, and nobles.

6. ἀλλὰ ὃμιν εἰς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ, Εἰς αὐτός, &c. "But (whatever be their opinions) there is to us (there is believed by us Christians to exist) but one God, the Father, from whom, as Creator and First Great Cause, all things have their origin." In this whole sentence the ellipsis of the substantive (and that to be accommodated in sense to the nature of the clause) is to be attended to.* At εἰς αὐτὸν Theophyl-

* Krause compares a similar phraseology in an Oracle ap. Macrobius Saturn. I, 18. εἰς Ζεὺς, εἰς Αἴδης, εἰς Ἡλίος, εἰς Δίόνυσον, εἰς οὐ τὰ πάντα. I cannot find the passage; but I suspect that the punctuation is defective, and that εἰς Αἴδης — Δίόνυσον should be put in a parenthesis. Most of my readers will remember the Ἐκ
lact supplies, ἐκειστράμμεθα, καὶ εἰς αὐτῶν ἐσμὲν ἡρτημένοι. It shews, he says, the τῶν λόγων τῆς πρὸς αὐτῶν οἰκείωσεως.

On the sense of the phrases distinctly applied to God the Father ἐξ ὦ, and εἰς αὐτὸν; and, to God the Son, δι’ αὐτοῦ, there are various opinions. By the recent Commentators they are, in a manner, explained away. The best exposition (as far as explanation is practicable) is given by the antient Commentators. See, especially, Chrysost., from whom Theophyl. explains the δι’ ὦ and δι’ αὐτοῦ thus: Διὰ τοῦ υἱὸν τὰ πάντα εἰς τὸ εἶναι παράκλητον, καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ δι’ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ εἶναι παράκλητην, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἑαυτῷ τούτῳ, πιστοὶ γενέσθαι, καὶ ἐκ πλάνης πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν μετέλθειν. Thus in the Father they recognize the origin of all things, and their continuance; to the Son they ascribe, mediately, the creation of all things, and, as respects Christians, a twofold creation, natural and spiritual. Grot., Rosenm., and Krause explain δι’ ὦ τὰ πάντα, "by whom all things of the new creation are," i. e. "who is the author of our religion, and of our salvation." But the exposition of the antients is far more satisfactory. In the τὰ πάντα, the universe, are included human beings. In the καὶ ἡμεῖς, however, it is not necessary, with the antients, to recognise both a physical and moral creation, but only the latter. So that I assent to Grot. (and most Commentators for the last century) that ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ signifies, "and we (Christians) are by him (what we are)," namely, regenerated and saved. See 1 Pet. 1, 21. This interpretation is, moreover, supported by Theodoret, who thus excellently explains: τὸ δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ, οὗ τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἄλλα τῆς σωτηρίας αἰνίττεται. δι’ αὐτοῦ τῆς σωτηρίας τετυχῆκαν. See other interpretations of the Fathers in Sicc. Thea. Eccl. 1, 1088.

Δίδος ἄρχόμεθα of Theocritus. Max. Tyr. 17, 5. (cited by Wet.) very clearly shows the nature of the Heathen notions of the unity of the Deity: ἐνα ἰδίοις ἐν ἐν πάσῃ γῇ ὄμφων νόμῳ καὶ λόγῳ, ὅτι θεὸς εἰς πάντων βασιλεὺς καὶ πατήρ, καὶ θεοί πολλοὶ, θεοῦ παῖδες, συνάρχοντες θεῷ.
The mode of interpretation adopted by the ancients is ably defended, and learnedly illustrated by Dr. Whitby, to whose annotation the reader is referred. Grievous, however, it is to have to record the apostacy of one who had "known the truth, as it is in Jesus;" yet, on referring to his exposition of this portion of Scripture, in his Last Thoughts, (his δευτερα) φορτίζεις, but not, according to the adage, σο-φαρέξαι,) that apostacy is but too apparent. Full of perversion and quibble is his whole exposition. "Ah quantum mutatus ex illo Hectore," &c. In the words of the Prophet, "How is the gold become dim, and the fine gold changed." (Lam. 4, 5.)

With respect to the distinction which is here laid down between the Father and the Son, and to which the Socinians so confidently advert, we do not (as Mr. Slade truly observes) deny that distinction, and yet we maintain that Christ forms a part of the divine nature and substance. "We (continues he) are as strenuous for the Unity of the Godhead, as the most decided Socinian can be. The question between us is, whether or not, in this unity of nature, there is an incomprehensible distinction of persons, as it is called."

7. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τῷ σὺν ἡ γνώσις, "but all have not the knowledge (in question);" "all do not know these truths;" namely, that idols are nought, and have no virtue in them to sanctify or pollute food. These ἀσέλειας are supposed by Rosenm. to have been of the Anti-Pauline party, who had lent an ear to the Judaizers; or also Gentile converts, who could not all at once lay aside the notion that the Gods existed, though they were false Gods." It is probable that they consisted of both these classes.

7. τίνες δὲ τῷ συνείδησι τοῦ εἰδώλου—ἐστίνους, "but some, in the consciousness or secret opinion of the idol, as being something (i.e. a real being, or a representation of one) even yet eat of the food, as if of food offered to some really existing demon." Schoettg. here explains συνείδησις an idea or obscure
thought; and he refers to Eccl. 10, 20. For other examples of the sense opinion, sentiment, judgment, Schleus. refers to 1 Cor. 10, 28 & 29. 2 Cor. 4, 2. and 5, 11. The var. lect. of some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, συνέδεια, which is mentioned as probable by Griesbach, is regarded by the Critics as a gloss. It rather seems a paradiorthosis, or false emendation.

7. καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνης αὐτῶν ἀσθενής οὖσα μελόνται, “and their perception of right and wrong being weak, and ill-informed, their conscience is defiled, and they feel self-condemned.” This seems to be the true sense of this difficult passage, of which the expositions of the modern Commentators are very vague and unsatisfactory. The obscurity of the sentence arose from its very elliptical nature, and from the word σωφροσύνης being used as a vox praejudicis. The kindred passage of Rom. 14, 23. ὁ δὲ διακρίνομεν ἐν φάγμα, κατακεκριθα, ὃτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως. Πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀμαρτία ἐστι is the best Commentary on this. Yet Hamm., Grot., and Vorst. may be consulted, and especially Chrysost. and Theophyl., who illustrate the subject from the case of a Jew converted to Christianity in respect to touching a dead body.

8. βράμβα δὲ ἡμῖν οὐ παρίστησι τῷ Θεῷ. The Apostle now proceeds to the other plea by which the Corinthians justified their eating idol meat; and this is derived ex natura rei; q. d. “food (you will say) does not commend us to God;” i. e. “whether we choose what food to eat, and what to avoid not, it signifies nothing: therefore we may eat idol meat without sin.” Such is the mode of interpretation pursued by all those Commentators who adopt the hypothesis mentioned at ver. 1., and even by some who do not adopt it, as Mackn. And so, long ago, Calv. and Parseus. And this may be the true sense; yet the interpretation is somewhat strained, since it requires δὲ to be taken in the sense atqui, for which I know of no authority. I prefer, with some others,
as Hamm. and Slade, to suppose the words said by way of concession; q. d. "but though neither eating," &c. Yet it is unauthorised to take it in the sense but though. So that, upon the whole, the best founded interpretation seems to be that of Chrysost., Theophyl., and the other Greek Commentators, whom see. Theophyl. excellently details the scope of the verse thus: Ἰνα μὴ εἴπωςιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ καθαρὰ ἐστίν συνειδήσει, καὶ τι μεὶς εἶτις διὰ ἀσθένειαν σκάνδαλόν ἔχω; δεικνύω ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ φαγεῖν ὅλος ἐτὶ καταφρονήσει τῶν εἰδολων, οὐδὲν ἐστιν. Καὶ γὰρ ὃ ἀδελφὸς μὴ ἐβλάστηται, οὐδὲ ὅταν ἔπαινητον τι ἑστιν εἰς θεώματα. Ἡρωμα γὰρ οὐκ ἐκεῖ ἥμαρ τῷ Θεῷ. Crelt., too, who has sifted the sense with his usual minute diligence, comes to the same opinion; and so also does Grot., who observes: "Qui sine scrupulo talia conviviam iniant, volebant crede sapientiores cæteris; at ait Paulus non ob id Deo esse acceptiores." So also Whitby and Doddr. thus: "But why occasion this inconvenience? The great God does not so much esteem a man for being, or disapprove of him for not being, superior to such little scruples; but the tenderness of his conscience, together with the zeal and charity of his heart, are the grand qualities he regards."

Παρισταναι properly signifies to introduce to any one, as to a king, or great man; and here signifies to introduce into the favour of God. (See Schl. Lex.) Περισσεύομεν is well explained by Theophyl. περισσοῦ τι ἔχωμεν, καὶ εὐδοκιμοῦμεν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ: and ὀστεροῦμεν by ἐλαττοῦμεν. These are properly military or agonistical terms, but are often used in this metaphorical sense; as in Rom. 3, 7. 2 Cor. 3, 9. and especially 8, 7. ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ ἐν ταύτῃ περισσεύετε—ἴνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῇ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύετε and very often elsewhere. The sense is, therefore, well represented in our Common Version, which Dr. Mackn. has here by no means improved upon. Mr. Slade (with less than his usual prudence and judgment) has chosen to desert all preceding interpretations, and offers the following version: "It is true that, by eating, we run
into no excess; neither, by neglecting to eat, are we chargeable with any defect." This he supports by the argument, that περίτος denotes excess of any kind; referring to Scapula. But his good sense might have suggested to him how precarious and uncritical it is to argue from a primitive to a derivative, or vice versa. And here there can be no reason to do it; since the proposed interpretation is not only unsupported by the usus loquenti, but little agreeable to the context.

9. Ἐκέτε τὸ δὲ μῆκος ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὐτή πρόσκομμα γένεται. Grotius and others observe, that ἐξουσία here signifies, by metonymy, the exercise of this liberty, or right. And in this view Beza renders, "istud quod vobis est licitum." But the Apostle evidently recognises no such right; and he shews it to be sinful at 10, 15—23. It should seem, therefore, that by ἐξουσία is meant, not liberty or right strictly speaking, but what is claimed as a right; though, in fact, an abuse of right. I am surprised the modern Commentators should not have seen this, especially as it is plainly pointed out by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Ὑσιμᾶς, who explain it, προτετεία, αὐθαδεία, ἀλαζονεία. "Not γνώσις (says Chrysost.) much less τελείωσις." This sense of ἐξουσία is indeed found in the best Classical writers.* A similar use is found in the Latin licentia (which the Vulg. here rightly uses); from whence our licentious.

Πρόσκομμα, a stumbling-block, a σκάνδαλον, causing him to take offence, and perhaps desert his

* Ex gr. Thucyd. 1, 30. p. 86. Baver. ὑβρεί δὲ καὶ ἐξουσία πλούτου' which has been imitated by Demoet. (See Med. 99. ἐν ἐξουσίαις καὶ πλούτου υβριστή. Where I would cancel καὶ, as in Max. Tyr. Dist. 96. 7. ἐν ἀκαλύσῳ ἐξουσίᾳ υβριστή. In Procopius, Arc. Hist. 36. ἐξουσία πλούτῳ, I would read, ἐν πλούτῳ. Thucyd. 8, 45. ἡ μὲν πενία ἀνάγκη τὴν τόλμαν παρέχοντα, ἡ δὲ ἐξουσία ὑβρεί τὴν πλεονεξίαν, &c. which perhaps Aristotle has in view in the following fine remark in his Rhet. p. 53. συμβέβηκε τοις μὲν πένην, διὰ τὴν ἐνθείαν ἐπιθυμεῖν χρημάτων, τοίς δὲ πλουσίοις, διὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν (seil. τοῦ πλούτου) ἐπιθυμεῖν τῶν μὴ ἀναγκαίων ἱδονῶν.
Christian profession. (See Matt. 5, 29.) Tois ásbe- 

"to those who are less instructed on the real 
nature of Christ's kingdom, (which, as it is said in 
Hebr. 9, 10. does not consist in meats and drinks,) 
and therefore wavering, and whom (as Chrysostom 
paraphrases) ye ought rather to reach out a hand to 
sustain, than push down or trip up."

10. èdi γα — éstheiv. This is meant to illustrate 
the preceding. The sense may be expressed as fol-

lows: "Thus, for instance (γα), if he see you, who 
have this (boasted) privilege, sitting at table in an 
idiol-temple, will not his conscience (weak, unin-
formed, and wavering as he is) be built up, con-

firmed, and emboldened, so as to eat what has been 
offered to idols?" Καταχειμ. is a vox proprìa de hac 
re, signifying properly accumbent, reclining, after 
the manner both of the Orientals and the Greeks, 
who had indeed many customs in common. Examp-
les may be seen in Schleus. Lex.

10. éidboleiμ. In this word (which is often found 
in the Apocr., see Schleus. Lex. Vet. Test.) the ter-
mination is to be attended to, namely, -eiv, which is 
appropriated to a place of religious worship. Many 
words of the same force occur in the Classical 
writers, especially Thucydides; as Ποσιδανείων, 'Απολ-

λοίνειων, &c. The present term is very rare in the 
Classical writers. One example is cited by Krause 
from Plut. 6, 274. ήδη τα Τρολας εισοραν ειδολεια 

dédīkas.

10. óικοδομηθήσεται. Oni the sense of this word the 
Commentators are not quite agreed. (See Grotius, 
Elsner, and Kypke.) Wetstein, Storr, and Rosenm. 
think it is to be understood ironically; q. d. "egre-

giē Ædificas scilicet!" "So far from building up 
and edifying him, you destroy him." But this seems 
too fanciful. The best-founded interpretation ap-

pears to be that of Chrysostom and Theophylact: 
άρα ωi μη λάβη ἀφορμὴν πλείστ εἰς τό καὶ αὐτὸς τά εἰδω-

λοθατα ἐστθειν, καὶ μαλλον παγιωθήσεται εἰς τό ὀλοθαν 

eίναι τι τά εἰδωλα; ἀγνωσώ γαρ τόν συν λογισμον, μεθ' οὗ
1 Corinthians, Chap. VIII.

Thus it signifies confirmed, emboldened. And so the best modern Commentators understand it. Krause compares Joseph. Ant. 16, 6. εἰς ταρακτήν τὸν ἐκείνους ἀκοδίμων αὐτῶν. And Plut. 1, 2, 93. Qui sedificaret suam inchoatam ignaviam. Thus σωειδό. denotes opinion, &c.; as supra ver. 7.

Rosenm. observes: "Hec verba repetit Apostolus, sed ita, ut doceat, quam egregia scilicet scilicet correctio sit, quam externa solum actione metiantur, ob id ipsum perniciosam, quod interno sensu, quamvis imbecillii et falsus, non respondeat; ipsam vero conscientiam et sensum (σωειδόν) non continuo emendari, si modo expressurus actus vescendi."

11. καὶ ἀπολείται ὁ ἄδειαν ἀδελφὸς ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει, "and thus thy uninformed brother perish by thy knowledge; he, I say, for whom Christ died;" i. e. "and thus thou wilt be the means of his perishing, or failing of salvation, by deceiving him in what may undermine his Christian principles, and in the end shipwreck his faith." The antithesis in ὁ ἄθε-νᾶν and τῷ γνῶσει is very striking; as was perceived by Theophylact, who paraphrases the words thus: καὶ γενήσεται πρόφασις ἁπολείας εἴρηκα τῇ σῇ τελείωσιν. The δὲ ἐν Χ. & suggests the peculiar enormity of the crime, and its unsuitableness to the Christian profession, by thwarting the designs of the Redeemer in favour of one's brother, or being the means of his being deprived of that salvation which Christ purchased by his death for him and all. Theophylact well paraphrases: Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἰησοῦς οὐδὲ ἀποδεικνύς παραγήγατο ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν σὺ ὁ δὲ ὑπὲρ βραβιᾶτον ἀπέχει, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλίσηται.

12. This is intended further to illustrate the enormity of the offence.

13. οὕτω δὲ ἀμαρτάνωτε, &c. "but (remember) by sinning against (i. e. injuring) thy brother." Then the words καὶ τιτυπτομεν των σωειδόν ἀσθενῶς are exegetical of the preceding, "by thus wounding and injuring their weak conscience," &c. Eις
I CORINTHIANS, CHAP. VIII. IX.

Χριστῶν ἄμαρτάνετε, “ye sin against and offend Christ; ye injure his Religion,” and frustrate his benevolent designs for their salvation.” See Theophylact.

15. διότερ εἰ βρώμα—σκανδαλίσω. This is intended to be the conclusion of the whole of the preceding reasoning. The Apostle, indeed, does not express this in the imperative mood, or give it as an admonition, though he means it as such; but out of modesty (or to show such an example as a teacher should in his own person), he says: “I will never eat meat more, if,” &c. The Commentators notice the hyperbole, and lay down the sense as follows: “Rather than cause my brother to sin, by the use of certain meats, I would never trust meat all my life again, abstaining from flesh, and living on bread, herbs, and roots.” See the Commentators ap. Pole and Rosenm. Chrysostom, however, and Theophylact, have much valuable matter; and the latter, among other things, observes, that the Apostle does not say, “If my brother take reasonable cause of offence, but if he take offence any how; and not only, I will not eat idolothyta, but, no meat at all; and not for a day or two, but, for all my life; and not merely, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσω, but ἵνα μὴ ἀπλῶς σκανδαλίσω.”

CHAP. IX.

The Apostle continues the same subject throughout this Chapter, and shows, by his own example, that many things in themselves lawful, ought to be abstained from for the sake of others; and how many things of much greater consequence he had abstained from, that he might not offend weak brethren, or throw an impediment in the way of religion. (Krause and Rosenm.)

On the scope of this chapter see the excellent illustrations of Chrysostom.*

* Of these the following, brought forward by Theophyl., are a good abridgment. Ἕκατὴ εἶπεν, εἰ βρώμα σκανδαλίζῃ τὸν ἄδελ-
1. οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος; A few MSS., several Versions, and some Latin Fathers, read οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; which is preferred by Beza, Grot., Bengel, and Pearce, and has been received into the text by Griesbach and Vater. The chief reason for this is, that they fancy a climax. Bp. Pearce takes ἐλεύθερος to signify a freeman; and thus, he thinks, there is a gradation from his right as a man to his right as an Apostle. But Lightfoot thinks St. Paul does not treat of political, nay, not even of Christian liberty generally, but of Apostolical liberty.

Upon the whole, the common reading (which is supported by the authority of the Greek Fathers, as Chrysost. and all the Greek Commentators, and is preferred by Rosenm.) ought, I think, to be retained. Wets. evidently prefers it, since he remarks: "de ἀπόστολῳ agit distinctius comm. 2. de libertate post comm. 4. et seqq."

It is well remarked by Crellius, that St. Paul here shows the foundation or basis of his own liberty; q. d. "am I not an Apostle, and am I not therefore free," i. e. "free from all things indifferent, and especially, for example (which he then mentions), free to live at the expense of the Church."

The next words, ὁ χειρὶ Ἰησοῦν, &c., as Crellius observes, are intended to remove a tacit objection, namely: "You are no Apostle, having not been received by Jesus Christ, when on earth, into the number of the Apostles." To which the answer is;
"Have I not seen (which interrogation has the force of a strong assertion)?" "I have assuredly seen Jesus Christ in the flesh;" alluding to the supernatural vision recorded at Acts 9, 22., and often mentioned afterwards. See Acts 18, 9, 24, 10. He means to say that he is thus an eye-witness; which formed a material part of the Apostolical character. So Luke 1, 2. καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἁπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτότατοι καὶ υπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου. So also 1 Cor. 15, 18. "And last of all he was seen of me." Compare Matt. 19, 15. The Apostle, too, had seen Christ, not in his humiliation, but in his glory. (See 2 Cor. 12, 1 seqq.)

1. οὐ τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Κυρίῳ; Here (as Crellius well observes) he proves his Apostleship, namely, from having, in the exercise of that office, converted them to Christianity; which, without divine assistance (a proof of his divine mission), could have been done. Therefore, by so doing, ἀποστολικὴν διακονίαν ἐπλήρωκε.

The words following, ἐν Κυρίῳ are not well explained by the Greek Commentators and the early moderns. They simply signify, "in respect of the Lord and his religion." With respect to the τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε, it may be observed, that in the Classical writers also, those who are any one's pupils, or elevees, are said to be their work. Thus, of the examples cited by Wet., Philo 2. 344, 14. ἐμὸν ἐστι τοῦ Μάκρωνος ἔργον Παῖς, μάλλον αὐτῶ, ἡ οὐχ ὢτον τῶν γονέων γεγένηκα. Seneca Epist. 34. Assero te mihi, meum opus es.

2. εἰ ἄλλοις—ὑμῖν εἰμι. Towards the understanding of this verse, it is important to observe, (with Chrysost., Theophylact, and Oecumenius,) that the Apostle here speaks κατὰ συγχαίροντι; q. d. "granted that I am not an Apostle to others, or, if there be any who doubt of my Apostleship, you cannot doubt it, to whom I have approved myself as such." Οὐκ εἰμί, i.e. "I am not (such)," &c. Ἀλλὰ γε ὑμῖν, "to you at least I am (i. e. have been) such." Ἀλλὰ
γε after εἰ has the sense of at certe (see Devar., Hoog. de Part., and Matth. Gr. Gr.); of which Raphel adduces an example from Herodot.

This seems to allude to some who had denied him to be an Apostle, though they acknowledged him as a Teacher.

2. ἢ γὰρ σφαγίς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀποστολῆς ἢ. ἢ. ε. Κ. This sentence is meant as a further confirmation of the preceding. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) rightly explains σφαγίς by ἀποδείξεις.* And the sense of the passage he well lays down as follows: κἂν βουλεύῃ τις μαθεῖν εἰπερ εἰμι ἀπόστολος, ὡμέας δεικνυτι καὶ ὡμείς ἐστε οἱ σφαγιζοντες καὶ ἑπιθεβαινοντες τὴν ἐμὴν ἀποστολὴν. Πάντα γὰρ, ὡσα ἀπόστολος, ἔργα ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνεδειξάμεν.

At ἐν Κυβέρ Grot. and others subaud ὄντες, "inasmuch as ye are Christians."

3. ἢ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία — ἐστι. "My defence against those that sit in judgment upon my Apostolical pretensions," &c. Ἀνακρίν. (as Rosenm. observes), is a forensic term, purposely employed by the Apostle, to hint at the arrogance of those who called in question his Divine mission. In which view Schleus. explains: "qui de causâ ejus cognituri quasi judices sedebant; qui sibi jus ejus actiones dijudicandi arrogabant et vindicabant." See 1 Cor. 2, 15. Crelius renders it dijudicant.

Αὐτῇ may be referred either (with the Greek Commentators, Crel., Vorst., and Beza) to the preceding, or (with most Interpreters) to the following; which seems preferable.

4. μὴ οὐκ ἔχωμεν ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν, &c. After this digression on his Apostolical dignity, St. Paul proceeds to prove by examples, that he had, in many

* And no wonder that it should have this sense, since σφαγίς meant properly the impression made by a seal, which being affixed to writings, is a proof and evidence of their authority. So that it comes, in the end, to signify generally, a demonstration; as Plato 185., cited by Kruse.
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things, not used the liberty which he possessed. (Krause.)

The φαγεῖν καὶ τίεῖν are *popular* expressions, simply denoting *sustenance*; q. d. "Have we not a right* to be maintained at the expense of the Church, παρὰ τῶν μαθητῶν," So Chrysost. and Theophyl.

By *we*, the Apostle means *I*, viz. as well as others. This right was originally granted to the Apostles by our Lord (see Mark 10, 7.): and Rosenm. observes that it was permitted among the Jews for teachers to receive a provision from all who were able and willing to supply it. Krause, too, observes that it was the custom of *all* nations of antiquity that the publicly constituted teachers of religion should be supported by the contributions of those whom they instructed. This privilege, however, St. Paul but seldom used, in order to avoid the imputation of interested motives.

5. μὴ οὖν ἐχομεν ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν. This passage has not a little exercised the ingenuity of the Commentators, and no interpretation hitherto proposed is without its difficulties. Most of the ancient Fathers, as also Theophyl. and Æcum., take ἀδελφ. γυναῖκα to mean a *sister-woman*; and they think it refers to *rich matrons* who followed the Apostles as they had done our Lord, and ministered to them of their substance. But of this no evidence has been adduced from the records of Ecclesiastical History, reaching back to this early period; and the

* Bp. Pearce would render ἐξουσίαν, not *right*, but *power*, "because every man has a power to eat at another's expense, but not a right." This, however, seems very sophistical. *Right* is here used *popularly* for *power*. But the common translation may be justified even on the Bishop's own principles. 'Exousia (says he) signifies *power* in general: sometimes a natural power, sometimes an usurped power, and sometimes a power given by human or divine laws, and then it is best rendered a *right*." True: but had not the Apostle a right by *Divine law*, inasmuch as this was the injunction of our Lord Jesus Christ, "who came from God, and was God;" and therefore to *Christians* it was a *right*. *Human* laws, indeed, had always granted it to the teachers of Religion; and the Jewish Doctors and teachers all had it.
woman, as well as the Apostle, is here supposed to be maintained at the expense of the Church; which would not be the case with those rich matrons.

Others render it a Christian woman. But, as Doddre remarks (from Witsius, and he from Crell., who has here an excellent note, in which he has anticipated almost all other Commentators), this would be superfluous, since any sister is a woman.

Preferable is the interpretation of Beza, Grot., Hamm., Pearce, and most Commentators for the last half century, who take it to mean a Christian wife, literally "a wife who shall be a sister." Yet ἀδελφή would, in this view, seem superfluous, since we cannot suppose an Apostle would have any but a Christian wife, still less take her about; and perhaps it would not be easy to establish this adjectival use of ἀδελφή, which ought, at any rate, to have come in after the γυναῖκα. To avoid this difficulty, some, as Slade, conjecture ἀδελφή γυναῖκα. But for this there is no authority; and it would rather require γυναῖκα ἀδελφή. That Paul had a sister is nothing to the purpose.

Upon the whole, I cannot approve of any interpretation hitherto brought forward; but I would propose to take γυναῖκα as a substantive qualifying the preceding ἀδελφή, by the ellipsis of ὁσαν; "a sister," i.e. "a sister-Christian, who shall be their wife;" which hints that it was necessary for the female travelling companion to be such; and this, indeed, decorum would require. One principal reason for their being allowed this privilege, was not so much that these females might minister to the domestic comfort of the Apostles, (which most Commentators suppose), as, rather, that they might be made serviceable to the conversion or catechetical instruction of females, to whom, according to the accustomed forms both of Grecian and Oriental society, the Apostles would have little opportunity of seeing. (See Suicer's Thes. 1, 729.) And that they did serve this purpose is testified by Clem. Alex. L. 7.

2 ⚫ 2
That Chrysost. thus understood the words I have some reason to think. At all events, he does not take that view of them which is adopted by many Greek and Latin Fathers and Commentators, a view which seems to have originated merely in Monkish prejudices. This sense of περιάγειν is illustrated by Wets. from Xen. Cyr: 2. περιάγη τούτο το μειράκιον and Juvenal, 1, 122. circum ducitur uxor. To which I add Theopomp. ap. Athen. 260 ε. καὶ περιήγησαν μὲν δύο καὶ τρεῖς ἐταμουμένους.

6. ἦ μόνος ἦνο καὶ Βαρνάβας οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ μη ἐργάζεσθαι; “Or (again) have I only and Barnabas no privilege of exemption from labouring at our trades for a maintenance?” Of this sense of ἐργάζεσθαι examples occur in Luke 13, 14. Joh. 9, 4. Rom. 4, 4. 1 Thess. 2, 9. Τοῦ μη ἐργάζεσθαι carries with it the consequence, “but of being maintained at the charge of the Church;” q. d. “are we to be made exceptions to the general rule?” I assent to Doddr. that this points at some peculiar spleen against these two Apostles of the uncircumcision. That Barnabas was the frequent companion of Paul, we know from Acts; and from the way in which Paul mentions him, we may presume that when he was with Paul he followed his example of waving his ministerial right.

7, 8. The Apostle now illustrates this right to maintenance by two examples, ex simili, one taken from common life and the customs of the Gentiles; the other from that of the Mosaic law.

7. τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίος ὕψοσις, “who ever goes to war at his own charges.” On the word ὕψ. I have before treated in the note in Luke 8, 14., and Rom. 6, 23. See also Rosini, Antiq. Rom, 10, 4.

7. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐσθίει. This is a popular mode of expression for: “and does not expect, or claim to eat of the fruit.” See 2 Kings 18, 31. With respect to the syntax ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ ἐρε, it is Hebrew. The Classical writers do not use the preposition. (See Steph. Thes.) In nouns thus taken partitively, μέρος is understood.
The reading of some MSS. τὸν κάρπον is ex emendatione.

7. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ γαλακτος τῆς ποίμνης οὐκ ἔσθεις; Grot. observes that milk is sometimes said to be eaten, viz. with bread; as 2 Kings 4, 42. Judith 10, 5. & 18, 11. But ἔσθεις may signify, feedeth himself.

8. μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ; “Do I argue resting merely on the authority of human institutions?” On this force of ἄνθρ. see the note on Rom. 6, 24.

8. ἢ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ ν. τ. λ., “does not the law of Moses, given by divine authority, say the same?” Here I would compare Dionys. Hal. 1, 258, 20. τι οὖν ὑμᾶς ἀποκρίνατει παραινῶ; μη συγχωρεῖν κ. τ. λ. (scil. παραινῶ.)

9. οὐν φιμάσεις βοῶν ἀλοώντα. Taken from Deut. 25, 4. The Apostle’s words agree with the Sept. 

Φιμάνω signifies capistrare, to muzzle. (See Schol. Lex.) The reason for this law is assigned by Joseph, Ant. 4, 8, 21. as follows: μη γὰρ—δικαιω εἰργεῖν τοὺς σωματίζομενους τοῦ καρποῦ, καὶ περὶ τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ ποιήσαντας. And Philo 711 e. (cited by Loesner) mentions this among the Mosaic precepts inculcating humanity and kindness.

Rosenm. observes, that there were four modes of threshing in use among the ancients; on which he refers to Bochart Hierog. 1, 2, 32., and Paulsen’s Travels. To which may be added Shaw’s Travels, and Harmer’s Obsb. The subject is, however, most copiously and satisfactorily treated by Schoettg. Antiq. trituræ et fallonie, p. 42., the substance of which was compressed by Schoettg. into a long and instructive note in his Hor. Hebr.

The custom of treading out corn by means of oxen, and sometimes horses, was chiefly in use both in Greece and Judæa, and all over the East; as it is to the present day. The use of it in Greece Wets. has proved by numerous Classical citations.

9. μη τῶν βων μέλει τῷ Θεῷ; The meaning of this elliptical sentence must be thus expanded:
"Doth God by this mean (only) to consult for the good of xen, (and not of men also)?" *

10. ἠμᾶς πάντως λέγει; By ἠμᾶς is meant us men. With respect to the πάντως, it must not be rendered altogether, nor yet surely, as is done by Slade; which does not suit the interrogation. It signifies imprimitis. So Hesych. κυρίως. Here we have, moreover, another idiom, which involves an ellipsis of με; "or saith he it not especially for us men?" q. d. "May not men learn much from this example." An argument, Grot. observes, ex minore ad majus. Then the following words directly affirm what was but hinted at in the preceding; and in these πάντως is to be repeated: "For us men, and our instruction, it was especially written."

The words ὅτι εἰς ἑλπίδι ὑφειλεί, &c. are rendered in our common version: "that he that plougheth," &c. But this cannot be permitted either by the ὅτι or the ὑφειλεί. I prefer, with the Vulg., Beza, and Schleus. : "For he that plougheth ought to plough in hope."

The words following καὶ ὁ ἀλόγων, τῶς ἑλπίδος αὐτῶ ὑπεξείν, are somewhat obscure; and so many are the var. lect., that Markland thinks it cannot be said what the Apostle wrote." The present text, he thinks, is unintelligible; and he resorts (as usual) to conjecture, for which, however, there is no necessity." The sentence is only very elliptical; and the construction may be thus traced: καὶ ὁ ἀλόγων (ὑφειλεί ἀλόγω) εἰς ἑλπίδι ὑπεξείν τῶς ἑλπίδος αὐτοῦ. "And he that reapeth ought to reap in hope to par-

* Here Grot. compares Philo de Sarif. Of γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ γόμας, ἄλλα ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινων καὶ ἀλόγων ἑξάντων' ἀπεί καὶ τῶν θυμη- νων φρονίς στην, ἀλλὰ τῶν θυμωντῶν, ἵνα μηδὲ πάθος καραῖνοι. And Philostr. V. A. 69. Τούτο δὲ οὐκ ὑπὲρ τῶν λεὸντων εἰσεφεν' οὐ γὰρ υπὲρ ῥωπιών ἁγνῆς σπουδᾶσθωμεν, ἀλλὰ ἡλικι ἐπὶ τοὺς τυρπι- νοὺς διὸνα, which, from the instances I have before adduced of Apollonius's imitations of the New Testament, will readily be recognized as one of them. Grot. also compares Demosth. c. Timocrat. Οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἐπούδασεν ὁ νομοθέτης: ἀλλὰ βουλήμενος ἠμᾶς ἐθέλειν πολλὰ ἀπέχειν τῆς τῶν ἑλευφέρων ἠμῶν.
take of (the fruits) of his hope.” This is an argutè dic-tum and paronomasia, such as is frequent in St. Paul.

The many various readings, of which Markland complains, only show that the ancients perceived the difficulty, and that the librarii sought to remove it (as does Markl.) by critical conjecture. Here the Greek Commentators possess not their usual perspicacity. They have failed to see the construction, and so have missed the sense.


On the sentiment, and its application, it is unnecessary to dilate: The Apostle means to say, that if this be true of men, i.e. of all who labour for the good of others, it is still more so of ministers of the Gospel.

The whole sentence is well paraphrased by Grot. as follows: “Qui jumentis consultum voluit, multo magis hominibus laborantibus, ut laborem soletur spes mercedis, sive ea detur in parte rei ipsius in quâ laboratur, ut fit colonis partiaris, sive in pecuniâ, quae omnium rerum vicem subit.”

11. The Apostle proceeds to illustrate this by another agricultural metaphor, in which (as Theoph. observes) he shows the justice of the procedure.

11. εἰ ἡμεῖς ὡμών τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπεραζομεν, “If (for instance) we (the Ministers of the Gospel) have, as it were, committed to you the seed of things spiritual,” &c. At πνευμ. must be supplied πράγματα, i.e. “if we have imparted to you spiritual benefits, namely, those that respect the salvation of your souls by the doctrine of the Gospel, &c.”

11. μέγα (scil. ἔγγον) εἰ ἡμεῖς ὡμών, &c., “is it a
great thing?" Grot. explains this mirum. And so Schleus. Lex., who compares 2 Cor. 9, 11. "Is it an unreasonable thing?"* The interrogative particle μή is, by abruptness, omitted.

11. τὰ σαρκικὰ (scil. πράγματα) θεος, "that we should reap and enjoy the worldly and carnal supports which you can supply to us."

12. εἰ ἄλλοι τῆς ἐξουσίας, &c. An argumentum ex minore ad majus. "If others," &c. (namely, those who had casually visited and evangelized the Corinthians; or, as many Commentators think, the false Apostles.) Τῆς ἐξουσίας υμῶν μετέχουσιν. Here we have a popular mode of expression, which seems to savour of the Hebrew idiom. In the explanation of this, different methods are pursued. Most Commentators, (as Beza and Grot.,) take the ἐξουσία υμῶν for ἐξουσία εἰς υμᾶς, "power over you."† And they appeal to Joh. 17, 2. Matt. 10, 1. Others think this method harsh, and take ἐξουσία for σοφία (which is, indeed, read in some MSS., but from a gloss). And this is supported by Schl. Lex., who refers to Thucyd. 6, 31. But that passage is nothing to the present purpose, and the interpretation in question is inconsistent with the words following. The former one is far preferable, and is confirmed by Wetstein's Classical examples. And yet I cannot entirely approve of it. The Commentators above mentioned would not have taken υμῶν for εἰς υμᾶς, if they had read or considered the exposition of Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) εἰ κρατοῦσιν υμῶν, ἐξουσίαξουσιν. Thus it appears that μετέχουσιν τῆς ἐξουσίας, being a compound phrase equivalent to αὕτως ἐξουσιάζουσιν, has the same regimen as the primitive, i.e. takes the genitive.

Chrysost. and Theophyl. confirm the opinion of

* And Kypke aptly compares Eurip. Incert. Trag. 401. τῶν λαβόντα τῶν λόγων καλὰ διάφορμα, οὐ μέγ' ἐργον εἰπ λέγειν. Wets., too, gives examples of this sense of magnum from the Latin Classics.
† Or rather it should be πρὸς. So Joseph. Ant. 9, 4, 4. (cited by Wets. καὶ δεσποῦντα ἔλουσις χρήσηται πρὸς αὐτὸν.
Estius, Hamm., Sclater, Doddr., and Mackn., who suppose that by the ἄλλοι are meant false teachers. Mr. Slade says not so much the Apostles. But as οὗ μᾶλλον ἥμεις follow, I do not see how this can be reconciled with the modesty of St. Paul. The sense of the elliptical words in question appears to be this: “Was it not equitable for us to enjoy this privilege, as having laboured for a year and a half in evangelizing you.”

12. ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐγχησάμεθα τ. ε. τ., “But we have not used this privilege.” Ἀλλὰ πάντα στέγομεν, “but we bear, endure all things.” Of the senses, both physical and metaphorical, of στέγειν, examples are given by Wets. and Kypke. The most apposite illustration is Themist. Or. p. 271. τῶν οὐ στέγοντα ὄρωμ. The term is, I think, cognate with tego (as στέγος and τέγος are the same word), and signifies properly to keep off; (as a ship that is not leaky,) or keep in, as spoken of a vessel which is water-tight, and holds liquids. Then it comes to mean continere, sustinere, tolerare, &c. All which senses are exemplified by the citations above mentioned.

12. ἵνα μὴ ἐγκοπῆν τινα δόμεν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χ. This seems an idiomatic expression for ἵνα μὴ ἐγκοπήσαμεν. The word is explained by Hesych. ἐμπόδιον. Theodoret well illustrates the metaphor thus: οὐκ ἐὰν γὰρ, φησί, τρέχειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ λύει τὸν δρόμον, ἐπέχει τὴν διὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος σωτηρίαν. The Apostle means to say: “lest the poor should murmur at the expense, and others should attribute to me interested views.” The whole sentence is thus explained by Theophyl.: ἐν μεγάλῃ στενοχωρίᾳ οὕτως ἵμας πάντα στέγομεν καὶ πείναν, καὶ δίψαν, καὶ γυμνότητα· ἵνα μήτις ἐγκοπῇ γένηται, τούτεστιν, ὃ σμικρὰ καὶ ὃ τυχόνσα ἀναβολή, εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίον καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα.

13. The Apostle now employs, in proof of his right to be supported by the Church, an example taken from the Mosaic Law, and the Priests and Levites, who lived Chiefly on the offerings of the Temple. See Vitringa de Syn. p. 74.
13. οίκ οиδατε στι, &c. "know ye not (i. e. ye all know) that those," &c. Οι τα ιερα έργαζόμενοι, "qui sacra faciunt," "sacris operatur." (See Schleus. Lex.) Here we are to understand the Levites and inferior Priests. And so most Commentators, including Wetstein, who, in this view, cites Hom. Od. 1, 101. οι τε δεισιν ιερα τα βέβουσι και εξαίτως έκατόμβας. Perhaps, however, the Apostle intended an antithesis, which may be best preserved by rendering: "Those that attend to the business of the Temple, live of the temple;" i. e. by metonymy, "of the offerings of the temple." Theophylact here has the following fine remark: οίκ είπε δε, ἐκ τῶν προσευχόντων ἐσθίουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τού ιερεί. Ἡμα μήτε οἱ λαμβανόμενεις αἰσχύνωνται, οἱ παρὰ άθροίταιν τρεφόμενοι, μήτε οἱ διδώτες ἐπαιρώνται.

The following clause, οι τῶ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσευχόμεντες τ. σ., is added by a sort of parallelism; though it seems to designate the superior Priesthood. So Theophylact. Προσευχόμενοι signifies to closely attend on or to anything,* in which sense it occurs in the Classical writers. (See Bos, Obs. S. 112, Kypke, and the note on 7, 35.) The word is, however, especially applied to attendance on sacred duties.† By the θυσιαστηρί. is meant "the duties of the altar."

13. ταθυσιαστηρίῳ συμμερίζονται. Most recent Commentators, after Kypke, consider the συμμ. as put for the simple μεζ. But this way of wrapping

† So Grotius: "Sacerdotes, quorum erat exta aris imponere, partes autem sibi retinere, Levit. 7, 6. ideo recte hic, partiri sum ipso altari, tam de Sacerdotibus quam de Levitis. Vide Deut. 18, 1." He also compares a similar figure in Euript. Ion. βδομος μεθερπον. The mode in which the victim was divided between the priests and the offerers is thus explained by Theophyl. Τῶν θυματων τὸ μὲν αἷμα προσευχήκε τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ, καὶ τὸ στεάρ θυματων τῶν δε ερεύν φαίνεται τα λαμβάνεις οἱ ιερεῖς οίον τὸ στομήν καὶ τὸν δείπνον μβαχώνα, καὶ τὸ ἄνυστρον τὰ μέντοι ἀλοκανώματα, μὲν τοῦ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐγλύνοντο.
up matters, however convenient, is never justifiable when further knowledge is attainable. Chrysostom and the Greek Commentators show the force of the εἰς; and they have been followed by Grotius, Vorstius, Crellius, Beza, Mede, and others. *

Here Wetstein cites a very similar sentiment in Joseph. b. 5, 13, 6. ἔλεγεν, αἰς δὲι μετὰ ἄδειας κατα- χρήσασθαι τοῖς θείοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ θείου, καὶ τοὺς τῷ ναῷ στρατευομένους ἐξ αὐτοῦ τρέφεσθαι.

Vitrunga de Synag. Vet. p. 78. has shown how this applies to the case of the support of a Christian Ministry.

14. The Apostle finally establishes this privilege of the Priesthood on the order of our Lord Jesus Christ; adducing, as Theophylact remarks, the strongest argument last.

14. οὗτοι καὶ ὁ Κύριος διετάξε. “Thus also the Lord has ordained, or appointed, that those who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel.” Theophyl. explains it, διετάξατο, (i.e. διάταγμα ἑποίησε) ἐνομο- βέτησε. The expression γὰρ ἐκ οὗ ἀρδ οἶνος, as used of food, or any business which provides a living, is illustrated with examples by Kypke. On the sense of εὔαγγέλιον the old Commentators unnecessarily perplex themselves. It simply signifies the alimony apportioned to the preachers of the Gospel by the Church, which, according to the direction of our Lord, is to be a living to the preacher.† In this view, Theophylact shrewdly and truly remarks: καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν, οὐκ ἐμπορεύεσθαι, οὐδὲ θησαυρίζειν.

Semler observes, that this is a “sententia, quae facilè corrumpitur, si qui id faciunt consilium principes et praecipium, ut habeant, unde vivant; cùm sit ordine posteriorius.”

* So Theophol. τὴν διανεκά δουλείαν καὶ καρπελαν διὰ τῆς προσ- εδρειας ἐνδείκνυε.

† So a Rabbinical writer cited by Schoettg. “Quomodo res comparata est cum discipulo sapientis a. viro docto? Resp. Incolae urbis ejus tenentur opus facere pro illo: is enim relinquuit jucunditatem suam, et studet iis rebus, quae Deo grates sunt.”
15. Now comes what Crellius calls the second part of the chapter. The Apostle has thus far asserted his right to receive maintenance from the Church. Now he shows that he has not used this power, lest he should hinder the salvation of any.

15. οὐδὲν τούτων, “not any one of those privileges (before mentioned, ver. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, & 14.), though as an Apostle I was free to use them.”

15. οὐκ ἔγραψα δὲ τ., “I have not, however, made these representations,” ἵνα οὕτω γίνηται ἐν ἐμοί, i. e. literally, “that it may be (henceforth) so in me.” A Hebrew expression, equivalent to, “that the same alimony may be assigned to me.”

15. καλὸν γὰρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἡ —κενάσῃ. The γὰρ shows that there is here an ellipsis of ωκί, “No! for it were better for me,” &c. Most recent Commentators join καλὸν and μᾶλλον, and take them as put for καλλὸν, by a Hebraism. I would rather, however, treat the μᾶλλον as out of place. The construction is this: καλὸν γὰρ μοι ἐστὶ ἀποθανεῖν μᾶλλον ἡ, &c. This syntax of καλὸν with the dative occurs also in Matt. 18, 8 & 9. 26, 24. Mark 9, 42. 43 & 47. The modern Commentators, however, treat this as an hyperbole for “molestissima quaeque perpeti mallem.”* But it is not necessary (nor indeed reverent) to resort to this principle here. Theophylact well paraphrases: Αἱρομαί μᾶλλον διαφθαρῆναι μιμω, ἡ, &c.

The construction ἡ ἰνα τις κενάσῃ is anomalous, and perhaps idiomatic or Hebrew. It is equivalent to, “rather than that any one should,” &c. The var. lect. have arisen from the endeavours of the librarii to remove the irregularity. Τις κενάσῃ, “should make void, show to be vain, by having to say that I took wages.” Τό καύχημά μου, “that whereof I may well be proud;” (as ἡ Cor. 1, 14.

* And Wetstein cites Sophocl. Aj. 1328. ἐκεῖ καλὸν μοι τοῦ δ' ἵνα παραμεῖνῃ διαφέρων προδήλως μᾶλλον, ἡ τις σὺς ἐντέρ γυναῖκος. Demosth. Phil. 3. ἔθναναι γὰρ μυρίακας κρείστον, ἡ κολακέλαι τι ποιήσαι Φιλίττη.
1 Corinthians, Chap. IX.

Rom 4, 2.;) namely, that of having preached the Gospel without remuneration. See 2 Cor. 11. and 1 Thess. 2, 9, & 10."

16. ἔαν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, &c. "Rationem superiōris dicti reddit Apostolus per occupationem." (Crepilus.)

The scope of this difficult passage is little understood by our modern Commentators, except Crellius. It is best pointed out by Theophyll. (from Chrysost.) as follows: Τι λέγεις; οὐκ ἔστι καύχημα σοι τὸ εὐαγγελίζομαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀδιάφανος κηρύσσειν νῦν τοῦτο ἐκείνου μείζον; ἀπαγέ, φησιν; ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, ἐπιταχμᾶ ἐστι καὶ χρέος, καὶ ἔαν πληρῶ τοῦτο, νῦν διὰ κατάραμον; οὐδὲ γὰρ μοι ἔαν πληρῶ· διαφέρομαι γὰρ πολλά, οἷς τὸ ἐπιτάγμα τοῦ δεσπότου μὴ ποιῶν. Τὸ δὲ, ἀδιάφανος κηρύσσειν, προαιρέσεως φιλοτιμίας καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καύχημα ἐστι. So that ἔαν γὰρ should not be rendered, with Doddridge, if; nor, with Macknight, when. Our English Translators have well rendered: "though I preach."

16. ἀνάγκη γὰρ μοι ἐπικείμαι. It is well remarked by Sclater, that we must here understand a necessitas hypothetica, namely, "if he would avoid punishment for disobedience to the commands of Christ so awfully laid upon him." And the same view is taken by Theophylact, who shows how reconcileable this is with free will.† The phrase itself is Classical, and is illustrated by Wetstein with several examples; as Zosim. 3. μηδεμία — ἐπικείμενης ἀνάγκης. Xenoph. Polit. Laced. ἐπιτίθεναι ἀνάγκην. Demosth. ἀνάγκας ἐπιθῆς.

The following words more strongly state the ne-

* Theophylact well illustrates the force of the term thus: καύχημа δὲ εἰπεν, ινα την ὑπερβολὴν τῆς χαρᾶς δεινη ἴσως γὰρ ἄντις εἰπεν, οτι ἄλλοις οὐκ ἐλάμβανε μὲν, πλὴν στέρνον καὶ διόνυσων τοῦτο ἐπιτηδεύνον οὖν, φησιν, ἀκέχω λυπεύονται, ἵνα καὶ καύχημα. And So Theodoret: Καύχημα καλεῖ προῖκα κηρύσσων, καὶ ὑπερβαίνει τὸν κελμένον δρόν.

† See Petav. Dog. Theol. 204. And this may be well illustrated by Liban. Or. 5. p. 198 D. δικαστή δ' ὑπερηφανείτω τοῦτος οἴη γὰρ ἀν φελθόντω χάρις τος γὰρ οὐ γένος αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνάγκην πράττειν, ἐπεράζε.
cessity, and illustrate it e contrario. Quod de rei estu eand mu. et, "the woe of severe punishment, as a transgressor.* So Maimonides. (cited by Grot.) "Si quis defugiat, eveniet ei quod Jonae, aut pejus aliquid."

Crellius well explains the sense in which the Apostle here uses καύχημα, namely, "something which any one has done without being impelled by Divine injunction and command, which if he had not done, he would have deserved severe punishment, but which he has undertaken of his own accord, and thus expects a peculiar reward, without any danger of punishment."

17. ei γαρ εκαν τοιτο πράσσω, μισθόν ἔχω, "if, for instance, I do this," &c.

The sense of this difficult verse is best cleared up by the Greek Commentators. In determining it, the peculiar use of ἐκαν and ἀκαν (which are in the best Greek writers perpetually opposed to each other) must be attend to.† Theodoret says they are put ous ἐπὶ γνωσθῆς, ἀλλὰ διδάσκαι ous ἰδικῷ εὐπληρώ τεσσερίως. And so also the Schol. Cod. A. ap. Matth. p. 229. But the passage is best explained by Ecumen. 503 A. ei γαρ εκαν τοιτο πράσσω, (τοιν; τὸ ἀδάπανον τιθέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον,) μισθόν ἔχω, ἐχαὶ, ὃτι καὶ τὸ κυρίο τοιαύτα ἐπιτρέψαιτο, ous ἐπιφανῆ. Ἡ ΟΤΤΩΣ. Εἰ γαρ τὸ κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἐμῆς ἢ ἀλλος φιλοτιμίας, καὶ ὁδεγμαί μοι ἀνάγκη ἐκ τῆς δεσποτικῆς ἐντολῆς ἐπένειτο, εἰκότι οὖτ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ μισθόν μέγαν ἐπιτρέπει, καὶ ἔχειν μοι ὁσ ἐπὶ ἰδίῳ κατορθῶμαι καυχάσθαι, εἰ δὲ οὐδ' ἰδιακών καταπιστευθῆς καὶ ἀνάγκη ἔχων ὑπηρέτειν, τούτῳ πράσσω, ous ἐπὶ ὅμοιος ὁ μισθός ἔσται, ous ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ καυχάσθαι. ἐπὶ τίνα οὖν ἐστὶ λαμπρός ὁ μισθός καὶ τὸ καύχημα; ἐφ' οὖτ' κηρύσσειν μὲν οὐ προσετάγῃν τὸ

* So Chrysostom explains: ἃ μὲν γαρ ὑπερ τὴν ἐντολὴν γίνεται, τοιάν ἔχει τὸν μισθὸν κατὰ τούτο; ἐγεῖ ἐν ἐντολῆς ταξεῖ, οὐ τούτον.
† Ecumen. 503 c. explains their difference thus: ἐκαν μὲν, ἔθει καὶ λογισμὸς συνεδρείω, ἀμαρσίδες φέρων καὶ χαίρων ἐπὶ τῷ γινομένῳ, ἔκαν δὲ, ἔθει μετὰ βίας καὶ ἀνάγκης τοῦ λογισμοῦ τοῦτο πράσσει.
Thus, I conceive, is established the true sense of this difficult passage, which has exceedingly perplexed our English Commentators. (See Hammond, Whitby, Macknight, and Slade.) After ἄκων must be understood from the context πρόσεειν ἀνάγκη, do it I must, for οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι. This latter, indeed, would not deprive us of a reward, but exclude any καύχημα. Thus ἄκων refers to his preaching the Gospel gratuitously; ἄκων, to the doing it for recompense. Mr. Valpy, I must observe, has of all our English Commentators come the nearest to the sense.

Οἰκονομίαν, "munus Apostolicum." Οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι is equivalent to ἐμὸν πεπίστευται οἰκονομία. This construction also occurs in Rom. 3, 2. (where see the note,) and Gal. 2, 7. πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, and often elsewhere. Classical examples may be seen in Wess. on Diod. Sic. 19, 58.

18. τὸς οὐν μόνον ἐστὶν ὁ μισθὸς; "What, then, is my reward?" There is here a difficulty, which Mede would remove by cancelling the interrogation. But this would make bad Greek, and destroy the energy of the sentence.

With respect to the following words, "what reward?—that of preaching the Gospel free of expense," there seems something strange. Now some modern Commentators, as Wetstein, Rosenmuller, Jaspis, and Krause, recognize an argutè dicturn; q. d. "What is my reward? Why, truly, to receive no reward at all!" But though I do not deny that such expressions occasionally occur in our Apostle, yet they are not to be unnecessarily multiplied. Nay this is inconsistent with the serious air
observable in the words following, which are sub-
joined, as Cæcumen. observes, to explain the prece-
ding, ἐπειδὴ ἀσαφῶς εἰρήκει. The difficulty com-
plained of has been occasioned by the peculiar use
of μυθός, which is explained by Theophyly. ὁ μείζων
μυθός καὶ καυχόμενος ἐξισοῖ. and by Theodoret καυ-
χήμα. This is, I think, nearly, the sense; but it is
more regularly elicited by Piscator, Vorstius, and
Crellius, who take the word to denote, by metony-
my, the cause of reward; q. d. (as Crellius sug-
gest,) "Quid igitur est quod mibi in hoc munere
obeundo singularem mercedem afferre potest et effi-
cere, ut jure gloriari possim?" (See Hammond,
Whitby, and Bp. Hall ap. D'Oyley.) This seems
to be the complete sense.

Grotius and others take μυθός for hope of reward.
But this is wandering too far. The Philological
Commentators have given many examples of this
use of τιβέναι for ποιήσαι, which is indeed very trite.
It may suffice to refer the student to St. Thes. or
Schl. Lex. 'Αδάσανων, gratuitous, costing nothing.
So Diod. Sic. 1, 6. ἐστι δὲ μὲν ἐκαίνω ὡς ἀν τις εἴποι,
ἐπαίλον ἄρετής ἀδάσανων, ὅ δὲ ψόγος τιμωρία φαύλοτης
ἀνευ πληγῆς.

'Ακατήρισσαν is rightly taken by the antient
Commentators, and the best modern ones, for χρή-
σασθαι, use, which is more agreeable to the context.
Yet as the exercising any such power to the utter-
most may be called a kind of abuse, and would have
been so in the peculiar circumstances of St. Paul,
the word may admit the other interpretation.

19. ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὁν ἐκ πάντων, &c. "Jam alio
modo ostendit se libertate suâ non in quavis re uti,
sed multa humaniter tribuere alis, multa sibi dene-
gare ipsi solere." (Krause.)

'Ελεύθερος ἐκ πάντων some understand of persons;
others, of things. (See Pole.) Krause renders the
ἐκ πάντων, "ex omni parte." But this the usus lo-
quendi will not permit. The Greek Commentators
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(rightly, I think) refer it to persons; which, indeed, the antithesis requires. The ἐκ is for ἀπὸ, is an Hellenistical idiom.

19. πάσιν ἐμαυτὸν ἐδωκάμασα. This may be considered in a two-fold view. 1. “I have enslaved myself to all, acting as their servant, and declining no labour in their service.” 2. “I have acted like a servant, by making myself subservient to their humours, and by yielding to their prejudices. And this not as a κολαξ, but ἵνα τοὺς πλεῖονος κερδήσω, “that I might gain the more.”* Here there is evidently, as Chrysost. says, an hyperbole.

On the sense of κερδήσω it is not necessary to press, with some Greek and early modern Commentators.† It is equivalent to σωζω, which is read in some MSS. (by a gloss,) and signifies to gain over to the Christian religion, and put in the way of salvation. One may compare Matt. 18, 9. ἐκερδήσας τὸν ἀδελφὸν σου, “brought him over to a right mind.” See also 1 Pet. 3, 1. Krause compares Heliodor. 4, 18. ἵνα ἐκ πάντων μίνους ἄλληλον κερδήσωμεν.

20. Here we have a general position illustrated with special examples. (Crellius.)

20. ἐγενόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαίος. By Jews almost all Commentators understand the Judaizing Christians. But if κερδήσω have the sense just laid down, it must chiefly refer to the Jews; and the following words will be a repetition of the same sentiment.

By κερδήσω we are not to understand that Paul only brought men over to his own party.‡

* I know not why some Commentators should treat the article as pleonastic. We perceive the force of it in our own language, and the Greek, it seems, had a similar idiom. Grotius well renders so plures, by which is not meant more than the other Apostles, as some explain, but more than he otherwise would. Theophylact remarks, that the Apostle does not say all; for that were impossible.
† Though it is prettily observed by Ecumen. εἶδες ἀγαπὴν; κερδός τῶν ἰησοῦ τῶν ἐκείρων σωμάτων.
‡ As is done by Chrysost. 383, 33., and also Whitby ap. Slade.

* By the first clause we may understand those who were actually
Theophylact observes, that we have ὁς Ἰωάν., not Ἰωάν., by which is meant the observation of their rites and ceremonies. That Paul did comply with the Mosaic requisitions in regard to meats, we have every reason to suppose. In regard to vows, we have an example at Acts 21, 17.; of circumcision, in his causing Timothy to be circumcised (Acts 16, 1.); and many other instances, including his regular attendance on the worship of the Synagogue, wherever he was. (See Acts.) To this, also, Rosenm. refers the Judaical mode of teaching and explaining the Scriptures of the Old Testament pursued by St. Paul, in which he "accommodated himself to the ideas and methods of thinking of the Jews." And so Krause, who regards the whole Epistle to the Hebrews as a proof and exemplification of this accommodation.” This, however, is liable to objection, and leads to many difficulties, to which I cannot now advert. See note on 1 Corinth. 15, 4.

Here Bulkeley compares Demophil. p. 24. “It is the part of a musician to put his instrument in tune, and of a wise and well instructed man to accommodate himself to every mind.”

20. τοὺς ἐκ νόμου. Most Commentators explain this, τοὺς δειλοῦν εἶναι ἐκ νόμου: and they refer to Gal. 4, 21. where there is the complete phrase. But according to the interpretation above suggested this is not necessary.

21. τοὺς ἄνωμοις. By these are not meant, as Lightfoot supposes, the Sadducees, but, as the Greek Commentators, Grot., and the best moderns explain, the Gentiles, to whom the Law was not given, and who are therefore, in Rom. 2, 12 & 14., described as οἱ νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες. To these the Apostle became ἄνωμος, by not observing the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law. See Gal. 2, 11. This use of the word being, however, irregular, the Apostle explains it by the Jews; by the second, those who were professedly converted to Christianity, and yet retained their prejudices in favour of many doctrines of the law."
parenthetical clause μὴ ὁ διὸ ἐνομος Θεοῦ, which signifies, "not wishing thereby to say, under no Divine Law," ἀλλὰ ἐνομος Χριστοῦ, "but under law towards Christ and the precepts of the Christian Religion." (See Theoph.) Thus Whitby paraphrases: "obedient to the law of Christ, and taking care, notwithstanding, to do nothing contrary to the moral law of God, and to the rules of Christianity."

22. ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενεῖς αἰς ἀσθενης, I. τ. ἀ. κ.
By the ἀσθ. are meant Christians, as yet weak in faith, i. e. in the persuasion of certain things, such as were those who still doubted as to things in the Christian religion indifferent. (Crel.) See supra, 8, 16, 11 & 13. (and the notes there,) and Rom. 15, 1.

How far the Apostle carried these compliances, and where he stopped, is well stated by Mackn., as follows: "These compliances with the prejudices of the weak he showed only to gain their good will.* For when the Judaizing teachers insisted on the observance of any of the rites of the law as necessary to salvation, he always resolutely withstood them, as in the case of Titus, Gal. 2, 3, 5 & 14.

22. τοῖς πᾶσι γέγονα τὰ πάντα Ι. π. τ. σ. The Apostle sums up the whole at once.
Krause renders: "propter omnes, in omnes me mutavi formas." This phrase Kypke has illustrated with several examples, the most apposite of which is Joseph. Vit. 1019. παντίως μὲν ἐν ἐνεχόμην πειθῶν αὐτῶς γείσασθαι τῶν ἄνδρων. And so Lucian. de Morte Peregr. (cited by Krause): ἀπαντὰ γὰρ δόξης ἐνεκα γενόμενος, καὶ μυρίας τροπὰς τράπομενος. Thus the Apostle means to say that he was eutrepælos, in a good sense. So Grot.: "Prudentis est, non inhæ-

* Yet, as Theophyl. observes, he sometimes kept out of sight doctrines at which he thought his hearers might stumble; as when, in addressing the Athenians, he spoke of Jesus Christ as a man. In fact, as Theophyl. observes, you sometimes see him not speaking plainly either concerning the Deity of the Son or of the Holy Spirit, because of the weakness of his hearers; and thus to the weak became he weak.
tere τοῦ καθ' οἷου, sed spectare τὰ καθ' έκκριτα.” Chrysost. illustrates the expression in question thus: ἐδράκετος λέγεται ὁ πόλιος, ὁ παντοδαίμων, ὁ πάντα γινομένος. But, to return to the Apostle, οὐ πρὸς τοὺς καίρους (to use the words of Theodoret) μεταβαλλετο, ἄλλα τὰς τῶν ἀλλων αἱ φελείας πάντα ἐκραγματεύετο.

Pάντως. This is by almost all modern Commentators rendered omni ratione. And this indeed may seem to strengthen the antithesis: but the sentence is sufficiently antithetical without; and I am inclined to assent to the Greek Commentators and Crel., who take it in the sense utique, saltem. So Hesych., πάντως οἷος. And perhaps such is the sense at Acts 28, 4. This agrees better with the following words τίναι, some; by which is placed in a strong point of view the Christian philanthropy of Paul, who so yielded to all, ἵνα καὶ εὐλογος σαθη, (to use the words of Theophyl.), for (as observes Theodoret) he knew that all to whom he addressed himself would not attain salvation. It is remarked by Theophyl., that “the τίναι was used, to encourage his converts.” And one may add, that it was said modestě.

It is strange that some Critics should have contended for the reading πάνως, which, though supported by some very antient MSS. and Versions (chiefly the Vulgate), and some Latin Fathers, may justly be regarded as a paradirothosis, originating in doctrinal mistake. Hence it occurs in the interpolated and emended Cod. Cant.

23. τούτῳ δὲ τοιῷ διὰ τὸ εἰςγγέλθην. These words are susceptible of two or three senses. (See the Greek Commentators and Crel.) To me the following seems to deserve the preference: “This I do for the Gospel’s sake,” i. e. for its further propagation. See ver. 12.

23. ἵνα συγκατανάσε αὐτοῦ γένωμαι, “that I might be a partaker of its benefits.” So Vorst., Crel., Grot., Rosenm., and Krause.

24. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι οἴ εὖ σταθή, &c. Now comes the third part of the chapter, in which the Apostle
admonishes the Corinthians, after his example, to press forward to the prize proposed in the Gospel, and in all things lawful so to conduct themselves as not to be an offence to any. (Crel.)

Here we have an agonistical metaphor *, and one of extraordinary vigour and beauty, and especially appropriate when addressing those whose city was so particularly famous for its games, called the Isthmian, and on the victors at which Pindar has written so many fine odes. On these Wolf refers to Fabric. Bibl. Antiq. p. 625. The great Thesaur. Antiq. of Græv. and Gronov. may also be consulted, or Potter's Antiq. Of the five áγάνες, boxing, running, wrestling, leaping, and quoting, the Apostle here alludes to the two first. The general instruction couched under this long-drawn metaphor, or allegory, is thus expressed by Theophyl.: Μη νομίσῃς ὅτι ἐπειδὴ ἔπιστευσατε, καὶ εἰς τὸ σταδίον τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰσῆλθεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο ὑμῖν εἰς σωτηρίαν: ἀσπέρ ὅμως ἐκεῖνος τὸ τρέχειν ἀττλώς, εἰ μὴ προσγενήται καὶ τὸ ἀμέμπτως, καὶ τὸ μέχρι τέρματος δίοι καὶ μόνος λαμβάνει τὸ βαρβατὸν ὁ οὖν ὁμαλῶς ὃσπερ ὡμέις κινουμένες μὴ λαβεῖν, διὰ τὴν τελευτητά δήθεν τῆς γνώσεως καταφρονῶντες, τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ τῶν εἰδωλολάτων ἐμφορουμένοι. So also ΟEcumen., whose matter, as well as the above, is derived from Chrysost.

In the sentence οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες, πάντες τρέχοντες, Grot. rightly remarks on the use of the participle for the noun σταδιοδρόμοι, and also the tractive of πάντες, which, however, seems doubtful. The sense is: “all the racers run, but one only ob-

* Similar ones are cited by Wets, from Joseph. Bell. 1, 31, 8. Lucian de Gymn. 13. Philo t. 1, 63, 28. t. 2. p. 463, 10. Dio 29. p. 291. I add Plato 760 x. τί δεύτεροι μὲν δεῖναι τε καὶ ἄδικοι δρῶν ἀπερ οἱ δρομείς, δοῦν αὐτοῖς αὐτοὶ τοῖς ἀδίκοις τὰς κάρας, ἀπο ἀνυμέν, μή; το μὲν πρῶτον δέος ἀποτελέσθω, τελευτῶντες δὲ, καταγελαστοὶ γένομαι, τὰ δὲ εἰς τῶν ἄων ἔγχρωμα καὶ ἀπεφανώς ἀποτελοῦντες οἱ δὲ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ δρομοί, εἰς τέλος ἐλθοῦντες, τὰ τὸ ἄδαλλα λαμβάνονται καὶ στεφάνωνται: οὐκ οὕτω καὶ περὶ τῶν δικαίων τὸ πολὺ εὐμελεῖται; πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἐκάστης τράξεως καὶ ὀμίλλες καὶ τοῦ βίου εὐδοκιμοῦντο τε καὶ τὰ ἄδαλλα παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν φέρονται;
tains the βραβεῖων, or crown adjudged by the βραβεῖα, or umpires, to the victor." See Etym. Mag. and Schol. on Pind. Ol. 1. all cited by Wets.

24. οὕτω τρέχετε, &c. "so do ye run (your spiritual race), that ye may obtain the prize (of your high calling in Christ Jesus)." Καταλαμβάνειν literally signifies, to lay hold of, obtain. On the sense of these words Wolf has copiously treated. It is here well remarked by Theodoret: Ἐκεῖ πολλῶν ἀγαπητας, εἰς ἀνακριττέται μόνος, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τῶν καλῶν ἀγαπητάτων ἡ καταγωγή τῆς ἀναρρήσεως.

25. πάντα δὲ ὁ ἀγαπητάτος, πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται. Here again we have a participle for a noun, ὁ ἀγαπητάτος for ἀγαπητής. Πάντα is for κατὰ πάντα, a very common ellipsis. The sense is, "not by this or that only, but all things." The sense of ἐγκρατεύεται is copiously illustrated by the Commentators, especially Grot. and Wets.*

The application to the Christian agonistes is very obvious, and is copiously illustrated by the modern Commentators, who, however, do not enough indicate, that the words, though they represent virtues of which the Apostle had set them an eminent example, yet they are intended especially as a censure on the prevailing vices of the Christians at Corinth, as their want of charity, luxury, fornication, drunkenness, &c.; though this is softened by ἐγὼ τοὺς, thus I, for example, at the next verse. The antient

* The most opposite passages cited are Epict. c. 35. θέλεις 'Ὀλομ. πια νυκτίᾳ; καθὼς, μὴ τοὺς θεοὺς, κομψον γὰρ ἐστιν ἄλλα σκέπει καὶ τὰ καθηγούμενα καὶ τὰ ἁκόλουθα, καὶ οὕτως ἀπο τῶν ἔργων. Δει αὐτοκτεῖν, ἀνακριττοφεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι περιπλέκεισθαι καὶ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ἐν ὑφα ἑκατομμύριστῃ, ἐν καύματι, ἐν φύσει, μὴ ψυχρὸν πίνειν, μὴ οἴνων, ὡς ἔτυχεν αὐλῶν, ὡς ιατρῷ, παραδέδωκέναι καυσὸν τῷ ἐπιστάγῃ, εἰς εἰς τῶν φύων παρέρχεσθαι. Horat. A. P. 412. Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam, Multa tuit fecit que puer, su davit et aluit; abstinuit Venere et vino.

Examples of the temperance and abstinence of the agonistes may be seen in Ælian. V. H. 3, 30. 10, 2. 11, 3. where see the Interpreters and Spangh. on Julian. Orat. p. 101. Pausan. Eliac. 2, 7. Themist. p. 5. Wets. remarks, that the preparatory training of these ἀγωνισταὶ occupied ten months.
Commentators excellently trace out the scope of the passage.

25. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἦνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβονσιν. Supply τρέχουσιν καὶ ἐγκρατεύονται from the context. "They do it to obtain a corruptible, fading crown;* but we an incorruptible, amaranthine crown of glory;" (as is said 1 Pet. 5, 4.) Rosenm. observes, that these victors enjoyed other honours and emoluments; as we find from Vitruv. Archit. 9. Praëf. The Apostle, however, is only speaking of that which they especially strove after, the crown; though certainly it carried with it other and more solid advantages, which to coarser minds might have most weight. So Plat. de Leg. 8. (cited by Krause): οἱ μὲν ἄρα νίκης ἕνεκα πάλης καὶ δρόμων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐτάλμησαν ἀπέχεσθαι λεγομένου πράγματος ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν εὐθαμίων; οἱ δὲ ἰμετέρω παιδεῖς ἀδύνατός ουσίον κατερείν, πολὺ καλλίνες ἔνεκα νίκης;

26. Ἔγα τοῖνοι ὀτρώ τρέχω, "I therefore (for example) so run." For it is truly remarked by Theodoret, προστίθησι καὶ ἐπιτοις αὐτοὶ τοῦ παραδείγματος. So also Chrysost. and Theophyl.

26. οἷς σὺν ἀδήλως. To these words various senses have been assigned, which may be seen in Pole, Wolf, and Slade. They are explained by Chrysost., Theophyl., Ócumen., the Syr., Crell., and Pearce, "not without purpose," πρὸς σκότον βλέπων (as Phil. 3, 4. κατὰ σκότον διάκων), not ἐκη, μάθην. And they think it levelled against the vices of the Corinthians. But this interpretation seems too violent and harsh. No proof is adduced of such a sense of ἀδήλως. The only interpretation that deserves any attention is that which I shall now proceed to detail, and which


seems to be the true one, namely, that of Theodoret, the Vulg., Beza, Luther, Hamm., Wells, Elsner, Wolf, Kypke, Hardy, Rosenm., Schleus., Krause, Shade, &c., who take ἀδήλωσ for ἐν ἀδηλῷ, "quasi dubio exitu, obscura et ancipiti victoria." So Theodoret: ὁ γὰρ ἀδήλως μοι στέφανος. Eelsner confirms this interpretation from Lucian de Gymn. 398. ἐν ὁ λόγῳ, ἐκ τοῦ ἀδήλῳ καὶ ἀμφιβόλῳ τῆς ἡκερ τοστοί τοιούτων, and Herm. p. 555. Krause adds Xen. Mem. 1, 1, 6. and compares Gal. 2, 2. Indeed, I remember to have met with the phrase frequently in the best Greek writers.

26. οὕτω πυκτεύον. A pugilistic metaphor. On the pugilism of the antients see Buretti Acad. Inscript. Fr. 3, 255. Ὅμω κάθεν ἀφρά σφεθαν, κ. τ. ε. "not in vain," "not striking an empty or useless blow." The mode in which the cests were fastened to the hands and other such matters may be sought for in the writers on Gr. Antiq. There were many ways in which the pugilists might beat the air, either in private exercise, or as a prelude to the contest, or in the contest itself, when missing their aim;* all which are illustrated by Faber in Agonist. and especially by Kypke in loc. The last would seem to be the one meant by the Apostle.

The true sense intended is thus expressed by Rosenm. (partly from Kypke): "Dicit igitur Paulus, se pugilatu certare, conatibus non temerariis aut incertis, neque cum hoste, qui ictus hos declinare et

* On which Kypke observes: "Dum in ipso certamine cum adversario agiliori et exercitatiuri confogebant, qui letus eorum apta corporis contractione, incurvatione, declinatione evitabat." This he illustrates from a kindred passage of Philo, p. 191. Τὸ δὲ συμβῆβηκεν ἀθλητὴν πιγμήν ἡ παγκράτιος τοις νίκαις καὶ στέφανων ἀγνικεδμένης οὕτως μὲν ἀνὴρ τὰς ἐκπεραμένεις πληγαῖς ἐκφέρεται τῶν ἵρων ἀποστείλατι, καὶ τὸν αὐχεναν περάγαν ὅσι ἔκεισα τὸ μη τροφήναι φυλάσσεται πολλάκις δὲ καὶ δεσποταῖς ποδῶν ἀκροὶ ἐπιβεβηκός προὶ ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐκάρας ἢ στείλας καὶ συναγαγόν ἐμπάλις, κατὰ κενοῦ ὕφερεν τὰς χειρὰς τὸν ἀντικαλον ἡμάκαρα, σκιαγραφεῖ τινὶ παραλήπτον δρῶντα. I add, Ariosto Orl. Furt. canto 2, 51. Festi Gradus 

*vento e laria vana, & Herodot. 1, 172, 12. τιτωντες δέχασι τὸν ἥρα.
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affugere possit, sed pugnare se cum semet ipso, ita ut non minori cum effectu quam nisi corpus sumum scil. τῶν πάλαιον ἀνθρώπων obtundat atque subigat."

27. ἄλλ' ἑπικιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα, καὶ δουλαγωγῶ. Ostendit quo pacto non pugnet: nunc etiam docet quo pacto pugnet.—Contunditur autem corpus nostrum, cum a rebus ipsi alicquuin gratis cohibetur, et ad res insuaves peragendas adigitur. (Crel.

The Apostle continues the pugilistic metaphor; for ἑπικιάζω signifies to strike under the eye, (or, as is vulgarly said, to give any one a black eye), sugilare, (which is from sub and γυάλον, the jaws) ; both pugilistic terms. I cannot but suspect that the ὅτα has reference to the mode in which the face is struck, when one combatant has the other under his left arm; which, I think, they call fibbing. Now as this kind of hitting is especially punishing (to use another technical term) to the adversary, and daunts and subdues him, so ἑπικιάζω came at length to mean treat with severity and harshness, subdue any one's spirit; and in this sense it is here used, namely, to denote repress and subdue evil inclinations, and bring the disposition under the dominion of virtue and religion. The force of the term, and what the Apostle especially meant to hint to the Corinthians, is well stated by Chrysost and Theophyl. Cæcumen, rightly explains ἑπικιάζω by δαμάζω, and δούλ. by ώς δούλον έγω. And he paraphrases the passage thus: οὐκ ἄφημι τῷ γαστρὶ καὶ τῷ σῶματι τὰς ἤμιας, ἄλλ' περισφήγων αὐτὸ, καὶ ἑπικιάζω, * which seems to correctly represent the sense.

Most Commentators here employ themselves in exemplifying this ἑπικιάζως in St. Paul's life and habits, which were indeed calculated to bring the body under subjection. See 2 Cor. 11, 7. The most important point, however, (though little attended to by the modern Commentators, * ) is, to notice that

* Grot. observes, that a similar use of the word occurs in Athenagoras; but he does not adduce any passage. I would compare Anacreon ap. Athen. Epist. ap. Cassub. Animadv. p. 792. ὡς μὴ πρὸς ἔρωτα πυκταλίζω.
the Apostle meant these words (as the Greek Commentators suggest) as an indirect admonition to the Corinthians to bring themselves more under the subjection of the Gospel, lest after having been evangelized and placed in a state of salvation, they might, at last, be cast away, and become reprobate. (See Theophyl. and Æcumen.) And it is well observed by Chrysost. 389, 6., that to avoid giving offence, the Apostle τοιοτα: καίνυ τήν παραλησίαν. This being the case, I do not see that such great stress can be laid on this passage as is done by those who attack the doctrines of Calvinism; nor that the passage gives any ground to suppose that the Apostle really had any doubts or fears as to his salvation. Yet it implies that the failure was possible, and therefore proves that persons may fall from a state of grace. See Bp. Bull’s “Refutation of the Doctrine of Final Perseverance.”

I must here notice another error, (for such I suspect it to be,) into which Commentators for the last century have run, namely, of fancying that the agonistical metaphor is kept up to the end of ver. 27. They render κηρύξας “after having acted as herald to others.” And ἀδελφός, they tell us, was the term applied to any prize-fighter who failed to obtain the victory. But of this use of the latter word they aduce no example. The term was merely employed of those who were rejected and not allowed to contend, from bad character.† And as to the metaphor in κηρύξας it seems very doubtful, and tends to inextricable confusion of metaphor, by which the Apostle will represent himself both as an ἀγαμοτής and a κηρύξ. Neither was the κηρύξ of sufficient dignity ‡

* Grot., however, observes, “Tacitâ comparisone perstringit illos epulatores Corinthianos.”
† So Chrysost. t. 5. p. 123. (cited by Wets.) εἰτε δὴ μοι, παρακαλῶ, εἰ τοῖς Ὄλυμπιακοῖς ἀγώνιν οὐχὶ ἵστησεν ὁ κηρύξ· ἴστησεν ὁ κηρύξ· δοῦλος ἄτροφος, μὴ ἀκάκλατος; μὴ ἲλέγητος; μὴ τρόπων τοιχηρῶν; † Those who have read the Greek Dramatic writers, especially Aristophanes, will want no proof of this. See also Eurip. Suppl. 426., from Troad. 425., it appears that they were held in much the same estimation as Bumbarliffs with us.
for us to suppose that the Apostle could intend to represent himself under that character. Besides, there is no proof that the καρός pronounced any such exhortations to the combatants as the Commentators tells us. It appears to have been merely his office to ask certain questions previous to the combatants engaging.

The Greek Commentators, and the modern ones, up to the time of Faber (in his Agonist.) Lydias, and Dr. Hammond, interpreted καρός. in the ordinary sense, viz. preach, instruct,* and recognized in ἀδόκιμος rather a metaphor taken from bad money, which will not pass, or be taken. So Schleus. Lex. The instruction here meant is well laid down by Theophyl. and ÓEcumen., as follows: “It is not enough for me to preach and teach, nor for you to believe and have faith, unless both you and I respectively show ourselves irreproachable, and subdue evil desires, bringing our passions into complete subjection to the Gospel.

I cannot conclude my annotations on this interesting portion of Scripture better than by employing the words of Dr. Macknight: “This passage, in which the strong and continued exertions necessary for restraining men's fleshly appetites are described, being plainly metaphorical, the Papists have erred in interpreting it literally, and in founding on the literal sense their fastings and scourgings, and bodily penances, whose influence, it is well known, is to nourishing superstition, and to make the pretended penitent careless of real holiness; but by no means to weaken his animal passions, or to correct his vicious conduct.” In refutation of this perversion of popery see Dannhauer ap. Thes. Theolog. et Philolog. p. 533., Deyling Obs. Sac. 288., and others referred to by Wolf.

* And so Wolf, who thinks this interpretation is to be adopted, especially “cūm non tam Apostolus, quàm Christus ipse, ut ἀγνωθηται, dici propriē possit renunciare victores.”
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On the connection of this chapter with the preceding matter, Commentators are not agreed. Some recent ones, as Krause, (and formerly Erasm.), contend that there is no connection at all intended, but a transition, or digression. It appears, however, to me that there is a very close connection between them; and this has, I think, been well pointed out by all the Greek Commentators (especially Chrysost., who, in his Homily on this passage, takes in the first twelve verses of the following chapter), and, of the moderns, by Grot. and Crell. So the former: "The Apostle had just before described himself as mortifying the lusts of the flesh, that he may not fail of the hoped-for prize. He admonishes the Corinthians to do the same, and not to let themselves be lulled into security (as many then did, and now do) by the idea of the many spiritual gifts they had received from God; for that by these they were not placed beyond danger, but were under so much the greater obligation to care and watchfulness." This he shows to be adumbrated in the circumstances of the Hebrew people, in which the wiser of the Hebrews recognised a type of the times of the Messiah. And so Theophyl.: Καταλέγει πόσων ὕποκάθησαν δορεάς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ: καὶ δείκνυε μετὰ τὰς δορεὰς ταῦτας, τοὺς πολλοὺς μὴ ἀρέσκαντας τῷ Θεῷ. Ταῦτα δὲ λέγει, δεικνύει ὅτι ὁστὲρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἦν ὅπως ὁ τοσοῦτον ἀπολαύσας δορεάν, ἐπειδὴ τὰ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῶν οὐ παρέχοντο. Ἡμεῖς οὖν ὡμᾶς ἀφελήσει η ὀρθία, καὶ τὸ μονοτρείον ἀξιοθάνατον πνευματικῶν, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἁξίους ἑαυτῶς παρασχεῖτε τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος. See also Bp. Pearce and Dr. Wells.

The connection, indeed, is apparent from the use of γὰς, which has been edited by Griesbach from the best authorities. And if δὲ be retained, the sense will be the same, δὲ being used for γὰς (see Schleus. Lex.) which might afford some ground for suspicion that γὰς is only a gloss of δὲ.
1. οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. "I would not that ye should be ignorant." But *ignorant* they were not, and could not be. And yet, as Chrysost. observes, it shews that the Apostle did not consider them as very well informed. It is well remarked by Grot. that though they had read these things in the Old Testament, they had not sufficiently retained them in memory, or understood their more hidden sense: so that ἀγνοεῖν signifies *immemorem esse*; as in Rom. 6, 9. 7, 1. In the same manner the best Commentators explain; and Schleus. Lex. says it is an idiom formed on the model of the Hebr. יִתיָנֱל. Krause takes it to be equivalent to *scitode*. But this is too much in his way of wrapping up matters by a short cut to be satisfactory.

1. δι' οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν. Semler very well prefaces this with, "Redite igitur, fratres, in istam vetustioris temporis historiam." And this for the purpose above detailed, namely, to show the consequences of resting too implicitly on God's favour, without endeavours to approve themselves worthy of it.

The πάντες may appear to have nothing to do with the argument, and, as such, it is overlooked by all the Commentators except Crellius, who rightly regards it as meant to hint that not any of the Egyptians, and none but the Hebrews, experienced that favour.

By ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν is meant, "were under the guidance of the cloud," were safely conveyed by it, and were safe under it; it being, in fact, both a guide and a shelter, or defence.* This sense of ὑπὸ is, however, more appropriate to the dative; on which Krause refers to Hemst. on Lucian 1. 355.

1. καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς βαλάντος διήλθον, "and all passed safely through the sea." Compare Exod. 13,


2. εἰς τὸν Μαυρίν ἐβαπτίσαντο. This passage has not a little perplexed the Commentators. Hence the variety of opinions as to its sense, even among the antients. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) explains it thus: τὸ Μαυρὶ ἐκοινώνησαν τῇ τῶν νεφέλη ἱκίας, καὶ τῆς διδόου τῆς θαλάσσης ιδόντες γὰρ αὐτῶν πρῶτον διαβάντα, κατετόλμησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ τῶν ὕδατων. Ὡσπέρ καὶ ἐφ' ἑρμῶν, πρῶτον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποδανόστος καὶ ἀναστάντος, βαπτιζόμεθα καὶ αὐτοὶ, μεμονευόμενοι τῶν θανατοῦ διὰ τῆς καταδίωξας, καὶ τῆς ἀνάστασιν διὰ τῆς ἀναδίωξας. Εἰς τὸν Μαυρὶν οὖν ἐβαπτίσαντο, ἀνεί τοῦ, αὐτῶν ἀρχηγόν ἐσχον τοῦ τύπου τοῦ βαπτισμάτος τύπος γὰρ βαπτισμάτος ἦν, τὸ, τε ὑπὸ τῆς νεφέλης εἶναι, καὶ τὸ τῆς θάλασσας διελθεῖν. And in the same manner it is explained by Ὀκευμένιος, Phot., Gregor., and Ambros.; and this interpretation has been adopted by Est., Tiren., Menoch., and many other Roman Catholic Commentators, as also some Protestant ones, as Grotius, Whitby, and Locke. But it involves considerable harshness. Many other interpretations may be seen detailed in Pole and Wolf.

Baptism, it must be remembered, was a symbolical rite, by which any one bound himself to faith and obedience to any teacher of religion, and the baptism itself was a form of initiation and inauguration into that religion. Thus the sense is: "they were, by passing under the cloud, and through the sea, as it were baptized, or initiated into the religion promulgated by Moses; and thus thoroughly recognized his Divine mission, and bound themselves in future to obey his injunctions." This was partly seen by St. Basil and Mort. ap. Gataker, and distinctively by Crellius and Hamm.* And this interpre-

* Thus the former; "Consequens illorum beneficiorum divinarum hic exprimit, nempe quod Israelites tanta beneficia a Deo per Moesen adepti, ei se plane initiariunt, eum pro duce divinitus sibi dato tantis experimentis edocti penitus cognoverint." And the latter; "Baptism being among the Jews (as well as Christians) the
tation was afterwards supported by C. Vitringa, Wolf, Bengel, Rosenmuller, Semler, Krause, and Schleus.*

On the cloud as it is described in the Old Testament, namely, as "a pillar of a cloud by day, and a light by night," Wetstein (partly from Hamm. and others) compares similar expressions concerning Mount Ætna in Pind. Pyth. 1, 40. A. Gell. 17, 10. Thucyd. 3, 88. Macrob. 5, 17. and other writers.

As to the var. lect. ἐβάπτισθήσαν, it seems to be a gloss; for ἐβάπτισαντο is a reciprocal for a passive.

The ἐν in ἐν τῷ νεφέλῃ, I think with Crellius, signifies by, because of; since, as he remarks, "causa Israelitis fuit, ut sese Mose penitus adducerent, eique initiarentur." It is also truly observed by Crellius, that the Apostle uses the term ἐβαπτ. as well by a tacit comparison of this with the baptism by which Christians are initiated into Christ, as also because the material of the cloud and sea suggested the expression."

3, 4. καὶ πάντες τῷ αὐτῷ βρώμα πνευματικόν—ἐπιον, i.e. the manna, and the water issuing from the rock when struck by Moses. Now each of these is termed πνευματικόν, the most probable interpretation of which expression is that of the Greek Commentators and the most eminent modern ones, namely, bestowed by Divine favour, and in a supernatural

ceremony of initiation of all that entered into the covenant, by the same reason as such are said to be received under the wings of the Divine Presence, they may also be said to be baptized in, or with, the cloud and sea, that covering them with the cloud, and environing them with the sea, being on God's part the receiving them under his protection to bring them safe to Canaan, and so to perform to them his part of the covenant, and on their part an obligation to be for ever obedient to God, under the conduct of Moses; the assuming of which, is being baptized into Moses."

* Which last (in voce), after having cited and explained the passages where βαπτίζειν, or βαπτισθῆναι εἰς, occurs, remarks: "Ex omnibus his locis satis superque apparat, formulam, βαπτισθῆναι εἰς δυνάμι τινος, significare in universam, se nominis aliquis, doctrine, institutioni, auctoritati addictum proficiet per baptismi ritum, unde illustrari potest locus 1 Cor. 10, 2. ubi Israelitae, qui Mose
and miraculous manner;"* for the latter suppose the former. It is rightly observed by Grotius, that the manna was a type of Christ, the "true bread from heaven." And, notwithstanding what some modern Commentators urge, there is also, I think with the Greek Interpreters, an allusion to the Lord’s Supper; q. d. "as you Christians eat the body and drink the blood of Christ in the Eucharist, so those Israelites ate and drank spiritual and supernatural food and drink in the desert."

4. ἐπινυν γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, "And they were supplied with drink from the spiritual rock which followed them, even Christ." Such is the literal sense of the passage: but it has perplexed the Commentators not a little to show what is meant by the spiritual rock which followed them. To remove the difficulty, some, as Le Clerc, Wets., and Pearce, with the Syriac, take it to denote, literally, the water thus miraculously drawn from the rock, which was conveyed miraculously through the desert. But this is embarrassed with many difficulties. It has been objected that there is no evidence of the fact, and water could not, in those

duce ex Aegypto exierant, dicuntur, πάντας εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαρίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφελῇ καὶ τῇ βαλάνσῃ, h. e. omnes se professos esse sectatores Mosis ducis et imperatoris, cum nubem illam et Mosem ducem sequentur per Mare Rubrum, coll. I Cor. 1, 13, 15. Nec alia sunt ab hoc hucusque comprobato usu sacro verbi βαρίσαντο loca N. T. in quibus partim de ipso Christo per Johanneum susceput baptismo, partim de baptismo, Johannis instituto, expounditur. Quod enim ad baptismum ab ipso Christo per Johanneum susceputum attinet, ε ἐνlocis Matth. 3, 13—17. John 3, 31—33. patet, Jesum hoc rite pon solum inauguratum fuisse ad munus publicum, ut palam declarat esse filium Dei, sed etiam Christum eo se ipsum obstrinuisse byte ac doctrinæ, volutati divinae omni ex parte convenieni; baptismo vero, quem Johannes divino præcepsus usurpavit, Judæi non solum erant obstringendi, τῇ μεραβλη, Matth. 3, 11. sed etiam initiandi in novam economiam Messis propediem auspiciandum, Matth. 3, 2. Act 19, 4."

* So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) Πνευματικὰ δὲ ταῦτα λέγει, δεικτεὶ εἰ καὶ αληθὴ γένος, ἄλλ’ οὐ φύσις ἀκολουθιά ἐγίνοντα, ἄλλα χάριν πνευματικά, τρέφοντα μετὰ τοῦ σώματος και τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς ἐναγοντα. So also Oecumen.
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parched countries, be preserved potable so long, without a perpetual miracle; neither is it certain that ἄκολωθι will admit the sense conveyed. Yet this seems to be proved from Αἰlian Var. Hist. 12, 40., (cited by Wets.) καὶ οὖν καὶ ἀνωτέρω ηκολογεῖ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; and so Judith 12, 2. Nevertheless, on account of the above and other objections to which this interpretation is liable (which may be seen in Wolf), it seems to be untenable.

Others, as Grotius, Whitby, Shuckford, Bengel, Mede, Hamm., Doddridge, Macknight, Slade, and many others, are of opinion, that the Apostle has reference to some Rabbinical stories, which relate that after the water had first flowed from the rock, it perpetually followed them afterwards through the desert. (See Shuckf., Wall, in his Crit. Not. 1, 106., and Macknight.) The Rabbinical passages containing this notion may be seen in Wets. and Schoettgen. But this is liable to numerous objections (See Wolf); and why embarrass ourselves unnecessarily with Jewish fables? Crellius, indeed, argues that "the water must have flowed with them, or other water must have been supplied by a new miracle; which, had it been the case, would have been recorded." That, however, does not follow; and besides, we know that it was obtained in time of need, and divinely furnished to them. (See supra.)

Upon the whole, the best founded interpretation seems to be that of Calvin, Glass, Wolf, Rosenmuller, and Krause, who understand the ἐξ ημῶν ἐκ πέτρας, not of a natural rock "tanquam causa materialis (to use the words of Wolf) ex qua," but a spiritual rock, "tanquam causa efficiens, a qua illa aqua et pati potest sit." This significatio of ἐκ is found in Matt. 1, 20. Joh. 6, 25. Joh. 18, 2. Rom. 11, 36. And for examples of this significatio Rosenmuller refers to Matt. 21, 25. Joh. 1, 13. Rom. 5, 16. "Here, therefore (Wolf observes) Christ, who, with his omnipotent and gracious presence, attended the Israelites, is represented as the author and fountain
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of the miraculously produced water.” And Krause remarks: “This signal goodness of God was shown to them in the same manner on other occasions (Compare Exod. 17, 6. Num. 20, 10.); so that the water never failed them, but, as it were, followed them. Hence by the usus loquendi, either popular or poetical, this rock might be represented ἀκολουθήσας, for ἀκολουθεῖν signifies sequi, comitari.” This interpretation is, moreover, confirmed by the Greek Commentators. See Chrysost., from whom Theoph. expounds thus: Φησὶν, ὅτι οὕτως ἡ τῆς πέτρας φύσις τοῦτο ἔχορήγει, (ἡ γὰρ ἄν καὶ πρὸ τοῦτου ἀνέβλυσε) ἀλλ’ ἐπέρα τῆς πνευματικῆς πέτρα τῆς εἰργάσατο, τούτοις, ὁ Χριστός. And Theodoret thus: Βούλεται δὲ εἰσεῖν, ὅτι οὐ τοῦτο ἴνα ἐκεῖνης ἡ πέτρα, ἀλλ’ ἡ θεία χάρις ἡ καὶ τῆς πέτρας ἐκείνης παρ’ ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἀναδόθαι τὰ ἡδύρα τῶν ἱδάτων παρασκευάζασα. εἰ γὰρ ἡ πέτρα αὐτοῖς ἰδο- λούθει, ἣ τὰ τῆς πέτρας ἱδάτα, πάσας ἀδιός ἐδεσθησαν ἱδά- των; And Rosenm. suspects that the Jewish traditions meant only to express the sentiment.

4. ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἡν ὁ Χριστός. These words are, by the Commentators, explained according to the interpretations adopted of the preceding. Many render: “This rock signified Christ.”* A very common sense of εἶναι, and which is in itself unobjectionable, and is especially adapted to the first and second interpretations above detailed. Not so to the third, which, if founded in truth, requires that we should here, with the ancient Commentators and many modern ones, as Wolf, Dr. A. Clarke, Rosenm., and Krause, understand Christ himself, who, according to the opinions of the Jews, invisibly accompanied the Israelites through the desert (See the Targum on Is. 16, 1.) ; or suppose a metonymy, with this sense:

* They think there is a correction inherent in the words, which they would thus paraphrase: “Not that the rock from which the Israelites had drunk, accompanied them (as the Jews fable), but Christ is to be understood under the name of that rock which accompanied them.” But this seems too arbitrary and licentious an interpretation, and (as Rosenm. observes) requires πέτρα to be taken in a double sense, natural and figurative.
that rock from which the water flowed was a sign, and indication of the Messiah present and assisting." This interpretation is supported by the authority of the ancient Commentators. Thus Chrysost.: οὐ γὰρ ἡ τῆς πέτρας φῶςς τὸ ὑδάτι ἥφιε, ἀλλ' ἐτέρα τις πέτρα, πνευματικὴ τὸ πάν εἰργάζετο, τούτεστι, ο Χριστὸς ὁ παρῶν αὐτῶς πανταχοῦ, καὶ πάντα θαυμάτωργαν, διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἔστεν, ἀμέλειανσή. And, more clearly, Theophyl.: Τὸ δὲ, ἀκολουθοῦσας, ἔστεν, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ παρῶν αὐτῶς πανταχοῦ, καὶ πάντα θαυμάτωργαν. And so ΟΕcumen.

Hardy, Krause, and Slade introduce, with commendation, the following remark of Le Clerc: "Notum est illo sævo Judæos, quos securi Apostoli, frequentissime ὡς V. T.-comparationes desumere et ad ejus historias ita alludere, ut passim earum verbis utantur in rem suam; non quod censerent ea loca complecti præfigurationes eorum, quibus ea aptabant, sed quia elegantia hoc erat Judaicæ, omnia videri desumere e V. T. Vid. Galat, 4, 24, 25 & 26." So Rosenm.: "Cæterum hæc Pauli disputandi ratio tota est Judaica et Rabbinica. Mori Judaico Paulus se accommodavit." But in the former observation there is much to object to; and as to the latter, the notion of accommodation must be with caution resorted to, (See on 9, 20.), and in no case are we to unnecessarily entangle ourselves with Rabbinical dogmas or Jewish fancies.

Before I conclude this annotation, it may not be improper (for the sake of my younger readers) to animadvert on a strange and incautious remark which Wets. has inserted among numerous Classical citations, which, on that account, wear a somewhat ominous aspect. "To the Jews (says he) who had only drank of the Nile water, and had in Egypt seen no fountains or bubbling brooks, it could not but have seemed strange to behold the water springing from a rock; and yet that this was according to the regular laws of nature; experience shows. And Aristot. observes on this in his Meteor. 1, 2." He then, oddly enough,
brings together several mythological stories of water having been similarly produced either by some God openly, or (as was thought) by secret divine interposition. Thus Antoninus Liber 4. τὸ λουτρὰ τοῦ Ὠρακλεώς ἡ μυθολογούσων Ὠρακλέα πληξαντα πῇ κορώνῃ τῆς πλάκας τοῦ ἄρους ἀναβήναι. Pausan. 3. αἰς ἡμιατο ὧτο δίψης, παίσαι τῇ λόγχῃ τῆς πέτρας, καὶ οὕτω μυθήσας τὸ ὑδρ. Apollon. 1, 1146. ἐτελ οὗτι παρατερεῖν ὅσα τῷ ναίειν Δίδυμον, ἀλλὰ σφιν τῷ ἀνέβραγε δινάδος αὐτῶς ἐκ κορυφῆς ἀλληκτον. Callimach. H. in Jovem 31. Rhea ἔθε καὶ ἀνταυῶσα θεὰ μεγαν ὅροθι πῆχυν πληξεν ὧρος σκήπτρο, τὸ δὲ ἔδειχθα πουλί διεστη, ἐκ δὲ ἔχειν μεγά γεώμα. Eurip. Bacch. 703. θυροῦν δὲ τοῖς λαβοῦσα ἐκτηθεῖσθαι εἰς πέτρας, ὅθεν ἀποβάθης ὤδατος ἐκκενθὰ νοτί. Lucian D. Mar. 63. τῆς γην — ἀναδοθὴν ἐάσω πατάξας τῇ τριάντῃ τῆς πέτρᾳ. Dionys. Hal. Ant. 1; 55. Plut. p. 262 δ. But to what do all these fables tend? Not by any means to invalidate the truth of the miracle recorded by Moses, but rather to confirm it. For there is surely great reason to suppose that these very ancient μύθοι were entirely founded on the true miracle, the account of which had been circulated through most parts of the world, and having been handed down by oral tradition, was at length, by crafty Priests, appropriated to various gods of the Heathens; just as Philostrat., in his life of Apollonius, often grafts into his narration some of the beautiful and interesting traits of the character of our Redeemer, as depicted in the Gospels; which, indeed, considering all things, was infinitely more credible than this appropriation of the ancient mythography.

5. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εἰσόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς. Here we have a remarkable meiosis; q. d. "but with most of them God was much displeased." And then is added (by which the cause may be collected from the effect) καταστράφησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Our Translators have ill rendered the τοῖς πλείοσιν many: which would require πλείοσιν. With the article it always signifies the greater part; and, by a peculiar
idiom found in Scripture, and sometimes in the Classical writers, it signifies so much greater a part as to amount to nearly all: for here only two persons were accepted, Joshua and Caleb, all the rest having perished in the desert. See Num. 14, 16. 29, 30, &c.

Οὐκ εἰσόκησεν is, by Theophyl., well explained, οὐκ ἦρέσθη. So Thucyd. 358, 13. οὐκ ἄρεσκομένος τῇ καταστάσει, where see Valckn. on Herodot. 7, 160. The same use of the word, and with this meiosis, occurs frequently in Herodot., Lucian, and D. Cass.; as Herod, 4, 78. 8, 34. 9, 66. Hence in Dio Cass. 324, 75. for τῇ παρούσῃ καταστάσει ἦρεσθη, I conjecture τ. π. κ. ἦρέσθη. I must not omit to notice that εἰσοκαίν ἐν τῷ is, by the Commentators, rightly accounted a Hebraism formed from דָּעַם.

On the nature and extent of the sins committed by the Israelites in the desert, Commentators variously speculate. Crellius has discussed the subject at great length, and with his accustomed ability; but to enter into this question here would be out of place. Grotius makes the inference: “Idem eveniet multis Christianis qui magnis datis bene non utuntur.”

The κατεστράθησαν is formed on the words of the Sept. in Num. 14, 16. κατέστρωσεν ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ. The word is not well rendered overturned, or cast down. It signifies “they were stretched out, or strewed dead on the face of the desert.”* Wets. has illustrated this from Herodot. 9, 75. κατέστρωσεν οἱ βάρβαροι. Xen. Ráed. 4. οἱ δὲ Πέρσαι —πολλοὺς κατέστρωσαν. Ælian A. N. 7, 2. λοιμὸς δὲ αὐτῶν ἀφὸν συλλαβαῖν κατέστρωσε. See also 2 Macc. 5, 26. 11, 11. 12, 28. And see Jungerm. on Pollux 9, 153. It would appear, then, that the Apostle meant, “slew them in the desert:” and, as Schleus. remarks, that is simply the sense of the Hebrew word in Num. 14, 16. The

* So Sanhedrim, fol. 110, 2. “Hominex, qui in deserto fuerunt, non habuerunt partem in mundo futuro.”
term, it may be observed, here represents death in its most affecting form. It denotes, Theophyl. remarks, τὴν ἀθρασίαν αὐτῶν ἀπολέσας, καὶ τὰς ὑπελάτρις κολάσεις; and is, I think, a most awful image, and indeed type of the eternal perdition of the wicked; as, in fact, is suggested by the words following.

6. ταῦτα δὲ τούτοι ἤμεν ἐγενήθησαν, "These things," i. e. punishments inflicted by God on the Israelites.

Ἐγενήθησαν. Our English Translators render were. And so Beza, fuerunt. It is better rendered by Mackn. have been. But I prefer, with Schleus., sunt: for the past tenses are often used in a present sense.*

This sentiment the Apostle further unfolds at ver. 11. I must not omit to remark, that ἤμεν is for ἤμι; as in a kindred passage of 1 Pet. 5, 3. Τούτως here signifies "an exemplar for imitation;" a signification often found in St. Paul. (See Pole and Schl.) Hardy (from the early Commentators) thus paraphrases: "Exemplaria comminitoria nobis esse debent. In iis tanquam in typo quodam expressit, quid nobis espectandum sit, ut illi, peccemus; poenas nimimum pares.

How this was meant to apply, may be seen detailed in Whitby. Theophyl. well remarks (from Chrys.), that the benefits bestowed on the Israelites were intended to be types to us, as well as the punishments inflicted on them; and he observes, that as in gifts they stood pre-eminent, so did they in punishments.

* In this view, such events are examples to all future ages; which reminds me of what Thucyd. says on the proper use of history: "Οὕτω δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γεγομένων τὸ σαφὲς οἰκεῖν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ ἀνθρώπων, τοιοῦτων ὡς καὶ παρακλητῶν ἐπεστέκα, ὕφελμα κρίνειν αὐτά, ἀρκοῦντ' ἄλλα, which is thus imitated by Dion. Hal. p. 675. ὑπελάτρις κολάσεις τῶν μελλόντων οἱ παράδειγμα ποιομένοι τὰ γεγονότα τῶν ἐσομένων and 685. Polyb. L. 28. ιδα δὲ κεντινομένωι λείπανε τῶν ἑκατέρων δύνανται καὶ τὰς ὑμαις περισσείς τὰ μὲν αἷρα διωτείν, τὰ δὲ φεύγειν ἄλλοι. And to omit numerous other passages which I could adduce, Sophocles has thus briefly and admirably expressed the use of all history; namely, to enable us τὰ καίρα τοῖς ἐκμαίρεσθαι.
6. eis to elwai hymas etiwbwrwds kakow. This is here expressed generally, but further on unfolded particularly.

Our English Translators, and Dodd., render: "that we should not lust after." But the noun etiwbwrw, with the verb substantive, is a stronger expression than if the verb etiwbwerw had been used. So that the sense may be more correctly represented by, "lusts after evil things." The word is somewhat objected to by Pollux,* but it is found in the best writers, as a vox media. So Plato (cited by Wets.) ontow twnw, oI twn kakow etiwbwrwosin etewron de oI twn agaw. Pollux 8. 7. ta etw oI etiwbwrw y. and Theocr. 10. 17. eure theo oI elwron eteis paulatw, to eteis wmeis. One may also compare Habak. 2. 9. "Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness." Grot. observes that the word properly denotes those who, not content with necessaries, seek luxuries and superfluities.

It is remarked by Theophyl. that this general expression is first used, since every evil originates etiwbw. Thus (I add) Thucyd. 9. 45. represents desire and hope as the passions which lead men into evil, and plewta blaktous. Here, however, Theophyl. thinks it has reference to the savoury idol feasts, especially as the words muw eidiw. follow.

7. emde eidoalloatrew ginwde. The construction is here changed from the first person to the second person: then at ver. 8. the first is again used. Then, further on, the persons are again changed, with that grata neigentia so characteristic of the idiotical style, and, in some measure, found even in the best ancient writers.

* I suppose, because these verbs in tws were grown out of favour in his time. Yet they had been much used, for the purpose of imparting vigour to a sentence, by the earlier writers, and even that great model of pure Attic, Thucyd., who in 1. 70. has a whole cluster of them, when describing the Athenians: tolmwrai, evyewrai, aknov prois ymas mellogas, kai apodwmwrai proes evdymotwros.
By εἰδολ. γιν. the Apostle means: "do not, by participation in the idol feasts, seem to be idolaters;" as is plain from the words καθὼς — ώς γέγρα-
tav' Ἐκάθισεν, &c. which have reference to the great sacrificia! feast (to the golden calf) mentioned at Exod. 32, 6. Of this use of the formula, and the words which follow, see the illustrations of Suren-
hus on the quotations p. 541.

'Ἐκάθισεν, "sat down to table." Καὶ ἀνέστησαν
παίζειν. On the sense of παίζειν the Commentators
are not agreed. Some, as Hamm., Fessel, Wolf, &c.
assign to it the impure sense so frequent in the Latin
ludere. But as only public merry-making is meant,
this cannot, I think, be admitted. The most general
opinion is that of Grot., that it refers to the dances
which were performed around the idol to the ho-
nour of the God; as we find from ver. 19. of the
same Chapter. This, too, is supported by the au-
thority of the Greek Commentators, as Theophylact,
whose words are these: χόρους γὰρ στήσαντες περὶ τῶν
μόσχων, ἔπαιζον ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. And also confirmed
by the Rabbinical writers. Elsner, too, strongly
supports this interpretation. Yet his examples are
not all of them apposite; as, for instance, Judg. 10,
25., where Samson, fettered and chained to a pillar,
is ordered παίζειν. Now, in this passage, the word
can only mean leap, tripudiare. And so ludere in
Virg. Æcl. 6, 27. Hor. Carm. 3, 11, 9 & 15, 11.
And as to Herodot. 9, 11. Τακίνθια ἄγετε καὶ παίζετε,
there it only means "keep holiday;" just as the
vulgar use the term to play. His other examples,
however, and those adduced by Loesn. and Krause,*

* Of which the most important is Philo 677 D. (where this very
subject is treated of) εἰτα χρυσοῦν ταῖρον κατεκενεσάμενοι μίμημα
τοῦ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱερωτάτου ζώου δοκούντος εἶναι, θυσια ἄθυτος
ἀνήγαγον, καὶ χόρους ἄχορεύουσιν ἱστασαν, ἕμνους δὲ ἢδον
θρήνων οὐ δενδραφερότας καὶ ἐμφορθεύτως ἀκράτους, δυσφίλη μέθη
κατέσχοντο, τῇ μὲν ἔξι διδυμίας ἐστὶν ἐλέες καὶ ἀφρούμης κωμᾶς ἐν
καὶ παννυχίους, ἄρροφοὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος, ὑδέας κακῶς ἐκπείθουν
ἐφεδρευόντας δίκης. Ταῦτα ἐπιθέσατο Ἡρωδ. 1, 1. ἐς ὁρίσμιον ἄνιστανθαι —
παίζειν.
prove that as παίζεω is very often associated with χορεύειν, it has a strong affinity to it.

After all, however, I am inclined to think, with Elsner and Slade, that παίζεω has here a general notion, similar to that in Herodot. above cited, and 1 Chron. 15, 29. 3 Esdr. 5, 3., which includes leaping, dancing, singing, and all other kinds of festal sport, and does not exclude the first mentioned signification; since there is reason to think that these dances, like most of the Oriental ones, were very indecent. And this is alluded to in Zosim. 4, 39, 7. μέμοι γελοιον, καὶ οἱ κακῶς ἀπολογομένοι ὁρχησταλ, καὶ πάν ὅ, τι, πρὸς αὐτὰρχότης κ. τ. λ.

8. μηδὲ πορνεύομεν, καθὼς τ. ἀ. ἐ., “neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed.” To this idolatry, connected as it was with gluttony and inebriety, necessarily led. The circumstance alluded to is recorded in Num. 25. init., when the Israelites were allured by the Moabitish women to fornication, and, in the end, to idolatry; a crime which was visited by the loss of twenty three thousand* of their number in a battle with the Philistines. Krause remarks that at ἔπεσον there is an ellipsis of νεκροὶ, which is supplied in D. Hal, νεκροὶ πίπτουσιν. There is a similar use of the Heb. יָצַד cadere, and, indeed, in the corresponding words of most modern languages.

The plural πορνεύομεν, Grot. thinks, is used out of modesty, κατὰ κοίνωσιν. And this, he observes, is usual with the Apostle. The principle, however, admits of many exceptions, some in this very Chapter.

By πορν. is here denoted all sorts of illicit connexion with women; and (as Grot. thinks) there is an allusion to the incestuous person. Krause thinks

*The Hebrew text has twenty four thousand, which is confirmed by Philo and Josephus. To reconcile the difference, various methods have been devised, the most probable of which is that of Grotius, Bernard, Ernesti, &c., that twenty three thousand fell by the sword of the enemy, and the other thousand by the Zelote, Phineas and his companions. C. 25, 4 & 5.
the term may here signify "epulis sacris participando scortari," adverting to a sort of spiritual whoredom. This, however, is too far-fetched to be admitted. And it must be remembered that cautions against fornication were necessary in so immoral a place as Corinth. (See Doddr. and Slade.)

9. μηδε ἐκπειράσαμεν τὸν Χριστὸν. On the various readings Κύριον and Θεον it may suffice to refer the reader to Vater and Slade, Dodd. and Whitby. For my own part, I see no necessity for altering the reading to Θεον, which seems to have sprung from Κύριον; and I conceive that the passage, as it stands, affords one of the most illustrious proofs of the divinity of Jesus Christ. See the immortal Defensio Fid. Nic. 1, 1, 15. of Bp. Bull.

The word πειράζεις properly signifies to make trial of any one's ability to do this or that; but it may also denote to try any one's patience, and that in various ways. In respect to God, we may be said to tempt him by perverseness and disobedience of every kind. In the passage of the Old Testament alluded to (Num. 21, 5.), the Israelites tempted God by impatience under evil, despair of deliverance, and an utter want of faith and reliance on God. Those, also, are said to tempt him, who, discontented with present blessings, rudely demand more, as if to try whether God can confer more; and of this the Israelites were guilty. Which of these are meant, and how far they apply to the Corinthians, we cannot, without more knowledge of the circumstances of that Church, exactly determine. The Commentators variously speculate. Theophylact thinks this πειρασ. was, by demanding signs from God: Chrys., that it was, by impatience for the benefits and rewards of the Gospel. Krause explains it of impatience under adversity, and despair of the divine assistance. Others think it was, by asking greater spiritual gifts and supernatural favours, when they had not made a due use of those they had. But that could only apply to a few. Rosenm. thinks it ad-
verts, in a *general* way, to their "yet adhering to the vices against which they had been warned by Paul, as if to see whether God would support the authority of Paul or not." But the opinion of Chrys. and Krause (which is nearly that of Schoettg.) seems to be the best founded.

I cannot but think that the next verse is closely connected with this by a sort of parallelism. Thus Theophyl. explains nearly as Chrysost. had done the preceding: ἐγγύγγυγον λέγοντες, Πότε ἦξει τὰ ἀγαθα, καὶ ἐάς πτερ αἱ κακάσεις; (See also Chrys.)

On the circumstances alluded to by the Apostle, see the passages in the Old Testament and the Commentators in loc. On the fiery serpents see the note of Mackn.

10. ἀπαθοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ. Most Commentators would understand ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλεθροφοροῦ the angel of death, called by the Jews Sammael. But this Storr thinks not agreeable to the account in the Old Testament; and he would take the expression ἀπαθοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ as a pleonasm for ἀπαθοντο. Yet I do not see how a pleonasm can here be well imagined, and I would therefore understand these words of the destroying angel, namely, of death, so often mentioned in the Old Testament. * Rosen. and Krause think that as the *plague* is especially mentioned, the ὀλοθρευτός must be understood as said of it by prosopopeia: as Ps. 28, 49. Exod. 12, 23. Ἡρῴδων Sept. ὁ ὀλοθρευτός. And the same prosopopeia, they ob-

serve, is sometimes ascribed to lightning. This notion, however, seems to me very exceptionable. The principle, indeed, is too often introduced by our recent Commentators, and forms part of a system by which the truth is so diluted, lowered, and explained away by critical and grammatical hocus-pocus, that little or nothing stable remains. As to lightning being personified, that is merely in highly poetical diction. But such examples of lyric boldness are very different from expressions which occur in plain prose, and which therefore admit of no other than the plain and literal sense. It is well remarked by Crellius, that the destroying angel in Exod. 12, 23. is similarly called ὁ ἀλβρευτής.

11. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα—νοοθεσίαν ἴμαν. These words are a repetition, though with greater perspicuity and exactness, of the admonition at ver. 6. (where see the note.)

The reading τοὺπατι is a mere gloss.

When the Apostle says these things happened for our admonition, he must not be considered as intending to confine it to the Corinthians. Such examples (as Mackn. observes) were meant for all succeeding generations who should have any knowledge of their history. See the note on ver. 6. On νοοθεσία (which is Hellenistical for the more elegant Greek term νοοθετήσις) see Schl. Lex.

11. τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰῶνων. This expression is very unhappily rendered in our Common Version, "ends of the world;" as if St. Paul had meant to admonish them that the world was near its conclusion. For although this notion is countenanced by all the ancient Commentators, and many moderns, yet it seems to rest on no foundation, and the error arose among the antients from their imperfect acquaintance with Jewish literature and antiquities. It has, I think, been satisfactorily shown by Lightf. and Schoettg.,

* So Bp. Pearce rightly observes, that "this is not St. Paul’s meaning; for he did not imagine that the end of the world was at hand, as some Commentators have, much to his prejudice, supposed."
that there is an allusion to the Jewish mode of computing the years of the duration of the world. Now they maintained that 6000 years were to form its duration; dividing the whole into three periods; 1. the era before the law, the Patriarchal; 2. that of the Mosaic Dispensation; 3. the Evangelical, or that of the Messiah, מָשִׁיחַ. See Targ. Hier. on Genes. 3, 18. Locke thinks αἰών may denote a considerable length of time passing under some one remarkable dispensation.

Thus the τέλη τῶν αἰώνων denoted the last of the Jewish ages, the times of the New Covenant, that period after which no new law or further revelation would be made by God, the last dispensation of God to man, called αἱ ἐσχαταὶ ἡμέραι and οἱ καιροὶ ἐσχάτων in Acts 2, 17. 2 Tim. 3, 1. Hebr. 1, 2. 1 Pet. 1, 5 & 20., and πλήρεια τοῦ χρόνου or τῶν καιρῶν in Gal. 4, 4. Ephes. 1, 10.

The above sense has been satisfactorily established by Crel., Grot., Light., Schoettg., Olear., Wolf, J. Capell., Parsæus, Locke, Whitby, Pearce,* and Rosen.

12. ἀστεὶ ὅ δικών ἐστάναι, βλεπέτω μὴ πέση, "let him therefore that thinketh he standeth," i.e. firm, or

* He well remarks: "How long this age was to continue, St. Paul undertakes not to teach; and therefore we learn nothing from him concerning the time when the world shall have an end. In Hebr. 1, 2. Christ is said in the same sense to have appeared ἐν τῇ ἐσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ, and in Hebr. 9, 26. St. Paul speaks of Christ's being manifested ἐν τῇ συντέλειᾳ αἰώνων; both which phrases, as well as this in the text, relate not to the end of the world, but to the preceding ages being ended. I have therefore expressed this passage, 'upon whom the last age is come.' Before I leave this head I would observe, that there is a difference in the New Testament between τέλος or συντέλεια αἰώνων, and αἰώνως; for συντέλεια αἰώνως signifies as I have explained it above; but συντέλεια αἰώνως (which we meet with in Matt. 24, 3. and 28, 20.) seems to signify the end of that age in which he who spake then lived, i.e. the end of the world." The learned Prelate is, I conceive, right in rendering, "the last age," or σόν. Schoettgen endeavours to account for the plural in τέλας and αἰῶνων thus: "Extremitates duorum univers, quae se invicem atigerunt, nimirum finis Veteris, et initium Novi Testamenti. His temporibus tunc Paulus et Corinthii vivabant, quibus V. T. ad finem vergebant, Novum vero jam initium sumserat." But this seems very fanciful.
in acceptance with God, viz. (as most Commentators think) by the use of the ordinary means of grace, the sacraments, &c. I think, however, with Chryso- sost. and Theophyl., that there is a reference to the pretended τελείων, who were proud of their superior knowledge: and it is probable that in so wealthy and luxurious a city the Christians were generally too arrogant, and had not enough of Christian humility.

Theophyl. on the use of δεχω (which has been by some thought pleonastical) observes, that it hints they do not really stand, or at least, if their standing be accompanied with arrogance, easy would be their fall.

By τινεσ is meant, not so much "fall into sin and hell" (as Hardy explains) as "fall from grace and a state of salvation," and therefore fail of attaining salvation.

13. πειρασμὸς υμᾶς οὐκ εἶληφεν εἰ μὴ ἀνθρώπων. The connexion here is not very obvious; and, as such, it is variously traced. By Doddr. thus: "It is true indeed, and it is a matter of great comfort and thankfulness to reflect upon." This, however, is very inartificial and unsatisfactory. The connexion is laid down in a very masterly manner by Chrysost., and from him by Theophyl., as follows: Ἡμιν δὲ πολλοὺς ὑπενεγκόντες ἦνε πειρασμός, ίσα μὴ λέγωσι, Τί ἡμᾶς κάθοδεις; Πολλοὺς γὰρ ὑπομείνατες πειρασμοὺς οὐ πεταί- καμάνε· φησιν, ὅτι οὐκ εἶληφεν, υμᾶς πειρασμὸς, εἰ μὴ μικρὸς καὶ σώμμετος ἀνθρώπων γὰρ πανταχοῦ τὸ μικρὸν καλεὶ. Availing himself of this aid, Crell., too, has very well explained the passage. He rightly notices, that there is here an anticipation of an objection. Yet, I think, he takes too confined a view of the Apostle's meaning, when he supposes that the words only relate to the participation in the idol-feasts; q. d. "but surely we are already enough hated without there being any occasion, by further non-compliance, to increase the bitterness of heathen persecu-

* This idiom is well illustrated by Gataker and Grot.
tion." The same view of the subject is also taken by some eminent Commentators, as Whitby and Macknight.

Others understand this of afflications. For the various other interpretations I must refer the reader to Pole, Wolf, &c. The chief fault of all of them is, that they are too confined. I conceive that the πειρασμος was meant by the Apostle to refer to whatever could tempt Christians to forsake their faith and allegiance to their Lord and Saviour, whether the sudden attacks of open persecution, or the perpetual, but not less formidable, effects of hatred and ill will, and the latent, but more dangerous, sapping of their principles by jeers and derision; and lastly, the trials of their virtue by the many temptations to sin which so proverbially immoral a place must have supplied. These, and many other πειρασμοι, including that to which the above Commentators advert, namely, of undue compliance by participation of idol-feasts, may easily be imagined.

To support them under such like trials of their virtue, the Apostle first reminds them that their temptation is no more than human nature is liable to, and therefore able to bear. This sense of ἀνθρωπος is frequent both in Scripture and in the Classical writers. Thus Theophyl. explains it σύμμετρος. And Schleus. compares Ἱερ. Cy. 1, 31, 40. ἀνθρωπίνα ἀμαρτάνειν. Polyb. 1, 6, 1. ἀνθρωπίνη κακία; and especially Ἁeschyl. Pers. 703. ἀνθρώπεια δ' ἀν τοι πάτρα ἐνόχει βρατοῖς. To these I add Thucyd. 8, 40, 5, 103. and Sophocl. Ed. Col. 598. Οἰδειν οἶδαι, ὥστε, δεινά, πρὸς κακοίς κακά. Θεσ. τι γὰρ τὸ μείζον ἢ κατ' ἀνθρωπον νοσεῖς.

Then, as Theophyl. observes, he consoles them by bidding them look up unto God, who is faithful,* viz. to his promises, and will never deceive.

* Some recent Interpreters, and among these Schleus., following J. Capell., have assigned to πιστος the sense benignus; appealing to 1 Cor. 1, 9. 1 Thess. 5, 24. 2 Thess. 3, 5. 1 Pet. 4, 19. But this seems a groundless and unwarrantable refinement. On the sense
The construction ὅς ὦκ ἐκάσει seems to be idiomatic and Hellenistical for καὶ ὦκ ἐκάσει; καὶ being taken in the sense inasmuch as. At δὲ δύνασθε there is an ellipsis either of πράγμα, or μέρος, or the like. Ττενεγκε, too, must be supplied from the context, and that (which is rare) from the following words. Theophyl: well explains: “cause that the temptation shall be proportioned to your real strength,” or else (as every temptation is greater than our power, unless he help us), “exert his interposition to bring it to an issue in our deliverance.”

18. ἀλλὰ ποιήσει σ. τ. τ. κ. τ. ζ. “he will, together with the trial (unto which he hath permitted us to be exposed) make an ἐξάσει, i. e. a way out, i. e. contrive a way of deliverance from it. So Theophyl. ἀπαλλαγή. Phavorin. explains it τὴν παίσιν. Schleus. (after many Commentators) renders, “hunc exitum.”

But this seems far less suitable, and does not correctly represent the sense of the τὴν, which is this: “He will contrive the (i. e. such a) mode that shall deliver us.”

19. τοῖν δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς ἔπεεγκειν, is for εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς. At these words the Commentators causelessly stumble, and refine too much. The sense is simply, “that we may, at least, be able to bear the trial (if

commonly ascribed to the word Crel. has an excellent note; but my limits will only permit me to introduce the following remark: “Fidelis vocatur Deus, quia non solum dictis et convertis stet, sed etiamis nulli aperte promissionis obligation intercesserit, id faciat, quod eum facere consentaneum est, ita ut nullâ ex parte officio suo desit, nec quemquam in eo, quod merito nec iurià sibi a Deo spondeat, destituat. Promiuit autem Deus, nobis in tentationibus suam opem et auxilium, quo frettie cuncta possimus sustinere. Ex quo sequitur, eum nihil, quod vires nostras excedat, et intolerabile sit, nobis imponi passurum esse. Sed etiamis nobis istud aperte et expressè non promississet, quia tamen nos ad sempiternam felicitatem bonā fide vocavit, hae ipse res id ab eo exigit, ne nobis unquam desit, neque nos ob imbecilliatem nostram perire et salute excidere patiatur.” See also Whitby and Suicer’s Thes. 2, 740. Doddridge compares Ps. 103, 13 & 14., and observes, that there are numberless passages in which God encourages his people to hope for his presence and help in pressing dangers.
God does not see fit to deliver us altogether out of it." For in the former case ἐκβάω is applicable, since God's help to support trials leads to our deliverance out of them. See Chrysost. and Origen, as cited by Mr. Valpy.

The word ἀνευγκεῖν is a strong term, and signifies to bear up under. Numerous examples are adduced by Wets. of the ἀνεφερεῖν, both in its physical sense (by which loads are said to be borne) and its metaphorical, by which labours, troubles, sicknesses, and the tempers of men are to be endured.

14. διάπερ, ἀγαπητὸi μου, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας. The best Commentators are agreed that the Apostle does not mean to bid them fly from idolatry itself, (since of that no Christian could be supposed guilty,) but all approximation to it, or whatever might draw them over thereto, such as participation in idol feasts, which, as it countenanced idolatry, partook of its nature. Thus the Apostle returns* to the subject treated of at c. 8, namely, the eating of idol meat; and shows how far it is lawful, and how far unlawful. He first shows that it is not lawful for them to eat at idol feasts; since that is a kind of idolatry, 14—24.: but that it is lawful for them to eat the flesh that had been so offered, when sold in the market and set on private tables, 25—33. In order to evince the necessity for this abstinence from participation in heathen rites, he lays down the position, that every sacrificial feast is a kind of worship, or association in the worshipping of the deity to whose honour the feast is instituted. And this he illustrates by two examples, one taken from the Christian Lord's Supper; the other, from the sacrifices of the Jews; from which he at ver. 20. draws the conclusion, that Christians who were accustomed to be present at Heathen sacrificial feasts were considered by other heathens as persons favourable to

* The particle διάπερ is, I conceive, indicative of this transition. See 1 Cor. 8, 13. and 14, 3.
their idolatrous religion, in the same manner as those who were present at the sacred feasts of the Christians, thereby declared publicly that they belonged to the society of Christians.

Such is the view of the scope of the Apostle in the remaining part of the chapter taken by Rosenm. and Krause (from Griesbach and the best of the early Commentators), which is confirmed by Chrysost., Theophyl., and the other Greek Commentators.

15. The Apostle prefaced his remarks with an expression which, as Theophyl. observes, καταλαθίωσε τὸ τραχὺ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ αὐτῶς τοὺς ὑπευθύνους κρίνας καθίσει. It is also observed by Theophyl., that the words κρίνετε ύμεῖς ὑπὲρμα indicate the Apostle’s reliance on his own reasonings, as true and convincing; and the κρίνετε implies that he desires no other judges of their truth and reasonableness. With this I would compare the prefatory dict of Pythagoras, ἀείσω συνετος.

16. τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὑπὸ εὐλογηθένθη, &c. In interpreting this verse, it is, I think, of importance to keep in view the popular cast of the expressions, which is perceptible in the anacoluthon in the first clause, and especially in the use of the verb substantive for some other word, such as the context must suggest. Had our Roman Catholic brethren borne this in mind, they could not have fallen into the error they have done, of supposing the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

On the sense of τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, הַלַכ מְלִיבֵל Commentators are not quite agreed. (See Pole, Wolf, and others.) The best Commentators, for the last century, are of opinion that it stands for τὸ ποτήριον εὐλογηθένθη, or εὐλογηθένθη, “the cup for which we return thanks to God,” or “over which,” &c. This, they think, was an usual mode of expression to denote the Eucharist, and adopted from what was called the cup of blessing * in the Paschal feast; and the

* Of the use of this term Wetstein adduces numerous Classical citations.
cup, they say, was sanctified, or consecrated by thanksgiving. This interpretation is much confirmed by the Fathers and antient Commentators. So Chrysost.: τοτερίων εὐλογίας ἐπάλεγεν, ἐπέκειν αὐτῷ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες· οὕτως αὐτὸν ἀκουομένης, θεωράμαζον· τε ἐκπληττομένοι τῆς ἀφάτου δαιμόνιας, εὐλογοῦσις ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸ τούτο ἐξήγειν. And a little before: εὐλογίαι ὅταν εἶπαν πάντα ἀναστύσασα τὸν τῆς εἰεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ δήσωμαι, καὶ τῶν μεγαλῶν ἔκειναν ἀναμιμητικοῦ δαιμόνια· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἢμεῖς ἐκπληττόμενοι τῷ ποτήριῳ τὸς ἀφάτους εἰεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἀποελαίωσαμεν, οὕτως αὐτὸ προσάγαμεν καὶ καταφθάναμεν, εὐχαριστοῦμεν ὅτι τῆς πλάνης ἐξήλευσε τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος. And so Theophyl.

But, to proceed to consider the sense of ἐὐλογοῦμεν, on this the modern Commentators are not agreed. Various interpretations, with more or less of truth, may be seen detailed in Pole. I can only advert to two which are the most probable. 1. That of many early modern Commentators (especially the English non-conformists), Pisc., Calvin, Beza, Gataker, and others, who explain, "sanctify by holy solemn prayer, consecrate to a sacred use." And this interpretation is adopted by Doddridge, who remarks, that "that is said to be blessed which is set apart to a sacred use (as Gen. 2, 3. and Ex. 20, 11.), and on which the blessing of God is solemnly invoked." But this is entirely unsupported by any antient authority, and seems too harsh an application of the word to be admissible. The best founded interpretation appears to be that of Chrysost., ÓEcumen., and the other antient Commentators, which has been adopted by various eminent modern ones, as Erasm., Beza, Vorst., Vatab., Grot., and almost all those of the eighteenth century, who take εὐλογεῖν as put for εὐχαριστεῖν; as εὐλογία for εὐχαριστία at Matt. 26, 26. (where see the note.) Compare also Matt. 14, 19. Luke 9, 16. Mark 6, 41. 8, 7, 14, 22. Now as He to whom we give thanks is God, so it appears that τὸ ποτήριον εὐλογεῖν is equivalent to εὐλογεῖν τὸν Θεόν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποτηρίου. Thus Photius explains it, εὐχαριστεῖν.
In this view, the Commentators (as Krause) cite Justin. Mart. Apol. 1, 86. τὴν δὲ εὐχὴν λόγου τοῦ παρ' αυτοῦ εὐχαριστησίαν τρέφην, ἐξ ὧς αἷμα καὶ σαρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκεῖνον τοῦ σαρκοτωμοῦστος Ίησοῦ, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα εὐδοκῆμεν εἶναι. See Vorst. Philol. Sacr. p. 207. and Dr. Cudworth's Discourse concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper.

Yet it may be admitted, that by this εὐχαριστία pronounced over the cup, it is really consecrated and sanctified. For, by blessing and returning thanks to God and to Christ, we sanctify and segregate the cup from other cups, and make it fit to be used for so holy an occasion. On this subject (which it would be here out of place to treat at large) I beg to refer my readers to the Anti Muratorius de Rebus Liturgicis of the learned and orthodox Ernesti, and inserted in his Opusc. Theolog. especially p. 15—22.

But to proceed, οὕτω κοινωνία τοῦ σάματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ is an idiomatic or popular expression, in which the ἐστι, according to the best Interpreters, antient and modern, imports signifies, "is the symbol of:" or, as others explain, "is a participation of:" So that the sense of the passage may be thus expressed: "Those who partake of the Lord's Supper are κοινωνοὶ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ τοῦ σάματος Χριστοῦ, and thereby form one society of worshippers of Christ, and commemorators of his death and sacrifice for sin." And this interpretation is very much confirmed by the antient Commentators. Thus Rosenm. cites Theodoret. But Chrysostom is yet more apposite. He says that "we are, by partaking of the sacramental elements, considered as united with God." So also Ecumen. 515 A. οὕτω κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστι; συνάστει γὰρ ήμᾶς τῷ Χριστῷ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, σὺς μέλη τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τῆς μεταλήψεως. And Phot. ibidem. 'Ἀποδεικνύεις ἐστι τοῦ εἰρήμενου τὸ ἐπαγόμενον ἡδονήν γὰρ δῆλον, φησίν, ὅτι τὸν ἄρην δὴ κλώμεν κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστι, τούτῳ δὲ εἰς κοινωνίαν ἡμᾶς τοῦ σώματος συνάγει τοῦ Χριστοῦ; ἡδονήν ὑπομενόν.
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δι' εν σώμα ἐσμέν καὶ καλούμεθα οἱ πάντες Χριστοῦ συναπτόμενοι, οἳ τοῦ κοινοῦ σώματος κεφάλι, εἰ ὡς μὴ τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ αἵματι εἰς κοινωνίαν συνηγόμεθα, τινὶ ἂν ἐπέφη ἐν σώμα ἦμεν καὶ ἐκαλούμεθα. Grotius and Wetstein compare a not dissimilar sentiment in Val. Max. 6, 2. "Scipio Jovis epulo cum Gracco concordiam communicavit."

The idiom ἄρτον for ἰ ἄρτος ὑν (by which the antecedent follows the case of its relative) is very trite, and the Commentators compare the well known "urbem quam statuo, vestra est." There is an ellipsis of some words equivalent to quod attinet ad. It must, however, be observed, that this idiom carries with it emphasis, and imparts energy to a sentence; as in Soph. Ed. Tyr. 451. λέγω δὲ, τῶν ἄλλων τούτων ὑν πάλαι ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ εἶναι ἐνθάδε.

Upon the whole, it is plain that the Apostle introduced this illustration from the Eucharist, to show that as Christians who participate in the Lord's Supper are supposed, by commemorating his expiatory death, to be united with Christ, and to publicly profess that they belong to the Christian society; so, by a parity of reasoning, those who participate in Heathen sacrificial feasts must thereby be supposed to profess an union with idolaters, in faith and practice, or at least to be favourably inclined to idolatry.

17. δι' εἰς ἄρτος, &c. These words are explanatory of the preceding.

'Aratos signifies, not bread, but loaf, or cake; as often. See Schl. Lex. Πάλλοι is here (as frequently) for πάντες. The sense is, "as the loaf is one, so we, who are many, (i. e. we all,) are one body." Whitby (after Hamm. and Locke) paraphrases thus: "Because the bread is one, one loaf being broken for us all, we who partake of it, being many, are one body; owning ourselves thereby all members of that body, of which Christ is the head." So Rosen. "Unam constituimus societatem arctissimè conjunctam, sicut ex multis granis et farinae particulis factus est unus panis, et plura membra inter se conjuncta constituunt
corpus." There is here also an allusion to the Paschal feast, in which it was customary to break a loaf, or cake, of unleavened bread. See the note on Matt. 26, 26.

Elsner has here (as Doddridge observes) an admirable note, to show that eating together in a religious manner has been, in almost all antient nations, a token of friendship.\* "And it is certain (continues Doddridge), as is intimated below, that by sacrifices, and the feasts on them, they held communion with the real or supposed deity to which they were presented.

18. Ἐκτένετε τῷ Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα; οὐκ ἦν ἐστὶ διαθήκη, &c. Now follows another example, taken from the Jewish rites, to shew the force that resides in a feast conjoined with religious observances. Moses, it must be observed, had instituted certain feasts, at which those who had offered up victims were enjoined, not only to dispense thereof to their family, servants, and friends, but distribute the relics among poor strangers. See Deut. 16. Thus it would be evident that those who attended at the idolatrous rites in question participated in idolatry. Here Wetstein, among other passages, cites Philo, T. θ. p. 245, 19. κοινωνία τοῦ βασιλέως.

19. Εἰσέπερ, consider. By Ἰσραήλ κατὰ σάρκα is meant, "the Israelitish nation considered as one family, in respect of ancestry, religion, &c. The words κατὰ σάρκα indicate that the Apostle means the Jews by birth and hitherto unconverted, not the Jewish Christians, who are in Gal. 6, 16. Rom. 9, 6.

\* I cannot, however, but consider some of Elsner's citations little to the purpose. Besides, the simply eating together, or being admitted to any one's ἔστιν, or fire-side, was supposed, in ancient times, to imply a sort of sacred association and friendship; for it included participation in sacred rites, since the ἔστιν had a little altar. So Jamb. de V. P. 18. τὸ γὰρ ἄρχαν τευτικὸν χαρακτῆρα ἔτη ἐν ἀρχηγοὶ κοινωνία ὁ πλοῦς. Thus in Thucyd. 1, 196. Themistocles, when he wished to be the ιερὺς of Alcmena, is said καταὶς εἴτε τῆς ἔστιν.
and often elsewhere called Ἰσραήλ κατὰ πνεῦμα. (Krause.)

18. οὐχὶ οἱ ἑσθιοῦτες τὰς δυσᾶς, κ. τ. λ. ἐ. “Are not those who eat of the flesh of the victims supposed to be participators in the worship of the altar to the honour of the God thereof?” So Whitby: “They, by partaking of the gift consecrated to the altar, of which one part was consumed upon it, partake with the altar, and own that they communicate with and worship that God, at whose altar or table the meat was offered in honour of him.”

The application and conclusion to be drawn is obvious. See the Paraphrists.

19. Here again, as at 8, 4., the Apostle adverts to those arguice by which some defended this familiar society with Pagans, and shows that, even their own premises being conceded, the conclusion thence drawn would not follow; since the cause of censure was seated in this, that the Pagans must necessarily suppose that Christians who were present at their sacred feasts worshipped the deities to whose honour those feasts were instituted. (Krause.)

19. τί οὖν φημι; “what then do I conclude?” “what is my meaning? That an idol is any thing, or is of any effect! Or, that the idol-meat is any thing? (i.e. differs from other meats.) No: this is not my meaning. I grant that an idol is nothing, and that meat offered to idols differs in nothing from other meat. But that it is lawful for Christians to be present at the Heathen sacrificial feasts, that I do not grant. (Rosem.) This is all the explanation that the words require. On the sense of οὐχὶ οὐτί see the note supra 8, 4. The ellipsis of οὐχὶ after an interrogative sentence, (as here at εἰσέχω, τι ἐστιν;) is not confined to the Scriptural, but is also found in the Classical writers; and examples from Arrian, Diss. 1, 29. 4, 7. & 2, 23. are cited by Raphael; to which I add Liban. Or. 104 d. κεράνων ἑκατερον ἄθρειος; (οὐχὶ) ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτος κατένευεν. On
this idiom see Hoog. de Partic. p. 9. If I am not mistaken, it sometimes is found in Plato.

20. ἐαυτοῖς θεοί, καὶ θεοί. The Commentators do not here attend to the omission of the article, but render θεοί God. But Jehovah the Apostle could not mean. It should rather be rendered, “a God (much less the great God.)” By the δαιμ. are meant the falsely called Gods of the Heathens; and the word is used by the Apostle in the sense in which it is employed by the Jewish writers. Thus the Sept. use the term to denote the Heb. בֶּן לֵךְ (i. e. the Pseudo-Deities of the Heathens,) at Ps. 46, 5. And so Deut. 32, 17. (which passage seems to have been in the mind of the Apostle,) ἐνυπαν δαιμονίων καὶ θεοί, Hebr. בַּלְשָׁן. Yet the term was sometimes applied by the Heavens themselves to their Deities; as appears from Xen. Mem. 10, 1. Arist. Rhet. 2, 23. and other passages referred to by Schl. Lex. in voc. §. 3. See Grotius, Macknight, and Pearce. It is observed by Mede ap. Pole, that it was the opinion of the Heathens, that the supreme and celestial Deities were to be worshipped with a pure mind, accompanied with hymns and praises; the Demons, with sacrifices. And he refers to Porphyry on Eu-seb. Præp. Evang., Herm. Trismeg. in Æsculapio, and Apulej. de Daemonio Socratis.

20. ού δέλω δε ωμᾶς κ. τ. δ. γ., “but I would wish you,” &c. By κοιν. γίνεσθαι is meant, “to partake of the meat placed upon those tables.” And the reason is evident, because the Demon himself was supposed to be personally, though invisibly, present.* and as at 1 Cor. 5, 11. it is enjoined, with such an

one (i.e. an immoral brother, a fornicator) no not to eat, much less was it allowable to eat at a table where a Demon was supposed to be present. So Chrysost. (cited by Krause.) ei γὰρ ἄπ᾽ ἀνθρώπων τὸ κοιμανεῖν ἀλλα καὶ τραπέζης φιλίας ἀφομίη καὶ σύμβαλον γίνεται, ἐγχαρεῖ καὶ ἐπὶ δαιμόνων τούτο συμβήναι.

21, οὗ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν, &c. The δύνασθε is to be taken in a popular sense; q. d. “Ye cannot, consistently with your obligations to Christ and to God; ye ought not; it is not suitable, and therefore not lawful for you,” &c. So Glass, Crell., Grotius, and Vorstius. On this idiom see Suic. Thes.

Ποτήριον Κυρίου, the cup, i.e. the Sacrament celebrated in honour of the Lord. The ποτήριον δαιμόνων alludes to the cup poured out at the Heathen libations to the Gods, and drunk at the sacrificial feasts. So Virg. Æn. 8, 273. (cited by Wets.) “Quare agite, Ο juvenes, tantarum in munere laudum, cingite fronte comas, et pocula porgite dextris, Communemque vocate Deum, et date vina volentes.” Where see Heyn. Now to drink of this vinum libationis was strictly forbidden by the Jewish Rabbis. So, among the Rabbinical citations in Wets., Horajoth, fol. 2, 1. “Quinam est apostata? qui edit morticina et a bestiis discræpta, abominabilia et reptilia, et bibit vinum libaminis.” Krause notices that this passage is elegantly interpreted by Origen, c. C. 397. as follows: ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐ, ὅσον ἐπὶ βραδυμασί τὸ συνεστισθαι δαιμόνι τούτου ἄλλους οὐκ ἱσμέν, ἢ καθώς τὰ καλαίμην παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἱερὸντα ἐκδει τῖς, καὶ πίνει τὸν τῶν παρὰ τοῖς δαιμόνιοις γυνομένων σπονδών οἶνον. He observes, too, that τραπέζης depends on μέρος understood; and he cites a passage of Lys. p. 271. where it is supplied. Yet so rare is the complete phrase, and so trite is the subaudition, that I should suspect the μέρος to be from the margin, but that a passage of Æschyl. Ag. 490. occurs to me, which sets this question at rest: οὐ γὰρ ποτήριον—θανῶν μεθέβειν φιλτάτων τὰφου μέρος. Of the
phrase μετέχειν τραγωδίας examples are adduced by Loeenser, Wetstein, and Krause. See also Groovon. on Herod. 4, 154. Wetstein also cites a curious Rabbinical passage, where it is said: "Tres quicibum capiunt in una mensa, et conserunt in ea verba legis, perinde est ac si comeditissent de mensa ipsius Dei S. D.

22. παραγγελών τιν Κύριον; Παραγγελών* is by almost all the Commentators here taken to signify irritate, provoke, like the Hebr. נָא and נוּר, which the Sept. render sometimes by παραγγελων, sometimes by παρείσεως, and παρεργίζειν. So Deut. 9, 21. παρείσαραν με εις ου θεον, παραβιβαναν με εις τωι ειδολειοις αυτων. (Which passage the Apostle seems to have had in view.) I am, however, inclined to think (with Beza, Est., and our English Translators, supported by the Syr.) that the common signification of παραγγελων, found also in Rom. 11, 11. (where see the note,) may be retained; since God is, in the Decalogue, and in various parts of the Old Testament, described, in reference to idolatry, as a jealous God, who will not permit his glory to be given to another; and, as Doddridge observes, "there may be an allusion to idolatry as a kind of spiritual adultery, such too was the opinion of Olearius, Wolf, and Pearce, whom see.

22. μη ἐνχωρετειν αυτω δένειν; "Are we stronger than He, that we can venture thus to provoke him, and brave his wrath." This, Theophylact observes, is said εις άτονοι λέγειν εκάγειν.

23. πάντα με εξεστιν, &c. The Apostle now returns to what he had treated of at c. 8., namely, on abstinence from certain meats. (Krause.) q. d. "All

* This term generally signifies to provoke to emulation; as in Rom. 10, 19.; but ἐνχωρεῖν will denote any of the more fervent affections, especially wrath; and the παρά has sometimes an intensive force, of which Vigerius instances παραδιδοναι and παραθερμαίνειν. But in the former word the παρά has the sense of into, or unto. I add παραθήγων, Dionys. Hal. 483, 39.
things (I repeat) are permitted to me:” for the words occur supra 6, 12. where see the note.

In the next clause, Crellius observes, the objection and its solution is repeated; but ὀἰκοδομεῖ is substituted for συμφέρει, by a parallelism. And the same view is taken by most recent Commentators. But to this I cannot assent. It seems to be not so much a parallelism as a reiteration of the gnome, with a slight change, by way of explanation. It should appear, too, that a stress is meant to be laid upon μει, myself.

Grotius remarks on the transition from the second person to the first; and he has discerned the true reason for it, namely, because it is a gnome of universal application, in which case the first person is used, populariter. Yet I suspect that μει ought to be referred to an ἔργον left to be supplied after οἰκοδομέ. And indeed the same view is taken by Chrysostom, who well observes, that the Apostle, in using the two terms συμφ. and ὀἰκ., means the former ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, and the latter ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, one’s fellow Christian; and in ὑπέρ συμφέρει has reference to his own destruction; in ὀἰκ. ὀἰκ., to the laying a stumbling block in the way of one’s brother. So also Theophylact, Ecumenius, and Theodoret. The only modern Commentator who has seen this is Crellius, who explains, “Μὴ ὁμοίως αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔργον ἐκαστὸς. Many Commentators take this as a general maxim; and compare that in 1 Cor. 13. “Charity seeketh not her own.”

But that passage is not

of general application; neither is this. Both are to be restricted to the case in question, and the subject matter. Here there can only be reference to the use of idol-meats and other ἀδιάφορα. So the Greek Commentators, Crelius, and the best modern Interpreters. It is thought by Pearce and Rosenm. that there is an ellipsis of μόνον and καλ. But this gloss I can scarcely approve. The Apostle seems to mean, that we should not consider our own gratification at all, when it injures the spiritual good of our neighbour, and in all cases prefer it to our own. So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) τὸ ἐκεῖνον σύμφερον χρῆ πρωτιμᾶν καὶ προαιρεῖσθαι τοῦ ἱδίου. And so Crelius: "Monet et præcipit, ut quisque in rerum per se licitarum usu non suum commodum quærat, quod non nisi carnale et exiguum esse potest: sed ut ad proximi commodum, quod cum salute ejus conjunctum est, respiciat."

25. πῶς τὸ εὖ μακελλῳ πωλούμενον ἔσθε. The Apostle now gives a rule for their conduct as to the eating of idol-meats, by which he both leaves room for Christian liberty, and again tempers it with due regard to the spiritual good of others. (Crelius.)

Πῶς τὸ εὖ μ. π. This evidently refers to idol-meat being sometimes sold in the market (as we know it was) by the priests, nay some poor or mean persons, who (as we learn from Theophr. C. 8.) used sometimes to salt it, and lay it up for private use. On μακελλ. a Latin word like φλαγελλοῖν, see Schl. Lex. Plut. (Quæst. Rom.) explains it by κρεατοῖν. These were neither regular built shops, nor booths, but only stalls set out in a certain part of the forum.

25. μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες. On the meaning of ἀνικρ., the modern Commentators are not quite agreed. Some render it discriminantes. But the Greek Commentators, and the most judicious of the modern ones, are agreed that it signifies "making no enquiries." Here Lightfoot observes; "Innumerabilibus serè scrupulis in conviviis suis vexebantur Judæi quoad rem comedendam, ut et quoad societatem
quácum est comestum, et modo comedendi. De fructibus et oleribus mensæ appositis, an rite decimata, an sacrata aut profana, an mundâ aut pollutâ. De carne appositâ, an ea de Idolothyris, de dilaceratis, de suffocatis, de non rite mactatis. Quæ omnia abolevit Evangelium."

It is rightly remarked by Theophylact, that after having bid them abstain from idol-meat; lest they become too scrupulous on that head, the Apostle gives them a general rule to direct their conduct.

25. διὰ τὴν συνειδησίαν. This is not well rendered by Doddridge, "with a view to satisfying your conscience." It may refer either to the conscience of others, lest by so doing you raise needless scruples, or your own, i. e. lest, on enquiry, you should learn that it is idol-meat, and your conscience be wounded if you eat it. Or, if you ascertain that it is not so, your conscience be unnecessarily disturbed.

26. τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου, &c. These words refer solely to the second interpretation of διὰ τὴν συνειδησίαν above detailed; and the sense is: "You need none of you feel scruples in your own minds: for as the earth and all its productions are the Lord's, there is nothing naturally impure, but only so in the opinion of any one. So Theophylact. Of the modern Commentators, Crellius has best explained the sense. The words are from Ps. 34, 1. which may be compared with 1 Tim. 4, 4. The πλήρωμα (which answers to the Hebr. פלאים,) signifies whatever fills up the world, all God's creatures, whether animate or inanimate. See πλήρωμα θαλάσσης in Ps. 96, 11. and elsewhere.

27. καλεῖ, scil. ἐπὶ δεῖνον, "invites you." This sense of καλεῖ, sometimes with, but usually without, the addition of δεῖνον, is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Of course, the δεῖνον here is supposed not to be an idol-feast. Ἐλέτε, choose; which (as Theophylact observes) also expresses the Apostle's permission. Παρατιθέμενον, "set upon the table." This is a vox solennis de hac
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re, and occurs both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. So Xenoph. Cyr. 2. (cited by Krause.) ἂν δὲ τὰ μὲν παρατιθέμενα ἢ τὰ τοιαύτα τέ καὶ τῶν καινωπών οὖν δὲ τὸ διήκον.

28. εἰ δὲ τὰς ὑμᾶς ἀπήν. Τίνος εἰδωλοθυτῶν ἦτο. Some eminent Critics, as Gale, Bengel, and Schleusner, would read, with three MSS. and some Latin Fathers, κεροβυθίνος for εἰδωλθ. But that depends upon who the τις may be supposed to represent: if the host, then, as Wetstein observes, he would use the term employed by Heathens, not the contemptuous one used by Jews or Christians: but if, as is more probable, we are to understand by τις some scrupulous Christian, then εἰδωλοθυτῶν must be the true reading. As, then, probability is entirely in favour of the second interpretation of τις, and authority almost wholly with εἰδωλοθυτῶν, certainly that reading ought to be retained.

28. μὴ ἔσθιε, δι' ἕκειν τὸν μηνύσαντα, Χ. τ. σ. There is some difficulty in the interpretation of this sentence, owing to the extreme brevity with which it is worded. The difficulty rests with δι' ἕκειν τῷ μηνύσαντα, καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν by not attending to the sense of which words many have taken a wrong view of the whole passage; and some have thought that the words following, τοῦ γὰρ — αὐτῆς ought to be cancelled. Now the sense of τῶν μηνύσαντα must depend upon the interpretation of the τις just before. If it signify (as I think it must) weak brethren, then διὰ will signify, "on account of," "in deference to the scruples of." The words following, καὶ τῶν συνείδησιν, are exegetical, and as τὴν συνείδησιν is put (as the Apostle himself just after explains) for τὴν συνείδησιν αὐτῶν, or τῶν ἐτερῶν, so here there is a kind of hendiadis, and the sense is: "eat not, out of respect to the conscientious scruples of him who told thee."

Then follow the words τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου — αὐτῆς, which clause is omitted in seven uncial MSS. and a few others, with the Vulg. and some Latin Fathers, together with the Copt., Αἰθιοπ., and Arm. Ver-
sions, and it has been rejected by most modern Commentators, as an inept insertion, and thrown out by the recent Editors; but, I think, on insufficient grounds. The weight of authority is in favour of the clause. For besides the immense preponderance of MS. testimony, it is supported by all the Greek Fathers and Commentators, especially Chrysostom, who supposes an ellipsis; and he, in conjunction with Theophylact, paraphrases thus: "I do not bid you abstain from them as being harmful, but for the conscience of, &c. For that they are not naturally impure, I have already told you. The earth is," &c. So Theodoret: καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐσθίειν τοῦτο τέθεικεν, καὶ ἐν τῷ μὴ ἐσθίειν διδάσκων ὁς καὶ μεταλαμβάνοντας εἰδέναι δεῖ, ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα ποιήσατα καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν μὴ ἐσθίοντας τοῦτο προσέκει πεπείσθαι. And so Schlitting, who well observes: "Egregiè Apostolus illam ipsam rationem hic attulit, ut eam in tali casu non tantum non valere, sed etiam in contrarium valere ostenderet."

Some antient and modern Commentators, as Doddridge, take it to mean, "abstain, therefore, from this food, for as the earth is, &c. so all things are open to you, and you may satisfy yourself with other food." But this seems too harsh. Phot. ap. Æcum. has expounded the passage with his usual ability.

29. ἵνα γὰρ ἡ ἐδεικνύω μου καὶ εῖται ὑ. ἡ. σ. There is some obscurity in this sentence, and a seeming incoherence, which has caused difference of opinion. The difficulty has been occasioned by the great brevity and abruptness of the composition.

Many eminent modern Commentators have endeavoured to remove this difficulty by supposing a change of person; taking these to be the words of an objector. But if so they would not, I think, have been introduced with γὰρ. Besides, this is merely suppositional, and there is no appearance of an answer to the objection. Others, as Hamm. and Doddridge, attempt to remove the difficulty by inserting a clause, thus, "as to what lies between
God and my conscience." That, however, is too arbitrary and precarious.

The difficulty has, I think, been occasioned by the idiomatic and popular use of κρίνεται, which seems to signify, "is to be condemned;" κρίνειν being here used for κατακρίνειν. So that ἵνα ἡ ἐλευθερία μου κρίνεται may be rendered, "what occasion is there that my liberty should be condemned?" And this interpretation is supported by the authority of Chrysostom and the Greek Commentators. So ӨEcumen. 520 a. paraphrases: Τις γὰρ χρεία ἵνα τὸ ἐλευθερίαν μου, τούτεστι τὸ ἀπαραίτητον μου καὶ ἐλευθερίαν, ὑπὸ ἄλλας συνειδήσεως; τούτεστι κατακρίνειται ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ Ἐλλήνου συνειδήσεως: where for ἀπαραίτητον I would read ἀπαρατήσεις, from Chrysostom and Theophylact. Mr. Locke's interpretation (which has been followed by many Commentators, as Wolf, Hardy, Slade, and Valpy) comes to the same thing; as does also that of Rosenm.

'Ωντι is an elliptical formula for τι γέγονεν; ἵνα.

30. εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω, τι βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν οὐ εὐχαριστῶ; In these words there is a difficulty, which, I think, is best removed by the Greek Commentators. (See Chrysostom and Theophylact.) ӨEcumen. 520 b. thus excellently paraphrases: εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω. Διὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῇ ὑστάσει μου τὴν ψυχήν ὑπὲρ τὴν πονήσασαν, διὸ πεπείσθαί μηδὲν τοιαύτῳ μολύνεσθαι: θαρρῶν οὖν τὴ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστί. Εἰ δὲ, φησὶν, ἐκ χάριτος Θεοῦ γέγονες τέλειος, ἀλλη εἰδέναι μηδὲν εἰναι τὰ εἰδώλα, καὶ καθηγημένην, αἰς λέγεις, ἔχεις τὴν ψυχὴν, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν παραβλάπτεσθαι, κἂν μετασχεῖν θυλήθη τῶν εἰδωλοθυτῶν, τι βλασφημεῖσθαι σαυτῷ προσκευάζεις, καὶ διὰ σου τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸν Θεόν; So also Theodoret.

Here again Mr. Locke has hit on the true sense, except that he interprets χάριτι: "with thanksgiving," for which use of the word in the dative I can find no authority, and the sense is not near so opposite as that of the Greek Commentators, which is also adopted by Grotius, Beza, Sclater, and Estius.
S1. The interpretation of the two preceding verses which I have adopted leaves the admonition in this free and unfettered by any such modifications as those are compelled to resort to, who suppose here an answer to a preceding objection.

The ὅν has here its most usual sense, namely, the illative, or conclusive; (see Schl. Lex.) q. d. "Upon these principles act in whatever ye eat and drink, and in all your conduct keep an eye to the glory of God,* and do not injure the cause of religion by throwing stumbling-blocks in the way either of unbelievers, to hinder them from embracing it, or of weak scrupulous believers, to shake their attachment to it." This is doubtless what the Apostle had chiefly in view, and the above sense is well laid down by Theophylact and Oëcumenius, and has been adopted by the best modern Commentators. (See Grot. and Locke.) Yet the admonition admits of general application; nay I believe the Apostle meant it should be so applied. So Chrysost. 405, 37. εἶδες πῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ προκειμένου ἐπὶ τὸ καθ' ὅλον ἐξήγαγε τὴν παραίνεσιν, ἐνα κάλλιστον τὸν ὄρον ἡμῖν δοῦσ, τὸ τὸν Θεὸν διὰ πάντων δοξάσεις.

With the sentiment Grot. compares the Hebrew dict cited by Maimonid. לָלָל נָטָשׁ וְלְשָׁם שָׂמַיִם. And Capellus gives several similar passages from the Rabbinical writers, where it is directed that all actions, even eating and drinking, be done in the name of God; which is nearly equivalent to εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. It could hardly be expected that the Heathen Philosophers should inculcate any admonition so spiritual as the one in question, and yet Wetstein has adduced from Arrian, Ep. 1, 19. the following similar sentiment: εἰς θεοῦ ἀφορώτες ἐν πάντι, μικρῷ καὶ

* Grotius has, I think, rightly seen the chief scope of the direction (and that which the context requires), namely, "to beware lest by any act of yours, under any circumstances, the glory of God be injured." And so Vatab. and Tirin. By the Glory of God is especially meant the spread and influence of the religion he has promulgated by Christ.
μεγάλα. * And Cicero, in his Offices 12. says, there is no part of life, however insignificant, without its Deity: yet he makes a reference to that great Being to whom it is especially a duty. Epictetus, too, (cited by Bulkley,) on being asked how any one may so eat as to please God, answered, by eating justly, temperately, and thankfully. But the sentiment that comes the nearest to this of the Apostle is one of Socrates ap. Plato 85 c. Ταῦτα ἐὰν αὐτῷ πρακτέω καὶ γυμνάστεω, καὶ ἐβεβλέσσθαι καὶ τυτέω, ἀν τῷ ἐν δικῇ τῷ ἐρυθρῷ, καὶ ἐπαίνοτο μᾶλλον, ἢ ἢ γυμναστὶ τῶν ἄλλων. The context will show that, under the figure of an ἐρυθρῆς the Philosopher intended to represent God.

For the application of this maxim to the practice of a Christian, Dr. Whitby has given the following admirable directions: "In things capable of honouring God positively, or proper to give glory to him, have always a general intention of glorifying God in the doing of them, that in the virtue of that intention you may proceed to particular actions. In things not capable of honouring God positively, be careful that you act so, as that the name of God be not blasphemed, or his doctrine evil thought or evil spoken of, by reason of your actions. Yea, do and abstain from all things so as to satisfy your own conscience, and discover to others that the honour of God, and the advancement of the interests of his Kingdom, are much dearer to you than any gratifications of your carnal appetites, or any temporal concern."

62. ἄφροκοστος γίνεσθε. The Apostle here explains what he especially meant by εἰς διὰ πνεύματος Θεῶν. viz. to avoid giving offence, &c. For ἄφροκοστος is one of those adjectives which are used either in a passive, or an active sense; as here. On which see Hemst. on Lucian 1, 179. The sense is: "Be not any occasion of stumbling, either to the Jews, or Greeks, or

* I cannot, however, but suspect that for this the Philosopher was indebted to St Paul.
Christians:" for that is the sense of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ. (See 1, 2. and the note there.) So Theodoret paraphrases: ἐξ ὑμῶν πρόφασις σκανδάλου μηδὲ μία γίνεται. And so Hesych. ἀπρόσκοπτων ἀσκανδαλιστῶν. See also Theophylact. By σκανδαλίζειν is meant, "give any one a handle or occasion to sin." The sentence is thus paraphrased by Rosenm. "Beware lest the Jews have it to say that you are not sincere worshippers of the true God; lest the Greeks say, that you think there is no harm in idolatry; and lest the Christians, as yet weak in the faith, now that certain evils are impending, be induced to forsake their Christian profession."

33. καθὼς κἀγὼ, &c. It is well observed by Chrysostom, that after having struck them with fear by setting forth their responsibility for the injury and prejudice they might occasion to the Jews and the Heathens, he makes his caution more palatable by proposing himself as an example; q. d. "I exhort you to no more than I set you an example of. For I kata πάντα τ. a. seek, study to please and conciliate men;" as 9, 22. The words following μὴ ξητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ συμφέρουν are added by way of explanation, and show what sort of compliance this is; not a base κολακελα from worldly motives, not having for its end his own advantage, but the good of others, and that good of the highest sort, namely, that they should be brought over to the Christian religion, and be put into a state of salvation, or be preserved in it. For that is the sense of σωθ., on which see the note on Matt. 1, 21. The cause is well explained by Phot. ap. Æcumen.

Examples of this accommodation must occur to every one, as, eating or not eating certain foods, receiving or not receiving maintenance as a minister, in short, by becoming all things to all men.

The τὸ συμφέρου τῶν πολλῶν here signifies the good of others; as we say "pro bono publico." Thus Chrysostom takes it for κοινῆ. Grotius has here the weighty reflection, that the eternal salvation of an-
other far outweighs any temporal convenience of our own.

CHAP. XI.

Verse 1. This first verse has been most injudiciously torn from the last chapter by the Latin Fathers, though it coheres with it most closely; yet (as Beza observes) so that, by an admirable art, it is made at once the conclusion of the preceding disputation, and a transition to what follows.

It is well remarked by Rosenm., that lest he might seem to extol his own example, the Apostle refers it to Christ, whose manner of teaching and living he imitated. And in the same view Théophylact paraphrases: \(\text{Εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ Χριστὸς ἐμῷ σπάνιον τὸν καταφρονῆσαι καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δοσὶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ θανατοῦ ὑμᾶς, τὸς μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ; Οὐ γὰρ τοιοῦτον ἐγὼ ὑμῶν κρίττομ, ἐγὼ δὲ κἀγαθὸς ἐμοὶ, ὁ πάντων ἀνυπηκτός ὑπερέχω.\)

The contents and plan of this chapter may be seen detailed by Macknight and others. Schöttg. gives the following plan of the next four chapters:

"Agitur hic I. de comâ virorum et mulierum, 11, 8—15. II. de Agapis, 11, 16—34. III. de ordine in Ecclesiâ ratione donorum Spiritus Sancti diversorum observando, 12—14." He then observes on the subject which occupies 11, 8—15. "Apud Judeos mos erat, ut viri in sacris caput tegerent, foeminae vero nudae essent, prout prolixè probat Lightfootus ad h. l. Quia vero Corinthi aliter fieri solebat, idque itidem ex more Judaico, qui nonnullam variavit, ut infra ad v. 5, 10, 14. notamus, D. Apostolus, prudentiae Ecclesiasticae specimen praebens, mandat, ut in sacris viri nudo, foeminae operto capite essent. Ita rectè Grotius. Nam quæ reliqui interpretæ testimonia adducunt, de Romanis agunt, caput in sacris velantibus, non vero de Graecis."

2. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πᾶντα μου μέμητο. *

* And, as such, is united with it by Chrysostom and the Greek Commentator.
"Now I praise you, brother Christians, because ye have been (κατὰ) πάντα, &c." The πάντα is variously explained by Commentators. But it is not necessary to dwell upon it, since it may be regarded as an adverb and equivalent to πάντως, "in all respects;" which, from the nature of the subject, must be limited to ecclesiastical matters. The Commentators might have better dwelt on the signification here of μέρος, which is somewhat unusual. The sense is, "that you have not forgotten, but have been observant of my orders:"* an idiom not unknown in our own language. However, as it appears from what follows, that there were some things which they had neglected, so the πάντα must not be pressed upon, but be understood to denote upon the whole. On which softening Theophylact observes: ἃς γὰρ εἰσεῖ ὑστὸς μελᾶτειν τοῖς ἐπίσκοποι τοὺς ἀπὸ τούτων βελτισθῆναι προσδοκόμενος.

By the παραδόσεις are meant the directions, injunctions, and ordinances, whether written or oral, which the Apostle had left with them, for the regulation of the Church. Thus the word is often used in the sense precept, institution, &c. So 2 Thess. 2, 15. καταλληλῶς τὰς παραδόσεις, ἃς ἐνδοξητε, ἐτε διὰ λόγω, ἐτε διὰ ἐπιστολῆς. In Gal. 1, 14. it is used of oral tradition, and in Col. 2, 8. of precepts in general. Thus the verb παραδόσεως is used both in the Scriptural and Classical writers in the sense hand down to memory, whether by writing, or by tradition, but generally the former: and sometimes it signifies to deliver or hand down from one's ancestors certain observances. (See the examples in Steph. Thean and Krause.) On these παραδόσεις Theophylact remarks: Ἑστείθην δὴν, ὅτι καὶ ἄγραφος τοῦτο τὰ παρά-

* Or at least, (as Mr. Slade suggests,) "he had perceived, from the questions which the Corinthians had put to him on this subject, in their letter, that they were, in general, desirous of following the directions which he had given."
of the other Apostles; nor are the words any evidence that the Apostle did not leave the directions in writing; and least of all will they afford any countenance to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Tradition, which Estius would from hence bolster up: for the very nature of the term suggests the idea of nothing more than directions with respect to the external forms of religion, which may change with manners and customs, and has no reference to doctrines and the essentials of religion. In matters respecting the preservation of order and decorum there were, as Rosenm. observes, many things which in themselves did not materially affect piety, but which it was advisable to have established on general rules, lest discordant customs or disputes should injure the Church, and from disputes schisms should arise.

3. The Apostle now proceeds to touch on another abuse which had arisen in the Corinthian Church. This subject is well illustrated in the following extract from Grotius, Storr, and Rosenm. "Ipsae Corinthiorum litterae quaestionem de cultu feminarum cum alterâ de Idolothytis conjuxisse videntur; quare Paulus hanc tractionem superiori annectit. Idem nemo, qui templâ idolorum denuo frequentare solebat, ex fano in ecclesiâ translatum voluerunt reorem, ut mulieribus liceret in concione sacrâ orare temoto velamine, v. 5. Quum autem ipsius etiam antijudaicae partes complures (Paulini et Apollo- nii) Christiani a Judaico ritu, quem ab ipso Paulo et Apollo, quum inter Corinthios versarentur, tegere vidissent, recedere dubitarent, quaestionem hanc in epistolâ partis antijudaicae communi nomine exarata, ad Paulum retulerunt. Is igitur laudat Corinthios, quid inconsiderata certorum sociorum cupiditati non statim obsecuti fuerint, sed memoras Apostoli, moribus ab ipso ut alibi, ita etiam Corinthi servatis, vicem facere noluerint, verum ex ipso prius percontari maluerint, num in veteri instituto novari aliquid liceat."
So Theophyl.: Αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἀκατακάλλυτοι καὶ ἑγέρται καὶ προεφήτους, (καὶ γὰρ καὶ γυναῖκες προεφήτους τοῦτο) οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες ἕκομαν, ἀπε ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ διατριβάμενες, καὶ οὐκ ἑγέρται καὶ οὐκ προεφήτευσον. Ταῦτα δὲ Ἑλληνικοῦ χόμου ἦσαν.

The expression θέλω ὡμᾶς εἰδέναι, which occurs also at 10, 1. is not, as some recent Commentators treat it, a mere formula of transition, but is rather one of earnest exhortation to attention, not dissimilar to several employed by our Lord; as, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear," q. d. "attend to what I say."

In order to show that Christian wives ought to have their heads veiled in divine worship (ver. 5.), the Apostle offers the following reasons: 1. That the wife is in the power of the husband, but that the husband, in all things pertaining to religion and divine worship, is subject to no one but Christ.

Κεφαλὴ is here used, like the Hebr. שָׁמוּר, improperly, for master, chief, &c. (See Schl. Lex.) The ratio metaphorie is obvious, since the head is considered as the chief member of the body of a rational being, the faculty of reason being there seated. See Col. 2, 19. Κεφαλὴ also denoted parent. So Theodore: κεφαλὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ ὡς πατὴρ καὶ αἰτίας ὑνομάζεται. This allusion is illustrated by Wets. from Artemid. 1, 2 & 87. 3, 67. 4, 26. So also Achmet, c. 127. (cited by Wolf): κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὡς ἀνή. Besides this general position, the Apostle shows that in all things pertaining to religion the Christian recognizes no one as Lord but Christ.

Κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὡς ἀνή, i. e. "the woman, besides the supreme Lord Jesus Christ, has another Lord, even her husband." The Philological Commentators here supply us with abundant proofs and illustrations of the inferiority of the wife to the husband. One passage may suffice. Menander: τὰ δευτερεία τῆς γυναικῆς δεῖ λέγειν τήν δὲ ἡγεμονίαν τῶν ἱλατῶν τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔχειν.

On the next words, κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ, δ Ὑδωρ,
(which the Socinians have so perverted, to defend their dogmas,) the recent Foreign Commentators give a very vague and precarious account. The earlier modern Commentators are far sounder. (See Vorst. and Est. ap. Pole, and also Whitby.) But I agree with Wolf, that the most satisfactory interpretation is that of the Greek Fathers and Commentators. See Chrysost.,* Theodoret, Suic. Thes. 1, 96., and Petav. Dog. Theol. 343.

4, 5. Here προφητεύω is used like the Hebrew נבירה. On the sense, however, of this word Commentators are not agreed. The antient ones do not touch upon it. Of the moderns, some, as T. Aqu., Beza, Calv., Paræus, and others, give it the sense, "read and interpret the Holy Scripture." But this is curtailing the plain force of the word, which seems to require the interpretation adopted by Est., Wells, and Pearce, namely, "to teach and communicate, by inspiration, the doctrines of revelation." Both these interpretations, however, are liable to one especial objection, namely, that the Apostle at c. 14, 34 & 35. says "I permit not a woman to teach and preach:" neither is it probable that the practice should have been so common as this use of the word would imply. Most recent Commentators, as Wets., Mede, Wolf, and Locke, (and formerly Hobbes,) have (in order to avoid this difficulty) adopted the interpretation first propounded by Menoch., namely, "to sing divine hymns under the impulse of the Divine spirit."

* From whom, chiefly, Theophyl. has the following annotation: Χριστοῦ δὲ κεφαλὴ ὁ Θεὸς, διὰ τὸ αἰτίου εἶναι αὐτοῦ, ὡς καθή γε δῶ. Οὐ δὲ γὰρ τὰ περὶ κεφαλῆς εἰρημένα ὁμολογεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ ἐκλαμβάνειν ἀλλ' ἡμῶν μὲν κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός, καὶ ὡς δημιουργὸς καὶ ὡς σώματος αὐτοῦ ἤκος ἡμῶν ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ Χριστοῦ κεφαλῆς, ὡς αἰτίου αὐτοῦ. Εἰ δὲ καὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπινον ἐκλάβοις οὕτως εἰρηθῆ χεῖ τῷ Πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ κεφαλῆς, δόκει αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστός ἐλέγχῃ ἡμῶν κεφαλῆς, οὐδὲν ἀσβέζει ἔτει καὶ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ λέγεται τοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁμολογεῖν κατεδέχετο, καὶ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν ἐχρηματίσει καὶ κεφαλῆς, οὐδὲν καίνειν εἰ καὶ τὰ γὰρ τατινήθην ὀνόματα καταδέχεται, καὶ τὸν κατὰ θεότητα πατέρα ἔχει κεφαλῆς κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ὡς ἀρχοντα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὡς Θεὸν αὐτοῦ.
And Menoch. observes, that *prophet* is used for *singer* in 1 Kings 10, 1. Par. 25, 1. (See also Est. ap. Pole.) But this seems to have little support from the import of the word. Without better authority, I see not how the notion of *singing* can be admitted. Perhaps recitation is all that is meant; whether of prose or verse, is uncertain; but probably *both*, though more frequently the former: and perhaps the verses were *given out* line by line, or couplet by couplet, for the convenience of the congregation. Thus *προφητεύω* would be equivalent to *προφημι* and *præcinère*. But if these were, as is probable, previously prepared, there is no room for *inspiration*. Possibly, however, there might be some women who possessed a poetical faculty like the improvisatore; and thus pronounced (ex tempore) certain carmina, or spiritual songs, to which the congregation sung: and this faculty might be, in some measure, produced, or aided by the Holy Spirit; which the word *προφητεύω* may very well be thought to imply. That Chrysost. entertained this opinion is clear, since he says that therein was fulfilled the prophecy of Joel, mentioned at Acts 2, 17 & 18. But it is probable that the women might be permitted to pronounce certain devotional compositions celebrating the praises of God and the blessings of redemption, similar in kind to that of Zacharias, Luke 1, 67. where he is expressly said, *προφητεύωσα* the very term here used. Schl., too, compares a similar use of the corresponding Hebr. *נַחֲלָה* in 1 Kings 18, 29. 1 Sam. 10, 5 & 6. and *προφητεία* in Philo 2, 178. τῆς κατ' ἐνθουσιασμὸν *προφητείας* (said of Moses's Canticle of the Red Sea); and in Esth. 6, 12.

Bp. Pearce has here a very instructive note.

Κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, scil. τι, i.e. κάλυμμα, which ellipsis is supplied in Plut. (cited by Krause); εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν ἢκε ἑθάδισκε κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχων τὸ ἱμάτιον. On the covering of the head see the notes of Whitby and Doddr.

4. κατασκύμαι τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. It is not easy to
determine the exact import of this expression, here and in the antithetical clause, since it is susceptible of two senses, both sufficiently apposite. Many modern Commentators, in the first, interpret it "dishonoureth Christ as his head;" and in the other, "dishonoureth her husband, who is her head." But all those who thus prophesied were not married women. This therefore cannot be tolerated: neither do I find any countenance for it in the antient Commentators. It must, I think, be interpreted in the physical sense: only we are to advert to an idiom by which the head is put for the person: so that in the former clause it may be rendered, "disgraces his person and dignity," i.e. himself, namely, by adopting what was thought to imply servitude: and in the latter clause, "disgraces her person," i.e. herself, by violating propriety; since for women to have the head uncovered was considered, both by the Greeks and Jews (the latter especially), as a flagrant impropriety; which is proved by numerous citations in Wets. Rosenm., however, suspects that it was usual in Greece for the women to be unveiled in the temples: a custom, he thinks, which some, through hatred of Judaism, wished to introduce into the Corinthian Church.

5. ἐν γὰρ ἐστι καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἑξυφασμένῃ, "it is one and the same thing as if she had been shorn." Of the idiom ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, which is also found both in Latin and English, Kypke gives many examples: and he moreover observes, that ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ is for μία καὶ τῇ; referring to 10, 6. 6. 11. But this seems to proceed on a mistaken view of the construction, which is (I think) as follows: ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐστι (αὐτῇ καὶ) τῇ ἑξυφασμένῃ, i.e. "it is as bad as if she were

* Wolf unites both the physical and metaphorical.
† And especially her head; since, as the Apostle adds, it is "as if she were shorn."
‡ Thus Selden, Ux. Hebr. 3, 17. tells us, that a neglect of being veiled in public was a lawful cause for divorce. That the custom had prevailed from the earliest antiquity is clear from Gen. 24, 65.
shorn." Now the Antiquaries and Philologists have proved that all the antient nations agreed in accounting this as the greatest dishonour and disfigurement to the person of a woman. Hence it was only adopted as a sign of extreme grief, (see Deut. 21, 12.), or was imposed as a mark of infamy and disgrace on adulteresses and harlots. See the copious Classical illustrations of Wets. and Kypke.*

6. εἰ γὰρ οὖν κατακαλύπτεται γυνὴ, καὶ κειράσθαι. Here we have the same sentiment further unfolded. Καὶ κειράσθαι is a popular expression for "she may as well be shorn." Κειρ. properly signified to be shorn; εὐρ. to be shaven. But the distinction was often neglected. Rosenm. observes: "Κειράσθαι referre solent ad occiput: εὐράσθαι vero ad sinciput."

The Apostle's argument is, that by so uncovering their faces they injure their reputation.

7. ἀνὴρ μὲν γὰρ οὖκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κε- φαλὴν. This is the second reason why the Christian wife should have her head veiled; because she is bound so to do by every mode of evincing respect and modesty towards the other sex. A man, the Apostle says, is not obliged (for that is the sense of ὀφείλει) to cover his head, ὑπάρχουν, being (i.e. since he is) the εἰκών καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ, i.e. especially, and, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the image and glory of God, in which words most Interpreters think there is an hendiadis, for "the glorious image of God." But this seems harsh. I should think, with Grot., that it may import an effulgence or ray from the Divine light; since ἡβλέβον, which answers to δόξα, has properly that sense. The old Commentators, however, speculate too minutely on this as well as many other points, which are either mere refinements, or undeterminable. The leading idea seems to be this, that man,

invested by God with authority over the whole creation, may be considered as the image of God, and, as it were, a ray from his brightness, just as viceroys and rulers are sometimes metaphorically said to be eikon of their sovereign. In this view Krause cites Plut. ap. Stob. 152. "Arxan de eikoun theou tou pantos kraitontos" also a sentence from Poet. Gnom. eikou de basileous empsychos theou. And so Rosenm.: "Est enim vir in supremo gradu collocatus in hoc mundo, et tanquam secundarius aliquid Deus, ipsius etiam mulieris respectu."

7. γυνὴ δὲ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστιν. This is well explained by Theodoret thus: 'H de γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐξουσίαν τελεύσα, τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐστιν δόξα, καὶ οἷον εἰκόνα εἰκών ἄρχει μὲν γὰρ καὶ αὐτή τῶν ἀλλών, ἀλλ' ὑπετέκταται τῷ ἀνδρὶ προσετάχθη. And in the same manner Ωcumenious explains. See also Photius and Theophylact. Schoettgen very well explains thus: "Vir ad imaginem Dei, et propter Deum conditus est, ut ejus gloriām amplificaret: mulier vero præterea propter virum, ut ei adjumento esset, (adeoque mulier gloriam Dei secundario tantum promovet,) quod gloriosum est sexui masculino." So Slade: "The man holds his authority under God; the woman, her's under the man." The wife (it may be added) shines, like the moon, with a borrowed light, fulget (as Mr. Valpy says) radiis maritii. The inference, then, meant to be drawn from

* * Ovid. Met. 1, 76. (cited by Wets.) Sanctius his animal, mensisque capacius alte Deorat adhuc, et quod dominari in cætera posset; Natus homo est, sive hunc divino semine fecit ille opifex rerum, sive—satus Japeto—sinxit in effigiem moderantum cuncta Deorum. I cannot but think that this, with much other cosmographical knowledge, &c. was derived, though in a circuitous manner, from the books of Moses.

† So Diogen. 1, 9, 51. τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀνδρας θεών θεον εἰκώνα εἶναι. Lucian, pro Imag. 28. τὸν ἀριστον φιλοσοφών εἰκόνα θεοῦ τὸν ἀνθρωπον εἰκόνα εἶναι.

‡ In which view it is beautifully observed by Penelope in Hym. Od. 1, 18, 253 & 4:

   Ei keivos (Ulysses) γ' ἐλθὼν τὸν ἐμὸν βίον ἄμφιπολεως,
   Μείζων κε κλέος εἰς ἐμὸν καὶ κάλλων οὔτω.
   Νῦν δ' ἄχροαι τὸν γὰρ μοι ἑκέσσενεν κακὰ δαιμόν.
it is this: She ought therefore to appear with the symbol of modesty and subjection which are implied by the head being covered.

8, 9. The Apostle now shows the grounds of this right of superiority, 1st, in respect of nature (so Chrys.: ἀνδρὸς, ἄρχῃ τοῦ ἄνδρος); 2dly, priority of creation; 3dly, purpose of creation. For Adam was first created, then Eve; who was, moreover, formed out of his side, and for a helpmate; referring to Gen. 2, 18—21. Compare also 1 Tim. 2, 13. Theophil. explains verse 9. thus: οὐκ ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐκεῖνη, ἀλλὰ ἐκεῖνη δὲ ἐκεῖνος.

10. διὰ τούτου διήλεξεν ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἐχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τούς ἀγγέλους.

Perhaps among all the passages of the New Testament there is not one that has more exercised the learning and ingenuity of the modern Commentators, or in which their endeavours to elicit what they think a satisfactory sense have been less successful. See Pole and Wolf, and the Commentators by them cited. The chief difficulty, however, does not rest with the ἐξουσία, which all the antient Interpreters are agreed has the sense of καλύμμα, a veil. The only question is, why, and with what allusion, that term is employed. The antient Commentators think it was so called, as being τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐξουσίας καὶ κυρίωτητος ἐνδεικτικόν ὑπαρχον καὶ παρασταθηκόν (to use the words of Phot. ap. Οἰκομ. ) . And this opinion is supported by most of the early modern Commentators. (See Wolf, p. 477.) But to this it has been justly objected by Salmas: "An aliquis potestatem habere dici debet, quam penes aliqui sit, necio, aliique judicent, si sciunt." And still more ably by the learned Bp. Marshall: "If the emblem of power was worn by the woman, it is rather a token of subjection on the part of the man; and if ἐξουσία relates to the authority of the man, it is very improperly applied to the dress of the woman; on the other hand, if a veil is a token of submission, the use of ἐξουσία in that sense involves a contradiction."

Of the recent Commentators some are inclined to regard the ἐξουσία as the name of a female ornament for the head, formed of braid of hair set with jewels, (See Wolf 475.) Others, as Fischer, Schleierm., and Rosenm., regard it as denoting a veil, though (and I think rightly) not with any reference to the superiority of the man to the woman, but of the married woman over the maiden;* superiority, in point of honour and dignity being, in the East, ever conceded to

* And this does not materially differ from the opinion of Bp. Middleton, who thinks that the veil might have acquired the name, from the power or license which it gave the wearer to appear in public.
them, as indeed is the case even at the present day in every country of Europe. Indeed the very term domina, mistress, implies this. It is truly observed by Fischer, after Bp. Pearce, that names of things are not unfrequently put for the names of their signs and tokens. "Veil, then, (continues he), is called ἐκωσία, because it was a sign of honour; for it is well known that the state of married women was among the Jews more honourable than that of unmarried women; and ἐκωσία also signifies dignity, prerogative, and indeed every thing that is superior and excellent. See Joh. 1, 12. 2 Macc. 1, 13. 11, 58. For this reason the Sept. in Gen. 20, 16, elegantly termed Sarah's veil, which is called by Moses himself ἡματή Ἑλληνιδα, τὸν ἰμαν τοῦ προσώπου." I would compare, what it is strange the Commentators should have omitted: Virg. Ἀν. 7, 814. sit regius ostro Veles honos leves humeros; ut fabula crinem Auro internectat.

Nor is it any wonder that there has been no example of such an use of the word yet produced from any antient author, considering how very few works have been preserved in which any such term could be expected to be found. Thus Colomesius, Obs. Sacr. 21., has adduced a passage from Ardelphus, where imperium is used for a braided curl or lock; and Olear. (cited by Wolf, 475.) has adduced a passage from Callistatus (a writer of the time of Euripides), who uses the phrase ἐκωσίαρ προσώμαρος for what is vulgarly called a topping (from Fr. toupée;) and yet if the two passages had not been noted, the significations in question might have been denied. If, too, we consider how difficult it is to account for the names of many ornaments and utensils in common use in all nations, and how very slight have been the reasons for their original adoption, it need not be wondered that difficulties should arise, after they have grown into disuse, respecting their real sense and ratio significations. A remarkable example may be found in the female ornaments mentioned by Is. 3, 18 seqq.

But proceed we to consider the yet more difficult expression διὰ τοῦ ἀγγείου. Here, again, it is impossible for me to detail, much less review, the various opinions of Commentators. As to the conjectures of learned persons, since they are wholly unsupported by evidence, and have in themselves little probability, I shall omit them altogether. Taking the present reading to be genuine, there are two classes into which the significations ascribed to the term ἀγγεῖον may be distributed; 1. natural; 2. metaphorical. The former has been, almost invariably, adopted by the ancient and early modern Commentators. A mode, however, not without its difficulties, which have to some appeared so formidable, that they have, with more or less success, devised various metaphorical explanations, for the detail of which I refer the reader to Pole and Wolf. Some, as Beza, Pseudo-Ambros., and Clem. Alex., interpret it of the Bishops and Doctors of the Church. But the ratio metaphorae would be exceedingly harsh; neither is it decent to suppose such grave and dignified personages to be in danger of being ensnared by the beauty of women.

The most favourite opinion for the last half century, and adopted by almost all recent Commentators, is that of Heuman, that it designates spises sent by the Heathens to attend at the Christian meet-
inga, in order to watch for and report any improprieties or indecencies. Those who support this interpretation, refer to the same messengers given to the spies sent by the Israelites to examine and reconnoitre the land of Canaan. (See Josh. 6, 17 & 25. James 2, 25. Heb. 11, 31.) But these were only so called by the Israelites, not by Canaanites, who would have bestowed on them a far less favourable name. As little to the purpose are the Classical passages that have been cited. (See Wolf 480.) And although Heuman has proved, from Tertull. Apolog. C. 7. that spies were sometimes sent by the Heathens for the purpose in question, yet one can scarcely suppose that it was regularly done; which would be implied by the use of the article. It is justly objected, too, by Outrein and Wolf, that the word ἄγγελος, put absolutely, is, in the New Testament, only meant for incorporeal spirits, either good or bad, and the word ἄγγελος, with the article, is no where used but of the holy angels and ministering spirits: besides, if this interpretation were adopted, the reasoning of the Apostle would lose half its force. And finally, if such emissaries had seen the women unveiled, they would have seen no more than was perpetually to be seen in Corinth.” This last objection, however, seems not well founded; though, as to the interpretation in question, it cannot, I think, be admitted.

After all, the physical sense of the word is the more obvious; nay even many Commentators, who adopt the metaphorical sense, acknowledge that this yields the most natural interpretation of the word; and, if I mistake not, it involves the fewest difficulties. The term must be understood, however, not of bad angels, as Heins., Whitby, Lightf., Wells, Schoettg., Wets. and Mackn. suppose (which involves great absurdity), but of good angels, who, according to the opinions of the Jews, were ministering spirits attendant in the house of God, and symbols of his presence. And this interpretation is supported by the authority of the Fathers and Greek Commentators, almost without exception; and, of the modern ones, it has been adopted by Cam., Pisc., Capell, Grot., Mede, Menoch., Est., Vorst., Schlicting, Hanfm., G. J. Vossius, Elsner, Pearce, Dowdr., and others, whom see, and especially Grot., Mede, Hamm., and Elsner. Wolf has a most masterly review of the different opinions, and upon summing up the evidence, he decidedly prefers the physical sense. That the Jews were firmly persuaded of the presence of angels at places of divine worship, has, he thinks, been clearly proved by Grot. in loc., Buxtorf Syn. Jud. C. 15., Eisenmeger in his Judaimus detectus, P. 2, p. 393., and Elsner Obsb. Sacr. And that the earliest Fathers thought so, is clear from Tertull. de Orat. C. 13., Origen c. Cels. L. 5, p. 233. (speaking of the angels bearing the prayers of men to God) ἀναβαίνειν μὲν προσάγοντας τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπερείκεις καταβαίνειν δὲ ἀν ἔκειθεν, φεροντας ἐκάστην καὶ ἄλλαν τῶν ἀπὸ θεοῦ τι αὐτοῖς διακονεῖν τοῖς εὐφημικοῖς προσαναφοράν. And in the same place, he gives a caution against, on that account, commending our prayers to the angels; that it is to the Son of God only, who is Lord of the angels, that we should commend them: ταύτα μὲν γὰρ δήσων καὶ προσευχών καὶ ἐνεπείναι καὶ εὐχρηστίαν, ἀναστημένον τῷ ἐπὶ κάσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάνων
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καγγέλου ἰδρυτέρως, ἐμψύχου λόγου καὶ θεοῦ. Const. Apost. L. 8 C. 4., where it is said, that there are present in the Church with God our Judge, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, πάντα τὰ ἁγία καὶ λεπτομερὰ πνεύματι (on which passage see Cotelerius). It is rightly remarked by Wolf, that the Jews did not derive the opinion (as Elsner supposes) from the Platonists, but from more certain ancient works (and such they would be far more likely to have read), namely, the Apocryphal Tob. C. 24, 15., or rather the Scriptures themselves, reasoning from consequences deduced from passages there found. In answer to the objection of Heuman, that, by a parity of reasoning, the women ought to have been veiled in their private retirements (since angels were, by the Jews, supposed to be present in private as well as in public places), he well remarks: "Multa domi licent, que in publico conventu divino cultui dedicato fieri non expedit." And he concludes with the following weighty observation: "Enimvero etiam hoc loco manifestum est, angelorum presentiam instar appendicis relicuis argumentis addi, quibus Apostolus contenderit, feminas velatas esse debere, quorum prima ex viro sit desumpta, et in commodum viri condita, atque vel eo nomine viro subjecta sit, subjectamque se illi esse externo ejusmodi indicie profiteri debeat. His rationibus jungitur denique in presenti commate Angelorum presentia."

I shall conclude this annotation by subjoining the masterly paraphrase of Chrysost. 419, 9. Πάντα τὰ ἁγία τὰ εἰρημένα ἀπαντά, μᾶλλον δέ ὃι διὰ τὰ ἁγία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἁγγέλους εἰ γὰρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καταφεύγεις, τοὺς ἁγγέλους αἰδεύεται. So Theodore, who paraphrases: διεκτύω τὸν υποτάγμαν ἐκατόν συνεπίκουσα, καὶ ύπόθετα τῶν ἁγγέλων ἔνακε, οἱ ἐφεστάσαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν τόστων εἰρημένην παστερνέμον. See also Phot. ap. Cæcumen.

11. πλὴν οὗτε ἀνήρ χωρίς γυναικός, &c. There has been some doubt as to the construction of this sentence. One thing is clear, that there is an ellipsis of ἐστιν, which Schilting, Grot., Hardy, Par, Vorst., Rosenm., and some recent Commentators join with ἐν Κυρίῳ, and they take for Κυρίῳ ἐστίν, "is the Lord," i.e. belongs to a Christian society; referring to Galat. 3, 28. πάντες ἐστίν ἐν Κυρίῳ. But there the phrase is complete, and not, as here, broken into two. Besides, the sense assigned is not suitable to the context. The scope of the Apostle, and the sense of the words, was, I think, rightly pointed out by Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators. As the Apostle (they say) had given much superiority to the man, showing that the woman was from him, and by him, and under him, so now, in order neither to raise one too high, nor depress the other too low,
he says that though at the first creation the woman was from the man, yet the man is descended from the woman. The ἐν Κυρίῳ Chrysost. and Theophyl. explain: Θεῷ τὸ πάν ποιοῦντος καὶ διωγοῦντος τὸ ὑπέρ, καὶ τὴν μήτραν βασιλέως. Photius more simply: διὰ τὸν Κύριον, since (he adds) αὐτὸς ἐκημισάσθησεν εἰναι αὐτῶς ἀλλήλων αἰτίους. And so Theodoret: διὰ γὰρ τῆς συγγελακίας καὶ κοινωνίας ἡμίτοιχος τὸ γένος. Thus ἐστι is taken populariter for ἐκτίσθη: and ἐν Κυρίῳ is used in the same sense as in Eph. 5, 22. Now this interpretation is extremely confirmed by the next verse, which is exegetical of the present. Among the few modern Commentators who have seen the real sense, I may number Bp. Middleton.

Πλὴν, however: Γαρ, nempe. The inference which the Apostle means to be drawn, is this: that the man ought not to be too elevated with his superiority, nor the woman depressed with her inferiority, since they were, in many respects, dependent upon each other, and therefore the sexes ought to cultivate an indissoluble union.

The words τὰ δὲ πάν τα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ (scil. ἐστι) are taken, by Chrysost. and Οἰκουμ., as subjoined for the purpose of consoling the woman, by suggesting to her that this is no κατάρθωμα of the man, but proceeded from the wise disposal of God. The words are, indeed, meant for both sexes, just as they might apply, and have a general sense, importing that all these matters were ordained to be as they are by the instrumentality of God; and therefore that his will is to be fulfilled, by the sexes cultivating unity, and consulting the happiness of each other. This seems to me the true interpretation, and it is supported by Beza, Sclater, Menoch., and Krause.

13. The Apostle now returning ad propositum, uses another mode of evincing the impropriety of women being unveiled in public worship; and this, by appealing to natural feeling, common sense, and their own private judgment and notions of decorum.

13. ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς, “in your own minds.”
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14, 15. η ουδε αυτη η φυσις διδασκει υμας, &c. The sense of this somewhat perplexing passage has been thought exceedingly obscure by various learned moderns, as Salmas., Revius, Beverland, and many others, whose opinions are summed up by Pole and Wolf, to which I refer my readers. As to the difficulties complained of, they have been (I think), in a great measure, occasioned by an inattention to the simple and popular cast of thought which distinguishes the Scriptures, and especially of our Apostle, and by the fondness for refined discussion and ingenious hypothesis, which too much distinguishes the modern Commentators. The ancient ones find no difficulty at all, by taking the word φυσις in a popular acceptation. It cannot mean, as Beverland, Locke, Whitby, and Pearce, maintain, the constitution of the sexes; which would be very harsh; any more than reason and experience, as Mackn. translates. Now there are two senses assigned to the word by the ancient and some eminent modern Commentators, either of which may be adopted; 1. "That internal sense, or natural instinctive perception which suggests what is right and wrong;" 2. (as Chrys., Grot., Perizon., Hamm., Heuman, Roseum., and most recent Commentators, interpret) use, custom. This signification is frequent in the best Greek writers, from whom examples are adduced by Hamm., Grot., and Wets., to which I add Thucyd. 6, 17. η ανωτα παρα φυσιν. But, in fact, these two senses may be said to merge into each other; since, according to the adage, use is second nature.* This mixed sense is distinguishable in Demosth. de Cor. (cited by Wets.) φανησται τοινυν ταυτα παντα ενιαύτη φου μονον εν τοις νομοις, αλλα και η φυσις αυτη τοις αγρα-φοις νομιμοι και τοις ανθρωπινοις θεσει διαφικεν. To

* So Schleus.: "Φυσις etiam res dieuntur, quae sic abierunt in consuetudinem, ut primum factae sunt altera naturae consuetudines, quae inde a longo tempore et apud plerisque ita sunt receptae et invaluerunt, ut naturae maxime consentanescit, et ab instinctu quodam naturali profectae videantur."
which I would add Thucyd. 2, 45. in his admonition to the Athenian matrons: τῆς ὑπαρχόσσης φύσεως μη γένεσθαι χέρων.

By κομόν is meant: "lets his hair grow long." On the subject of men’s wearing the hair short, a custom which prevailed in different nations of antiquity, the Commentators, especially Wets., furnish numerous illustrations from the Classical writers.* The Hebrews seem to have been always of opinion, that long hair was, as the Apostle says, ἀτιμία ἄθροι, i. e. indecorous in him. And this the Rabbinical citations of Lightf., Schoetgg, and Wets., tend to prove. This, too, was the opinion of many Greeks. So Eustath. on Hom. II. γ. p. 288. κόμην δὲ ἐχεῖν καὶ ἐπικομοῦν εἶναι γυναικότερον ἐστὶν.

15. γυνὴ δὲ ἐὰν κομίζῃ, δέξα αὐτὴν ἐστὶν, i. e. it is an ornament to her and becomes her. The Apostle then adds: δι’ ἡ κομή ἀντὶ περιβολαίου, δ. ἀ., where ἡτί

* Thus Herodot. 1, 82. 'Αργεῖοι μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦτο τοῦ χρόνου κατακεφάλασαν τὰς κεφαλὰς, πρῶτον ἐπάναγκες κομίζοντες, ἐποιήσαντο νόμον, μὴ πρῶτον βρέφεις κόμην 'Αργεῖων μηδένα, μηδὲ τὰς γυναῖκας σφὶ χρυσοφορῆσιν, πρὶν ἀν ὑπέρακαν ἀναρχῶσιν. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τὰ ἐναντία τούτων ἔθεσαν νόμον, οὐ γὰρ κομίζοντες πρὸ τοῦτον, ἀπὸ τοῦτο τὸ κομῖν. Aristot. Rhet. I. τὸν ἐν Λακεδαιμονίοιν κομῖν καλόν, ἐπειδήραις γαρ ὑπειράζει, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ κομίζοντας ράβδων οὐδὲν τοῖς θρόνοις ὑπολογίζον. A most ingenious way of accounting for the Lacedemonian custom, and which may, I think, be illustrated by the fact that in many Oriental countries (and also, I think, in ancient Mexico) persons of the higher classes wear the nails immoderately long, to show their quality, as not being compelled to any of the common employments of life, with which this would be inconsistent. But perhaps both the Historian and the Philosopher were mistaken. The Lacedemonians, and the Greeks in general, (κορυφομόωντες Ἀχαῖοι,) probably had the custom from the nation whence they derived their origin. Now they were, we know, of Asiatic origin, and in many Asiatic nations men wore the hair long, especially the Sarmatae, from whom their descendants, the Russians and Poles, nay even the Germans, retain the custom, which, if I am not mistaken, was found, with other Sarmato-Mongolian customs, in ancient Mexico. It has probably been always prevalent in the cold countries of the North. So Ciem. Alex. Parasag. 3, 3. τῶν ἔθνων οἱ Κέλται καὶ Σκύθαι κομών. And D. Chrys. Or. 35. (cited by Wets.) οἱ πλευραῖς τῶν βαρβάρων κομώσαν, οἱ μὲν ακέραι ένεκεν, οἱ δὲ καὶ πρέπειν ἀντὶς νομίζοντες.
has the signification of nempe. The sense is: "it is given her instead of and as a sort of natural veil" to show that she requires the use of a veil." When it is said δέδοται αὐτῇ, i.e. by nature, it is manifestly true in point of fact, since the hair of women naturally grows to a much greater length than that of men.

The sentiment of the Apostle is exactly paralleled by one of Phocylides, v. 199., cited by the Commentators, where he concludes an admonition against letting boys' hair grow long in these words: "Ἄρσενον οὐκ ἐπέτεικε κομη, χρίσασθαι δὲ γυναιξίν. Here I wonder no Critic has conjectured χρίσθη; and still more that neither the Editors of Phocyl., nor the Commentators ad h. l., should have seen that the passage is imitated from this of St. Paul, by the writer of those verses, which were probably an interpolation: unless, indeed, as Brunck and many recent Critics have thought, the whole of the poem was a fabrication of some Christian writer of the fourth century.

16. εί δὲ τις δοκεῖ φιλονεικὸς ἔκαστι, &c. Most modern Commentators think there is a pleonasm in δοκεῖ, which, in other passages also of the Scriptural and Classical writers, is supposed to have place. See Gatak., Pearce, Rosenmuller, Blackwall, and Krause. But this is, as usual, a mere expedient for hiding ignorance. Here, at least, there is no necessity to resort to such a precarios principle. It may be rendered, with Luther, Casaub., Grot., and Wets., debeat, thinks good. (See Grot. on Matt. 3, 9.) There appears also to be an omission of a clause; q. d. φιλονεικὸς ἐστσ — τοῦτο μόνον λέγομαι. The word φιλονεικὸς signifies "fond of strife," i.e. disputation. The Classical writers generally for

* Thus Musonius ap. Stob. de impudicitia (cited by Krause) calls a woman's hair αὐτῇ ἑκάτερον της πάσης πεποιθήσεως. And so Galen de Usu part. (cited by Wets,) κεφαλῆς μετὰ κομψῆς ἔξειν [τοῦ βηλού γένος] καὶ σκέπης ἐνεκα, καὶ κόσμου, καὶ τοῦτα αὐτοῖς καϊνὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἀνδράς.
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Φιλονεικος ειναι use φιλονεικεω, which sometimes occurs in the sense to be fond of disputation, of which the philologists produce examples from Plato, where it is associated with ἀμφισβητιω. It often, too, occurs in Thucyd.

By ημεις some understand the Apostle himself. But it rather seems to mean we Apostles, myself and the other Apostles.

By "such custom" most ancient and modern Commentators understand τω φιλονεικεων, which makes a good sense, but not (I think) the sense intended. It seems more natural to refer it (with Grot., Cam., Mede, and many modern Commentators) to the allowing women to be unveiled in places of divine worship. And so Theophyl.

Most Commentators, ancient and modern, think that after ἐκκλησιαi there is an ellipsis of ἄλλαi. Which seems required by the context and the nature of the subject; and by ἐκκλ. must be meant the other Christian congregations besides that of Corinth. It is a strange notion of Tirin., Est., and Bp. Pearce, that by ημεις are meant the Jewish Churches. The Apostle would scarcely put the Jewish and Christian Churches on the same footing; still less would he class himself with the former.

17. As to what had been enjoined at 5, 3 seqq., the treating on those points had been rendered necessary by the letter of the Corinthians, to the heads of whose queries the Apostle wished to answer: but he takes occasion, from the answer to the question (τουτο παραγγελλων) to touch on certain vices of which he had information from the letter to the Corinthians, but merely from report. (Rosenm.)

This view of the subject may, perhaps, be too formal and hypothetical; but the connexion is, I think, correctly traced. That had, indeed, been ably laid down by Grot. as follows: "Ut pergam dare praecepta περι ευταξιας, sunt quorundam facta quae laudare non possum." Some ancient and modern Commentators trace it thus: "Thus far I have
praised you, but now I must blame you,” &c. This sense, however, cannot be correctly elicited from the words. The passage may be thus paraphrased: “While I am giving you this direction, I cannot but take occasion to censure you on the ground, that,” &c. The word ἐκκλησίαι seems to me to have suggested to the Apostle the idea of giving them a re- buke for some irregularities in the public worship of the Church. Ὁύκ ἐκκαίνω is plainly a miosis delicately implying blame, of which examples are ad- duced by Raphel and Wets.*

If the above view of the connexion be correct, the Var. lect. of some few MSS., together with the Vulg. and some Latin Fathers, will deserve no atten- tion, as being a mere error of the scribes (for the ὁ and ὁν are frequently confounded), or perhaps originating in some attempt to help the connexion by critical emendation.

Συνέρχεσθε, “assemble for public worship.” Ὁύκ εἱς ὁ κρεῖττον, ἀλλ’ εἱς ὁ ἤττον. This is said with great delicacy and yet firmness. The expressions εἱς ὁ κρεῖττον and εἱς ὁ ἤττον, and their application, can require no explanation. But the sense of εἱς may deserve attention. It is not, that they assembled together for the purpose, not of being better, but worse, but that the result of their assembling to- gether was, not edification, but deterioration.†


† This deterioration Grotius attributes to the abuse of the Agape, in the following able note: “Nox vetus erat in Orca, ut divites quasdam offerrent diis, quae deinde in usum cedebant pauperum; aut ut fuerat ταρδαιον, ubi alius plus, alius minus, conferesbat pro suis opibus: omnes autem de omnibus pari jure epulabantur. Meminit Scholiastes Aristophanis utrisque moris; illius quidem ad Plutum, hujus verò ad Pacem: Plutarchus Lycurgo, ubi συντομία Laconica describit, έτι ταυτοι δεῖκον τῷ πάντω τῷ ἠλωτείου βενδι- ειτός. Hunc morem non imitati tantum erant, sed multum supe- raverant primi illi in Achaia Christiani quos Paulus instituuerat, et non dubium quin et exemplo illius κοινοθύου, quod hierosolymis in- stituerant Christiani, accendebat ut ad illud ipsum, quantum fieri
18, 19. ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ is, by some Commentators, construed with the words following: and thus ἐκκλησίᾳ will have the sense of concio, meeting. Now this word (like συναγωγή) will signify either the place of meeting, or the assembly itself: but the former sense is here the more apt, since the construction just mentioned would needlessly occasion at once a pleonasm and an hyperbaton.

18. ἀκούσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχουσα. The word σχίσμακα here, and in 1, 10., denotes, not separations from the Church, but dissensions in it, and is synonymous with αἰγέρεις just after, and ἐρις καὶ διχοτοσίαι at 3, 8. This is plain from the expression ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ: yet, as Rosenm. observes, though they continued to assemble in the same place, and joined in the same worship, they could not refrain from mutual hatred, carrying their factious preference to Apollos, or Cephas, into the religious assemblies and sacred meals." See also Beza ap. Pole.

18. καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω, sub. κατὰ (of which ellipsis Wets. adduces examples from Thucyd. 2, 64. & 4, 80.), "I credit the representations I have posset, accederent. Itaque Dominicus diebus divitum sumptu siebant convivio de quibus pari jure et pauperes et divites secebantur, et pauperes auferebant ἀνοφόρα. At, Paulo digresso, divites, qui aetare disciplinā teneri nolebant, doctores sibi adsciverant aptos suis ingenios, cumque illis, spretis pauperibus, epulas habebant lauros quorum deceret." So also Schoettgen: "Vetere Christiani primis Ecclesiae temporibus cibos in templum aut locum conventus deferebant. Ex iis primum desumptum est, quantum panis et vini ad S. cœnas administrationem necessarium erat, de reliquis convivio publicum institutum, quod Agapas dixerunt. Quum vero apud Corinthios variis abusus accederent, qui v. 21 & 22. memorarant, Apostolos illos taxat, et verum S. cœnam celebrandi modum tradid." Thenphylac. too, has this excellent illustration: "Ωσπέρ οἱ ἐν ἀρχῇ πιστεύουσαι, κοινὰ πάντα ἔχοντες κοινὴ ἐστίωντο ὁπώς κατὰ τινὰ μιμοῦν τοὺς, έκ καὶ μὴ ἀκρίβης, ἐν Κορινθίου κατὰ τινὰς ἡμέρας, συριστοὺς ἵκους, κοινῆς εὐωχιοντο μετά το μεταλαβεῖν τῶν μυστηρίων, τῶν μὲν πλουσίωτερον εἰσφέροντας τὰ ἐκθέματα, τῶν δὲ πεντήν τις αὐτῶν καλογένως καὶ ἐστιωμένως. Διὰ τούτων τὰς διχοτοσίας διεφθάρη τὸ θαυμαστὸν τότε καὶ φιλόληξιν καὶ φιλόσοφον ἔθος, καὶ οὗ παρὰ πάντων ἐπηρεῖτο.
heard, or believe you (i.e. some of you) blameable, or believe some of you in some measure blameable." [*]

19. δει γαρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα, &c. Chrys., Theophyl., and the other Greek Commentators, remark that by αἰρέσεις are meant, not differences of opinion in doctrine, but differences of practice, and factions. So Theodoret explains it, φιλονεικίας, οὐ τάς τῶν δομιμάτων διαφοράς.* (See Hardy.) They rightly, too, explain δει by ἐνδεχεται. The term, it must be observed, is not (to use the expression of Theodoret) ἀναγκαστικῶς, i.e. does not imply simple or absolute necessity, but (as Theophyl. says) what must be while men continue to be men, δι' ἀνάγκης ἐστιν ἀνθρώπους ἄντας ὑμᾶς μὴ πάντας ὀρθοποδεῖν. Thus (adds he) our Lord said ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, instead of ἐπεὶ πωμησθη εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ, ἀνάγκη καὶ σκάνδαλα εἶναι καὶ ἐρχεῖσθαι; q. d. "and for this reason I believe the report." In the same manner the word is explained by the best modern Commentators, † who refer to Matt. 18, 7., and compare Marc. Anton. 9, 42. ὅταν τίνος ἀναἰσχυνθῇ πρεσβυτῆς, εἰδὼς πυμῆνω σεαυτοῦ, δύνανται οὐ ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ ἀναἰσχυνθοΙ μὴ εἶναι; οὐ δύνανται μὴ οὖν ἀπαίτει τὸ ἀδύνατον εἰς γαρ καὶ οὕτως ἐστιν ἐκείνων τῶν ἀναἰσχύντων, οὐς ἀνάγκη ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ εἶναι.

The Apostle then shows the reason why‡ such events have been permitted by God to arise, namely, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι Φανερὸς γένονται ἐν ὑμῖν, "that those who are of approved faith among you may be made ma-

* And Wetstein rightly observes that aἱρέσεις is here a milder term, to signify the same as σχίσμα. And he gives several examples from Joseph., Philo, Athen., Galen, Sext. Emp., and Cicero, of the use of the word in the sense philosophical sect.

† Su Bp. Pearce: "Δει γαρ signifies not here an absolute necessity, but such a necessity as arises from the tendency of several causes to affect it: it means that the thing will be done, not that it must or ought to be done; and thus δει signifies in Matt. 24, 6. 26, 54. Mark 8, 31. and Acts 1, 16. In the same sense is ἀνένδεκτον ἐστι used in Luke 17, 1. and ἀνάγκη ἐστι in Matt. 18, 7."

‡ Theophylact observes that the ἵνα has not the causal, but eventual force. See the note on Acts 21, 23.
manifest.” Δοκιμ. signifies tried and true Christians, who have approved their virtue, fidelity, and steadfastness* in the doctrines they have been taught. (Compare 2 Cor. 10, 18. 13, 7. 2 Tim. 2, 15. James 1, 12.) And such, it is hence evident, were some at Corinth.

20. συνερχόμενον οὐν ἐνεμὸν ἐπί τὸ αὐτό, &c. i. e. (as Hes. explains) ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τότον. See Acts 2, 1., and the note. Οὐκ ἔστι Κυριακόν δείπνων φαγεῖν. The ἐστὶ is used impersonally; or (as some say) there is an ellipsis of τότο. It is plain that Κυριακόν is for Κύριαν; as in Apoc. 1, 10. ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ημέρᾳ. It is strange that Mackn. should have thought the expression signifies a Lord’s-day meal. Such a use of the word would be very irregular; and as to the authority of the Syriac Version, to which he appeals, it is in itself of little weight. Neither does the opinion of some Commentators, (as Grot. and others,) who take it of the Agapæ, seem to deserve much attention, since the antithetical clause τὸ διὸν δείπνων in the next verse would appear to confine this to the Lord’s Supper: and this interpretation is supported by the Greek Commentators and the more eminent moderns. Yet it seems certain that in the Lord’s Supper was comprehended the Agapæ.

It is proper to attend to the sense conveyed by this (I think) idiomatic, or popular and sarcastic sentence (not dissimilar in expression to an idiom found in our own language), which is as follows: “To eat the Lord’s supper is not, cannot, surely, be the purpose of your meeting (since that you do not eat): for your meal is not common, but separate; every one eats his own supper.”

21. ἡκαστὸς γὰρ τὸ δίδων—προλαμβάνει. Macknight’s translation of these words is a tissue of blunders. The sense is very well represented in our Common Version. Προλαμβάνει ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν seems to advert to the eagerness with which each, as it were, snatched up the food he had brought, and filled himself there-

* So Theophylact: δοκιμοὺς λέγει τοὺς ἐς τὸ έδος φυλάττοντας.
with; which would cause the poor, who brought little or nothing, to come off with meagre fare. There seems to be no doubt but that what is here mentioned has reference, not to what happened at the *eucharist itself*, but the *Agapae* which preceded. On these *agapæ* see Suic. Thes. and Schl. Lex. Common meals, in imitation of those of our Lord and the Apostles, were (it seems) instituted after divine service on the Lord's day, and either preceded (which seems most probable), or (as others say) followed the eucharist. Now in these, though each brought τὸ ἱερὸν δεῖπνον, yet it ceased to be his own after it had been thrown to the common stock. Propriety and decorum, therefore, as well as religious feeling, required that the food should be eaten *as* from a common stock. This, however, was prevented by the eagerness with which the rich snatched the best fare, and the selfishness with which they endeavoured to get as large a share as possible of the food; by which the poorer sort would be pinched, and even obliged to put up with bones and scraps. A practice this, which tended to produce heart-burnings and bickerings, in the place of that spirit of Christian charity and unanimity which the *Agapæ* were meant to inculcate and promote.

There is reason to think that these *Agapæ* were joined to 'the Lord's Supper, after the example of our Lord, who celebrated the Sacrament after the Supper. There might also be an intention to imitate those Symposia, or *Picnics*, of the Greeks, towards which each contributed his own provision; and then all partook in common. Though there is reason to think that that selfish principle which will ever prevail in all mixed meetings, frustrated the ends for which *those* meetings, as well as the *Agapæ*, were instituted. Raphael, who has well illustrated the subject, adduces a passage much to the purpose from Xen. Mem. 8, 14, 1. ὡς τῆς ἤλευθερίας οὐκ ἔνδειπνον οἱ μὲν μικρὸν ἢπον, οἱ δὲ πολὺ φέροιεν, ἐκεῖνες ὁ Ἑκάτης τῶν παιδῶν τὸ μικρὸν ἢ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τιθέναι, ἢ
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21. ὡς δὲ μεθύει. The ancient Commentators rightly notice that the ratio oppositi requires this word to be interpreted of *repletion*, if not excess both in *eating* and *drinking*. Schl. confines it to eating. But this would unnecessarily increase the catachresis. Chrysost. rightly includes both, explaining, δεῖνον ἀτίμωσετι, ὅτι γαστρίζωνται κατὰ μεθύον. It is not, however, necessary to suppose any excess of drinking, but merely *drinking to satiety*;* as at Joh. 2, 10. (where see the note), and often in the Old Testament. The crime imputed to them is not drunkenness or gluttony, but gross and rapacious selfishness at a feast united with the Lord's, and formed on such principles of love and Christian communion as should be a proper introduction to it.

22. μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχοντες, &c. These words, I think, prove that the Apostle laid no *brutal excess* to their charge, because he only uses the expression *eat* and *drink*, by which he however means eating and drinking to satiety.

* I am surprised that some recent Commentators should introduce the *unile* derivation of μεθύω from μερὰ and θύειν. Not less absurd is that proposed by Lennep and Scheid. The truth is, the root cannot be found in the Greek language at all, but seems to have been derived from the Sarmatian or Scythian. Nay the word is found in almost all the Northern languages, and is distinguishable in our *mead*, which simply signifies *wine*. Nor does δείκνυον come from δείκνυι, but from δεῖν, *to match, mep, quasi δέκανσιν, literally signifying a snack, or luncheon.*
By ἐκκλησ. some, as Grot., understand the place; others, with more probability, the company, and congregation. The general sense of the words is too obvious to require explanation; but the clause ἐκκατασχύνετε τῶν μὴ ἐκοινώνεσι may deserve some attention. There is an ellipsis in τῶν μὴ ἐκοινώνεσι, which some, as Whitby and Mackn., supply by χρήματα. And this is common in the Classical writers. But here the ratio oppositionis and the context seem to require something more special. It is plain that we must subaud, from the preceding, εἰκασ ἐς τὸ ἐσθιεῖν καὶ πίνειν, attending to the sense there meant by ἔσθ. καὶ πίν., namely, eating and drinking to satiety. Thus they would put to shame those who, if they must contend with poverty, ought to be left to bear their want at home, and not be shamed with it abroad, and insulted by so rude a comparison with the abundance enjoyed by their richer brethren, especially at a meal which was intended to put all on the same footing.

Rosenm. and Krause explain the τῶν μὴ ἐκοινώνεσι “qui non habent quod afferre possint;” which comes to the same thing. But the ellipsis is too violent.

Theophyl. well remarks on the mildness (and he might have added affectionateness) of the expressions τι συνε, εἶπο, &c., which may be imputed to a wish not to exasperate the rich against the poor.

23. In order to show how unseemly and criminal was the abuse in question, the Apostle lays before them the whole history of the institution of the Lord's Supper, that they might the better understand the purpose of Him who instituted it, and thus more clearly see that by such conduct that purpose was

* For, as says Juvenal (cited by Grot.) “Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se Quam quod ridiculos homines facit.” Which our English Juvenal has thus spiritedly imitated:

Of all the griefs that harass the distress,
Sure the most bitter is a scornful jest.
entirely frustrated. The γάρ is therefore very significant.

On the sense of παρέλαβον there has been some difference of opinion. Several modern Commentators, and indeed most recent ones, seem inclined to interpret it of tradition derived from the Apostles, the eye and ear witnesses of the thing itself; no one of the present Gospels having been then in being. Rosenm. thinks the Apostle derived his information of this rite from the Gospel of the Hebrews, or of the Egyptians, or some other! And he refers to Boltet. But though it is true that παρέλαβον is sometimes used of tradition, whether oral, or in writing, as the examples adduced by Wets. and Krause will shew, yet it is equally applicable to information, or intelligence communicated in any way: (see Joseph., cited by Wets.): and here the interpretation in question cannot be admitted, since it is not agreeable to the scope of the passage, and the intent of the Apostle, indeed, to use the words of Jaspis, "incidit nervos Apostolicæ argumentationis et admonitionis." In short, it rests the whole on some hearsay oral information (for of the Apostles nothing is here said) or on some apocryphal Gospel; a principle most unsound and pernicious, and involving the absence of all inspiration in the Apostle.

Other Commentators, as Beza, Camer., Paræus, Hardy, and most recent ones, assign the sense, "non meum inventum est, sed a Domino." This, Jaspis maintains, is Paul's especial purpose; q. d. "non excogitavi novam cœnæm, quam institui, Christus est ejus autor, illius utpote unius Domini authoritas in ecclesiâ Chr. unice vaileat." But such a sense cannot be elicited on any correct hermeneutical principles; and by this interpretation is, I think, curtailed the Apostle's meaning, which seems to be as follows: "The institution which I am now about to advert to is what I myself received from the immediate and personal communication of the Lord himself, and, according to the ex-
press injunction therein contained, appointed for your observance. It is not, therefore, of my own devising, nor that of any man, but Divinely instituted, and consequently imperatively binding on all Christians.” This interpretation the plain and natural import, sense, and construction require; and it is supported by the authority of all the antient Commentators. It is placed too beyond doubt by a kindred passage of this very Epistle, 15, 3. παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρᾶξις, εὶ καὶ παρελάβων where, as in the present place, there is reference to the revelations vouchsafed to Paul by our Lord himself. So Gal. 1, 11 & 12. “I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” See also 2 Cor. 12, 1. I would also refer the reader to the able inferences drawn from this interpretation by Dr. Doddridge.

Παρέδωκο many modern Commentators render delivered up. But though the word properly signifies no more, yet that is only when it is (as it almost always is) accompanied with the adjuncts εἰς τινα, τινας, or εἰς φυλακήν, which here some Commentators would supply, but without any authority; and as treachery was combined with the delivering up, and was probably uppermost in the mind of the Apostle, so that there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation betrayed. See the able inferences drawn from the institution of the Eucharist by our Lord on the night previous to his crucifixion by Dr. Mackn., and extracted by Mr. Slade.

24. On εἰσαριστίσας see the note on 10, 16. and those on Matt. 26, 26. and Luke 22, 19 & 20. It is observable that after ἐκλασε we have not here καὶ ἔδωκας τοῖς μαθηταῖς; but (as Krause rightly remarks) κλάν αὐτον involves the idea of distribution: and, indeed, in our own language, to break bread, is vulgarly used as a phrasis praegnans, also including the eating it. The εἰσι must (as all Protestants except the Lutherans maintain) be interpreted signifies; on
which sense see the note on Matt. 26, 26. Krause observes, that this is proved by the usage of Scripture, as Gen. 41, 26 & 27. Ezech. 37, 11. Dan. 2, 38. 4, 19. Matt. 13, 37—39. Joh. 15. 1—5. 1 Cor. 10, 4., also Gen. 17, 10. and Exod. 12, 11. where the verb εἶδω is used in the same manner, and finally, from the nature of the thing, and the context.

24. κατέμενον. Here again κατέμενον is a vox prægnans, and signifies both broken and given (which is added in the Cod. Cant. by a gloss), i.e. “given up to death for you,” the present (as Krause observes) being used pro proxime futuro; as in the verse following, and supra, 3, 10. 5, 23. 6, 6. and elsewhere. On the sense of the word I need not further dilate. It will suffice to refer the reader to Whitby and Macknight.

24. τούτῳ ποιείτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, “perform this rite, as a commemoration of me,” by which is meant, “of this my death and the benefits thereby imparted to all Christians;” therefore the reception of it must be a duty on all. I must not omit to advert to the words λαβέτε, φάγετε, which are omitted by some very antient MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and thrown out of the text by our recent Editors. On weighing all that has been urged in defence of the reading by Whitby and Matth., I must confess, I think it has been cancelled on just grounds. No imaginable reason can be conceived for the omission of the words, but many for their introduction. The omission may very well be justified by the parallel passage of Luke. Besides, it is not probable that St. Paul meant to give a formal statement of the exact words of the institution, of which they could not be ignorant. He seems only to give it in a general way; and thus he omits some other words, which may very well be supplied; as εἴδω, just before, and πιέτε εἰς αὐτὸν: while, on the contrary, St. Matthew has omitted the words τούτῳ ποιείτε εἰς ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, though they are recorded by St. Luke, to whose nar-
ration of the circumstance this of St. Paul bears a strong affinity.

25. ἰδὼν γὰρ ἄν πίνητε, “as often as, whenever ye drink it. The Popish interpretation of this term (which is very properly exposed and refuted by Mr. Slade) is such as none but those utterly ignorant of the force of the expression would ever think of, and none but those determined to pervert it, would ever have devised.

26. τῶν θανατῶν τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἀ. ἀ. ἀ. Many would take καταγγέλλετε in the imperative. But this seems very harsh. The indicative use is far more natural, and is supported by the antient Commentators. Nor can I approve of the interpretation, “ye ought to shew,” though it is maintained by Grot. and most recent Commentators. The use of the present is indeed in the New Testament often vague and extensive; as indeed is the popular use of the verb substantive in modern languages. The sense, therefore, may be expressed by, you may, will, and ought to show.”

Καταγγέλλειν signifies to celebrate with praise (like ἀναγγελ.) and here Commentators interpret, “celebrate with due praise, and thereby commemo-rate the Lord’s death and the benefits thereby obtained.” “Αὐτὸς ὁ δὲ ἐλθὼν, “till he come,” namely, at his second advent, to judge the world. Photius thinks there is here an hyperbaton. But he is, I think, mistaken. There is rather an omission of a clause; q. d. “(and this you are to continue to do) till he come.”

27. Having shown the intent of the Lord’s Supper, the Apostle draws from what he had said the following conclusions, which he introduces with the illative particle ὥστε; q. d. “So that or this being the case, or this being the intent of the Lord’s Supper, it follows,” &c.

27. ὅσα ἐν ἑαυτῷ τ. ἀ. τ. ἤ π. τ. π. Here ἤ is put for καὶ: an idiom frequent in the Old Testament, as
Gen, 8, 22. where Sym. καλὸν ητε τομηῦν: Sept. καλὸν καὶ τομηῦν! Nor is this foreign to the popular use in most languages. Some MSS. read καλ; but that seems from correction. So AD. Several Versions, too, are appealed to in favour of it. But in such a case Versions are questionable evidence, since Translators are not bound to render idioms literally. See the note of Whitby. As to the arguments from this disjunctive particle, deduced by the Romanists, that the bread may be given without the cup, that the "whole Christ" may be contained in either, it would be (as Mr. Slade justly observes) like the argument on v. 25., and if it proved any thing, prove too much; since it would authorize a separate use of the cup, as well as of the bread; whereas they never presume to give the cup without the bread."

"Ἀναξιος. Most recent Commentators join this with Κυρίου. But this is supposing an hyperbaton, and a use of the article for the demonstrative pronoun, very needlessly. Besides, the common interpretation, which unites τοῦ Κυρίου with τὸ ποτῆριον, proceeds on a far more natural mode of construction, and yields a very good sense: whereas τοῦ Κυρίου cannot be necessary to the interpretation of ἀναξιος, which signifies, "in a manner unworthy and unsuitable to the purposes for which this rite was instituted," or "without due regard to the sacrifice and death of Christ, and of the benefits of which we are thereby made partakers."

27. ἐνοχος ἐσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου. On the meaning of this clause Commentators are not agreed. Grot. renders it: "par fecit quasi Christum trucidaret." And in the same manner the words are interpreted by the Greek Commentators and some early modern ones. So Theophyl.: ἐνοχος, οίς καὶ ἐκεῖς τὸ αἷμα. And both he and the rest (especially Chrysost.) have much ingenious speculation on the coincidence between the murderers of our Lord, and those who take the sacrament unworthily.* But

* And Zeltner carries it yet further, by asserting, that unworthy
although this would be the sense, if the words were those of a Classical writer, yet in the interpretation of St. Paul's phraseology, the apparent sense is not always the real one; that must depend upon the context and the whole tenor of Gospel doctrines. Here the only mode of interpretation which will bear examination is that of Casaub., Lightf., (and perhaps Grot.) Locke, and Whitby, adopted too by almost all recent Commentators, namely, "he shall be guilty respecting the body," i.e. "guilty of profaning the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and consequently shall be amenable to the punishment due to such an abuse of the highest of the means of grace." Thus Schleus. observes, it is not said de reatu poæne, but de reatu culpa. This is, however, somewhat too refined a distinction; for the one supposes the other. So Exod. 22, 3. ἔνοχος ἔστι and Gen. 26, 11. ἔνοχος θανάτῳ ἔσται. The word ἔνοχος is not unfrequent in the New Testament; but I know of no passage exactly parallel to the present one but James 2, 10. γέγονε πάντων (scil. νόμων) ἔνοχος, "he is guilty of all, will be liable to the punishment of all." The construction with the genitive is rare even in Scripture; though it occurs in Hebr. 2, 15.; and still more so in the Classical writers. The Commentators refer to Mark. on Lys. p. 568.

28. δοκιμάζεται θε αὐθεντος ἐκαστος, καὶ ὅστις, &c., "let a man (ἐν, ἐκαστος), let every person examine himself." This must necessarily mean, examine himself on the matter in question, namely, the sacrament, and therefore must imply, try whether he has the feelings and dispositions which a participant in participants do really eat and drink the Lord's body! Into what absurdities, alas, has the licence of interpretation hurried Protestant Commentators!

* The use of this general term (though I do not perceive that the Commentators notice it) may be considered as supplying the strongest argument against the Popish custom of denying the cup to the laity. For, to interpret the ἀνθρωπος (every man) of priest only would be harsh indeed.
so powerful a means of grace ought to have, whether he comprehends the end and purpose of the instruction, and whether he feels a suitable gratitude for the sacrifice it commemorates, and is firmly resolved to perform the moral duties enjoined by its founder; otherwise it will be taken not only frivolously and ineffectually, but ἀναξίως, and therefore guilty.

Καὶ ἄφτως, “and then,” (which is a frequent sense: see Schl. Lex.) and, by the force of the argument, then only, “let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup.” Many Commentators, antient and modern, think that the examination should be general, extending to his belief and practice in other respects. See Selden de Syn. 346. and Gatak. on Anton. p. 381., who appeal to the Fathers. So Theodoret: Σο γενοῦ κρίνη, καὶ τῶν βεβαιωμένων ἀκριβῆς δικαστῆς, ἐρουμέν τὸ συνείδος, καὶ τότε δέχον τὸ δάρου. And, in fact, the examination as above suggested includes every important head of Christian faith and practice.

On the sentiment Wets. aptly cites Seneca, Ep. 28. Initium est salutis notitia peccati. Egregiē mihi hoc dixisse videtur Epicurus. Nam qui peccare se nescit, corrigi non vult, deprehendat se oportet, antequam emendet.—Ideo quantūm potes, te ipsum coargue, inquire in te: accusatoris primum partibus fungere, deinde judicis, novissimē deprecatoris, aliquando te offende.

29. ὦ γὰρ ἐσθίον καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως, κ. ἐ. τ. κ. π. This is added, to explain and confirm what had been before said, and to give a reason why the examination should be serious and deep; namely, since he who eateth and drinketh ἀναξίως, i. e. unsuitably, and without the due ἀντιμαχεία just before enjoined, he (it is implied) not only derives no benefit from this holy rite,* but eateth and drinketh his own condemnation; which is a popular phrase for “by eating

* And that, as Theophyl. suggests, through his own fault, and not because of any defect in the nature of the institution, ἀπερ ὁ ἁλιος τοῖς ταῖς ὁψεῖς διεφθαρμένος βλασφίρει ἡ.
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and drinking he only incurs condemnation."* Κρίμα is here, as elsewhere, for κατάκριμα, condemnation (ἵλεγ. Is. 26, 9.), and consequently punishment; which is agreeable to what was said just before, ἔσο-γες ἐστι τῷ σῶματος, &c., to further explain which, it should seem, the following words, μὴ διακρίνω τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου, were added. These words may be interpreted, with almost all modern Commentators, "not putting a difference between, not discriminating the sacramental bread and wine, the symbols of the Lord's body, from the food which was used at an ordinary meal; thereby defeating the end of their Lord's institution, by uncharitableness, disunion, and excess;" in fact, by making the sacramental supper a mere common meal; or, more literally, "who does not set a proper value on the death and sacrifice of Christ." This, however, seems too limited an interpretation. For, as it is plainly intimated at vv. 27 & 28. that the unworthily participating must chiefly depend upon the δικαίωσις, so I conceive the μὴ διακρίνω must be co-extensive with the μὴ δικαιοζων just before.

30. διὰ τούτο εὖ ὑμῖν πολλὴ ἀφθενεῖς—ικανόν. Theodore introduces these words with the reflection πισ-τότε δὲ τὰ μέλωμα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γεγενημένων. The Apostle evidently advert to the sickness and mortality which prevailed among the Christians, and ascribes it partly to the judgment of God for their irregularities in this respect. Such is the plain import of the words, and on this all Interpreters, ancient and modern, were agreed, until some recent German Commentators broached a new interpretation, namely by giving a metaphorical sense to each of the terms ἄφθενεῖς, ἄφθος, and κομίόνται: an exposition so unsupported by the usus loquendi, and so objectionable on the score of doctrine, that it deserves no attention. The reason they allege for resorting to

* So Theodore: Οὐ γὰρ μόνον σωτηρίας ἐκεῖθεν οὐ τεῖχη παρα-νόμος τοῦ δῶρον δεῖόμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ δίκαι τινές τῆς εἰς αὐτὸ παροι-πίας.
this desperate sort of interpretation is, that we have no good evidence of the mortality here alluded to. But how in the nature of things was it likely that we should? Are we not destitute of evidence on many other points equally interesting and important. Besides, is there not evidence enough in the fact that similar judgments were exercised upon Christians for other heinous offences. See 1 Cor. 5, 5. 1 Tim. 1, 20. 1 Joh. 5, 16. James 5, 14 & 15. As to what those Commentators remark on the accounts, in after times, of the sickness and death of persons who had profaned the Sacrament, admitting (which, however, seems not very probable) that all are fables, that will not prove that such judgments were not exercised under a Dispensation so altogether extraordinary as that of the Apostolical age. I would here compare a very sublime passage of Αeschyl. Chœph. 270—6. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς δυσφρένου μεταλλήματι Βροτοῦς πιθανῶς καὶ δραπετείως εἶπε, τὰς δὲ νόσους, Σαρκὰς ἐκειμενάζοντας ἀγρίως ἡμῖν γὰρ αὐτὰς ἠλπίζομεν εἰς ἑσπερᾶσθαι ἀρχαίαν φύσιν. Δεικνύω δὲ κόρας τὸν ἐπανεκτελεῖς νόσων. See also the commencement of Hom. II. and Soph. Ædip. Tyr.

With respect to the words themselves, there is evidently a climax; and ἔναν signifies literally 'a good many.'

31. εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖτος διεκρίνομεν, &c. These words are a further explanation of the preceding subject. It is agreed on by the best Commentators, that διεκ. is used in the same manner as διακ. at v. 29. Which may be granted, so that διεκ. be taken in the sense of διοικ. at ver. 28. Κρίνειν is here plainly used for κατακρίνειν.

32. κατακριόμενοι δὲ, ὅπως τῷ Κυρίῳ παρευρίσκεσθαι—κατακριβώμεν. This seems to be added, to somewhat console those who are suffering under sickness so inflicted; and the sense may be thus expressed: "But when we are so judged and visited by the Lord, we are not capriciously tormented, but corrected for our reformation, in order that we may not be condemned to eternal reprobation with the world," i.e. the im-
penitent and unbelieving. Thus there is a strong emphasis to be laid upon ταὐτ. Of ταὐτ., as denoting the paternal castigation of the Lord, we have examples in Hebr. 12, 7 & 10. 2 Cor. 6, 9. Hebr. 12, 6; and it is frequently so used in the Old Testament. (See Schleus. Lex. V. T.)*

33. ἀστε—συνερχόμενοι, &c. This concludes the preceding subject. Συνερχόμενοι, scil. εἰς τὰ Κυριακά δεῖν, “to the Agape and the Lord’s Supper which followed it.” Adverting to the insult and rejection which the poor had sustained, the Apostle subjoins the admonition καὶ ἄλλοις ἐκδέχεσθε, which words some interpret, “wait for each other; do not hastily anticipate each other, μὴ προλαμβάνετε; so that the table may be common to both rich and poor.” This, however, seems harsh. I prefer, with others, as Ros. and Mackn., to render it, “receive each other with hospitality,† and treat each other as you treat private guests.” This, of course, implies that there shall be a perfect community between the rich and poor, and it is a very delicate way of inculcating the injunction. It is here well observed by Theophyl.: τοῦ εἰτεν, ἄλλοις μετάδοτε, ἄλλ’ ἐκδέχεσθε δεκδύον ὅτι καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐκείστε εἰσφέρομεν, καὶ δεῖ ἀναμένειν τὴν κοινὴν συνελευσίν.

34. εἰ δὲ τις πεινᾷ—συνέχησθε. Grot. and Hardy here recognise a χλεινασμός, or irrisio acerba, bitter sarcasm. Be that as it may, the sense is: “If any one (meaning, of course, one of the richer sort) be so hard to be satisfied that he cannot sufficiently gratify his appetite at the Agape, let him take an ἀντεπαστ at home, and not make a feast meant for religious and benevolent purposes subservient to the mere gratification of sensual appetite, lest he should

* As Classical examples have not been adduced by the Commentators, the following may be acceptable. Xen. Hist. 5, 3, 7. ἐν μένοι γε τῶν τουτών παθῶν ἐγώ φημι ἀνθρώποις παιδευεῖσθαι. Soph. Ed. Col. 562. οἶδα γ’ αὐτὸς ὦ ἐπαιδεύοντα λένοι, ἢ ὕπερ σὺ, χωτὶ μὲλιτ’ ἀνήρ ἐπὶ ζῆνης θήλησα κινδύνουμαι.

† A frequent sense. So προσ. in Sir, 6, 33. and 18, 14.
so act as to incur condemnation and punishment," which is suggested in the following words, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε. On which Theophylact well remarks: Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ αἰσθήσαν αἱ συμελεώτες, ἵνα εφελθῇ διὰ ἀγάπης συνέρχομεν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, βέλτιον οἶκοι ἀσίν, ἀλλ' ἵνα μάλλον αὐτοὺς ἐφελκύσῃ πρὸς τὸ συνέρχεσθαι αἰς δεῖ.

34. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ, αὐτὸν ἐλθεῖν, διατάξωμαι. By τὰ λοιπὰ some understand, "what else requires to be corrected in this matter." Others, "what else relates to the external ἐκκλησία of the ecclesiastical polity," &c. including such other matters as the Corinthians had by letter interrogated the Apostle upon. The latter mode of interpretation seems the best founded; but both may be united.

It is observed by Krause, that this, and similar passages, seem to have given occasion to the forging of certain books professing to be the διατάξεις Ἀποστολικαί, one of which is found in Cotel. Petr. Ap. But it may be questioned whether the Canones Apostolici are to be regarded as a mere fabrication; though that they have been much interpolated, there is little reason to doubt.

CHAP. XII.

Here commences the fifth section of the Epistle, which reaches to the end of ch. 14. and treats concerning the nature and use of spiritual gifts. In ch. 12. St. Paul shows, that all those gifts were alike effected by the Holy Ghost, and all were for the use of the Church; and therefore that no one should value himself upon his gift, so far as to content another who had an inferior one. In ch. 13. he recommends love as a higher perfection than all the gifts of the Holy Ghost put together, because all those gifts must cease here, but love will remain for ever in heaven. And in ch. 14. he gives particular rules about the use of their gifts in public assemblies. (Bp. Pearce.)

In the Apostolic Church there were many extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit; but some, puffed up therewith, used them rather to the scandal than the benefit and edification of the Christians; so that for the Apostle to treat on these also was very necessary. He, first, then, lays down the principle, that nothing is to be done to the injury of, but every thing to the promotion of, the glory of
Christ, 12, 3. 2. He describes these gifts of the Holy Spirit, 4, 11. 3. He teaches that all things are to be used for the common benefit: and, 1st, this is illustrated by a simile, 12—31; 2dly, the law of charity is explained, ch. 13; 3dly, it is declared by application, ch. 14. (Schoettg.)

Chrysost. has here a long and valuable introduction, of which I can only insert the commencing passage, which merits especial attention: Ὅτεν, ἀκού τὸ χρίσμα σφόδρα ἐστιν ἀσάφες, τὴν δὲ ἀσφέιαν ἢ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀγνωστὶ τε καὶ ἐλεύθερον τοῖς τῶν μὲν συμβαίνονταν, τὸν δὲ οὐ γινομένων.

Theophyl., too (from Chrysostom) has the following illustrations: Οἱ προσεύχοντες ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ βαπτισθέντες, κάντες τῷ Πνεύμα ἐλάβασιν ἕκατεν ἀθανάτον ἤν τούτο, ἔλεγεν Αἰσθητοὶ ἔδειδα τὴν αὐτῶν ἐνεργειαν, καὶ ἡ γλώσσα εἰλάλον, ἦ προείφθεν, ἦ ἐθανατοφόρον. Παρὰ Κορινθίους οὖν διὰ τὰ χαρισμάτα στάσεις ἦσαν, τῶν τε μείζονα λαμβάνοντων ἐπαιρομένων, καὶ τῶν ἐλάλησεν, διαφθοροῦντων ἑκεῖνοι. Ἑκεῖνα ἦσαν καὶ μάντες τινες καὶ ψευδοψφήται, καὶ ὄσχημα διεκρίνοντο ἀπὸ τῶν ἀληθῶν προφητῶν.

VERSE 1. περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν, ἀδέλφω, οὐ δέλα νεὰς ἀγνωστὴν. What is the sense of πνευματικῶν must depend upon the word to be supplied. Some subaudion χαρισμάτων: others, ἀνθρώπων. Either is suitable enough to what follows, and either is, in some sense, contained in the other: but the former is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators, and seems to deserve the preference; as being the more regular ellipsis; for it must be observed, that πραγμάτων, the real ellipsis, from the nature of the subject, stands for χαρισμάτων, which word is used a little after, and the whole phrase χάρισμα πνευματικόν occurs in Rom. 1, 11. and πνευματ. signifies supernatural; as 1 Cor. 10, 5. where βρώμα πνευματικόν is said of the manna rained down from Heaven, which is called by Joseph. Ant. 8, 1, 6. Θείον and παράδοσιν. And so also supra 14, 1. ἔδειξεν καὶ πνευματικὰ. In support of the subaudition ἀνθρώπως * the Commentators adduce a similar ellipsis from 2, 15. But there ἀνθρώπως precedes; so that it is not so much an ellipsis as a repetition ἀπὸ κοίνου.

By the χαρ. are meant the internal and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, especially that of

* Resorting to which, the recent Foreign Commentators pare the sense down to Christians.
tongues, and many others mentioned further on by the Apostle.

The words οὐ δὲ λέγω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν are a meiosis, and a formula requesting attention, equivalent to, "I wish you to be well assured of that which I am about to say to you." (See the note on 10, 1.)

2. οἴδατε — ἀπαγόμενοι. These words, Rosenm. observes, are parenthetical, and meant to remind them of their former miserable ignorance, while in idolatry, in order that they might perceive the superiority of their present condition.

As examples, he cites 6, 11. Rom. 6, 17. Eph. 2, 11. Tit. 3, 3. "Formerly (continues he) when they were Pagans, they had no knowledge of God and true religion, and irrationally and habitually followed the superstitious rites of their ancestors. But now, when they had taken on themselves the doctrine of Christ, they were so instructed by their teachers as to know on what arguments and reasons the truth rested, and by what tokens true teachers might be distinguished from false ones." I cannot, however, see that the sentence is properly parenthetical; for there seems at ver. 3, a reference to what is contained in it, at least by subaudition.

It is truly remarked by Theodoret, that the sentence is obscure from its brevity. "The Apostle," says he, "intends to show the τὴν διαφορὰν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴς μυθολογίας, καὶ τὴς εὐσεβείας τὴν ἀληθείαν. By ἐθνῶς is meant not so much Gentiles as Heathens in the popular sense, i.e. idolaters.

2. πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα — ἀπαγόμενοι. This is, I think, an idiotical form of expression, which may be rendered, "were carried away after (viz. to worship) dumb idols." The ἀφανή, Grot., Drus., and Krause think, is used liked εἰδωλα καφᾶ at Hebr. 2, 18. to denote that they are mere stocks and stones. And so Theodoret, who paraphrases: Πρὶν δέξησθε τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ φῶς, ἐπὶ τῷ φεύγει δουλεύοντες, δίκην ἀλόγων τῇ κριτεὶ περιήγεσθε, τῇ τῶν ἀναίσθητων εἰδώλων ἑξαπάτη ἀδικολομένωι. But, as it is associated with ἀπαγόμενοι,
which seems to refer to the artifices of crafty priests and politicians, the chief of which was that of making the idol utter oracles and return answers, so I think, with Mosheim and Le Clerc, that ἄφωνα has an allusion to this. And so Hardy, from the early modern Commentators: "Quae nihil respondebant queren-tibus, neque per sacerdotes, neque per cacodem-nem, sed turpiter deceptosuisse fraude sacerdotum, qui simulabant se spiritu Deorum agi, aut arte humanâ decipiebant credulos, ita ut persuaderent ii, statuas locutas quae erant ἐδώλα ἄφωνα." The ἀπαγόμενος is a very expressive term, on which see the explanations of Sclater, Est., and Menoch. ap. Pole, some of which, however, are too fanciful. The word properly signifies to be taken away, i.e. out of one's course; which implies either unwillingness on our part, or passive acquiescence. Thus it was applied to those who were carried away into bondage, or led away to punishment. It has here reference to the irrational blind infatuation by which they were led away to idolatry, like brute beasts that have no understanding. This is especially dwelt on in the words following, ὡς ἡ γεσθε, which are meant to be exegetical of the preceding. They imply, 'without any reflection on your part,' which Æcumen. explains by ὡς ἑτοχε; and the Syr. sine discrimine.*

All the antient, and many modern Commentators, especially Grotius, (who has here a learned and able note,) think that there is reference to the dæmons, by whom it would seem that the heathen priests were sometimes inspired: and this seems confirmed by the verse following. But here, I conceive, are meant, not so much ματρεῖς, or priests, as the people, who can hardly be supposed to have been under demoniacal influence. Yet both may be intended.

*Which is base and brutish; for, as says Seneca, (cited by Wetstein,) "Non eunt, sed feruntur." And 37. "Turpe est atern non ire sed ferri." Wetstein also cites Dionys. Hal. 22. οὕτως ματρόμεθα, καὶ ματρομεθα, καὶ δικοὶ ποι ἣν ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος ἄγρ. πορευόμεθα.
Krause thinks it plain that the origin of the abuse of the gifts now about to be treated of is especially to be traced to the state of paganism from which the persons here spoken of had passed.

3. ὅτι γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὁδηγός, &c. The particle ὅτι is not, as Rosenm. supposes, merely resumptive, but has great extent of signification. It is well expressed by Markland thus: “For which reason, viz. because you were formerly led away and seduced by your guides, I now give you a rule by which you may distinguish concerning spiritual things and persons. The rule is this: No man who speaketh by the Spirit of God,” &c. And by Doddridge thus: “I am careful to give you the following hints concerning spiritual gifts, because in proportion to the degree in which God hath magnified his grace in calling you from idolatry to such extraordinary privileges and endowments, I am solicitous you may be preserved from abusing them, and engaged to improve them in the wisest and most faithful manner.” This, however, seems wandering too far.

Γνωρίζω. Few of the Commentators have discerned the full force of this word, which they render doceo, “notum vobis facio;” “I give you to know.” But more is intended. It is well explained by Markland, “I give you this rule to distinguish.” And so Macknight: “The Apostle adds this, to teach the Corinthians how to distinguish the inspirations of God from those evil spirits.” In the same light it is viewed by Krause and Schleusner, the latter of whom, in his Lex. 1, 536. defines it, “indicium certum alicujus rei do, significo, dico, quibus signis aliqua res cognosci et ab aliis discerni possit.” And he refers to Luke 2, 15. and Ez. 44, 25., remarking, too, that this signification had been established by Steph. Thes. and Jons. Ferc. Lit. p. 36. and also by Loesner, who cites Philo 317 D.

The ὅτι has the sense of scilicet.

By ὁδηγός some Commentators think is meant the
Jesus, who pretended to the Holy Ghost, and yet spoke against Jesus Christ, and denied that the Holy Ghost was ever given to the Gentiles. (See Acts 10, 45.) And so Locke. Macknight thinks there is an allusion to the Jewish exorcists, together with the Heathen priests and priestesses, who in their enthusiastic fits reviled Jesus. Indeed both may be supposed to be meant; and it is plain that such language, if inspired at all, must have proceeded from demons, and not the Holy Ghost. A similar mode of discerning true and false Christians is found in 1 Joh. 4, 2. At the second ouden some repeat from the preceding clause en pneumatì Theou λαλῶν: and Macknight, en pneumatì. But this seems unwarranted.

The phrases λέγει ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν and εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν answer to each other, and must be explained with a reference to each other. The former is equivalent to βλασφήμειν at Acts 25, 11. where see the note. On ἀνάθεμα see the note on Rom. 9, 3. It here means an abominable, detestable person, not fit to live, to use the words which their fathers had said of Jesus, when they exclaimed, “Away with such a fellow from the earth.” From the nature of the expression, and the peculiar bitterness of the Jews towards Jesus, there is no doubt but that these were chiefly Jewish impostors, who pretended to inspiration. The sense of ἀνάθεμα λέγειν and ἀναθεματίζειν is copiously illustrated by Krause.

Hence the opposite εἰπεῖν Ἰησοῦν Κύριον must be taken with considerable extent. It is well explained by Calov. ap. Wolf: “Jesum agnoscre Dominin, in eum credere, nomen ejus invocare, celebrare ac glorificare, verà fidei confessione, sanctà obedientiâ, et subjectione.” And Krause aptly compares Stob. Serm. 29. Ζηνα δὲ τὸν ἐξαντα, καὶ ἢ ταξὶ πάντες ἔφτευσαν, Οὐκ ἐθέλεις εἰπεῖν:

The words εἰπεῖν ἐν Πνευματι ἄγιοι, are, by many recent Commentators explained, “nisi in religione Divinâ rite institutus.” But this is, I think, an un-
founded interpretation. That they must be taken in their plain and usual sense, of the grace of the Holy Spirit, is evident from the antithetical clause ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ, and equally so from the words following, διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσι, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, especially as πνεῦμα is there (as Markland and Middleton observe) taken in the personal sense. The sense, therefore, must be, "under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and his Divine assistances."

It is not necessary to press on the sense of δύναται, which often has but a slight force. Indeed this is manifest from the antithetical word λέγει. There is moreover to be supplied, from the nature of the subject, εἰλικρινῶς.* As to the subaudition of Macknight, it is far too harsh to be adopted.

The sense here of πνεῦμα is very rare in the Classical writers. Schleusner cites Joseph. Ant. 4, 6, 5. τοῦ Θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνω: πνεῦματος, καὶ προφητεύων ἡράκλεως. I add Philostr. Vit. Ap. L. 7, 34 fin. τις ἀπολογησόμενος ἐσται; χρόνος, ἔφη, καὶ θεῶν πνεῦμα, καὶ σοφίας ἔρως, ἡ ζωή: where Olearius remarks, that Apollonius probably picked up this rare use of the word at Babylon. To me it seems far more probable that he derived it from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, which there is the strongest proof that he had read, in his imitations of them, not a few of which I have myself pointed out in the course of this work.

4. διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσι, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα. The Apostle now proceeds to enumerate the various gifts and graces of different Christian teachers, for the purpose of showing that no one of them is to be despised, and yet no one to be extolled above the rest.

On this difficult passage there has been much discussion among the recent foreign Commentators, almost all of whom, for the last half century are of opinion, that the difficulty may be removed by supposing that the endowments here spoken of were natural, i. e.

* So Theodoret paraphrases the clause thus: οὕτως ὁ πάλιν αὐτῶν εἰλικρινῶς ἀπολύει τοῦ Θεοῦ, μὴ ἐπ' ἐκείνη τῆς χάριτος φυτεύσανον.
bestowed by nature, though cultivated and improved by use and art. This hypothesis was first publicly professed by Eichhorn, and was farther digested and illustrated by Paulus, Noessel, Rosenm., Krause, and a whole phalanx of German Theologians.* And undoubtedly all that learning, ingenuity, and acuteness could confer on any hypothesis, has been bestowed on this. Yet, after all, it appears to me to be wholly groundless and untenable, and to carry with it other and far more formidable difficulties than it seems to remove. It is impossible for me in a note to enter at large into the nature of the hypothesis in question, or refute the interpretations it carries with it of the following verses. I must therefore content myself with observing, that though the learned persons who support it are pleased to treat the view of this passage which has hitherto prevailed as a mere assumption, yet their new theory is at least equally an assumption, and (not to mention the violence and extreme straining of the sense, and torturing of the expressions which it requires, and which will be seen as we enter into particulars) it is one standing entirely apart, while the commonly received interpretation is supported by the usus loquendi; for in the terms and phraseology employed, and in the things signified, it has the analogy of Scripture and the tenour of the Gospel system in its favour. Those learned persons too often forget that the dispensation of the Gospel was, in the time of the Apostles, altogether extraordinary, supernatural, and miraculous, as indeed we might reasonably expect that a system meant to work such a mighty moral regeneration would be. And, to advert to the meaning of particular words and phrases, if it could be proved that certain terms (as χάρις) were susceptible of certain senses consistent with an explanation of these dotes ingenii (as they term them) on natural principles, yet if such significations be not only at variance with the context, the scope of the Apostle, and the whole tenour of the other Epistles, it will be to no purpose to advocate them. Let it be remembered, too, that some weight must be admitted to be due to the opinion of the Primitive Church, I mean of the first three centuries, on the sense to be ascribed to the expression used by the Apostle in this whole passage. Now that opinion unquestionably is entirely in favour of the commonly received interpretation. At the same time, I am quite disposed to admit the difficulties we have to encounter in determining the exact import, and defining the limits, of the several χάρις. Indeed Chrysostom himself unequivocally acknowledges this: yet there is not the less reason to suppose them supernatural. And be it remembered, that if the terms

* Among the few exceptions, may be reckoned Schleusner, who in his Lex. uniformly adheres to the commonly received interpretation, which ascribes these gifts to the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit.

† And decidedly by the context, by which I mean the ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ Αλλῶν, between which and the present words there is evidently a close connection, a connection which has been ably pointed out by the antient Commentators.
employed are some of them such as may seem to imply human powers, yet that is not at all inconsistent with the interpretation which supposes them gifts of the Holy Spirit, since in all such cases the co-operation of the human ἐνεργοῦσας with the Divine ἐνεργεῖν is quite agreeable to the analogy of the Gospel system.

But, to omit many less conclusive reasonings, the most important term πνεύμα must be interpreted of the Holy Spirit. I mean in the personal sense, since this is the same agent with Him who in the two next antithetical clauses, or parallelisms, is called Κύριος and Θεός. Here I must observe, that that consummate Grecian, Markland himself, though he is in general sufficiently inclined to innovation, yet here acknowledges (ap. Bowyer) the distinct mention of the three Persons of the Trinity in these three verses. And even Dr. Owen, one of the greatest innovaters of our Theological School, makes the same admission, and asks what stronger proof we can have of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost?* But if this be the case, we cannot help admitting the operations performed and faculties bestowed to be supernatural.

The commonly received interpretation of these verses is also ably supported by Bp. Middleton, who at the same time points out both the personality of the Holy Ghost and His identity with the other two persons of the Trinity, to the following purpose. "The concluding clause, ὁ ἐνεργεῖν ῥὰ τὰ ἀνα ἐν πάσι, must be understood as applicable to the Three Persons; else the two preceding verses would be defective, and only the last complete. It is the same Spirit — who does what? and the same Lord — who does what? ὁ ἐνεργεῖν ῥὰ τὰ ἀνα ἐν πάσιν. The personality of the Spirit is also clearly asserted ver. 11. where he is said to distribute gifts according to his pleasure, which is the attribute not only of a Person, but of a Being, who is omnipotent. The Spirit is there said to work τὰ ἀνα, plainly comprehending all the miraculous powers enumerated from 7 to 11. inclusive, among which are χαίρεμαι, spoken of in ver. 4. and ἐνεργήματα in ver. 6. The διακονίας of ver. 5. are not expressly mentioned; but if this term relate principally, as it is usually understood, to the office of preaching, it will be included in the enumerated operations of the Spirit; for λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως, ver. 9. are the qualities by which διακονία are rendered efficacious. See Acts 6, 4. and note at Acts 6, 1. It appears, therefore, that all the miraculous powers mentioned 4, 5. are, in verse 11. imputed to the influence of the Spirit, who is there made solely to be the cause of effects above severally ascribed to the Spirit, to the Lord, and to God; and consequently that he is identified with the other two Persons."

* How sensible the antient Theologians were of the importance of the present passage to the doctrine, is plain from the numerous citations from them adduced by Petav. Dogm. Theol. L. 2. 13, 3. & 14, 3. In the number of these may be also reckoned Phot. ap. Cæcumen. 536. than whom I know no one who has considered the subject with more ability.
I will conclude these introductory remarks by observing, that the great Mr. Locke unequivocally admits the χαρισματα to have been supernatural. "They were (says he) above all human power. Men of themselves could do nothing of them at all, but it was God, as the Apostle tells us here, who, in these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, did all that was done; it was the effect of his immediate operation, as St. Paul assures us in that parallel place, Phil. 9, 13. In which chapter, ver. 3 and 14. we find that the Philippian stood a little in need of the same advice which St. Paul so at large presses here upon the Corinthians."

But to proceed to discuss the phraseology, διαφόρως δ' ἡ χαρίσματων εἰσὶ, τ. δ. ο. π., here we have an elegant mode of expression for διάφορα εἰσί χαρίσματα. In τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα we have an elliptical expression for, "but it is one and the same Spirit who is the bestower."* It must be observed that χάρισμα is a word never occurring in the pure Classical writers, nor in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament, but was (I conceive) an Alexandrian word. It is a verbal noun formed from the last participle, κεκάρισμα, and signifies properly any thing bestowed or conferred on any one by grace and favour, and solely at the good pleasure of the giver. Thus, then, it is applicable to the gifts of men: yet it was always employed by the New Testament writers, εκαρισμω to denote the gracious gifts of God. I say always, for although it occurs about fourteen times, yet invariably either τοῦ Θεοῦ is added, or left to be understood, or else the subject is of such a nature as implies that the χάρισμα proceeds at least mediately from God, or from the Holy Ghost. Thus in Rom. 1, 11. χάρισμα καθορισμένον is for χάρισμα ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος. The other passages where τοῦ Θεοῦ does not occur, admit of an easy explanation; as the reader will find by consulting them; which he may most conveniently do by turning to Schl. Lex. in voce. We have the very same appropriation of the term ἐνέργημα infra.

But to proceed, in the next clause of this antithetical climax (for such, as Phot. observes, it is) we have διακονίας. Now in the interpretation of this word the moderns are not agreed. Most have traced too minutely and scrupulously the analogy between this and the χαρισματα and ένεργηματα. They think it signifies ecclesiastical offices, not pertaining to deacons properly so called, but Pres-
byters and Bishops. The greater part of the recent Commentators regard the three words as altogether synonymous; and, in support of this opinion, they appeal to the authority of the antient Greek Interpreters. Yet these do not admit them to be verbs ἰσοδύναμων in the same sense as those Commentators maintain. Thus Phot. ap. Ócumen. says they ἰσοδύναμεῖ, because the gifts imparted by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are equal." There is no doubt but that they are, in one sense, synonymous, as all indicating the gifts of God and the graces of the Holy Spirit; yet they seem used with reference to the various views under which those gifts may be considered.* The first will signify all the gifts of free grace imparted by the mediation of the Holy Spirit. As to the second, namely, διακονιαῖς, the allusion seems to be that pointed out by Theophyl. and Phot., namely, that it is meant to suggest that these endowments carried with them the obligation to labour for the spiritual good of others. The third expression, διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων needs not occasion any perplexity: though the recent Commentators, solely regarding the use of this term, and its cognate words in the Classical writers, take it to mean simply works and operations. But its true force was distinctly seen by the antient Commentators, especially Theodoret, whose words are these: Ἐνεργήματα δὲ πάλιν ἐκάλεσε τὰ χαρίσματα, ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς Θείας ἐνεργούμενα φόσσως. And so Mr. Locke, as above cited. The ἐνεργήματα undoubtedly alludes to the inward impulse of the Spirit.


7. ἐκάστῳ δὲ διδοται — συμφέρων, "But to each in particular (and every one) is given this manifestation of the Spirit (i. e. are imparted these manifest gifts of the Spirit) for utility," i. e. for the common good of all the Church, and consequently, not for ostentation, or lucre's sake. Φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος is for Φανέρωσις τῶν χαρισμάτων τοῦ πνεύματος: and διδοται η Φανέρωσις is for πεφανερωμαι: for, as Grot. observes, Φανερῶν signifies to give so that one may be seen to give, like the Heb. יִלָּחֵץ in Jer. 33, 6. And

* I am gratified to find this view of the subject confirmed by the authority of the father of all legitimate interpretation and the prince of Commentators. They are (he says) ὄνοπής ἀνθρωποί μόνον, ἐπεὶ πράγματα τὰ αὐτὰ.
he renders: "Donum quo Spiritus suam præsentiam declarat."

8. Now the Apostle proceeds to treat per μερισμὸν on the diversity of these gifts.

8. ὃ μὲν γὰρ — ἄλλον δὲ. "To this is given—to another;" a somewhat uncommon apodosis. As to the gifts in question, it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to settle their exact import; and, as Paræus says, nec mirum ignorari proprias vocum differentias, quorum res amisimus. Something has been done towards the illustration of this obscure passage, in an excellent Sermon of Bp. Horsley, No. 14. With respect to the λόγος σοφίας, on its interpretation modern Commentators are not quite agreed. Grot. understands it of the ἡθονη or "faculty of pronouncing weighty sentences, like the proverbs of Solomon:" Vorst., Beza, and others, "a knowledge of divine mysteries:" others, "the faculty of explaining them." Whitby, Locke, Doddr., and Mackn., understand by it "the wisdom given to reveal the Gospel to the world:" and Krause would regard the λόγος as pleonastic, in imitation of the Heb. רָי.

The λόγος γνώσεως is by some taken to mean an understanding of mysteries, especially those of the Old Testament, such as the calling of the Gentiles.

Doddr. regards it as a lower degree of the σοφία. Rosenm. (after Krause and others) thus explains: "Lambda γνώσεως est facultas perspiciendi, quid aegendum aspernandumque videatur, h. e. de practico genere omnino; λόγος σοφίας autem per disjunctionis legem est de theoretico genere magis, quæ in vero potius quam in æquo rectoque videndo versatur, et curiositati magis aut cupiditati discendi ea, quæ credenda spennanduque sint, quam virtutis studio satisfecit." But almost all these interpretations are liable to objection. The last is too hypothetical: and least of all can it be approved that λόγος is to be considered as pleonastic, since in the first clause there seems to be an allusion to the expression of one's
thoughts in speech or in writing. Upon the whole no opinion appears to have so much of truth, as well as of simplicity, as that of Chrysost. and the other ancient Commentators, and the Scholiasts, who consider the λόγος σοφίας as meant of those high endowments by which St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John, and the other Apostles, were enabled to evangelize the world; now these included both Divine wisdom of the highest kind, and the faculty of communicating it for the instruction of others. The λόγος γνώσεως they interpret of that inferior kind of Divine illumination which was imparted to the generality of those who had a sound judgment and knowledge of divine things, but could not well teach them, nor impart what they knew. For, as observes Theoph., η σοφία διδάσκει, σοφεία τις οίνα, αει καὶ διασαφῶς τὰ κρυπτὰ. Thus Bp. Horsely explains the word of wisdom, of a talent of arguing from the natural principles of reason, for the conviction and conversion of philosophical infidels: "the proper gift (adds he) of the Apostles, who were to carry the glad tidings of salvation to distant nations, among which the light of revelation had either never shone, or had, at least, for ages been extinguished." The word of knowledge he explains of "the talent of holding learned arguments from the Old Testament, to silence the Jews." But this seems an utterly unfounded hypothesis, though by no means novel.

Wets. (after Locke) has applied the σοφία to the Apostles; the γνώσις to the Prophets; and the πιστίς to the teachers.

Krause observes, that the phrases κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, and ἐν τῷ πνεύματι are synonymous, and equivalent to: "The Spirit worketh all these." It is of more consequence, however, to advert to the cause of this reiteration of what he calls synonymous* phrases, which Chrys. hints was this:

* Not so synonymous, however, but that they may be distinguished, in the manner suggested by Theodoret, διάφοροι μὲν οἱ κροννοί, μᾶλ 
δὲ πάντως πνημή.
it was for impressing on their minds the co-operation of the Holy Spirit in all and each of these gifts, so that those who possessed the higher ones might be induced to cultivate humility, as knowing from whom they held them; and those who possessed the lesser might be consoled, from the consciousness that the gifts were all derived from the same divine source.” Of κατὰ in the sense here employed, Kypke adduces many examples. To me it seems that by will not inadequately represent all the three prepositions here used.

9. έτέρα δὲ πίστις. This is explained by Bp. Horsley of a depth and accuracy of understanding in the general scheme of the Christian revelation, for the improvement and edification of believers.” But this seems too fanciful. Most recent foreign Commentators take it to mean, not supernatural faith, but merely a human fiducia, or firm persuasion of the final success of their pious labours. This, however, would not have required the Holy Ghost. Of all the modern Commentators, it has been best explained by Grot., whose words are these: “Fides hic intelligitur non ea quae in omnibus Christianis requiritur, sed ea per quam quis credit Deum per se aliquid miri velle facere, ut infra 13, 2. Matt. 17, 20. Huc pertinet potestas Dænones ejiciendi. Solebat Deus hoc premium dare adultæ et bene conservatæ fide, Marc. 16, 17.” And so Whitby, who, however, would chiefly understand by it “a peculiar impulse that came upon them when any difficult matter was to be performed, which inwardly assured them that God’s power would assist them in the performance of it.” “Whence (continues he) it is often mentioned as a preparatory disposition to the working such miracles, and is sometimes styled the faith of God, Mark 11, 22., sometimes faith without doubting, Matt. 21, 21., and so it was a præ-requisite to the casting out stubborn devils, Matt. 17, 20., and to the ensuing gifts of healing and working miracles; and hence perhaps it is that in the fol-
lowing enumeration of them, ver. 28, 29, 30., we find no mention of it.” And so Doddr.: “Faith, as an extraordinary gift, in this connexion, must in the general signify, a firm persuasion of being called out by God, at any particular time, to perform some miracle, and accordingly going about it without any suspicion of fear, in confident dependence on a correspondent divine interposition.” So also Mr. Slade: “Such a faith as would make them equal to any extraordinary exertion which circumstances might require, whether of teaching, of enduring persecution, of ejecting demons, or any other.” Matt. 17, 20. 21, 21. Mark 11, 22. 1 Cor. 13, 2. James 5, 15.

This interpretation is much confirmed by Chrys. and the Greek Commentators. “It is not (says Theophyl.) a faith of doctrines, but of miracles.” And so Theodoret: “By faith the Apostle here does not mean that which is commonly so called, but that of which he shortly after says, ἔν ἐκώ πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν, ἀπε ἐνη μεθιστάνει.”

9. ἀλλ' δὲ χάσιματα ἑαμάτων. In the interpretation of this clause, those recent Commentators who understand all this passage of natural endowments; are put to great streights. Krause defers the consideration of it to a separate Excuraus. Rosenm. thinks it only refers to those natural means which the Apostles sometimes used, as anointing the sick with oil. But how, then, comes it to be added ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι? “Because (says Rosenm.) those anointings were directed to be performed in nomine Domini!” But such an anointing might be performed by any one who had not this χάσιμα ἑαμάτων. And who can suppose that such a comparatively insignificant office would be denoted by the expressive term

* Here many difficulties have been unnecessarily raised. To me it seems clear that the Interpreters above adverted to did not regard this faith as actually carrying with it the working of miracles, but such a divine faith as would suffice for the working of miracles. And so Chrysost. understood the passage. He remarks that this faith is the mother of miracles, i.e. tends to the production of them.
χάρισμα ἰαμάτων? Besides, we have not ἐν ψηφίσματι τοῦ Κυρίου, but ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ψηφίσματι, i.e. "by the same Holy Spirit that worketh the other gifts." We must therefore retain the received interpretation, and understand it of the miraculous healing of diseases.

It is rightly remarked by Mackn., that this gift is expressed in the plural number, to denote the variety of diseases that were healed.

The ancient Commentators, very judiciously, maintain that this has reference especially to the Apostles; and, indeed, it is not clear that it extended much further; and still less that all these gifts are to be supposed to have been communicated to the Corinthians. Dr. Mackn., indeed, urges that in Mark 16, 28. (rather 17.), the promise is made to those who believe. But see the note on that passage, from which it will be very evident that the πιστεύωσαι there is only to be understood of those mentioned at the 14th verse, i.e. the Apostles, and perhaps some of the seventy disciples.

10. ἄλλω δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων. The plural is here to be accounted for on the same principle as the χάρισμα ἰαμάτων just before. In the interpretation of this χάρισμα, the Commentators above mentioned are again put to great straights. They are compelled to explain it of the faculty of performing things arduous, and which require great powers; "and such (says Rosenm.) as were believed and seemed to be beyond human ability." But who can suppose that the Apostle would have employed such a strong expression to denote no more than that? It were, however, folly to waste any more words on such a precarious hypothesis.

The greatest difficulty connected with this clause, (and that of which the moderns especially complain,) is to distinguish the expression here used, from the χαρίσμα ἰαμάτων; to remove which difficulty, Mackn. adopts the desperate course of interpreting the ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων of what he calls an inworking
of miracles, or a communicating to others of spiritual powers: a most unheard of exertion of power for any mere man, and quite inconsistent with the words of the Apostle himself at ver. 6., where it is said to be God that worketh all in all.

Dr. Dodd. says, "it is difficult to distinguish this from the πίστις as explained above." True; but not so on the interpretation which has been above adopted. (See the note.)

With respect to the distinction between these ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων and the preceding χαρίσματα, much unnecessary difficulty has been occasioned by supposing them to be, as it were, contradistinguished from each other; which they are not. They are merely mentioned separately; and the most probable distinction is that suggested by Sclater and Estius, and adopted by Whitby; namely, that the expression in question is used κατ’ ἐξοχήν, and denotes the power of working the more extraordinary miracles. Thus Whitby explains it of the "doing of things beyond the course of nature, and wrought by an immediate divine hand; such as the supplying a defective member, or the raising the dead; also the curing of diseases by a shadow passing over the patient. Some, as Dodd., would confine this to the dispossessing of demons. Whitby, however, says it is plainly distinguished from that gift at Mark 7, 22. (rather Matt. 7, 22.), "Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works?" But in that passage there is, in fact, no such distinction, since at δυνάμεις there is (as often) an ellipsis of ἀλλας. And here the casting out of devils may be included.

I must not omit to advert to the opinion of all the Greek Commentators, and of Grot., that the expression belongs to the working of miracles for the purpose of inflicting punishment by disease and death; as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and of Elymas, &c. Now, if a contradistinction were
intended by the Apostle, this might be thought to be his meaning; but as that is not the case, and as the interpretation is very hypothetical and precarious, it is better let alone. Yet, undoubtedly, these most astonishing examples of supernatural power must be included in the comprehensive expression ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων.

10. ἀλλὰ δὲ προφητεία. In the interpretation of this term, the recent foreign Theologians have exceedingly laboured, especially Noesselt and Rosen., to whose speculations, however, I cannot ascribe much value. It may be easily imagined, that they interpret it of “publicly teaching the doctrines of the Gospel, explaining the Scriptures, and applying them to the use of their auditors.” But this is undoubtedly too limited a sense, especially as it does not recognize the operation of the Holy Spirit. I would apply some of this censure to the laboured definition of Schleus., in his Lex.: “facultas extra-ordinaria a Deo concessa, quâ doctores Christiani in ecclesiâ apostolicâ, præditi spiritûs divini impulsu, ad docendum, cohortandum, et consolandum in conventibus sacris assurebant, libros Judæorum sacros et inprimis vaticinia Vet. Test. de Messiâ explicant, eorumque eventum subtiliter et populari modo demonstrabant.” This is true as far as it goes, but I see no reason to suppose that the usual sense of the word was not meant to be included by the Apostle, viz. the prediction of future events. To this sense, indeed, Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators confine it; and a confirmation of this may be found in the next clause διαιρέσεις πνευμάτων, which seems to be associated with this, as bearing a strong affinity to it.* See this interpretation detailed in an admirable note of Whitby.

* I have, indeed, on other occasions, noticed how much the Apostle is accustomed to throw such lists of names of virtues and vices, or mental and spiritual qualities, into groups; and an attention to this will often, I conceive, guide us in the interpretation of an obscure and difficult passage. Thus here the λόγοι σοφίας and
10. ἄλλῳ δὲ διακρίσεις πνεύματων. This does not signify (as Krause explains) "facultas dijudicandi interpretes S. S. in sententiis suis discrepantes," but must denote faculty of diving into the heart, and discerning the secret dispositions of men. We may suppose that this is especially meant of those whose spirits it would be most important to know, namely, prophets, and teachers, and ecclesiastical rulers: a faculty highly necessary, since many deceivers were abroad. See 2 Joh. 2, 7. Hence the admonition in 1 Joh. 4, 1. μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστευεῖτε, ἄλλα δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα. This high faculty of the Apostolic age was vested, (no doubt, by the wisdom of God,) in those who had the greatest necessity for it, namely, the Apostles, Bishops, Pastors, and governors of the Church. On this subject the notes of Grot., Camer., and especially Whitby and Mackn., may with advantage be consulted.

10. ἑτέρῳ δὲ γένη γλωσσῶν, ἄλλῳ δὲ ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν. Γένη refers to the various kinds of tongues. So Gloss. Albert. ιδιότητα διαλέκτων. And so Hesych. explains γένη by διάφορα. This first clause is evidently to be understood of the faculty of speaking in tongues which one has never learned. The next clause ἄλλῳ δὲ ἐρμηνεία refers to a faculty closely connected with, though inferior to it, and yet sometimes scarcely less useful, namely, the interpretation of foreign tongues, whether expressed orally, or in

the λόγος γνώσεως form one group. Πίστις seems to be placed alone, as being a fundamental principle on which all the other χαρίσματα were founded. The χαρίσματα λαμάτων and the ενεργήματα δυνάμεων form another group; and so, I think, do the προφητεία and the διακρίσεις πνευμάτων. And lastly come the γένη γλωσσῶν and the ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν.

This whole passage is plainly alluded to in the Constit. Apost. L. 8. C. 1. διάφορα γὰρ ἐστὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ χαρίσματα, παρ' αὐτοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ διδόμενα· καὶ σὺ μὲν εἶλθαι τοῦτο ἔκεινος δὲ ἄλλο τι· ἢ γὰρ λόγον σοφίας, ἢ γνώσεως, ἢ διακρίσεως πνευμάτων, ἢ πρόγνωσιν τῶν μελλόντων, ἢ λόγον διδασκόν, ἢ ἀνεικείας, ἢ ἀγαθείας, ἢ ἔγκρισει σιν νομον. Here for διακρίσεως was evidently adopted the reading διακρίσεως, which is found in some good MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, and is also followed by Theodoret.
writing, and the rendering them into the vernacular tongue. On both these last clauses the reader may, with advantage, consult the instructive notes of Dr. Mackn.*

11. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ, &c., "Now all these (diversities of gifts) that one and the same Spirit worketh (in them), dividing and distributing to each separately his own gifts, according to His own good pleasure (and wise counsel)." Such is, I conceive, the true sense of the passage.

* Who concludes with the following very sensible remarks; "Such were the supernatural gifts with which the first preachers and ministers of the gospel were endowed; and by which they effectually and speedily established the gospel in the most populous and civilized provinces of the Roman empire. But these gifts were equally necessary for the upholding of the church. For the greatest part of the first believers having been originally heathens, were utterly destitute of all spiritual ideas, and bad but very imperfect notions of morality; many of them being men of low birth, their minds were not much cultivated by education. Few of them were acquainted with the sacred books of the Jews. And, with respect to the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, they were not published till a considerable time after numerous churches were planted in many countries of Asia and Europe. In these circumstances, the knowledge of the gospel which the brethren derived from the few preachings of the inspired teachers, which they had an opportunity to hear, could not, at the beginning, be either accurate or extensive. And therefore, to remedy that defect, the converts from idolatry were formed into churches, and appointed to assemble together for their mutual instruction, and for the joint worship of God. And lest, through ignorance or prejudice, they might have misled one another, the spiritual gifts were bestowed on a number of them to fit them for presiding in the public worship. Others of them had an inspiration which qualified them for speaking to the edification, exhortation, and comfort of the rest. Others were fitted to lead the devotion of the congregation, by an inspiration which furnished them with prayers and hymns for public use. Others, by the gift of interpreting foreign tongues, translated into the common languages such parts of the writings of Moses and the prophets, as were read in their public meetings; as also the epistles of the Apostles, and the gospels, after they were published. And these gifts were continued in the church till the knowledge of the gospel became so general among the disciples, that the church could uphold itself by the exertion of the natural faculties of its members. Eph. 4, 13."

11. καθὼς βούλεται, "libero arbitratu." "For (observes Grot.) he is not bound to give such to every one, nor did he ever promise this to any one individually." Theophyl. observes how remarkably this passage shows the power of Him who, as God, ἐνεργεῖ ἀσ βούλεται.* See Whitby.

Διαφορὰ is a vox prægnans, implying both division and distribution; as in Luke 15, 12. See Hesych. and the Lex. Xen.

The ἰδία is omitted in some MSS.; but, I think, from mere accident. The reading ἰδία is entitled to some attention, and is confirmed by 1 Cor. 7. ἐκαστὸς τὸ ἴδιον γὰρ σωμάτα ἔχει. See also 15, 23 & 38. 12, 11. And ἰδία occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Yet here it seems to be necessary, and it may have the subaudition of μερὶδ. This expression with δημοσίᾳ corresponding to it is found in the best Greek writers. ἰδία does not often occur by itself; but it is found in Thucyd. 2, 13.

12. Every admonition hitherto brought forward the Apostle now blends together in a beautiful similitude taken from the mutual dependance of various parts of the human body; and this he recommends to the imitation of Christians, so that as the body consists of several members of different kinds combining to its support, so every Christian ought to contribute, in his way, to the common benefit of the Church, as the body of Christ. Compare Rom. 12, 4. Eph. 4, 25. 5, 30. (Krause.)

This again (the ancient Commentators observe) is meant to comfort those who had received the lesser gifts. The passage is well paraphrased by Theoph. as follows: "Ωσοστοί γὰρ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐν ἑστὶ καὶ πολλὰ, διὰ τὸ μέλη ἐχειν οὕτω καὶ τὰ μέλη καὶ πολλὰ εἰσὶ, καὶ ἐν, διὰ τὸ εἰς ἐν σῶμα συντελεῖν. Ποῦ τοίνυν ἢ διαφορά; ποῦ τὸ μεῖζὸν; ποῦ τὸ ἐλαττὸν; πάντα γὰρ ἐν ἑστὶν.

1 Corinthians, Chap. XII.

Οὕτως οὖν, φησί, καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς· τούτοις, ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία. Ἐπεί γὰρ κεφαλὴ ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οὕτω τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτόματων ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς. Καθάπες γὰρ τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἡ κεφαλὴ εἶς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν, οἷς σῶμα καὶ κεφαλὴν. See also Theodoret, who concludes thus: διδάσκει δὲ καὶ πῶς ἄπαντες οἱ πιστεύοντες ἐν προσαγωγεῖς σώμα. The sense may be thus expressed: “For as the (human) body is one, and (yet) hath many members, and all members of this one body, many as they are, form but one body, so also is Christ and his Church one.”

13. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἕν σῶμα ἐκκοσμοῦμεν. There is here no little variety in the readings of MSS., owing, it should seem, to some misapprehension of the sense of the verse, in which, it must be confessed, the metaphors are somewhat obscurely developed. The question, however, is this, what is the ratio metaphoræ and the object of the allusion. The ancient, and early modern Commentators maintain that there is an allusion to the sacraments of baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. “By being baptized (say they) we are all made members of the body of Christ, and united one to another under him the head; and this, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, we are all one in Christ, who by baptism have been admitted into his Church; and this union of ours, one with another, is testified and declared by our communion at the Lord’s table, which is here called a drinking into one spirit: referring to the sacramental cup. By baptism we are said by one spirit to be baptized into one body, and, at the Lord’s Supper, are said to drink into one spirit.” All this seems natural enough and much in the style of the Apostle’s comparisons; but the recent foreign Commentators, as Noess., Krause, Rosenm., and Jaspis (partly from Wets.*), maintain

* Who paraphrases: “Ut simus non unum tantum corpus, sed una etiam anima, Eph. 4, 4. et vis spiritus non tantum in speciem nos reddat nitidos et lotos, verum se in ipsas medullas penetret, et
that it is to be understood of the communication of χαρίσματα; as appears from Acts 1, 5. compared with 2, 1 seqq., 10, 45, 11, 16. And to this, Noesselt thinks, the ποτίζωναι may very well be referred, since the notion of pouring out is applicable to all that God has so largely bestowed upon us; as appears from Rom. 5, 4. Acts 2, 14., from which it is clear that ποτίζωναι, to drink, or to be imbued with, may be so received. And so Joh. 7, 37 & 39., compared with Acts 2, 17. This, indeed, seems plausible enough; but it requires ἐν πνεύμα to be read in the place of εἰς ἐν πνεύμα; and, after all, the comparison is by no means so apt, nor the sentiment so impressive. I would, therefore, retain the common interpretation, which is ably maintained and illustrated by Schleus. in his Lex. 2, 671.*

With the words εἴτε δοῦλοι, εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι 1 would compare Liv. 1, 8. sine discrimine liber, an servus esset. And Thucyd. 2, 78. ἄλλος οὔδεις ἦν, οὗτε δοῦλος οὔτε ἐλεύθερος.

14, 15, 16. καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐν μέλος, ἄλλα πολλά. This is well explained by Theodoret: Οὔδε γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἀπλοῦν ἔστιν, ἄλλα ἐκ πολλῶν μορίων συγκειμένων. The sense may be thus expressed: "It is not one member, however important, that constitutes the body, but all together." An argument omnium animet." And Jaspis thus: "Mutaus debet esse animorum studiorumque consensus et amicissima conspiratio; nam omnia illa dona profisciscuntur ab uno auctore, collata sunt in unum consilium, commune commodum, et omnes omnino Christiani unam societatem constituant. Eph. 4, 4."

* He paraphrases the words καὶ πάντες εἰς ἐν πνεύμα ποτίζωνεν thus: "Nos omnes etiam communi illo usu vini et sanguinis in Sacra Cenæ et ex uno calice bibentes obstringimus, nos concordem studere, eodem animi sensus habere." And he thus explains: "Quemadmodum enim ποτίζων in N. T. καί ἐξοχὴν de calice, vino repleto, cujus usus est in S. Cenæ, in N. T. usurpatur, ut supra jam exemplis idoneis ducit, ita etiam ποτίζωναι, potum accipere, potari, καί ἐξοχὴν de potu vini in S. Cenæ adhiberi in loco, ubi etiam baptismi mentio facta erat ab apostolo, nec prædicata contrarium suadent, admodum probabile est."
often made use of by orators, to excite great bodies of men to unanimity and concord. *

At *παρὰ τούτῳ* the *παρὰ* signifies *propter*; as not unfrequently in the best writers. Thus Thucyd. 2, 141. *ἐκαστος παρὰ τὴν ἐαυτῶς ἀμελείαν ὀδηγεῖ διά λάθειν.* See Raphel. Wets. here aptly compares Plotin. Ennead 3, 2, 4. *πάντα δὲ τὰ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐφιέται μὲν τὸ ἀγαθόν, τυγχάνει δὲ κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐαυτῶν ἐκαστα—οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἲσσα ἀπαίσιν δεὶ τοῖς μὴ ἱσσοις, οὐδὲ γὰρ δακτύλῳ τὸ βλέπειν ἀλλὰ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦτο, δακτύλῳ δὲ ἄλλο, τὸ εἶναι ὁμαί δακτύλῳ, καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἐχειν.

It is probable that the Apostle had here in view the Apologue of *Aesop*, which seems to have been derived (together with most others) from the East, that ever fertile source of tales, fables, &c.

17. *εἰ δὲν τὸ σῶμα ὀφθαλμὸς, ποῦ ἡ ἀκοή;* Here ἀκοή, the hearing, is, by a metonymy of the adjunct for the subject, put for the *ear*; as in Mark 7, 35. Luke 7, 1. 2 Tim. 4, 3. Acts 17, 20. and often in the Classical writers. With the sentiment Wetzstein compares Quint. 8, 5. Sed neque oculos esse toto corpore velim, ne cætera membra suum officium perdant.

18. *νῦν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς, &c.* “But now God hath placed the members each of them in the body as it hath

* The Apologue in Livy 2, 32. will readily occur to every one. A very similar sentiment is cited by Wets. from Longin. S. 40. τῶν γὰρ μελῶν ἐν μὲν οὖν τιμηθέν ἀρ' ἐπερ' τὸ ἄξιόλογον ἔχει' πάντα δὲ με' ἄλληλαις ἐκπηροί τέλειον σύστημα σωματοκούσμενα τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, καὶ θεῷ τῷ δεσμῷ τῆς ἀρμονίας περικεφάνεια. Rosenm. also refers to Dionys. Hal. 6, 66. Seneca de Ira, 2, 31. Aur. Vict. 18. Maxim. Tyr. (referred to by Rosenm. and Bulkley) illustrates the necessity of the lesser members of the body politic yielding to the greater, and all co-operating for mutual support thus: “The whole body is in good plight, while every part of it performs its peculiar office in behalf of the whole; the feet carry, the hands work, the eyes see, the ears hear, and so on: but should we have a fable telling us, that the feet or the teeth had quarreled with the rest, and refused any longer to do their office, how do we think the story would close, but in the death of the man.” I would add an apposite passage from Plut. Artat. 24. καὶ κάθασε τὰ μέρη τοῦ ὀμάτος Ἡσυχα καὶ συσπέννοντα διὰ τὸν πρὸς ἄλληλα συμφωνιὰν, ὅταν ἀποσκαθέδο καὶ γένηται χωρίς, ἀπροφεὶ καὶ οὐτεται.
pleased him,” i.e. in that situation, order, and place, and for that office that it has pleased him. "Εδέστο is for διέδεστο. Νυν has the sense of, “but as things have been now,” i.e. thus regulated.

19. εἰ δὲ ἡ, &c. “But if the members were one member, where would be the body?” i.e. there would be no body; just as a single college would not make an university. Theodoret observes that the one member would be useless, being destitute of the help of the rest. It must, however, be remembered, that the whole mode of illustration here is popular, and must not, therefore, be too much pressed, or refined upon. Ros. compares Cic. Offic. 3. Si unum quodque membrum sensum hunc haberet, ut posse putaret se valere, si proximi membri valetudinem ad se traduxisset, debilitari et interire totum corpus necesset esse.


21. οὐ δύναται δὲ ὑβαλμὸς — οὐκ ἔχει. Another familiar and apt illustration derived from the same metaphor. Οὐ δύναται here, as often, signifies, “cannot, consistently with duty and propriety,” i.e. must, and ought not. Many examples may be seen in Schleus. Lex. With the sentiment Wetstein compares Plotin. Ennead 4, 4, 36. ποικιλώτατον γὰρ τὸ πᾶν καὶ δυνάμεις ἀπειρο καὶ ποικίλαι, οἷον δὲ φασί καὶ εἰπὶ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλὰ μὲν δύναμιν ὑβαλμὸν, καὶ ὅσον τὸδε, τοῦ δὲ ἀλλὰν, χειρὸς μὲν τοῦ καὶ δυκτύλου τὸ ποδὸς, καὶ οὐδὲν μέρος εἶναι, δὲ μὴ ἔχει, καὶ οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ἔχει.

22. ἄλλα πολλά μάλλον—ἀναγκαῖα ἐστί. Theophylact well traces the scope of the passage thus: Νῦν δεικνύσων ὅτι καὶ χρειάσθη καὶ ἀναγκαῖα εἰσὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἐλάττωνα· δοκοῦσι γὰρ ἐλάττωνα, οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ.

The force of the πολλαὶ μάλλον, and the turn of the sentence is well illustrated by Schliting, in the following paraphrase: “Non tantum hoc verum non
est, ut membra quae minus existimantur praestantia non sint necessaria, sed etiam multo magis sunt necessaria quam quae existimantur praestantissima, verbi caussa, quod oculos inter membra praestantius, et tamen podex magis est necessarius quam oculus?"

On the sense of ἀποθεόσεως there has been some doubt raised. Many, keeping close to the literal sense, explain it of the eyes, which though small and weak, yet are very necessary: and by the ἀπημότερα and ἀσχήμων they understand the feet. "For (says Theophylact, who details this interpretation) we take especial care of the eyes, as being weak [so the Psalmist, "Keep me as the apple of an eye." Edit.]; and the feet we cover and guard with especial care, as being exposed to injury." And so our English Translators, Hammond, Locke, and most other Interpreters, including Theodoret.—Doddr., Bp. Pearce, Macknight, and others, take it of the brains, lungs, or other internal parts, which are very tender. Others, as Grotius, take it of the pudenda,* including the intestines, stomach, &c. And, upon whole, this opinion seems to be the best founded. (See Theophylact.) And certainly the eyes cannot be intended, since the μέρη are at ver. 23. called ἀπημότερα. Rosenm. here aptly compares Artemid. 1, 45. τὸ ἄδοιον — ἀγαγκαῖον τε καλέσαι, καὶ ἀγάγκης ἐστι σώματος. And he refers to Cic. de Offic. 1, 35. 23. καὶ αἱ δοκῶμεν ἀπημότερα—περιτίθεμεν. Καὶ ηλκς here the sense of "and thus." At τὰ must be supplied κατὰ, quod attinet ad. Ἀπημότερα, scil. μέρη, "less honoured parts," namely, the ἄσθ. just mentioned, the pudenda.† Τούτων τιμή περισσότεραν περιτίθεμεν. It is rightly remarked by Grotius, that

* Called by Plutarch τῶν οὖν εὐπρεπῶν τι δεχθήναι τοῦ σώματος μορίων.

† Krause remarks: 'Ἀπημότερα et ἀσχήμων plerumque putantur, quoniam in formandis illis magis utilitati, quam decori atque pulchritudini natura prospexit.' And he cites Artemid. 4, 27. καθόλου δὲ τῶν εὖ σώματι μερῶν τὰ μὲν ἄνω πρὸς τοὺς βελτίωνας καὶ ἐντιμότερους λάμβανε, κάντα δὲ ύποκάτω πρὸς τοὺς ἠττονας καὶ ὑποδεσσέτερους.
the τιμή here merely means that of clothing, which is all the τιμή they require. So the Latin cultus. There is also a notion of cherishing; as in 1 Pet. 3, 7. And so τιμὴ τοῦ σώματος in Coloss. 2, 28. It may be observed, that the verb περιτίθησι will readily suggest the kind of τιμή bestowed, namely of clothing. Thus the verb becomes a sort of vox prægnans. The expression, however, occurs also elsewhere: and Kypke cites several examples; as Esth. 1, 20. περιθήσωσοι τιμήν. Dionys. Hal. p. 62. τιμήν περιτιθέσει, and other passages; where, however, it is used in a metaphorical sense, there being, I imagine, some allusion to the robes with which, in antient times, persons were invested by monarhns as a mark of honour; a custom yet retained in the East.

23. καὶ τὰ ἁγίαμονα ἡμῶν εὐσχημοσύνην περισσοτέραν ἔχει. This is a sort of parallelism, and is exegetical of the preceding. Ἐχει, have, receive, τ. περισσοτέραν, "a more careful external ornament," viz. of clothing. This sense of εὐσχημοσύνη Krause illustrates from Diod. Sic. p. 54. τὰ πρόβατα τοὺς ἑρίους τὴν σκέπην ἀμα καὶ εὐσχημοσύνην περιτοιεῖ. The sense here of περισσ., by which excess is not meant, may be paralleled by our use of exceedingly.

Here Krause (after Wetstein) compares Seneca de Benef. 7, 2. His membris eum honorem exhibemus, ut ea removeamus ab oculis hominum, ut ea occultemus tanquam mysteria. Eurip. Hecub. 568 seqq. ἡ δὲ θυσίαν ὑμῶν Πολλὴν πρῶνοιν ἔχειν εὐσχῆμας πεσεῖν κρόπτειν ὡς κρύπτειν ὑματία ἀρσένων χρεῶν. The application is obvious. See Macknight and Slade.

24. τὰ δὲ εὐσχήμωνα ἡμῶν, οὐ χρείαιν ἔχει. Supply ἵνα αὐτοὶς τιμὴν περισσοτέραν περιτίθεμεν. Theophyl. well explains: ἵνα μήτις, εἰπῇ, καὶ ποιῶς ότος λόγος, προωνεὶ τῶν ἄγνωσμάν καὶ ἀτίμων, καταφρονεῖ δὲ τῶν εὐσχημών; Οὗ καταφρονούμεν, φησιν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνα οὐδένος ἐς ἡμῶν δεόνται, φύσει τὸ εὐσχήμων ἔχουτα. The Apostle, of course, especially adverts to the vol. vi. 2 p
24. ἀλλ᾽ ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασε τὸ σώμα—τιμήν. "God hath (wisely) attempered the human body and its parts, by assigning a greater honour to such a part of the body as was behind hand in that respect." The ὁδὸς τιμῆς signifies, "has caused that greater honour should be given," i. e. the honour of clothing. Τῷ ὑστεροῖτο, scil. μέρει. The singular is here used for the plural. At ὑστεροῖτο must be supplied τιμῆς from τιμήν. Ὑστ. signifies to fail of, to be wanting in.† See Rom. 3, 23. Hebr. 12, 15. Συνεκέρασαμεν signifies to mix together, atemper, compound, conjoin. So in a very apposite passage of Thucyd. 6, 18. (cited by Wets.) νεύσατε, νέστηκα μὲν καὶ γηράσα ἀνεμοὶ ἄλληλοι, μηδὲν δύνασθαι, ὅμοι δὲ τὸ τε φαύλον, καὶ τὸ μέσον, καὶ τὸ πάν ἀκριβές ἀν εὐκραθῆναι μάλιστ' ἄν ἰσχύειν. The force of the term is well illustrated by Theophylact thus: "Ὅστε εἰ συνεκέρασε, καὶ ἐν ἐπιότητι τῷ γαρ κεραύνομον, ἐν γινεται. Καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ ἐν τῷ ἑν τοῦ μείζον καὶ τοῦ ἔλαττον;"

25. ἦν μὴ ἡ σχίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι. "That there should be no member separated from, deprived of the care of, or neglected by the whole body." For such is the sense of the metaphorical expression σχίσμα, in which there is an allusion to the body politic, which is considered as a garment. This is meant to hint that no gift, however mean, as exor-

* In the same sense Diod. Sic. 1, 166. uses the expression κυριώτερον μέρος. See also 2, 165. and 9, 152.
† It is well observed by Theophylact, that the Apostle does not say ἄσχήμονι, or ἀγίμῳ, but ὑστεροῖτο; since, though by nature ἄσχήμονα or ἀγίμα, such parts are so necessary, that if those ducts be obstructed, intense torment will arise, and, if closed, death will speedily ensue.
 convincing, or interpreting the Scriptures, is to be undervalued. (Grotius.) \( \text{Ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ (sub. κατὰ and μέρος), "but that, in like manner, all the members may take care of each other." Theophylact elegantly illustrates this from the case of a thorn being fixed in the foot, in the pain occasioned by which all the members sympathize, and contribute their aid to remove the evil.}

26. \( \kappaαλ ἐπεὶ πᾶσχει, &c. \) I would compare a similar sentiment of Joseph. 1190, 8. \( \kappaαβαστὲ ἰὲ ἐν σαματὶ, τοῦ κυριοσάτου (scil. μέλους) Φλεγμαίνοντες, συνένοει: where I conjecture συνώει.

26. \( \epsilonἰτε δοξάστει. \) This word must be interpreted with reference to the antithetical πᾶσχει and the συνονύμησε συγχαίρει. It is usually rendered εχθροτατρ: and the Commentators refer to 1 Sam. 2, 29. where \( \text{ץלכ"} \) is rendered \( \text{ἐδοξάσας} \) by the Sept., but by Symm. \( \text{προετιμήσας}. \) Wetstein introduces an abundance of Classical illustrations; as Cic. de Offic. 3, 5. Seneca de Iræ 2, 31. Galen de Pot. 1. Sext. Emp. adv. Astr. 44. Dionys. Hal. 6, 86. Dio Chrys. 398 a. Joseph. B. 4, 7, 2. Val. Max. 8, 9, 1. Plut. 1, 216 b. Max. Tyr. D. 21, 4 & 5. and especially Plut. Sol. 1, 188 c. and the following very opposite passage of Themist. 117 c. \( \text{ὁσπερ οὐν ἔπι τῶν ἡμετέρων σωμάτων, κἂν τὸ τυχὸν μέρος πονῆν, παραπεμπεῖ τῷ σύμπαντι τῷ ἄλγηδόνα: οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς δῆς, κἂν μία πόλις πράττῃ κακῶς, ωκ ἐὰ σύμπασαν ἀρχὴν υγιαίνειν. It seems to be imitated from this of the Apostle.

27. The Apostle now passes from the example to the thing itself.

27. \( \gammaμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ. "Ye are the body of Christ, (see Eph. 1, 23. 4, 2, 15 & 16. 5, 23. Col. 1, 18.) and are each members;" q. d. "What I have been saying of the body and its parts holds good of you." The application is obvious.

Before \( \epsilonἰκ μέρους \) the Commentators think there is an ellipsis of the article \( \text{οἱ}. \) But this is not necessary. \( \epsilonἰκ μέρους \) is for \( \text{ἀπὸ μέρους, or rather κατὰ μέρος}. \) Vorstius thinks the expression is meant to
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exclude some unworthy persons, who seemed to be members of the Church. Bengel, with more probability, supposes it to have reference to some Romans who were members of the Corinthian Church.

28. The Apostle now resumes the subject he had diverged from at ver. 12. (Krause.)

28. καὶ οὐς μὲν ἔθετο—ἀποστόλους. This sense of θέσας, namely constitute, occurs also in the Classical writers, from whom examples are given by Alberci, Obs. p. 346. Krause remarks that οὐς μὲν required in the apodosis οὐς δὲ; but δεύτερον was used in conformity to πρῶτον, which was inserted in the first member of the verse: and he thence infers that the words πρῶτον, δεύτερον, and τρίτον, do not (as the Commentators think) denote degrees of dignity. But he himself seems to be mistaken. It is not unusual with our Apostle to use a μὲν, and also an ὅ μὲν, without an apodosis.

Ἀποστόλους, namely the twelve so called, καὶ ἔξοχόν. Προφήτας, Prophets. See the note at verse 10. These seem to have united with prescience, and prediction of future events, interpretation of the Prophecies.* See Warburton’s Doctrine of Grace, p. 120. I would here compare Jambl. de Vit. Pyth. C. 4. στεργόμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ προφητῶν. So the Egyptian Priests.

The δίδασκαλοι here mentioned seem to have been only teachers of the plain and fundamental truths of Christianity. By most Commentators they are supposed to have been those elsewhere called ποιμένες, appointed to a settled pastoral office over certain congregations (see Ephes. 4, 11.), including, as some

* Jasplis, however, defines them thus: “Erant certi Christiani homines, qui vel singulares ratione divino numine tacti cum mentis impietatem docebant, cohorabantur et consolabantur; vel subito fervore ac summo impetu divinum carmen recitabant; vel libros Judæorum sacratos, in primum vaticiniam de Messiæ explicant, eorumque eventum subtiliter demonstrabant; vel occulta proferebant, sive arcana hominum sensu aperirent, sive futura canerent; vel insigni quodam cum mentis ardore preces fundebant.”
say, not only Presbyters, but Bishops.* Though it it is more probable that they had the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline.

By the δυνάμεις and χαρίσματα are meant the persons who possessed the powers mentioned at ver. 9 & 10. Εἶτα and ἐπειτα are often used in distributive sentences, especially when long.

'Αντιλήψεις, i.e. helpers; though it literally signifies help. So Mod. Gr. βοηθείας, stays, helpers. In the sense help the word occurs in the best Classical writers. This term is supposed to be used with reference to the offices they discharged, ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι being often employed in the sense βοηθεῖν, both in the Scriptural, (see Schleus. Lex.) and the Classical writers (see Steph. Thes.) Thus the Vulg. renders it opitulationes. It is thought to denote (by a use of the abstract for the concrete) those who were afterwards called Deacons, whose office it was to superintend the care of the poor, the sick and stranger, the widows and orphans, and to administer to the effects of the dead. By Lightfoot, Locke, and others, these ἀντιλ. are supposed to have been the Vicars or Deputies of the Apostles, appointed for the purpose of baptizing, catechizing, &c. Probably both these offices were united.

28. κυβερνήσεις. On the exact nature of this office Commentators are not agreed. It is thought by several moderns, (as Vitringa de Synag. Vet. 2, 3. p. 509, Mosheim, Macknight, and Bp. Horsley,) to correspond to the discerning of Spirits before mentioned; as also that of the ἀντιλήψεις, to the interpretation of foreign languages. The reason is, that it was likely the names of the offices should correspond to those of the gifts. But it may be doubted whether the Apostle meant any such exact corre-

* The difference between these and the προφητεία is thus marked out by Theophylact: Ὁ μὲν γὰρ προφήτης, πάντα ἀπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος φθέγγεται· ὃ δὲ διδάσκαλος, καὶ οἰκονομή διὰ τοῦτο τρίτος ὀφέλος. The διδ. are always mentioned after the προφ. and were undoubtedly inferior to them.
spondence of one to the other.* At this great distance of time it is not very likely that we should be able to satisfactorily unravel difficulties of this nature. Here surely, if any where, the opinions of the early Fathers and Commentators deserve attention; and in the interpretation of these two disputed terms they, I think, have come far nearer to the truth than any of the modern Commentators. Chrysostom and all the Greek Interpreters consider them as importing the same thing. These functionaries were, I imagine, so called with reference to the two different parts of their office; the ἀντίλ. superintending the care of the poor, the sick, and strangers; the κυβερν. the burial of the dead and the administration and executorship of their effects, including the care of widows and orphans. Thus Theophylact (from Chrysostom) well explains them conjunctively, τὸ ἀντέχεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενῶν καὶ τὸ κυβερνᾶν ἦτο οἰκονομεῖν τὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. Theodoret, too, explains both together by οἰκωμίας. And Genadius ap. ÓEcumen. says that κυβερν. is the same with, or very like the ἀντίλ. It should seem, therefore, that the sense is not governors, but managers.† So that the gloss of Hesych. (which refers to this place,) προφητικαὶ ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ φρονήσεις did not require the emendation proposed by Pric., Alberti, and Schleus., ἐπιστήμαι. The φρονήσεις (for which I formerly read προφητήσεις) may be thought to belong to some other

* Bp. Horsley, however thus contrasts the gifts and offices:

Gifts.
1. The word of wisdom.
2. The word of knowledge.
3. Faith.
5. Healing.
6. Prophecies, or Predictions.
7. Discerning of Spirits.
8. Tongues.
9. Interpretation of Tongues.

Offices.
1. Apostles.
2. Prophets; i.e. Expounders of the Scriptures of the Old Test.
3. Teachers of Christianity.
4. Workers of miracles.
5. Healers.
6. Helpers; ἀντιλήψεις, such as Mark, Tychicus, Onesimus, etc.
7. Governments.
8. Gifted with tongues in various ways.

† And so Semler takes it.
passage. But how, it may be asked, can such offices as the Diaconal and ¢Economical be thought to correspond to any of the supernatural χαρίσματα? "Because (says Theophylact) these functionaries were not to rest on their own diligence, but were to look up to God for help and blessing." But this is no more than what is true of all those who discharge the offices of philanthropy and benevolence. Indeed (as I before observed) it is probable that the Apostle did not intend all these offices to correspond to the χαρίσματα before mentioned; as in the case of the ἀντιλήψεις, and κυβερνήσεις. Thus, in his enumeration of the offices which have χαρίσματα appertaining to them,* he omits these: neither are they found in the first enumeration at ver. 8—10.

29, 30. The terms here used have been explained supra. Rosenm. paraphrases thus: "Fieri non potest, ut omnes unam, eandemque provinciam gerant. Non omnia possimus omnes."

31. ἐπιλούετε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα. There has been some doubt as to the reading and sense of this clause. The word ἐπιλούετε may be taken either in the imperative, or in the indicative. Most Commentators, antient and modern, choose the former. Yet some take exception at it. "It seems extraordinary (says Doddridge) to suppose that after the Apostle had been showing them that these gifts were not at their own option, and that they ought not to emulate the gifts of each other, nor to aspire to superiority; he should in effect unsay all again, and give them such contrary advice." And so Phot. ap. Æcumen. 547 B. πώς γὰρ ὅσε τολλάκις πρὸς τε τὸ συμφέρον εἰπὼν λαβεῖν ἐκαστὸν τὸ χάρισμα, καὶ μηδὲν διαφέρειν τολλάκις ἐνδειξάμενος τὸν δοκοῦντα ἐχεῖν τὸ μείζον χάρισμα, πρὸς τὸν ἐχούντα τὸν ἐλαττον; And he and Vorst. would take the sentence interrogatively. But "there are too handles by which

* As is evident from the words following, ἐπιλούετε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα.
every mortal thing may be taken," and these learned men seem to have got hold of the wrong one. ζηλ. is a vox mediiae significationis. Now if the word be taken in a good sense, the Apostle will not unsay all that he has been saying. Besides, who ever saw an interrogative sentence introduced with a δε? As to the indicative sense without an interrogative, it is very frigid; and ζηλ. in a bad sense is inconsistent with та κρείττωνα. I would, therefore, retain the common interpretation, which is far more suitable to the preceding; q. d. "Have all the higher gifts? No: but all (you say) desire them. That I hinder not. Be it so. Seek after them by prayer unto God. Seek after (I say) the higher gifts, ye that have the lesser." Thus the imperative has, as often, a preceptive sense, or rather that of "do so, per me licet." So κελεύω has often this significance; as in Thucyd. 4, 28.

The above is, I conceive, the true meaning of the Apostle, and has been best discerned by Chrysostom and Grotius. Of ζηλ.ω in the good sense examples from the Classical writers are produced by Alberti and Elsner, to which I add Thucyd. 2, 37, 59, & 43. Scriptural examples may be seen in Schleus. Lex.

This being the sense, the καλ following is (I think) for καίτω, sed tamen. The δείκνυμι is by many Interpreters taken in a future signification, which, indeed, often occurs in present tenses; but one may render more literally, "I am now going to show you," &c. 'Οδοω is by many Commentators rendered genus vitae. But this seems not very suitable to the context. It rather seems to signify "way or method of attaining" (namely, what you aim at); as in Joh. 14, 4. Καθ' ὑπερβολὴν is an adverbial phrase put for an adjective; which is not unfrequent either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. Theophylact well explains it: ὑπερέχουσαν ἥτις φέρει ἐκ πάντα τὰ χαράσματα.
CHAP. XIII.

Theophylact illustrates the scope of the chapter thus: Οὐκ ἔστις ὑπειδειξεν αὐτοῖς τῶν ἱδίων, ἀλλὰ συγκρίνει αὐτὴν πρότερον πρὸς τὸ δοκῶν αὐτοῖς χάρισμα εἶναι μείζον, τὸ τῶν γλωσσιῶν, καὶ δείκνυσι ταύτην ἀνυγκρίτως τούτων ὑπερέχουσαν, καὶ μὴν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάντων χαρισμάτων, καὶ τὸτε ἀξιοπάθητον ἀποφαίνει.

Verse 1. It would be difficult to find a finer passage than this in the writings of Demosthenes himself; and the best modern Commentators observe, that in καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων there is a beautiful hyperbole,* of which Wetstein adduces examples from Aristid. p. 274. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀν εἰ πᾶσαν ὑπερβαλομένην τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποις δύναμιν καὶ φανήν. And Virg. Æn. 6, 625. Non mihi si lingue centum sint, oraque centum, Ferrea vox, omnes scelerum comprehendere formas, Omnia poenarum percurre nomina possem.

The I is used populariter, and with the accustomed delicacy of our Apostle. He has in view some of the Corinthian teachers, who were proud of their gift of tongues.

The γλώσσαις καλ. refers to the gift of speaking with tongues, mentioned 12, 10. where it is distinguished from the ἐρμηνεία γλώσσων. See the note of Whitby, who shows by many apposite quotations that the Apostle, in this and the following verses, reckons up the things which were of highest value with the Jews, and which rendered their wise men the most celebrated.

'Αγάπην. Rosenm. observes that this is better rendered benevolentiam than amorem, which cannot be extended to all. This indeed is clear from ver.

* It is not therefore necessary to debate (as do the old Commentators) whether the Angels have a language. It was sufficient for the Apostle to suppose this, especially as it was the opinion of his countrymen, some of whom even thought that certain of their Rabbins had attained a knowledge of it, which they supposed was the key to all mysteries.
4. See also Matt. 24, 12. Ἐγένετο is ill rendered by our English Translators and Doddridge, "am become;" and worse by Macknight, "I became." It is strange these Interpreters should neither have re-collected the very common use of γίνεσθαι for ἔλθει, nor the scarcely less trite one of the preterite middle for the present. The sense is, I am; I am (but as) a χαλκὸς ἡχόν, ἡ κύμβαλον ἀλάλαξον.

By the χαλκὸς is, by metonymy, meant some brazen wind instrument, and the epithet ἡχόν seems to suggest the idea of a trumpet, which perpetually carries epithets similar to this; especially as ἀς is also in the Latin used for that instrument. So Virg. Aen. 6, 840. Dat signum speculâ Misenum ab alta Aere cavo. And 9, 503. At tumba terribilem sonitum procul Aere canoro Increpit. But the Romans had other brazen wind instruments as well as the trumpet, and especially something like our horn, which seems to be meant at Aen. 3, 140.

With respect to the κύμβαλον, the best idea of it may be formed by consulting the picture given by Pignor. de Serv. p. 166. On the thing signified see Lampe de Cymbalis Veterum, p. 176 seqq. and Ellis on the same subject, in his Fortuita Sacra, p. 316 & 334. Wetstein cites many passages of the Classical writers, where the word occurs, and which admirably illustrate its nature. Thus in Herodian 5, 5, 19. it is associated with τύμπανα; and in Athen. 361. we have αὐλῶν βόμβως, καὶ κύμβαλων ἡχός, καὶ τυμπάνων κτύτος. And 636 l. τυμπάνωι καὶ βόμβωι καὶ κύμβαλωι, κύμβαλωι μεταξὺ; καὶ βόμβως, καὶ κύμβαλως, καὶ κύμβαλως; καὶ κύμβαλως, καὶ κύμβαλως; καὶ κύμβαλως, καὶ κύμβαλως; καὶ κύμβαλως. Anthol. 6, 5, 1. κύμβαλα δὲ ὁξυφόγυγα, βαφυφόγγας δὲ ἀλαλητῶν αὐλῶν. Nonnus Dionys. 14 & 29. κύμβαλα ἀνείλουσα βαφυφόγγα δηγοῦ ἁλαλᾶ. Wetstein has also several passages on the κώδων, and tintinnabulum. But those were of a very different kind, being merely bells, such as military watchmen carried about, on which he omits the most remarkable Classical passage, Thucyd. 4, 135. though I imagine it must be found in a Tract of a certain learned Antiquary de tintinnabulis veterum.
It appears, then, that the instrument in question was of brass, and emitted a very acute and sonorous clangor; for which reason the ἀλαλάξω is not well rendered tinkling, which would rather suit the tinnabulum. It answers to the strepitus of the Latin, especially as ἀλαλάξω is generally used of the military shout.

It is of more importance, however, to attend to the purpose of the Apostle in this comparison, which is by Rosenm. expressed thus: "Si facultate peregrinis linguis loquendi omnium maximè excellam, sed benevolentìa in alios destituar, illa tamen facultas mee salutì non magis conducit, quàm æra sonando ipsa juvantur." This, however, is very harsh and ill conceived. The Apostle, I think, rather means to say: "I should be like a cymbal, which emits indeed a dinning clangous sound, but though it may amuse, (and not* weary the hearer,) yet does him no good. So Theophylact explains: φανὴν μὲν ἀφιεῖς, εἰκῇ δὲ φθεγγόμενος, καὶ ὀχληρὸς ὁν, μηδένα δὲ ἐφελάν, διὰ τὸ ἀγάτης ἐστερηθᾶι.

Wetstein here remarks: "Eleganter et argutè Paulus Doctores Corinthiacos, qui dono linguarum gloriatant, sed caritate destituebantur, tubae et cymbalo comparat." The learned Commentator then cites many not dissimilar passages of the Classical writers, where those who delivered long lectures on virtue, and did not follow their own maxims, are compared to musical instruments, which utter fine sounds, but are themselves devoid of the sense of hearing or feeling. This, however, is not the Apostle’s meaning.

2. καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν. The προφητ., I think, has reference to the λόγος σοφίας at 14, 8.; and the εἰδὼ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πάσαν τὴν γνώσιν, to the λόγος γνώσεως in the same passage. Προφητεία must therefore be here understood conformably to the

* In which view Wetstein cites a proverb of Suidas: δωδωναίων χαλκῶν, said of tiresome persons. And so Burns:

"A clapper tongue was deave a miller."
προφητ. there. (See the note.) By the μυστ. seems to be meant the more difficult and recondite parts of the Gospel, and not (as Rosenm. says) things which, without a revelation, could not have been known; though, in a certain sense, the whole of the Gospel was a mystery. By the τάσαν τήν πίστιν is meant faith of the highest kind; and the words following are plainly hyperbolical, and probably adagial; since it appears from Buxtorf's Lex. Rabb. 1653, Lightf. H. H. on Matt. 21, 21., and Vorst. de Adag. N. T. C. 2, 3. that the expression ἄρα πρύπ was proverbially said of doing any thing most arduous and difficult. Μεθυστάνειν is put, by a kind of solecism, for μεθυστάναι. And it is reckoned among such by Lucian, Solæc. 7. and the Interpreters ad loc. Yet there is no doubt but this was a form in popular use.

2. οὐδὲν εἰμι. A popular expression, with which Wetstein compares several from the Classical writers signifying, "I am nobody." But here the sense is rather (as appears from οὐδὲν ἀφελοῦμαι in the parallelism of the next verse,) "I do myself no good; I am nothing more on that account; I am no nearer salvation." So Arrian, Epict. 4. 8. (cited by Wets.) εἰ μὲ τις θαλάσσαι δύναται, ἐγὼ οὐδὲν ποιῶ εἰ ἄλλον τε- ριμένω, ἦνα με ἀφελοῦσο, ἐγὼ οὐδὲν εἰμι. And in this same view Whitby observes: "Our Saviour speaks of many being rejected at last, even though they had prophesied and wrought many mighty works. Matt. 7, 22 & 23."

3. καὶ ἐὰν ἑαυτόν πάντα, &c. Of the scope of the Apostle in this passage the Commentators seem little aware. Chrysostom has treated it with much ability: but even he fails (I think) in discerning it. The Apostle, I conceive, throughout this whole chapter, is exerting himself to lessen the too great anxiety of the generality of Christians for the χαρίσματα above mentioned; and, in order to do this the more effectually, he brings forward a certain principle which is of more value than them all, namely,
What, then, does he mean to denote by this term? He means (I think) real, unaffected, and heartfelt love towards God, and towards men, for God's sake. Not love towards God, as shown only in external forms, outward professions of zeal, nay even laying down one's life for the Gospel's sake, but internal and heartfelt love towards God, as separate from all motives of vanity, self-interest, obstinacy, or fanaticism; also love to man, both for the sake of man, and also in order to please God, not for our own sake, to please our own vanity, and to gain popularity. In the words ἐὰν γὰρ ἡμιζω the Apostle, I think, intended to give an example of two of the most remarkable and striking of those external marks of religion in its two principle parts, love towards God, and love towards man; and thus to show that if even these, being defective therein, are of no worth, it must à fortiori be true of others.

Such, if I am not mistaken, is the true view, and real sense intended by the Apostle to be ascribed to this ἀγάπη. This then may be a key to his meaning throughout the chapter, in which the Popish Commentators have been exceedingly annoyed with what seemed to them unfavourable to that alms-giving (or rather giving money to pious uses) which they lose no opportunity of extolling.

But to proceed to the consideration of the phraseology in detail, ἡμιζω, from ἡμίζος, a bit or piece (from ἡμίω, to break off), signifies properly to break off ἡμίω* and feed a person therewith; as frequently in the Old Testament. (See Schl. Lex.) And so it is used in Rom. 12, 20. (where see the note.) Here it signifies merely to break up any thing into ἡμίω, and distribute them. Therefore it is meant to denote charity of the most eminent kind, such as was then regarded such, namely, that of dis-

* Hence it is very appropriate to the mode in which infants are fed by the nurse, or younglings by the parent bird. So Porphyry. de Abst. 3, 23. (cited by Wets.) Columba ἡμιζουσι τὰ νεότητα. And Galen. ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν βρεφῶν, δόσιν ἡμίζουσιν αἱ τροφοί.
tributing or doling out Ἰδίων at one's gate; and, to raise this virtue to the highest pitch, it is here supposed that the whole of any one's property is thus distributed.

The next words relate to the other branch, namely, of love towards God; and this, again, is represented in its most striking point of view, namely, as shown in laying down one's life to bear testimony to the truth of His religion, and not only that, but laying it down in the most agonizing manner. That this may be done from fanaticism, obstinacy, vain glory, and other such selfish motives, the records of history, both sacred and profane, abundantly prove. And this Grat. exemplifies from the case of Calanus (recorded by Arrian), and of Peregrinus the philosopher. On which he makes the reflection: "Adeo apud Deum res istae ex proposito magis quam ex facto æstimantur." That this last does solely relate to martyrdom for religion's sake, is confirmed by this circumstance, that it is an allusion to what is said of Shadrach, Meschach, and Abednego, who yielded up their bodies to be burned, that they might not serve any God except their own God. The Greek Commentators, indeed, truly remark, that all this is said hypothetically: but still (as Whitby justly observes) this implies that the thing was not impossible, and that there was no necessary connection between these gifts and the ἄγαπη spoken of. See Matt. 7, 22 & 23. and 6, 2.

3. οὖδὲν ἄφελλονται, "I am nothing the nearer salvation on that account;" namely, because the thing is done for my own sake, not God's.

4. ἡ ἄγαπη, &c. After having said thus much in recommendation of this divine principle, the Apostle proceeds to describe it, and point out its nature: and this he does populariter, but in a most striking manner, by showing what are its effects, what its properties and attributes, and the marks by which it may be distinguished. To make this the more impressive, he personifies the virtue, or principle, by
using such language as is suitable to a person who is endowed with it. It may be observed, that though these characteristics are mostly such as pertain to this virtue as it regards men, yet they are all of such a nature as originate in, and are inseparable from the ἀγάπη as it regards God. Here it is truly and beautifully remarked by Mackn. “From what he says of love in this and in the following verses, it appears to be the grace which renders men most like God, and that which is the best preparation of them for living in heaven.” Hence Milton, in his Comus, terms it, “The golden key, which opens the palace of eternity.”

Among the γνωρισματα of this divine disposition, the Apostle first places μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται. These are meant to be united: and the latter, I think, is intended to explain the former. Μακροθυμεῖ signifies to be long-suffering, slow to anger and vengeance; as in Matt. 18, 26. 2 Pet. 3, 9., and often in the Old Testament. (See Trom. and Schl. Lex. V. T.) Χρηστ. is added exegesec ος gratia; as χρηστότης is found subjoined to μακροθυμία in Gal. 5, 22. Col. 3, 12. A description of true Christian magnanimity. Χρηστεύεσθαι signifies χρηστός, which has the same extent of signification as our adjective good, and denotes benevolent, benignant, mild, kind-hearted. Chrysost. has here a masterly explanation of χρηστεύεται, from which the following excellent remark of Theophyl. is derived: Ἐστείλας δὲ τινες οὐκ ἔρχεται γιορτασει σκέφτασι τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ κεχρηστεύεται, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις τούς κατ’ αὐτῶν ὀργιζομένους διὰ γεγενημένης καὶ εἰρανεύρουσιν, αὐτὸς δὲ παλαιότερος, μακροθυμοῦσα, μάλλον αὐτός ποιήσειν ἑκκαίεσθαι τῇ ἁγίᾳ διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν, τό, χρηστεύεται, ἀντὶ τού, χρηστόν ἠδονα καὶ ἄκακον ἑκάθεκναται· οὐχ ὅσον ἐκείνοι γε οἱ ἵνα ἐχθέντες, ὑποποίοι καὶ κακοθείς.

4. οὗ θηλοῦ. This term is susceptible both of a good and a bad sense. (See Schleus. Lex.) The context here undoubtedly points to the latter. By this the Apostle means to check the envious spirit with which the possessors of the higher γνωρισματα
were sometimes viewed by those who had the lower, or none at all. Theophr. rightly discerns the reason why this latter term is put after the former: ἕστι γὰρ καὶ μακρὸθυμῶν τινὰ εἶναι, καὶ βασκαλεῖν ἄλλ' ἢ γε ἀγάπη καὶ τούτο διαπέφευγε.

4. οὐ περιπετεύεται. On the interpretation of the word, neither the ancient nor modern Commentators are quite agreed. The ancient glosses found in Hesych. and the Etym. Mag, (formed, no doubt, from early Commentators) explain it ματαιοῦται, ἀτακτεῖ, καταπαρείται. And so Marc. Anton. p. 143. edit. Gataker. καὶ τὸ σωμάτιον καταιτισθαι, καὶ ἀρέσκεσθαι, καὶ περιπετεύσθαι: and Polyb. Excerpt. legat. 122. p. 1823. ed. Gronov. φῦσει δὲ ὦν λάλος καὶ πέρπερος καὶ κατακόρπις. Thus it will signify to be ostentatious and boastful: which interpretation is supported by Heins., Muret., Wolf, Fessel, Fabric., Rosenm., Ernesti, and other celebrated Critics. If this be the true sense, the next word φυσιοῦται must be considered as added by way of explanation. I am, however, rather inclined to think that the Apostle intended this as a separate trait; and therefore I prefer the opinion of Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, and several eminent modern Interpreters, as Hardy, Dodd., Jaspis, and Krause, including Schl. in his Lex. Its very origin, indeed, shows its sense: for, notwithstanding what some Critics may say, it is derived from the old Latin adjective perperus; or rather this old Latin was derived from an obscure Æolic word which did not find its way into the ancient Greek authors. It is well explained by Suidas προπετεῖν, and signifies to act precipitately, inconcisely, rashly, and thoughtlessly. To the establishment and illustration of this signification most of Wetstein’s Classical citations tend, especially Arrian Ep. 8, 2. ἥλεις, σοι ἔλθω, τίνα ἤμιν ἠδεῖξας, παριόντα, ταπεινῶν, μεμηλάμορον, ἄξωθομο, δειλῶν, πάντα μεμφόμενον, πάσιν ἐγκαλοῦντα, μηδέποτε ἥσυχιάν ἔχοντα, πέρπερον. So the Vulg.: “non agit perperam.” And the Syr.: “non tumultuat.” Of all the
Commentators no one has so well explained its true sense as Theophyl. (from Chrys.) as follows: οὗ προστεθεῖται, ἀλλὰ σωστῶν ἐργαζέται καὶ βεβηγμένα τῶν ἐχοντα· πέρπερος γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ μετεωριζόμενος, ὁ κοῦφος, ὁ βλακευμένος καὶ τούτω δὲ πρὸς τῶν παρ' αὐτῶν κόους καὶ νεωτερικοὺς.

This admonition was especially suitable to those to whom it was addressed, namely Greeks, who (and especially the Northern) were exceedingly prone to the very temper of mind which the Apostle here censures; as is clear from Thucyd. 1, 70. νεωτερο ποιοι καὶ ἐπινοήσαι οὕτῳ—οὕτω µὴτε αὐτῶς ἔχειν ἴσως ἐναι, µὴτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνδράσις εἶν—καὶ 3, 82. τὸ δ' ἐμ- πλήκτων οὖ άνδρός μαῖρα προσετῆθη. See the whole of the Chapter, which is one of the finest moral paintings that has ever been drawn, and various other parts of the historian, as also of Aristoph., Xenoph., and others. The temper, indeed, yet remains in the Greeks of the present day.*

4. οὗ φυσιώταται. On this term see the note on 4, 6. It is well observed by Theophyl., that the Christian may have the preceding virtues, and yet not possess true humility. This admonition is evidently meant to repress all boasting, and self-righteousness.

5. οὐκ ἀσχημονεί. It is not easy to determine the sense of the term ἀσχ., on which even the ancient Commentators were not agreed. Theoph. takes it to mean: "thinks it no shame to suffer in behalf of God and good men." But I see not how this sense can be elicited from the word. Others expound: οὐκ

* It is obvious how inconsistent this is with the δύση, in both views of it, either with true love towards God, since such levity shows the heart to be unaffected (so Eccles. 6, 2. "Let not thy heart be hasty to utter before God), or with love towards man, since it shows a want of that caution and deliberation, without which we may, nay must harm others, and even ourselves. So true is the observation of the wise man: "He that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly." Nay even in the pursuit of the best things this temper is to be avoided. In which sense I would understand the words of Solomon, Prov. 19, 2. "That the soul be without knowledge is not good, and (but) he that hasteth with his feet (i. e. makes more haste than good speed) sinneth (i. e. erereth)."
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I. This, however, seems very vague and frigid. Others, ωκ ἐξεζέρχεται τοῖς ἀδικοῖς σφόδροις. But this sense surely cannot be elicited from the word, and would, moreover, be a repetition of what had been before said. The early modern Commentators, and Hardy, explain, "agit modestè et verecundè;" which is, however, too vague and general. The true meaning of the Apostle has, I think, been best seized by Grot., who explains: "beware of doing what, even in the opinion of men, may be base or unseemly." The same interpretation is adopted by Rosenm., Jaspis, Schleus., and Krause, who compare 11, 13 & 14. Deut. 25, 3. Ezek. 16, 6. Sept.

The expression seems levelled against those who, out of a vain affectation of superior knowledge, thought they might set at nought the censures of the heathens, by eating idol meats, &c.

5. οὐ σητεὶ τὰ ἐαυτῆς, i.e. does not seek her own interest exclusively, nor to the injury of her neighbour, but (as Mede says) rather foregoes her right than pursues it in a manner inconsistent with charity. Agreeably to the injunctions of our Lord.

5. οὗ παροξύνεται. This cannot mean "is not provoked;" for such would be impossible in a world like this. Our common translators insert easily. The truth is, the term παροξύνεται is a very strong one, and denotes all those feelings of violent irritation and bitter exacerbation, which, in an irritable man, are so easily excited. I would translate: "is not violently exasperated; i.e. is not prone to violent exasperation." A temper which was but too common among the Greeks, and still is so.

5. οὐ λογιζεται τὸ κακὸν. This is, I think, ill rendered, "thinketh no evil;" though such is the interpretation supported by Grot., Par., Cal., Est., and others, who explain: "Dubia in partem accipit meiorem. Non est suspicax, sed aliorum dicta factaque benignè accipit. Non machinatur in corde malum adversus proximum etiam laceritus non im-

* The Cynics, it is well known, were fond of setting at nought all the common ideas of decency.
putat 'injuriam, hec vindictam expetit, sed dissimulat, excusat; ignoscit." All this, indeed, may be very suitable to the character here described; but had such been the sense intended, the article would not have been used; as in Matt. 9, 4. εὐθυμεῖσθαι πνεῦμα.

Hamm. here perplexes himself to little purpose: and as to Macknight's translation, "does not reason out or conclude," it is neither English nor sense. He also proposes "does not impute," which is intelligible. And so Erasmus. But neither is this permitted by the article, which, I think, refers to the foregoing word. The true sense seems to have been alone seen by C Ecumen. and Theophyl., who take it to refer to the preceding παραφύνεται; q. d. "not only is not prone to exasperation at injury, not only is not prone to pursue it with vengeance, but not even λογισταί," i.e. does not, as it were, enter it in a note-book, in order to bear it in mind, as matter of reproach or vengeance; ως μνησικατεί. On this sense of λογισταί see Schlex. Lex. in voce § 7. The above interpretation is also adopted by Wolf, Rosenm., Mede, Homb., and Olearius.

6. οἱ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδίκῳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Ἀληθ., it is evident, here means, not truth, but true, sincere, and real virtue, as opposed to the ἀδίκοι, which is a general term denoting vice and iniquity of every kind; a sense frequent in the New Testament. (See Schleus. Lex.) These two terms are also opposed in Joh. 3, 21. ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀληθείαν—ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων. The sense is plainly this: "rejoiceth not over the vices of other men, but over their virtues:" or, "rejoiceth not in any (reported)
iniquity, but in any true virtue." The συγχάρ. is said to be for the simple χαίρει. But the συγ. rather stands for επι, which is expressed in the preceding clause.

7. πάντα στέγει. This may either be interpreted "endureth all things;" as supra 9, 12. (where see the note), and so the ancient Commentators, and many moderns: or, with others, legit, reticet; as in Sirach. 8, 20. οὐ δυνήσεται λόγον στέγασαι and sometimes in the Classical writers. The latter sense seems to be the more agreeable to the context. And so 1 Pet. 4, 8., and James 5, 20. ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἀμαρτίων and also Prov. 10, 12. and Hesych. στέγει, κρύπτει. The πάντα, however, must here, and especially in the following clauses, be taken populariter, and also be restricted by the circumstances of the case. Thus Rosenm.: "Solent voces universales restringi ex materia subjacente." In like manner the πάντα πιστεύει must be interpreted, "trusteth all things which his knowledge of facts will permit him to believe." The following πάντα ἑλπίζει is nearly allied to this, and must be similarly restricted. And so, finally, must the πάντα ὑπομένει, i.e. all things, which with a safe conscience may be borne.

These four last clauses, however, admit of some variety of interpretation, according to the general view taken of their character. (See the Commentators ap. Pole.) Yet the στέγει must (I think) be interpreted as above; and the πάντα πιστεύει must not be confined to our dealings with our friends, but, as appears from the preceding, extends to our intercourse with our neighbours generally, and denotes a spirit of candour which is willing to believe...
and hope well of all men,* i.e. as well as their actual conduct will permit us to do.

On these last four verses see the excellent summary of Whitby.

8. ἐὰν ἀγάφη τινεῖ ὑπὲρτε ἐκκείπτει. There is more than one sense of which these words are susceptible (see Schol. ap. Matth.); but the context requires ἐκκείπτει to have the sense assigned to it by the Greek Commentators, οὐ διάλυεται, οὐ διακόπτεται, οὐδὲτο πάνεται, "nunquam usu caret:" the present being used populariter for the future, "will never cease, or come to nought," but (as Theoph. observes) ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι αἰῶνι μένει, τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων κατηγορίαν. And so Zonar. 679. This interpretation is confirmed by the following εἰτε δὲ προφητεία. It is rightly remarked by Rosenm., that εἰτε has here the force of "conjoining what is of the same nature or kind." There is also a verb omitted. Grot. well renders: "si alicui obtigere." These χαρισματα, it is said, will cease, (for καταργ. is synonymous with παύονται,) i.e. in a future life, since there will then be no need of them, for all will praise God. This is the general view taken of the sense. I cannot, however, but think it too confined. The gifts here spoken of ceased in a very short time after the Apostle wrote, having served the purpose intended by bearing testimony to the divine origin of the Gospel. It should therefore seem that the ceasing and coming to nought was meant to be gradual, and to take place first in this world, and then in the world to come. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): Εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ προφητεύει αὐτοί γλῶσσαι διὰ τὴν πίστιν παραδεχόμεθα εἰς τῆς πίστεως πανταχοῦ ἀπλαδεύσης, εἰκότως οὐ περιττά τάργυσαι, καὶ γὰρ μὲν, μάλιστα δὲ ὁτέ. So also Phot. ap. Cæcum.† It is therefore without reason objected by

* This virtue is beautifully depicted in Thucyd. 1, 68. (cited by Wet.). τὸ πιστὸν ὑμᾶς, ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος, τῆς καθ' ὑμᾶς ἀντοιχίας γίγνεται, καὶ ὑμῖν, ἀπιστοτέρους ὑμῖν ἄλλους, ἀν τι λέγουμεν, καθιστησί. Yet the words were a mere flattery, intended to cajole the Lacedemonians.

† And also Mackn.; "They shall be abolished in the Church on
Dodd.] that the γυναικεῖα cannot refer to every kind of knowledge, since the noblest shall be much improved.” The Apostle is here speaking of ἡ γυναικεία, namely, the supernatural χαρίσμα so called, which as a gift, has been long since abolished. What is here said of these three principal gifts is intended to be applied to the rest: and this seems to be suggested by the εἰτε, which is very elliptical; q. d. “But (all these gifts above mentioned will cease) whether prophecies, whether tongues,” &c.

9. ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γυναῖκοι, &c. This must be understood chiefly of another world, but partly also of this. Ἐκ μέρους is used in the same sense as at 12, 27.

11. The Apostle now illustrates this truth by two similitudes, one taken from the state of boyhood as compared to manhood; the other, from the view of objects through a dim and obscure medium. Schoett. well traces the scope of the Apostle thus: “He had said that charity is of greater value than the gifts of the Holy Spirit, because the former remains to eternity, but the latter will, in process of time, cease. Now he compares this life and the next with the age of boyhood and manhood. By boyhood he represents the present life, in which, as children delight in toys, so we delight in χαρίσματα. By manhood he represents the life to come, in which superfluous things will be done away with, and love only remain.”

11. οὖτε ἡμῶν ῥήματι, &c. Probably this was an adage, being also found in Maimonid. Grot. thus expounds: “Alius est sermo, alia studia, alii rerum conceptus pueris, alia hæc viris.”* . It is plain that

earth, after it hath attained sufficient internal strength to support and edify itself. See Ephes. 4, 11—14. They shall be abolished likewise in heaven, being of no use there, as the Apostle observes in the following verse.”

* Wets. has well illustrated this from the Classical writers; as Eurip. Peliad. 9. διδάσκετε δ’, δ’ τέκνον, τε βούλομαι, δια μὲν ἡ παις, μὴ ἐλεόν παιδὸς φονείν, ἐν παρθένου δὲ παρθένου τρόπον ἐχειν ὅταν δ’ οὖν ἀνδρὶ χλαίνων εὐγενοῖς πέτας, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ἄφειναι μιμανθήματι ἀνδρᾶς. Hor. Epist. 2, 1, 99. Sub nutrice puella velut cum
the apodosis is here wanting, which is, however, easy to be supplied, and was omitted agreeably to the genius of Oriental writing. I cannot assent to most recent foreign Commentators, who refer this to some "more perfect state of the Church, in which Divine knowledge should have made a considerable advance." For the very turn of the expressions, "see face to face," and "then shall I know even as I am known," is such as plainly to point at the knowledge of God, his ways, and works in another world. And in this manner the passage was explained by the antient Commentators, who rightly exemplify it by a reference to the mysterious doctrines of the Gospel, which we are enjoined to believe, but not permitted to fully understand. I have somewhere read, that Sir Isaac Newton thought his profoundest disquisitions on the laws of nature very possibly might appear to the Almighty as the merest trifles of puerile imagination. He said he seemed to be, in this life, as it were, only amusing himself, like a boy, with picking up pretty pebbles on the sea shore.

12. διέξωμεν γαρ ἠρτι δι’ ἐστῶτος ἐν αἰνήγματι. To comprehend the meaning of the Apostle, it must be observed, that he here somewhat confounds the na-

luderet infant. Quod cupidè petiit, naturè plena reliquit. Xen. Ped. 8. ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰς τὰς ἐν τὰν παίσιν νομίζομενα καλὰ δοκῶ κε-

καρπὸθείας. τετελεῖται δὲ ἡ ἔθνη, τὰ ἐν προδίκησιν τελειοι τε ἀνὴρ γενό-


* Thus Theophyl.: οὐτ’ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι τὴν ἀνδρειστέραν γνῶσιν

ἐξα, τὸτε καταργήθησει τῇ μιρρα καὶ πνημία οὐκετία γνῶσιν, ἡ ἐκ-

ταθα ἤχομεν. And Theodoret: ἀπελεύσατο τούτων τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ

παρόντος βίου διδομένην ἡμῖν γνῶσιν τῇ τῶν πνημίων γνώσει, τὴν δὲ

γε προσδοκήμενη, τῇ τῶν τελειῶν ἀνδρῶν.
tural and the metaphorical, the thing itself and that with which it is compared. Thus βλέπωμεν properly belongs to the latter, but is used for γινώσκωμεν; and εν αἰνιγματί, which properly belongs to the former, and for which one would have expected ἄμυδρος, is used of the latter. The phrase, Ῥος. thinks, is derived from Num. 12, 8. διὰ αἰνιγμάτων. But that is of a different nature. The expression in question signifies obscurity in such a way as anigmas are usually understood: and this is confirmed by Hesych., who explains it (I think with a reference to this passage) ἐν παρεκκλησίᾳ, by guess. And so Theophyl. understood it. Of Wetstein's Classical citations the following are the most apposite: Eurip. Rhes. 5. τὰ δ' οὐκ ἐν αἰνιγμοῖς σημαίνει κακά, Σαφώς γάρ αὐτά. Pausan. Arcad. 8. δι' αἰνιγμάτων πάλαι, καὶ οὐκέτ' ἐκ τοῦ εὐθεὸς λέγειν τοὺς λόγους. Ach. Tat. οὕτω φανερῶς, καὶ οὐκέτι δι' αἰνιγμάτων. Αἰσχ. c. Ctesiph. οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, ἀλλ' ἐναργῶς γέγραται. See also Bp. Blomf. on Αἰσχ. Αγ. 1081. Gloss.

With respect to the δι' ἐσώπτρου, I accede to the opinion of Bos, Elsn., Pearce, Wets., and most Critics since their time, (including Dr. Maltby, in a very instructive note to an admirable Sermon on this text), that it is to be understood of some of those transparent substances which the antients used in their windows, such as thin plates of horn, transparent stone, and the like, through which they saw indeed the objects without, but obscurely. Windows were often formed of the lapis specularis mentioned by Plin. 36, 22., which was very pellucid, and admitted of being split into thin crustae, though some were much more obscure than others. See the passages cited by Wets.* Humboldt (I think) and Dobrizhoffer both

---

* Among these are Plut. 198, 34. ὦ γὰρ διὰ κατόπτρου φαντασ-εύται ὁ νοῦς θεον δρωτα καὶ κοσμοτοιούντα. Strabo, p. 814 B. ἢν δὲ τις τόπος καὶ λίθον λευκὸν—�新λ ἢ τὰς διόπτρας βύλους μεγάλας ἑκάστου, ἑστε καὶ ἔτω κομίζονταί. Philo, 599, 15. δρομαῖος εἰς μέγαν οὗκον εἰσεπήδησεν, καὶ περιέλθων προστάτει τὰς ἐν κόλυμ 
θορίας ἀναληφθήσεαι τοῖς βάλχλ λευκῷ διαφανείᾳ παραπλησίων λίθοις,
make mention of a very pellucid kind of lapis specularis commonly used in South America for Church windows.

12. Πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον is supposed to be formed from στόμα κατὰ στόμα λαλήσω in Deut. 28, 37. Of course it signifies “most clearly.” Elsner here compares two fine passages from Plat. Phæd. 246. and Max. Tyr. D. 27. (which latter I had myself noted down); also Plut. de Os. p. 382. Krause, too, compares a very similar one of Philostr. V. Ap. 8, 26. βλέψας τε δεινὸν ἐσ τὴν γῆν, καὶ προβάς τριά ἥ τεταρτα τῶν βυσσίων, παιε τῶν τύφανοι, παιε, ἥβοα: ὅν τίς ἄσπερ ἐκ κατόπτρου τινος οἴδατον ἀληθείας ἤλκων, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ ὀφεί, καὶ ἐμπλαμβάνειν δοκῶν τὰ δράμενα.

The words ἄρτι γνώσκει, &c. are explanatory of the preceding; and καθὼς καὶ ἐπαγωγή can only be rationally understood of the knowledge of another world, where the Lord will be known, and all his dispensations, even as we are now thoroughly known by Him, “who spiest out all our ways;” nor is there a thought in our hearts but He “knoweth it altogether.” This view is confirmed by some antient Greek Commentators, as Photius. See also Schol. ap. Matth. Slade well paraphrases thus: “We do not yet thoroughly comprehend the designs of God; we

οἱ τὸ μὲν φῶς οὐκ ἔποδίζουσιν ἄνεμον δὲ εἰργοῦσι καὶ τὸν ἄφ' ἄλυνον φλογὰς. Wetstein also adduces many similar comparisons from the Rabbinical writers; as Jalkut Rubeni, p. 109, 1. O quanta fuit inter Mosen et reliquis prophetas differentia! Prophetae reliqui viderunt per specular non lucidum, neque poterant vultum attolere in coelum, ut viderent, quae in caelo aguntur. S. D. Dan. 10, 9. neque hic tantum, et ea verba ipsis non fuerunt satis clarè revelata. Moses vero vidit per specular lucidum, neque hoc tantum, sed et caput sustulit in altum, ut videret facie ad faciem, et vidit splendorem glorie ejus, neque mens ejus immutata est, neque facies, sicut reliquorum prophetarum. Jeboamoth, fol. 49, 2. Omnes prophetae viderunt per specular non lucidum; Moses magister nostri vidit per specular lucidum.

* Theodoret, exemplifying this from the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, says of the latter, Ἕντειθε γὰρ σύμβαλα τοῦ διεστρακοῦ θεῶθα σώματος, ἐκεῖ δὲ αὐτῶν ὀψωθα τῶν Δεσπότων, plainly in the very view we Protestants take of the Sacraments. Let not the Catholics pretend to say that the Greek Commentators countenance transsubstantiation.
cannot see him face to face, i. e. our knowledge of him is not like his knowledge of us: in the next life it will be otherwise; we shall then know him, even as we have been here already known to him." In illustration of this επίγνωσις Theophyl. has the following fine comparison: Ὁσπερ ὃ ἐν σκότει καθήμενος, ἔως μὲν οὐ βλέπεις τῶν ἦλιων, οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέχει τῷ καλῷ λει τῆς ἀκτίνος, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνη δείκνυσιν ἐκατ' ἐπειδὴ λάμπῃ· ὅταν δὲ αὐτὴς δέχηται τὴν ἀγιλήν, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς διάκει τῷ φῶς. For this, and another almost equally beautiful comparison, he was indebted to Chrysost. 13. νυνὶ δὲ μὲνει—ἡ ἀγάπη. These words seem very imperfectly understood by Commentators both ancient and modern. The recent foreign ones, as Krause, generally interpret πίστις fiducia in aliorum fidem atque integritatem in docendo, hortando, mo- nendo: ἐλπίς, spes in meliora ecclesiae temporae et perfectionem ejus statum. But this is a very unwar- rantable license of interpretation. Scarceiy better founded is that of Grot.: "will remain, in their effects, to all eternity;" as the works of the dead are said to follow them. "Thus (says he) faith, hope, and love will have their reward, 2 Tim. 4, 7 & 8., not prophecy, Matt. 7, 22." As little satisfactory are the interpretations of the other Commentators. The true scope of the passage was alone discerned by Theodoret, whose words are these: "Εδείξε ταύτα καθήμενος, μόνην δὲ τὴν ἀγάπην μένουσαν" Edieix δὲ καὶ τῶν νουμικῶν κατεργασάμενοι αὐτὴν ὑπέρχουσιν πε- ριττὴ γὰρ πίστις ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι βιω, τῶν πραγμάτων ἐναργίας φαινομένων ἐὰν γὰρ πίστις ἐπιζητάμενον ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων φαινομένων οὐκ ἐτι χρεία τῆς πίστεως· οὕτω καὶ ἐλπίς ἐκεί περιττή· ἐλπίς γὰρ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐλπίς· δὲ γὰρ βλέπεις τις, τι καὶ ἐλπίς; ἡ δὲ γε ἀγάπη ἐκεί μᾶλλον ἔχει τὸ κράτος, τῶν παθῶν φαινομένων, καὶ τῶν μὲν σωμάτων ἀφθάρτων γενομένων τῶν δὲ ψυχῶν οὐκάτι μὲν μὲν ταύτα, νὸν δὲ ἐκείνα προαιρομένων. See also Οἰκομ. and Theophyl. (whose matter is chiefly derived from Chrys.) The truth is, the difficulty hinges on this: The Apostle has omitted to mention
the cause of the superiority; yet he hints it in the words νῦν μένει (which many modern Commentators endeavour to render nugatory, silencing the first, and explaining away the second), namely, since the πίστις and ἀγάπη only remain in use now, in this world only, the ἀγάπη will also be exercised in another world, and to all eternity. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: "And Faith, Hope, and Charity, these three* together exist in the present scene only; but in the future world Faith and Hope will be done away, and therefore the greatest of these is Charity."

* There is no occasion, with Grot. and Est., to suppose that the Apostle made choice of three as a sacred number. The same occurs in Clem. Alex. p. 650 Bn. ὁ νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ τριῶν ἄρασμένος θεμελίως, πίστις, ἀλήθεια, ἀγάπη φαίνεται. Thucyd. 6, 73. Ερωκρατίαν, καὶ Ἡ καὶ Σ. τρίον τρεῖς. See also 1, 123. Euseb. ap. Stob. Serm. 271, 29. χρημάτων, καὶ σώματος, καὶ ψυχῆς, τριῶν ότων. Arist. Plut. 425. τὸ χαῖστι τοῦτο καὶ ταὶ Νεφέλαι, καὶ τὴν γλυτταν τριὰ ραῖν.
when faith is superseded by sight, and hope by enjoyment; when in his light we shall see light, and when, amidst the fullest communications of his love, we shall for ever love him and each other, with arduous which the best hearts, in their moments on earth, can neither attain nor conceive."

CHAP. XIV.

VERSE 1. διακείμεθα την ἀγάπην. I know not why some recent Editors, as Krause, unite these words with the preceding Chapter. For though they do (as Rosenm. says) cohere with it, yet, in respect to construction, they belong to the following ηλπύει δὲ; as appears from the δὲ, to which the apodotic μὲν is wanting. (See Hoog. and Devar. de Part. and Matth. Gr. Gr.) The sense is: Pursue (then) and studiously cultivate this love, yet (δὲ) desire spiritual gifts.* Most Commentators take the δὲ for το. But as the δὲ is apodotic, it ought rather to have the sense tamen; as in Matt. 8, 21. 23, 25. 2 Cor. 6, 10. and often in the Classical writers. Pisc. renders it autem, which, as δὲ immediately after occurs, may seem better. Yet the Apostle little heeds tautology.

The ηλπύει is not well rendered desire, which is too limited a sense. The term signifies both seek after and studiously cultivate. So that it was applicable both to those who had, and to those who had not the gifts. These χαρισματα having been before treated on at large, no explanation can here be necessary. Μᾶλλον δὲ signifies "rather than (any one of the rest), but chiefly." This use of the comparative for the superlative, which occurred just before in μείγιον for μέγιστον, is frequent in the Scriptural and not unknown in the Classical writers, and seems to be derived from Oriental idiom.

Of προφητεία an explanation was given on 12, 10.

* So Theophyl.: "Ινα μὴ νομίσων, δια διὰ τούτο ἔχεις την ἀγάπην, Ινα σείει τα χαρισματα ἐπάγεις, Ηλπύει τα πνευματικά, τουτέστι, τα χαρίσματα, ἐναρέτως δὲ την προφητείαν."
Though the Apostle’s expression refers to all, yet from what follows it seems that he has an eye chiefly to the gift of tongues.

2. ὅ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσα, &c. Here γὰρ must have the sense of exempli gratia. Γλώσσα signifies a foreign tongue, unknown to the congregation; which is a perpetual sense of the word in the later Greek writers. (See Schleus. Lex. in voce.) The earlier ones did indeed use it in this sense, but it was with the name of the foreign nation subjoined; as Thucyd. 1, 188. 8, 112. 6, 68. 7, 10. Λαλῶν must signify, not praying (as Krause and others suppose), but preaching, exhorting, &c.; for such is the popular sense of the word in Scripture, and this seems to be required by what follows. Οὐκ ἀνθρώπως λαλεῖ. A figurative expression for “it is as if he addressed himself not unto men but God; for (as the Apostle adds) no one understandeth him.” By ἀνθρώπως is meant the generality, the ἰδιωταί, who are not expected to understand a foreign language. Οὐδὲς must, I think, be taken with restriction, in the sense nemo fere; as in Persius Sat. 1. init. Quis leget hæc? nemo Hercule—nemo? Vel duo, vel nemo. For, (as Grotius observes) strangers seem to have very rarely attended. The words τῷ Θεῷ are therefore not to be interpreted (with some early modern Commentators) to the glory of God. They are merely added on account of the ἀνθρώπως; “he only addresses, as it seems, God.” Ἀκούει, understands. A very common signification, which some derive from the Hebr. השׁ. But it occurs in the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Grot., Kypke, Dorv. on Char. 562., and many others.

2. πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια. In the interpretation of these words great doubts and difficulties have been raised by the moderns, but (as will appear) very needlessly. Vorst., Casaubon, Le Clerc, Locke, Pearce, Semler, and others interpret, “speak to his own mind, or understanding.”* But neither the

* Nor was this (as I find from Phot. ap. Oecumen.) unknown to the ancients.
usus loquendi, nor the context, will permit this; since (as Whitby observes) the Apostle is all along speaking of spiritual gifts, i.e. supernatural endowments; "and the afflatus was to enable the man to speak the mystery, not to speak the unknown tongue." See the ratio of these χαρίσματα ably explained by Whitby. Almost all the recent Commentators either take πνεύματι to mean a foreign language, or for τὸ πνεύμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. But that subaudition would be intolerable without the article. Others, as Paulus, resort to critical emendation, which, however, is unnecessary. There is surely no difficulty, if the word be taken, as the Greek Commentators direct, and which is a mode of interpretation adopted by most early modern ones; for the Holy Spirit. The true scope of the words was distinctly seen by Chrysost., Phot., Theophyl., and especially Theodoret; who remarks, that they are brought in ἵνα μὴ ἀχρηστον τὸ χάρισμα νομίσῃ. So Phot. 552 B. paraphrases: εἴ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι λαλεῖ, ἔλαττον ἐστὶ τῆς προφητείας; ἐὰν καὶ η ἀφέλεια ἤττων. And Theophyl.; ἐν ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι λαλοῦσι μυστήρια. Ὡστε καθο μὲν ἐκ Πνεύματος λαλοῦσι, μέγα τὸ πρᾶγμα καθ' ἔδε ὡς ἀνθρώπους αφείλει, ἠττᾶται τῆς προφητείας. Ἐκείνη γὰρ καὶ ἐκ Πνεύματος, καὶ ἀφελεμένερα, τοὺς αὐτηρίκτους οἰκοδομῶσα, τοὺς ῥαβομοτέρους παρακαλοῦσα καὶ διεγέρουσα, τοὺς ἀληθευόντας παραμυθοῦμεν.

3. ὅ ἐν προφητείῳ, ἀνθρώπως λαλεῖ. The recent foreign Commentators endeavour from this passage to confirm their explanation of προφητείᾳ, by which word they maintain is meant a popular haranguer, or preacher of the Gospel; and at v. 1. Rosenm. and Krause maintain that προφητεία did not mean to predict future events, nor even to illustrate the obscurities of the Old Testament, nor to speak afflata quodam di-ino. And the former adds: "Quo enim jure, ut nunc alia taceam, Paulus hujusmodi dotes tanquam primarias, omnibus donis preferre ac commendare potuisset, (μᾶλλον δὲ ἧν προφητεύετε,) aut quae eustanta necessitas fuisset, ut his omnium minime ca-
rere Christiani potuissent?" But that the τροφητεῖα was a supernatural endowment, is clear from the whole tenor of these three chapters, and other parts of the New Testament. And as to what use they would be to Christians in general, I would reply, that the words ἔστωτε, &c. are not imperative, but preceptive and permissive,* meant, not for the generality, but for those only who aspired to the καθομα.

I must therefore retain the common interpretation of τροφητεῖα, and include the afflatus, or inspiration, and the prediction of future events among these endowments. Though I am ready to grant, that with these were conjoined the offices of preaching the word of God, yet with an authority and effect, on account of their high inspiration, superior to the διάσκαλον mentioned sup. 12, 28. and Eph. 4, 11. And surely the purposes meant to be answered, namely εἰκοδομὴ παράκλησις, and παραμοβία, would be far better attained by persons who to the ordinary qualifications of evangelizing added a certain degree (for we are not told how much) of inspiration, so as to be enabled occasionally, when need might require, to predict also.†

With respect to the words παράκλησις and παραμοβία, these are not (as is maintained by Krause) mere synonymes, but, as Grot. says, εἰκοδομή is the generic name, which is then separated into its parts. He then paraphrases thus: prodest monendo fragiles, solando afflictos; illos periculum, hos liberationis, predictione: utrumque cum circumstantiis quæ humanitus prospectari non poterant. Theophyl. still better, thus: τοὺς ἀντερίκτους εἰκοδομῶσα, τοὺς βαθμωμέτρους παρακαλοῦσα καὶ διεγείρουσα, τοὺς διηγομένους παραμοβομένη.

* Bp. Pearce and Dr. Dodd are the only Commentators who have seen this.
† Mackn., I perceive, gives up the prediction of future events, but contends for inspiration: which seems a needless concession, and, indeed, involving an inconsistency.
The οἶκος has been already explained at 8, 1.

4. ὁ λαλῶν γλῶσσην, ἐαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ. There is, I think, no reason, with some early Commentators, to too anxiously inquire how he edified himself, since on this the Apostle does not mean to dwell. There is here an ellipsis of μόνον, and, as the Greek Commentators observe, the Apostle is adverting to the case of one who had the gift of tongues, but not that of interpretation. This, Theophyl. says, was the case with many, ἄνισταν τοίνυν ἐαυτὸς μόνον αὐθέντως. His self-edification would consist in feeling his mind elevated with admiration and devout thankfulness. Yet I admit, with Doddr., that it was much more probable a man might be hurt than edified by the exercise of this gift, when attended with such ostentatious circumstances.

The ὁ προφητεύων, on the other hand, edified the congregation, nay sometimes the Church at large; for, as Grotius observes, prophecies were sometimes carried to other and distant congregations.

5. θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λ. γ. Lightfoot here very well renders “volo, hortor vos.” The word must be taken, like the ὑπερβολεῖ at ver. 1. rather as permissive. Thus the best Commentators render it vellem, optarem, “I should be very well pleased.” By this (Theophylact observes) the Apostle means to show that he does not undervalue the gift of tongues. See the note on 7, 7.

Melig, præstantior (so 13, 13.), namely, as being more useful to the Church. Melig η ὑ, &c. is an unusual syntax. In ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ there seems a sort of pleonasm, but it occurs in many good Classical writers. Examples from Plut., Sext. Emp., Aristot., and Lucian, are adduced by Wetstein on this passage and Kypke on 15, 2. It is, however, not so much pleonastic as strongly exceptive. Διερμηνεύως, “except he interpret.” And so all Translators, except Dr. Macknight, who renders, “except some one interpret.” The other, he says, would be at variance with the Apostle’s precept at ver. 28. where the ὁ λαλῶν γλῶσση is directed not himself to inter-
pret. But it is sufficient to answer, that the διεξ. is here suspended on an ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ, and the direction had not yet been given. And moreover, as Mr. Slade observes, “the Apostle might not here take it into supposition that any Interpreter was at hand.” As to the reading of some MSS. ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ ἃ διεξ. μηνεών, it is (I think) an alteration by some one who (like Dr. Macknight), stumbled at the expression.

With respect to the sentence itself, I do not discern in it the difficulty complained of by some modern Commentators, and which has led to variety of interpretation. Nor do I see (as Rosenm. thinks) that this difficulty can be diminished by placing a mark of interrogation after ὦφελήσω. It is not usual when any sentence is held in suspense by an εἰ μή, to place any mark of interrogation, until the end of the sentence. If this be done in the present case there will be no more difficulty. We have only to consider this as a negative sentence expressed, as often, by way of interrogation; in which case the negation is left to be supplied thus: “not at all.”

The only difficulty in this sentence rests with λαλήσω ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, which is regarded by the Commentators as a Hebraism for λαλ. ἀποκαλύψιν. It should rather seem put for δι’ ἀποκαλύψεως, i.e. “speak what had been communicated by revelation. I would compare Ps. 88, 19. (Sept.) τότε ἐλάλησας ἐν ὑφάσει τοῖς υἱοῖς σου. And Job 40, 22. λαλήσει σοι δεήσει, subauda ἐν. Macknight thinks that λαλεῖν ought to be rendered “speak intelligibly.” But this is an unwarranted and very unnecessary deviation from common use. The use here of the dative he also misconceives.

To turn to the consideration of the four disputed terms, ἀποκαλύψει, γνώσει, προφητείᾳ, and διδαξῇ both antient and modern Commentators have been much perplexed with them. Dr. Dodd, says he is “not certain how far different ideas are to be fixt to each of these words; or supposing that how far these are the appropriate ideas intended by each. And he numbers this among the many texts which he dares...
not pretend fully to understand." And Locke, after proposing an interpretation, ends by saying that "it cannot be made out, with certainty, what is the precise meaning of the words." Whitby, too, is here at fault, and has not shown his usual sound judgment and good sense. Doddridge nearly follows him, but with even less success. Mr. Locke's exposition would seem superior to either, except that he adopts the notion of ἀποκαλύψις signifying an inspired hymn. Dr. Mackn. has, perhaps, come nearer to the sense than any other modern Commentator. His paraphrase is as follows: "Unless I shall speak to you either by the revelation peculiar to an Apostle; or by the word of knowledge, the gift of a superior prophet; or by prophecy, the inspiration proper to an inferior prophet; or by doctrine, the inspiration proper to the ordinary pastor?" I must, however, object that there seems no ground to interpret the ἀποκαλύψις of the revelation peculiar to an Apostle. For here St. Paul, to show the superiority of some other gifts to that of prophecy, is supposing himself one of those teachers possessed of the gifts in question. Besides, I know no authority for his distinction between superior and inferior prophets.

Under these perplexities, I cannot but suspect some corruption of the text; though here the fertile imaginations of critical conjecturers, as Bowyer, Markland, Owen, &c. stand us in no stead. Upon close examination of the words, it appears to me that the ἦ after λαλήσαω has no place there, but has crept in by the confusion occasioned by the two other ἦς. Upon looking about for critical support to this conjecture, I find that such was the reading of several MSS., the Syriac, and some Latin Versions, and also of Theophyl. and Photius. That profoundly-learned Prelate has, of all the antient Commentators, best discerned the real sense; though in some things his interpretation is objectionable. He rightly takes ἀποκαλύψις as an adverbial phrase, for the adverb ἀποκαλυπτικῶς. And he explains thus: ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ λαλήσω ὦμῖν, φησίν, ἐν ἀποκαλύψις, τοῦτοσιν εὑσυνόπτα τίνα καὶ
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sovi̱η kai̱  υυσμενα, ἡ εν γνω̱σει, τουτέστιν ἵνα γινώσκετε ἀ
λέγω, ἡ εν προφητείᾳ, (ταύτην γαρ ἐνώπιον κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν̱
μειλίαν ἐλατομεῖν,) ἡ εν διδακὴ, οὐκ ἔσωμαι, φησίν, ὑμῖν ἐκφεύ̱
γε. Thus the sense will be: "Unless I shall speak distinctly, and with an interpretation of what I say, ἡ γνώ̱ση, &c. whether that speech be in the way of γνώσης, or προφητεία, or διδακὴ." In these three terms the Apostle, I think, has reference to three of the ἐγκαμμενα mentioned at 12, 8 seq. and 27, and these seem used exempli gratia. Thus the γνώ̱σης will correspond to the gift there called the λόγος γνώ̱σεως; the προφητεία to the προφητεία at 12, 10.; and the διδακὴ to the διδασκάλους at 12, 28. where it follows the προφητας, as διδακὴ here follows προφητεία. These terms must, of course, be here understood in the same way as in the passages to which they refer. The general sense is therefore well expressed by Photius as follows: ἐὰν εὐλογῶ ἔχων μὲν ὡς χάρισμα τοῦ γλαύσως λαλεῖν, μὴ ἔχων δὲ τὸ ἄλλο χάρισμα τοῦ γλαύσως λαλεῖν, μὴ ἔχων δὲ τὸ ἄλλο χάρισμα τῶν εἰρημένων τεσσάρων, τὶ ἔτσι εἶναι ὑμῖν θεός; Crysostom, too, was not far from discerning the real sense; and if he had only perceived the corruption which arose from the wrong insertion of the ἡ, he would certainly have discovered it.

Thus, I trust, all is made perfectly clear; and hence it appears that Mr. Locke and Dr. Doddre causelessly professed despair of ascertaining the true sense. I will only add, that the interpretation of ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, proposed by Photius, has been approved by Olearius, Wolf, and Schl. Lex.

7. ὄμως τὰ ἀληθὲς, &c. Here we have (as Krause observes) an illustration by examples derived from common life.

There is not a more manifest mistake in the whole

* So Photius: τὰ εὐλόγητα τῶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ χαρισμάτων· ταύτα δὲ ἔστι, γλῶσσαι ἐρμηνεύειν, καὶ τὰ ἐλατομεῖν παρὰ αὐτῶν ἄποκα-
λυτεῖν, ἡ συνάρφω, καὶ γλῶσσαι λαλεῖν καὶ ἄποκαλυτεῖν, δὲ καὶ γνῶσιν καλεῖν, ὅτι λαλεῖ καὶ ἐρμηνεύει ὃς εἰδὼς δὲ λέγει, ἡ προφη-
τείαν, ἡ διδάκτειν· τέτοιον τὸντο ἄριστον παρὰ τὰ εἰρημένα.
of our common translation than that here committed by following the Vulg. *tamen*, which is quite unsuitable to the scope of the Apostle’s words, as it was distinctly seen by the Greek Commentators,* who take ὅμως (for so it should be accented) in the sense of *quoque, similiter*. Kypke, indeed, adduces several passages from the Classical writers where ὅμως has this sense. But that is justifying error by error. In such minute matters as accents and punctuation, MSS. are of no authority, and are rather everywhere to be regulated by the rules of grammarians, formed on the usus loquendi of the best writers.

7. ἀγγελον, "things without life." Of this sense Wetstein adduces several examples, the most opposite of which is from Eurip. Ion. 881. ὅ τας ἀγγέλους μέλλεις κιβάρας ἐνταγό ἂν ἄγαλλος κέραιν ἔν ἀγγέλοις ἀρχεῖ. Piscator observes, that the Apostle uses φωνήν for ἄγαλε, or φθόγγον, referring both to the ὄργανα ἐμπένεντα and the κρωσικά. Φωνή is, however, distinguished in Arrian, Diss. Ep. 3, 6. cited by Wetstein.

7. ἐάν διαπολῆν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δέω, "unless they give a distinction in the sounds," i. e. yield a distinction in the sounds, or rather tones, such as are in the gamut represented to the eye by the notes of a music-book.†

* So Photius ap. Ceccumen. 555 D. καὶ τι λέγω ὅτι ἐφ’ ἡμῶν, ὅ τε νοουμένων ὕφελείης, τὸ δὲ μὴ νοουμένον ἄκρεδε; καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγγέλις ὄργανοι τοῦτό τέ εὑρεῖ καὶ ἐκιβάρας γὰρ καὶ ἀθλοῦ, μὴ συγκείεσθαι χρῆ τὰ λεγόμενα· ἔπει ὅτι ἄν ποτὲ τινὰ ψυχαγωγήσειν.

† That the antients used φωνή in this sense has been proved by Raphel, Obs. Polyb. in h. l. Rosenm. and Krause explain: "Nisi distinctos sonos edant, i. e. harmonicos secundum artem musicam compositos, qui certis harmoniis ac modulis testentur aut cantionis argumentum, aut effectum, quo vocat cantio." But this is elaborate trifling, or rather nonsense. The Apostle does not advert to the laws of harmony or melody, but is merely speaking of intonation. Now it is plain that unless an instrument has this intonation, the difference of tones cannot be expressed; so that no one can distinguish what is piped or harped, i. e. will not know one tune from another, nor perceive any tune at all. And this is all that the Apostle means.
8. καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν ἀδήλων φωνὴν σάλτιγξ ἔδω. The Apostle further illustrates the inconvenience of want of perspicuity in matters of this kind by another example.

The γὰρ is not (as Bp. Pearce treats it) an expletive, but has the sense of exempli gratiā: and in the following words the Apostle adverts to a use of musical tones in which their distinction was especially necessary, viz. for the purposes of war. That the antients used musical instruments, especially wind instruments, for military purposes, is well known to those who have read the Classical writers.* Now they were not used merely for the purpose of directing the steps in marching, but also (and especially the trumpet) for the purpose of signifying to the soldiers what they were to do, whether to advance, or retreat, take to arms or go to quarters; in fact to do all that is now done by the trumpets, fifes, and drums. That there were even names for the different tunes appears from Polyæn. 318. ἐκέλευσε τὰ σαλτιγκὴν ὑποσημήναι σημεῖαν Ἀφεβίας. When, however, these signals (for such they were) became known to the enemy, great advantage was sometimes thereby obtained.

So Herod. c. 78. Μαθαίν δὲ ὁ Κλεομένης ποιεύότας τοὺς Ἀργείους ὁκοῖν τι ὁ σφέτερος κῆρυξ σημήνειε, παραγγέλλει σὺρὶ ὅταν σημήνη ὁ κῆρυξ ποιεότας ἄριστον, τότε ἀναλαβότας τὰ ὀπλα, χαρέειν ἐς τοὺς Ἀργείους. The crafty general thus accomplished the defeat of the enemy with great slaughter. Sometimes, however, a counter-stratagem was employed, and with even

* On this subject Wetstein has numerous Classical citations, but of little consequence. The most apposite is Xiphil. p. 41. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ μάχῃ τούτῳ τὸν τρόπον, α. μὲν σαλτιγχεῖς εἰς ἐκατέρωθεν ὑπεσήμανε, καὶ οὕτως οἱ λαοὶ ἔπνιγον, πρῶτοι μὲν οἱ τότε σταυροὶ, καὶ τὸ παραπεραστικόν ἐν τούς τινι κυκλοφέει διὰ σαλτιγχεῖν μελῳδοῦντες, ἐπείτα δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι. Perhaps the most curious and important passage on this subject is Thucyd. 5, 70. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἡ ἔνοδος ἤ, Ἀργείοι μὲν καὶ οἱ ἑμμαχοὶ ἔστοιοι καὶ ὄργις χαράντες. Δακεδαιμονίω ἃ βαδέως καὶ ὑπὸ αἰλητῶν πολλῶν νόμῳ ἔγκαθοκτονών, οὐ τού θελον χάριν, ἀλλ’ ἵνα ὁμαλῶς μετὰ ρυθμοῦ βαίνοντες προέλθουσεν, καὶ μὴ διασπασθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἡ τάξις.
greater effect. So Polyæn. Strat. 5, 4, p. 497. Παμ-
μένην τούς πολεμίους ἐγκατα τοις χρυσάμενοι τῷ σώμα-
τις σάλευγγος ὑπεντάτιοι, προπαραγγείλα τούς ἐαυτοῦ
προτιτιβοιας, πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἀνακλητικὸν ἐπιδέσθαι, πρὸς
δὲ τὸ ἐπικελευστικὸν ἀνακατεχθαι τούτου ποιῆσαι, εἰ ἰμο-
τέρις μεγάλα τούς πολεμίους ἐθλασθαι.

When the Apostle says, “if the trumpet utter an
uncertain sound” (i. e. if the trumpeter sound his in-
strument without proper intonation), he adverts to
what did sometimes take place. Thus Polyb. 30, 18,
8. οἱ μὲν αὐλοται φωσάντες ἀδιάνυτα, &c. And,
what yet more illustrates the Apostle’s words, Liv.
25, 10 tuba inscincter a Graeco inflata, quis aut qui-
bus signum daret, incertum efficiebat.

8. τις παρασκευάσεται, ἡ. π. “who will prepare him-
self for war?” i. e. (as I understand it) for any of the
evolutions of war, and not battle, as the word is ren-
dered in our common version. This sense of the
middle verb is well known. See Dresig. p. 366. and
the numerous examples adduced by Wets. and
Krause (after Casaub.) and Polyb. 1, 12.

9. οὔτω καὶ ὁμεῖς, &c. “To apply this to the case
in question, if you, by the use of that foreign tongue
do not make your speech * intelligible, how will it
be known what has been said? “You will be like
those speaking to the air,” i. e. vainly. Εὐόημος is
for εὐόηλον, of which examples are given by the Phi-
lologists; as Ps. 81. 3. σαλεύσατε ἐν ἐσόμαρ. ᾽Οσ.
L. 2, εὐόημος αἰσθή. Porphyr. de Abstin. 3, 4. φήγ-
γηται φωνερὰ τε καὶ εὐόηρα.

The expression εἰς αέρα λαλοῦντες is compared by
Grot. and others to the εἰς αέρα δερεῖν at 9, 26., since
there is in both an idea of inutility. There rather
seems to be an allusion to some proverb similar to our
“you may as well speak to the winds,” i. e. it will be
to no purpose to speak. And Wets. compares Lu-

* Bp. Middleton interprets it “your tongue.” It means (he
says) the organ of speech, as opposed to the musical instrument
just spoken of. This, however, seems fanciful and ill founded.
cret. 4, 929. Tu fac, ne ventis verba profundam. Possibly, too, there is an allusion to the practice of young orators, who (like De.nosthenes) used to exercise their lungs by going to the sea-side and spouting to the winds and waves.

10. τοσαύτα, εί τόχοι, γένη φωνών ἐστιν ἐν κόσμῳ. Here is another argument, or illustration by example. In the interpretation of the words, we are especially to attend to the popular manner in which the sentence is expressed. This (I think) is especially discernible in the τοσαύτα and the εί τόχοι, in the former of which there is an ellipsis, which the Commentators variously fill up. Some, as Pisc., Beza, and Valpy, supply ὅσα ἄδραμον, “as nations of men.” This, however, is too arbitrary, and besides is inconsistent with the εί τόχοι. And, moreover, the words would thus be a mere truism. Macknight supplies, “as ye speak; as many as your most numerous assemblies.” But this is too arbitrary to be thought of. Grotius supposes that the Apostle means seventy, alluding to a common saying of the Hebrews; and adds εί τόχοι by way of adverting to tongues the Hebrews never heard of. But this rests on mere conjecture, and no such sense can be elicited from the words. I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen that the elliptical clause (which must correspond to the εί τόχοι) is the ὅσα ἄδραμον. Thus the sense will be: “Let there be as many kinds of languages in the world as ye may choose, εί τόχοι, if so many there should be.” For such is the sense of εί τόχοι, and not exempli gratid, or nempe. Now this mode of explanation will apply to all those numerous examples from the later Greek writers (as Dionys. Hal., Arrian, Lucian, Diog. Laert., D. Cass., D. Chrys., Athen., Galen, Herod., Arist., Plut., Plato, and others) cited by Wetstein and Loesner.

Φώνη in the sense language is frequent in the best Greek writers. At οὐδὲν we must supply γένος from γένη. Thus the sense is, “and no one kind of language (i. e. no language) is ἄφωνον.” This cannot
mean, as some explain, *mute*; for it is not likely the Apostle would say no nation is dumb, or no nation is without a language. The word must be meant to apply to the *languages*, and to assert that no one is without those distinctive idioms which separate it from others. This sense of ἄφωνος is indeed rare, but it involves no harshness.

11. ἐὰν οὐν μὴ εἰδῶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς. "If then I do not comprehend the force and meaning of the language addressed to me." This sense of δύναμις and δύναμιν is frequent in the Greek writers: and so the Latin *valor*. "Σαμοι τῷ λαλῶντι, &c. "I shall be, with respect to the speaker of it, a barbarian or foreigner; and the speaker will be in my estimation a foreigner." Such is the literal sense. Βαρβ. here signifies one who neither understands nor can speak a language. This sense I have copiously illustrated at Rom. 1, 14. With ἐν Krause compares the use of the Hebr. יִלְאָה and יְבָ. But they are not (as he says) redundant.

12. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ φηλασάτε—περισσεύστε. It is well observed by ὝEcumenius: παυσάμενος τῶν παραδειγμάτων, γυμνότερον αὐτοῖς παραίνει, repeating (as Theodoret remarks) his former injunction.

There are two ways in which the clause οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς may be and has been taken. Some antient and modern Commentators unite it with the former word, and assign to it the sense, "so will it be with you." This, however, is too harsh a subaudition; and that sense would require οὕτω καὶ ὑμῖν ἐσταί. Besides, the following weighty admonition would be too abrupt. Most Commentators (from Chrysostom), more rightly, I think, unite the clause with the ἐπεὶ φηλασάτε ἐστε, &c. and assign to οὕτω the sense therefore, or wherefore. The clause may, however, be more literally rendered, "Thus also (to apply this to your case), since you are desirous," &c. Φηλασάτε ἐστε must be taken in the same sense as φηλαύτε at 12, 91. and 14, 1. (where see the notes,) and πνευμάτων is for πνευματικῶν, scil. χαρισμάτων, as there.
12. πρὸς τὴν ὁικοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡτεῖε ἵνα περισ-
σεύητε. Almost all Commentators adopt the opinion of
Grotius, that there is here a transposition for ἡτεῖε
περισσεύειν πρὸς. This, however, is somewhat harsh,
and the figure in question is not often used by the
Apostle. Besides, I can find no example of ἡτεῖε
followed by an ἵνα. It is almost always used with
an accusative, expressed or understood, or, in the
place of it, an infinitive. And here, I conceive,
that construction is not deviated from. I would
subaud ταῦτα from πνευμ. just before. The words
are put out of their natural order, for the purpose of
imparting strength to the sentence; q. d. “For the
edification of the Church seek ye them that ye may
abound thereunto.” Περισσεύειν is, I think, used
absolutely; as at Phil. 1, 9 & 21. Col. 2, 7. 1 Thess.
1, 10. (where the sentiment is more fully expressed),
περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ ἑργῷ τοῦ Κυρίου.

13. διὸς τὸ λαλῶν γλαύσις προσευχήσατο ἵνα διερ-
μηνεύῃ. There are few passages which have more
perplexed the modern Interpreters, and on which
their labour has been less successful. Maussac. ap.
Wolf and Mackn. render: “let him (so) pray that
(some one) may (withal) interpret his prayers.” But
this is doing too great violence to the words. Others,
as Menoch., Vorst., Pisc., Wolf, Whitby, Knatchbull,
Rosenm., Krause, Schleus., and Pearce, render:
“let him (so) pray that he may (himself also) inter-
pret.” This mode of explanation is stoutly maintain-
ed by Bp. Pearce and especially Whitby, who offers
the following paraphrastic translation: “let him (so)
pray (with his gift, as) that he may (by the words
used in his prayer, or by explaining it in a known
language) interpret, and impart to others, what the
afflatus hath imparted to him, and not out of vain os-
tentation utter it in a tongue unknown. The argu-
ments used in support of it are these: “As it is
evident from ver. 4. and 28. that he who spake with
tongues understood the meaning of his own tongue;
nor can he be said to have the gift of tongues who
only has the gift of talking he knows not what, as the Phanatici did among the Heathens; nor can it be supposed the Spirit of God should assist men in that useless manner; these words cannot be here understood as an exhortation to this linguist, that he should pray that he might understand, and so be able to interpret his own words, which he already could do, had he been as willing as he was able, and had not more regarded the vain ostentation of his gift, than the edification of the Church.” And it is further urged, that the Apostle here discourses of speaking with an unknown tongue in prayer, and of praying also by the afflatus of the Spirit.” But these arguments seem to me by no means of such force as to induce us to embrace an interpretation at variance with the rules of construction, and which is liable to this insuperable objection, namely that it goes upon the supposition that the person who had the gift of tongues had also the gift of interpretation of tongues; whereas the contrary is evident from 12, 10. ἐτέρῳ δὲ γένη γλῶσσαν, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἐρμηνεία γλῶσσῶν. Not but we may conceive that some had both, and by the Apostle’s words it seems that more might have had them, by using proper means, especially the exercise of fervent prayer. Now the interpretation of tongues might surely have respect as well to the interpretation of their own words as those of others. And Mr. Slade, with his usual good sense observes that: “The inspired person, though understanding the general import of what he uttered, might not be able at once to interpret it, even in his own vernacular tongue: he might not be so well acquainted with the structure of the two languages, as to translate immediately and correctly, from the one into the other. Much less does it follow, from his thus understanding his own prayer, that he should have been able to perform the office of interpreter to another inspired person, though using the same inspired language. It is by no means necessary to suppose, that he had an accurate or a general knowledge of the language,
only that he was enabled to speak it as occasion required.” See ver 27.

There seems no reason, then, to desert the common interpretation, which the first of the arguments above detailed rather supports, and which is adopted by all the Greek Commentators and Translators; and, of the moderns, by Grot., Beza, Schilting, Cassaub., Vatabl., our venerable English Translators, Hamm., Schoettg., and Dodd. And this seems the plain and natural sense of the words, which are expressed populariter; nor is there any such difficulty in the following words as need compel any one to desert it. See the excellent exposition of Chrys., Cæcumen., Theophyl., and Theodoret, which last-mentioned Commentator interprets thus: Αὕτησιν τὸν δεδωκότα σοι τὸ τῶν γλῶττων χάρισμα, προσθείναι καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας, ἵνα προσφέρῃς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὴν ὁφέλειαν. And Chryostom thus: αὐτείς τοῖς μὴ γλῶττων ἐκείνων χάρισμα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐρμηνείας, ἵνα πάνω ὀφέλειμος γένη, καὶ μὴ ἐν σεαυτῷ μόνῳ κατακελευ-σης τὸ χάρισμα. And such, I conceive, is the true sense.*

14. ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, &c. In this verse (the sense of which has been strangely misconceived by some antient and modern Commentators) the Apostle means, I think, to excite them to aim at some higher gifts than the mere γλώσσας καλεῖν: and this he does by showing the inefficiency of that gift to general edification. But to consider the expressions in detail, in ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, I evidently denotes (per μετασχηματισμὸν) a person having the gift of tongues. The sense is: “For if I pray in a foreign and unknown tongue.”

14. τὸ τνείμα μου προσεύχεται. It is strange that

* From this, however, almost all the modern Commentators just mentioned somewhat deviate, by taking the words to mean that he should pray for the gift of interpretation of tongues instead of that of tongues. But this sense is by no means natural, or unexceptionable, and also requires the unauthorized subaudition of μᾶλλον. According to the interpretation I have adopted, dieuq. has the sense, to be endowed with the faculty of the ἔρμηνεια; as in 12, 30. μὴ πάντες διερμηνεύσοντες.
so many eminent modern Commentators should interpret this of the Holy Spirit, and yet more so, that Phot., Grotius, Par., Sclater, Locke, and Whitby, should render it, "my spiritual gift prayeth:" an interpretation which drew forth some severe animadversions from Le Clerc, to whom Whitby made a most spleenetic reply in a long, but little convincing annotation. It was in vain to urge that πνεῦμα, in all this discourse, no where else signifies mind; and the examples adduced by the Doctor are all but one in the plural; which somewhat alters the case. Instead of bandying about texts which have little reference to the point in question, Le Clerc should have demanded an example of τὸ πνεῦμα in the singular, with a personal pronoun: and Whitby was bound to produce it, or give up the interpretation. As that was not done (and, indeed, could not be done), the interpretation must fall to the ground.

The true sense seems to be that expressed by some ancient Commentators, and most modern ones, for the last century, namely mind. They take νοῦς to mean sententia, my sense, the sense or import of my words. Ecumen. thus excellently paraphrases: ἐὰν γὰρ λαλῶ γλώσσῃ, οὐ μὴν καὶ διερμηνεύω, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα μου, οἷος ἡ ψυχή αὐτῆς καθ' ἐαυτὴν αἰθελεῖται, ἀκαρπὸς δὲ μου ὁ νοῦς εὑρεθήσεται, τῷ μὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἀφελείν. νοῦ γὰρ καρπὸς, τὸ διὰ ποικίλων καὶ παντοδιάλεκτων λαλήσεων αἰθελεῖα τοῖς πλησίοις ἔπινοεῖ. And Rosenm. very well thus: "If I pray in a foreign language, my mind prayeth (I myself understand what I am praying), but my meaning (the meaning of my words) does not profit another who understands not that foreign language."

14. ἀκαρπὸς ἐστι, "instructuosus est," i. e. by a very common metaphor, "yields no fruit, brings no benefit (namely of edification) to the hearers."

15. τι ὁν ἐστι; A formula not unfrequent in St. Paul (as Rom. 3, 9, and 6, 15., where see the notes), and which occurs sometimes in the Classical writers. It is a conclusive phrase, introduced at the end of a
discussion, the sense of which is always nearly the same, but which requires to be accommodated to the context. Here it may be rendered: "What, then, is best for me to do, and most calculated for usefulness?" The answer to this is made in the first person, suitably to the μετασχηματισμός in the verse preceding. And the direction is not expressed by "Pray with," &c., but "I will pray with." It is well noticed by Chrys. and Æcumen., that this is the same as if he had said: "The best to be done is to ask God, in prayer, to be enabled to pray with the spirit, and to pray," &c. The passage is well paraphrased by Æcumen. as follows: Τι ὃν ἔστιν ὦ χρὴ αἰτεῖν τῷ Θεῷ; τι; τὸ προσέχεσθαι τῷ πνεύματι, οἷον τῇ ψυχῇ, ὅπερ εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ μόνου συνείναι αἰφέλεαι, προσ- έχνατοι δὲ καὶ τῷ νῷ, ὅπερ καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν πληρῶν φθάνει οἰκοδομὴ, κατὰ τὴν ἐπάνω παράγωγον, καὶ ψάλ- λειν δὲ ὁμοιώς. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: "The best to be done is to ask God to be endowed with the faculty of divinely inspired prayer in a foreign tongue, not with the spirit and soul only, and to my own edification only, but τῷ νῷ, so as to be understood by others also," i.e. "that I may have, too, the χάρισμα of interpretation as well as tongues." This is, I conceive, the only sense that can be affixed to the words consistently with the context, and it is supported, besides Æcumen., by Beza, Lightf., Vatabl., Menoch., Tirin, J. Capell., Vorst., Vitring., Hamm., Whitby, Pearce, Rosenm., Krause, and Jaspis. At least all those Commentators support the sense of νῷ just laid down, and it is very satisfactorily made out by Locke and Pearce. That sense, indeed, is required both by the context here, and especially by the parallel expression at ver. 19. διὰ νῦν μου (or, as the best MSS. read, τῷ νῷ), which they explain by ἵνα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κατηχήσω. Nor does this mode of interpretation involve so much harshness, if we consider, that in the best Greek writers the syntax of a dativus commodi vel scopi is often changed into an accusative with an εἰς.
or ψάλλειν. And Grot. well suggests that the Heb. ὕμνος is often so used.

Ψάλλειν here, as in Rom. 15, 19. Eph. 5, 19., and elsewhere, signifies to celebrate the Divine praises in verse. See a quite kindred passage in James 5, 13., where προςευκλεῖσθω and ψαλλέτω are, in like manner, antithetical. It is not clear, however, that this is to be understood always of a regular hymn sung. I conceive that it was, in general, only a composition in such poetic numbers as would admit of being adapted to music; though, I imagine it was often only recited. This, indeed, would especially appear from the passage of James. We may also collect from the term ψάλλειν here employed (especially in comparison with the use of it in other parts of Scripture), and also εὐλογηθήσεται just after, that the subject of the speeches of those who had the gift of tongues was usually the prayers and praises of God, either expressed in hymns, or in that sort of style, half prose and half poetry, so characteristic of the genius of Oriental writing.

16. ἐσεί, ἐάν εὐλογηθήσεται τῷ πνεύματι—εὐχαριστία. It is to be observed that ἐσεί, like some other particles, carries with it sometimes an ellipsis of ἄλλως, and must be rendered "since otherwise;" as in Rom. 96, 11, 6 & 22. 1 Cor. 5, 10., where see the notes. Nor are Classical examples wanting, some of which may be seen in Schl. Lex. The sense of the verse will be sufficiently clear if we attend the sense of the words πνεῦμα and νῶς before explained. Εὐλογεῖν, as Rosenm. rightly remarks, is of nearly the same import with ψάλλειν just before explained. Πνεύματι must be taken as in the preceding verse, and μόνον must be supplied; q. d. ἐάν οἷς τῷ νῷ; both of which phrases must have the same sense as in the preceding verse, i. e. "so that thou mayest edify in thy mind and soul; but not so that he may understand thee."

16. ἀνεπαρκοῦν τῶν τόπων τοῦ ἱδρῶν. The general sense of this term ἱδρώτης I have explained at Acts 6, 13., where I observed, that it denotes a private
person as opposed to those in any office, since they are, in a certain sense, public characters; and it sometimes denoted the ignorant, as compared to the learned; and for a plain reason, since persons in private stations may be presumed to be less knowing than those who fill public offices. For this reason ἰδιόται and φιλοσόφοι were opposed, and also because the philosophers were considered as public characters. Here, then, by τῶν ἰδ. are denoted persons who did not sustain a public character by the open exercise of any spiritual gifts, but possessed them not: and this is all that is meant, viz. persons εἰς ἀρχὴν, and unendowed with any χάρισμα.* All the significations of ἰδ. are illustrated by Wets., with exceeding minuteness, from Classical passages, every one of which, however, may be understood on the general principles laid down here, and in the note on Acts.

The phrase ἀναπληρῶν τῶν τόπων is said to be an Hebraism for ἐκ περιπέτειας, to fill a place, be in any state or condition. But similar expressions are found both in Greek, Latin, and even the modern languages. Examples are adduced by Kypke, Loesner, and Krause: as Liban. Ep. 289. εἰς ἅγιον ἐν ἰδιότοις χάραξ. Hierocl. in Carm. A. τῆς ἐφέξεως πληροῦντες χάραξις. Arrian Diss. Epicpt. p. 364. ὡς ἐνεπληροῦσι τῆς χάρας τῆς πρεπούσας. Tacit. Ann. 4, 38. si locum principum impleam. It may be observed, that the passages adduced by the Commentators have mostly τάξις, or χάραξ, which both seem to be military allusions. So that, after all, there is (I think) more reason to consider it as a Latinism than a Hebraism.

* Thus Doddr. renders it "private persons," as does also Mack., who remarks that Josephus Antiq. 3. C. 9. § 1. uses the word ἰδιώτης to denote a private person, as distinguished from the priests. In like manner (he adds), in this verse ἰδιώτης denotes those of the assembly who had not the gift of languages, and who were not teachers, but hearers only. And so the word is interpreted by Chrys. and the Greek Commentators. Slade, however, defends the common version, especially from ver. 23. It indeed comes to much the same thing; or both interpretations may be united.
16. πώς ῥεῖ τὸ ἀμήν. Mackn. rightly expresses the force of the article by rendering: "How shall he pronounce the Amen.*" By this use of the article, as Mackn. truly observes, the Apostle implies that it was the custom; a custom, as the Commentators satisfactorily prove, derived from the Jewish Church. See Grot., Buxtorf de Syn. Jud. p. 226., and other authorities referred to by Wolf, as also the note of Whitby. That it prevailed in the primitive Church we need not doubt, and the early Ecclesiastical writers supply abundant evidence. See Just. Martyr. Apol. 2. It is observed by Schoettgen: "Quum ergo ceremonia illa Amen respondendi Paullo Apostolo tantoperè probata sit, facilè judicari potest, quid de hodierno ritu sentiendum sit, quando ad preces publicas ministri Ecclesiæ vel unus tantum, vel pueri et symphoniaci tantùm Amen respondent. Nam id a totà Ecclesiá fieri debet, ut fiduciam erga Deum de certà precum exaudatione ostendat."

The word εὐχαριστία is for εὐλογία, and refers to the εὐλογήσει just before. Ἐπειδὴ τι λέγεις οὐκ οἶδε, "seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest." For acquiesce and approbation supposes and requires previous knowledge.

17. σὺ μὲν γὰρ οἰκοδομεῖται. The Apostle simply means to reason, that as he has known nothing of what has been said, he can have learnt nothing, nor be benefited.

Theophyl. rightly remarks that by the use of καλῶς the Apostle means to show that it is not his intent to depreciate the gift, but only to evince its inferior utility.

18. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ — καλῶν. It is well observed by Theophyl. (after Chrys.), that these words

* Every one knows that the word is properly an adjective signifying true, and, as such, was used as well in solemn asseverations, when ἐστι was left to be understood; as after prayer, which involved either asseveration, (as when the praises of God were pronounced,) or supplication, when his aid was sought, which required the ellipsis ἐστι.
are meant to preclude the supposition that he de-
preciates this gift because he possesses it not. The
remark is borrowed by Semler and others.

I cannot approve of the common translation, and
that of Dodd., "I thank God that I speak," &c.,
i.e. I thank God that I am enabled to speak. This
sense cannot be elicited from the words by any rules
of regular construction. Besides, this is neglecting
the sense of ἐχαριστ. what twice occurs in the preced-
ing verse. Bp. Pearce and Mackn. render the next
words: "I speak with more languages than you all." But
though this might be true, since (as Grot. says)
the Apostle enjoyed an ὀράδα, or conflux of all gifts,
yet the Greek words merely mean what the common
translation expresses, namely: "I enjoy and exercise
this gift of tongues more than you all." So Chrys.: τὸ ἐχαριστ.—καὶ ἕνω κάκτημα καὶ ὑμᾶν πλεοῦ.
Yet under this is delicately couched the sense which
Theophylact suggests, and indeed Chrysostom, who
enters into an able comparison of it with Rom. 11, 1.
eι τοι θάκει, &c. And he adds, that such is the cus-
tom of the Apostle.

Macknight here very justly remarks: "The Apos-
tle had this great variety of languages given him by
inspiration, that he might be able immediately to
preach the gospel to all nations, without spending
the time in learning their languages. But it must
be remembered that the knowledge of so many lan-
guages, miraculously communicated, was a knowl-
dge for common use, such as enabled the Apostle
to deliver the doctrines of the gospel clearly and
properly; and not such a knowledge of these lan-
guages as prevented him, in speaking and writing,
from mixing foreign idioms with them, especially
the idioms of his mother tongue. An attention to
such trifles was below the grandeur and importance
of the work in which the Apostle was engaged, and
tended to no solid use; these foreign idioms being
often more expressive and emphatical than the cor-
respondent classical phrases."
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19. ἀλλ’ εἰς ἐκκλησία θέλω—γνῶσις, "But in a Christian congregation I prefer, or choose, to say a few words so as to be understood, and that I may instruct others, rather than ten thousand words in a tongue foreign to, and unknown to the congregation." With respect to the phraseology, we have to notice the ellipsis of μᾶλλον, which is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. (See Viger., Bos, Ellips., and Matth. Gr. Gr.), especially when some word occurs in the sentence which, in a certain measure, includes the μᾶλλον; as here θέλω, which, though it generally signifies wish, also denotes choose. So θεόλομαι in the well known Homeric passage, Iliad, a. 117.

The idiom in πέντε λόγους is found in the popular and familiar style in all languages. Krause compares Aristoph. Ran. ὄντες ἐσθη ἢ ὁδόν οὐδένα and Nub. τρία ἰδώματα εἰπεῖν. Terent. Phorm. 4, 8, 33. Tria non commutabitis verba. Equally common, too, is the idiom in μορφῶς λόγους, by which a large limited is used for a great and unlimited number. This varies in different countries, and may be either 500, or 1,000, or 5,000, or 10,000.

19. διὰ τῶν νοὸς μου. This phrase must (I think), with Locke, Mackn., Rosenm., and many others mentioned supra ver. 15., be rendered: "so as to be understood by others." The following words ἰμάλλος κατηχήσω are exegetical. The reading τῶν, which is supported by many MSS., including all the most ancient, the Vulg., Copt., and Armenian Version, and some Fathers, deserves attention, and I think, with Bp. Pearce, that it is the true one. The common one has the air of a gloss; which this can never be, since it is the more difficult reading.

On the sentiment in μορφῶς λόγους see Doddr.

20. μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρέσιν—γίνεσθε. Theophyl. observes, that after he has shown them of what nature is the gift of tongues, the Apostle now uses a πληθυσμωτέρῳ λόγῳ, and rebukes them (though affectionately addressing them with ἀδελφοί), as being
puerilely minded; it being the disposition of boys to admire little things, because, perhaps, they are striking, (such as the gift of tongues,) but neglect and despise great things, ὅσ μηδὲν κανονπρεπὲς ἐμφασ-νίων, such as were the προφητείαι. There is here (I think) a figure frequent in the Apostle, namely, the epanorthosis. The Apostle, as it were, corrects himself, and, remembering another view in which the word παιδίων might be taken, and, by allusion, supply an instructive moral lesson, adds: ἄλλα τὰ κακία νηπιάζετε; q. d. "I give you leave to be childlike τὰ κακία, where I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen that ἐπὶ is to be understood, and that the sense is: "quod attinet ad malitiam," i.e. in respect to not being vicious." The idiom often occurs in the best authors, especially Thucydides. This childlike innocence and simplicity our Lord often earnestly enjoined. In this view it is finely observed by Thucyd. 1, 83. init. καὶ τὸ εὖθες,—οὐ τὸ γενναῖον πλεῖστον μετέχει.

Most Commentators think that the κακία signifies malice, meaning (as Locke says) all sorts of ill temper of mind, contrary to the gentleness and innocence of childhood; and, in particular, their emulation and strife about the exercise of their gifts in their assemblies. But I can find no authority in the New Testament for this sense, which is somewhat far-fetchèd, and, indeed, is not founded in truth, for boys are, I apprehend, not deficient in petulance and ill temper.

20. τοῖς φρεσὶ τέλειοι γίνεσθε, "in understanding, prudence, and judgment in approving those things which are excellent, be grown up men, and attain to something of the maturity of your Christian profession." This sense of τέλειος is frequent in the best writers, from whom many examples are adduced by Schl. Lex. Locs. cites Philo 446 d. where these words νίκιος and τέλειος are opposed to each other. It is of more importance, however, to advert to a similar metaphor in Ephes. 4, 13. μέχει καταντήσωμεν. αἱ
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πάντες εἰς ἄλλα τέλειαν, i.e. become mature Christians, both in knowledge and prudence.* The Commentators remark on the similarity of this to the injunction of our Lord, "Be ye wise as serpents, but harmless as doves." The passage is thus admirably paraphrased by Theodoret: Μη ἀντιστρέψητε τὴν τάξιν, μηδὲ τῶν παιδίων τὴν ἁγιασάν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁκικίαν ἡλιότητε τῶν δὲ τελείων μὴ τὴν πονηρίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγνίσκοιν ἔχετε.

21. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται "Οτι, &c. These words are referred to Is. 28, 11 & 12., and Jer. 5, 15., which passages may be regarded as predictive of the gift of tongues. It is well known that νόμος often signifies, as here, the Jewish Scriptures in general, and not the Mosaic books only. See Joh. 10, 34, 15, 25. The student may compare the words of the Hebrew and Sept., which differ much from St. Paul's. See the Hexapla. The Apostle, however, did not intend an exact citation. He merely meant to give the substance of the sense; which (as far as regards the Hebrew original) he has done. It is, at all events, a very happy accommodation of the words of the Prophet.

21. εἰσακούσωσαι μου, "hearken to, obey me. To the examples of this sense, adduced by the Commentators, I add Soph. CEd. C. 1645. τοσαῦτα φανερώσωσι, εἰσηκούσαις Ἐμμανουήλ.

22. ἀνέθεται γιλασάται εἰς σημεῖα εἰσὶν—ἀπίστωις. In order still further to show the inferiority of tongues to interpretation, the Apostle adverts to the chief purpose which signs were meant to serve, namely, for the conviction of unbelievers, rather than the edification of believers.

The sense is: "Wherefore the tongues (i.e., by

the force of the article, the tongues in question) are (meant) to serve for a sign, or mark, by which it may be known that the Christian doctrine is true. Yet these are (intended) not (so much) for believers, as unbelievers.† Some recent Commentators take the γλῶσσαι and προφητεία to denote persons endued with those gifts. But this is equally harsh and unnecessary.

The ω—άλλα must be rendered non tam—quid. Rosenm. thinks that the inference meant to be drawn by the Apostle is this: "Ergo προφητείας donum, quod inter vos viget pro divinae in vestram ecclesiam benevolentiae argumento habendum est." But he must have been alius agens not to have seen that the Apostle is drawing no such inference. The scope of the passage is plainly such as I have laid down. The tongues (he says) are only meant for a sign, and even that rather for unbelievers than believers; whereas the prophetia, though it is not so much a sign to the unbeliever, yet is especially such to the believer; being a sign and a confirmation of their faith, and an increase of their knowledge. And this, I think, is all that seems necessary to be kept in view.‡

* So 2 Cor. 12, 12. τὰ σημεία τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατευργάσθη ἐν υἱῶι.
† So Jaspis paraphrases: "Cum vident Pagnani, exteris linguis Ioqui Christiarnis repente contingere, attoniti, attenti sunt, cogitans, qualia hec? cogitans, quae qualis illa religio!"
‡ The early Commentators, on this passage, trifled egregiously. There is more solidity in the following passage of Theophyl. (from Chrys.) than in all their annotations put together: Τὸ δὲ σημείον ἐκπλήττει μὲν, οὐ πάντως δὲ διδάσκει καὶ ὕφελε, ὡσπερ καὶ βλάπτει πολλάκις, ὥστε ἡ άνευ ἐρμηνείας γλῶσσα, καθαύτη προφητῶν φησιν, διότι ἐφοίσιν δι' ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοῖς ἀπίστοις δεδόμαι τὰ σημεῖα τοῖς πιστοῖς οὐ δεύτερον, ἢ δὴ πιστοὶ δότες. And further on: 'Ἡ προφητεία, φησιν, ὕφελε τοῖς πιστοῖς, κατηχούσα τούτων, ἀρά οὖν καὶ τοῖς ἀπίστοις οὐκ ἦστιν ἡ προφητεία; καὶ τῶς παρακατικῶς λέγει, ὅτι ἐὰν πάντες προφητεύωσι, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ τοι ἀπίστως; ἦδον γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἡ προφητεία. Ἐστὶν οὖν εἰσίν, δι' οὓς εἰσίν ὁ ἀπόστολος, δι' οὓς ἦστιν χρήσιμος ἡ προφητεία τοῖς ἀπίστοις, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦστιν εἰς σημεῖον ἀνωφέλει, ὃς ἡ γλῶσσα. "Ὡς τὰ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν ἢ μὲν γλῶσσα εἰς σημεῖον ἦστι τοῖς πιστοῖς, τούτους, εἰς τὸ
23. The Apostle further evinces the inferiority of tongues, by showing the *misconstruction* which the gift might occasion to the Heathens; so that, unless employed in conjunction with interpretation, it might tend rather to the injury than benefit of the Gospel.

23. ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. The οὖν is not *conclusive*, but *transitive*, and may be rendered "now if," "if, for example." On συνέλθῃ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, see the notes on 11, 20. and Acts 2, 44. Καὶ πάντες, i. e. (as Est. and Menoch. explain) *all together*, *mixed*, *confused*, *tumultuous*. This, however, involves great improbability; neither do the words *imply* it. Grot. and others better explain the *all* by "one after another," all "in their turn," but all "in a foreign tongue." The Commentators, however, do not tell us who are to be understood by the *all*. Not surely all the *congregation*, for that was already said to be ἡ ἡκκλησία, but all those who have gifts sufficient to enable them to address the congregation.

23. εἰσέχωσι δὲ οἴδατε ἡ ἀποστολή. Almost all Commentators suppose these οἴδατε to be *Christians* who had not the gift of tongues. But how can this suit the words ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων? which will only apply to unbelievers.* Both words together were, I think, meant to express *unbelievers ignorant of foreign languages*. And so Chrysost. and the other antient Commentators evidently took the words, as did also the ἙθιοπικTranslator. The ἡ is for καὶ as often in the Old Testament, and sometimes in the New; as 1 Cor. 11, 27.; and may be rendered or even.

* And the same view (I find) is taken by Bp. Pearce. "For (says he) except the person entering were both unlearned and an unbeliever too, he would not think them mad for speaking in foreign languages; an unbeliever who was learned and understood those languages would not be surprised; and a believer who did not understand them, would in reverence think well of those speakers." Dr. Dodd. felt the difficulty, and attempts to remove it, but very inartificially and unsatisfactorily.
The only modern Commentator who has seen the true sense (though he did not seize the right clue to it) is Bp. Pearce. He would cancel the η; which is, however, quite unnecessary. It were uncritical to think of any such thing; since η very rarely creeps in, and here no account could be given for its insertion. Heathens and unbelievers (Whitby and Grot. observe) used to come to the Christian assemblies, (Acts 13, 44 & 48.) nor, whilst they assembled in the Jewish synagogue, could it be otherwise.

23. οίκ ἐρωτίων ὑπὶ μακενσε; “will they not say that you are frantic enthusiasts?” This, Mackn. observes, is not contrary to what is said at ver. 22., that the speaking in foreign languages was a sign to convince unbelievers: for the unbelievers to be convinced by that sign were such strangers as understood the language in which they were addressed; whereas the unbelievers and unlearned persons, who considered the speaking of foreign languages as an effect of madness, were those strangers who did not understand them.” Wets. cites the following very curious passage from Jambl. S. 3, 8. δει ἔτεην τὰ τῆς θείας μανιάς αἴτια. Ταῦτα δὲ ἑστὶ τὰ καθόκωντα ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν φῶτα, καὶ τὰ ἐνδιόρημα πνεύματα ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦ αὖ ’ αὐτῶν παντελῶς ἐκκράτεια—λόγους µὲν προε- μένην, οὐ μετὰ διανοίας δὲ τῶν λεγόντων, ἀλλὰ μανιοµένῳ, φαιν, στόµατι φθεγγοµένου αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑπηρετούντων ὃλων, καὶ παραχωρούσων µόνη τῇ τοῦ κρατήρων ἐνεργείᾳ.

24. ἐὰν δὲ πάντες προφητεύουσιν, “but if all (the inspired persons) prophesy,” i. e. perform the offices of the προφήτης, on which see the note on ver. 1 & 8. Ἐλέγχεται ὡτὶ πάντων, α. ν. π. In Ἐλέγχεται and ἀνακρίνεται the sense is not very clearly evoked. Hence the varying opinions of Commentators.* Most recent Interpreters explain, “he is convinced of

* Mackn. renders ἀνακρίνεται “is questioned by all,” namely, all who have the gift of discerning spirits, who will proclaim the purpose of his coming, namely, to be a spy.” But this is a mere tissue of misconception, and utterly unfounded; for the words “and thus the secrets of his heart are made manifest” have quite another meaning.
the erroneousness of his opinions concerning Christianity." But this, though a very good sense, is too limited a one; and for the person to be put for his opinion is not a little harsh. The true sense undoubtedly is that assigned by the Greek Commentators, and all the moderns down to Grot., which is both supported by the usus loquendi and by the words following, which seem meant to explain what is here expressed too briefly. 'Elégχetai, then, signifies, "he is convicted by all * (the preachers) of sin and iniquity and error in the opinions he had formed of the Christian doctrine. 'Anakrίnetai is a judicial or forensic term, which must (as Schleus. admits) involve a notion of condemnation, and is added to strengthen the sense. It is well explained by Semler: "Animi et conscientiae novis motibus tangitur haud dubiè; licet nemo ex istis, ipsum quasi nomine appellat, tamen eadem axiomata sæpius repetita, ejus conscientiam pulsabant." The above sense of élégχei occurs in Luke 3, 19. 1 Tim. 5, 20. 2, 15. James 2, 9. élégχόμενοι ὑπὸ νόμου οἷς παραβάται. See Wolf.

25. τὸ κρύπτα τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται, &c. These words need not have occasioned so much trouble to the early modern Commentators. They seem merely a popular description of the workings of an awakened conscience in the mind of an Heathen hearer: for, as the former words represent him convinced of sin, so these (I conceive) express the effects thereof, in open compunction for sins before concealed, or dissembled, nay, hardly known to be sins. The next words, καὶ οὕτω, πέτων ἐπί, &c. describe the final effects of that compunction, namely, in prayer to God for forgiveness, and acceptance, and in acknowledgment of the truth of the religion which he had before rejected; for this last is implied in the words ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἄνωτος ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστὶν.†

* For (as Doddr. well paraphrases) "every one of the preachers says something of which his conscience bears witness.

† So Wolf: "In hoc committae duplex effectus commemoratur,
This power has been, indeed, the especial privilege of faithful preachers in every age, and is well (though quaintly) expressed in the words of an antient English writer cited by Bulkley, as follows: "By preaching their conscience is gauled, their wickedness and hypocrisy discovered, their damnation threatened; they are called to repentance and forsaking of their pleasant sins, and to holynesse and innocencie of life. So that if there be any sparke of the fear of God in them, hearing preach, so often as they use to heare service, they will fall down on their faces, and worship God, acknowledging the great power of God in his ministers."

26. The Apostle now draws the conclusion, that the value of these χαράσματα is not to be measured by the nature of the gift considered in itself, but by the mode and degree in which the common advantage of others is promoted. This he recommends them especially to keep in view, 3, 5, & 12. See Rom. 14, 9, 15, 2. (Jaspis.)

26. τι οὖν ἐστιν; On this formula see the note on ver. 15. In these, and the words following, there is something not a little awkward, there being no appearance of an admonition, as we should expect. To remove this difficulty various conjectures have been devised, very little effectual. Grot., Pearce, Semler, and Macknight, would read the words following interrogatively. But this seems very harsh just after a former interrogation, and gives the sentence a very frigid air. Rosenm., Jaspis, and Valpy, would supply ἤ at each clause. But this is too precarious and arbitrary a principle to deserve much attention. The most favourite interpretation for the last half century is that of Locke, Wolf, Semler, and Dodd., who reject both the interrogation and the insertions, and take the words ἐκαστὸς ἔχει in the sense, "every

ex ἑλέγχω et ἀνακρίσει antea commemoratis consequens, nempe tum manifestatio cogitatorum animi interior, et adversus hominem ipsum, de eorum pravitate, ante ignorantia, convictum; tum exterior et non dissimulata ad Deum conversio."
one is ready (i.e. eager and impatient) to be heard. Upon this principle Doddridge offers the following paraphrase: "What a shocking thing it is, my brethren, that when you come together for the purposes of social worship, in which all hearts should unite, each of you is desirous himself to officiate publicly, in such a manner as best suits his present inclination, without any regard to decency and order." But surely no greater perversion of the sense of words can be conceived than this; and the ignorance shown in misconceiving the common formula τι ὅν εστίν, is very disgraceful.

After all, there need be no difficulty, if we consider this sentence as expressed populariter, and that an εἴτε is to be subauded from the following verse, where it is expressed. The sense then will be this. "What, then, is to be done (to avoid these evils, and promote the good in view; why this). Each (I will suppose) hath some gift or other: whether he hath a psalm, whether he hath," &c. (Well, be it so, so that all be done unto edification.) Keep that in view. "Let every thing be done unto edification." Of all the Commentators, Cæcumen. alone saw the ellipsis, and discerned the sense of the passage, which he excellently paraphrases thus: "Ἐκαστὸς ὁμῶν εἴτε ήσαμῶν ἔχει, εἴτε διδαχὴν ἔχει, εἴτε προφητείαν, εἴτε γνώσεων ἔχει, εἴτε ἐρμηνείαν ἔχει, τῶς ἐν τέλος πάντα δράτα, τὸ οἰκοδομεῖν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

The ἐκαστὸς is meant to suggest that the different χαρισματα would be distributed among different persons, and not all or several of them be found in any one person. So Theodoret: διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἐκαστὸς ὁμῶν τὸ δὲ ἔχει καὶ τὸ δὲ, τὴν τῶν μελῶν διαφοράν. On the imparting of these gifts Grot. rightly observes: "Omnia quae olim aut ex ingenio, aut ex labore, veniebant, tunc multis dabantur subito et dvinitus, ut ex eo intelligaretur Dei summa beneficentia"

The words which here express the different gifts are to be explained with reference to what the Apostle has before said concerning these gifts. Yet as he here speaks somewhat generally, and does not
use precisely the same terms, the Commentators vary in opinion as to the sense. Rosenm. huddles the first three terms together, and assigns this signification: “donum in peregrinâ linguâ precandi vel psallendi.” And he explains ἀποκάλυψιν “a clear knowledge of some truth hitherto unknown, or obscure to himself and others.” But this method, however it may be a convenient way of dissembling a difficulty, is not to be approved. The term ψαλμὸς, I think, denotes another supernatural gift, namely ψαλμοδία, and has not been distinctly mentioned before. Yet I think there is a reference to it at ver. 15. ψαλῶ τῷ πνεύματι—νοὴ, where see the note. Perhaps this was an extemporaneous and inspired composition in poetic numbers, adapted, or suitable to music. Grotius compares the Hymn of Simeon and Hannah, Moses, and Maria his sister, another of Moses, and that of Deborah, Hannah, wise of Elkannah, and that in Is. C. 5.

Διδαχὴ, which also occurs supra ver. 6. ἡ ἐν γναῖσει, ἡ ἐν προφητείᾳ, ἡ ἐν διδαξή, is well explained by Theophyl. διδασκαλίαν.* And so Suidas. It seems to denote an instructive discourse proceeding from one of the διδασκαλοὶ mentioned at 2, 29. μὴ πάντες προφηταὶ; μὴ πάντες διδασκάλοι; where see the note, and at 12, 28.

As to the γλῶσσαν and the ἐρμηνείαν, they require no explanation. The ἀποκάλυψιν will merit some attention. Rosenmuller’s exposition is shallow, and, indeed, a mere shift to avoid the difficulty. Most Commentators, with Grot., think it was a faculty of explaining what was wrapped up in the figures and mysteries of the Old Testament. But this is far too hypothetical and limited a definition. The sense has, I think, been best seen by Theophyl., who takes it as put for προφητείαν, the species being used

* Mackn. explains it, “a discourse for edification, exhortation, and consolation.”
for the genus: a figure common in Scripture, on which see Glass Phil. S. 1256.

27. The Apostle now proceeds to give some special directions as to the exercise of the gift of tongues, and shows how it may be so exercised as to tend to edification.

27. ἐπε γλώσσῃ τίς λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο, &c. It is plain that there is here an ellipsis, which Knatchbull fills up with ἔστω. But to this it is objected by Wolf, that δύο or τρεῖς refers to the speakers. Thus Rosen. subauds λαλεῖτωσαν, which is, so far, more exact. Yet this subaudition is harsh; whereas the other is mild, and such as is usual with the Apostle. Our common Translators, and Doddr., have therefore (I think) done right in adopting that mode of filling up the ellipsis. Mackn. (absurdly enough) understands by δύο η τρεῖς the λόγους, “because (says he) only one person is mentioned.” But how so? This cannot be inferred from the singular, which I am surprised none of the Commentators should have seen, is used, together with the verb for the plural, something in the way of an impersonal; as in Pet. 4, 11. el τίς λαλεῖ ὡς λογία Θεοῦ, el τίς διακονεῖ, &c., i.e. if there be any speaking. It must also be observed, that τίς, in the best Classical writers, is often (as Matth. Gr. Gr. observes, 487.) used in a collective sense for many, and often answers to the Fr. on, and our one; and, on account of this collective sense, the word which refers to it is sometimes put in the plural. See the examples of Matth., and of Zeun ap. Viger. Id. p. 41 a., and of Viger and Hoog. ap. Viger. p. 151. Such sentences are always commutable with impersonal ones, as τούτου δὴ τίς ἀποκρίνεται ἀν, “one might reply,” or “it might be replied.” It is strange that Schleus., in his Lex., has not touched on this idiom, nor even Wahl, whose article is, in some respects, more valuable than Schlesner’s.

27. κατὰ δύο—τρεῖς, i.e. “two or three at a time.” Such is the general sense of the idiom: but by time
must here be meant "day, or time of meeting." 'Ανα μέρος plainly signifies "each in turn." And so Polyb. 3, 5. 5, 8.

27. καὶ εἰς διερμηνεύεται, "and let there be always one to interpret." The Apostle, I think, means to say that this gift should be so exercised, that not more than two, or at most three, should speak on any one occasion, and that successively; and that there should always be one to interpret.

28. εἰν δὲ μὴ ἡ διερμηνευτὴς, "But if there be no one present who has the κάρμαμα of interpretation." Συγάτω ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. At συγάτω we must repeat τις, which is to be taken as before. When it is said εἰν δὲ μὴ διερμ., it must, I think, be understood, "if he himself cannot interpret, and there be no other who can do it." For though almost all the Commentators are of opinion that the Apostle expressly forbids a man to be his own interpreter, yet that sense cannot, I think, be proved. It is little probable in itself, and is contradicted by the manifest meaning of ver. 5 & 13., where see the note.* Mr. Slade has very judiciously treated this subject. "The gift of

* And so Doddr. admits that a man might have the gift of speaking with tongues, who could not interpret. And he attempts to remove the difficulty as follows: "The miracle (says he) which conferred the gift of tongues, seems to have been the instantaneous impressing on the mind the familiar and perfect knowledge of a language with which the person was before unacquainted; yet so that, from that time, the person receiving it should be able, without any new miracle, to use it as he thought fit; but I apprehend that every man using this gift, and understanding what he said, must have been able to have rendered his discourse, sentence by sentence, into his native language, he might be able to render it into a third, which might be that of many present. Now, in such a circumstance, the gift of interpretation might take place, if it consisted, as I conjecture it did, in an instantaneous capacity of understanding a strange language just for that time, and rendering what was spoken in it into the native tongue of the interpreter. (Compare the paraphrase on chap. 12. ver. 10.) On this hypothesis, and truly I think on this alone, one who had the gift of interpretation might not be able to speak any foreign language at all; and he who had the gift of a tongue, might not, in some circumstances, be able to interpret to those who were his hearers."
tongues (says he), and the interpretation of them appear to have been usually imparted to separate persons, for thereby the power of the Spirit was more conspicuously manifested; but it seems too much to say that these gifts were invariably distinct." Certainly the present passage does not compel us to suppose so. For (as Mr. Slade observes) the Apostle's injunction might only be given, on the supposition that the person had, as in ordinary cases, the gift of tongues without the power of interpretation. And though it should appear from the phrase ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἥπερ διερμηνεύῃ, that the Apostle did not, on the present occasion, contemplate the circumstance of these gifts being exercised by the same person at the same time, it does not follow that he actually prohibited them from being so exercised at any time. And this phrase in question no more precludes the possibility of a person's being his own interpreter, than the phrases in ver. 5 & 13. preclude the possibility of interpretation by others." Macknight, indeed, objects that for a person to interpret his own words would be mere ostentation; since he might as well at once speak the language into which he interpreted them. And so Whitby. But that proceeds upon mere misapprehension. For (as Mr. Slade truly remarks) there might be occasions on which such an interpretation might be useful and requisite; as, for instance, when the audience was of a mixed nature; which must very commonly happen." This view of the subject is adopted by Rosenm., and, what is more, is supported by the authority of Chrysost., who explains thus: "If any one has both gifts, let him speak; but if he has not, and wishes to speak, let him do it with an interpreter, and if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence." And so Οἰκουμένη.

The words ἐὰντε ὡς λαλεῖτω καὶ τῷ Θεῷ are not well interpreted by Grot. and other modern Commentators, "speak at home, what God and himself may understand." Chrysost. well explains: λαλεῖτω
κατὰ διάνοιαν, ἕξεμα καὶ ἀφόφητι.* And he suggests that there is implied, εἰ γέ βουλέται, “if he will speak.” “For this (says he) is not to be understood as an order, but a permission; as at c. 11, supra, εἰ δὲ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἷκῳ ἐσθιέτω, i. e. “if he will, and must eat.” It is plain that this kind of language is rather of discouragement, than recommendation of any thing.”

39. προφητεῖα δὲ δύο ἡ τεῖς λαλεῖτωσαν, &c. After giving directions for the regulation of the exercise of the γλωσσαῖα, the Apostle now proceeds to that of the προφητεία; q. d. “As to the Prophets, let two or three speak, and the rest,” &c. He means that these two or three shall speak ἄνα μέρος, in turn; as in the case of the Glossæ. Our common Translators have ill rendered: “let the Prophets speak two or three.” It should rather have been thus: “Let two or three Prophets speak.” I cannot assent to Beza and Sclater, that this is spoken hypothetically; q. d. “if there shall be so many.” It rather seems to be meant that there shall be at least two or three: though I think, with Chrys., that a greater number is not forbidden; nay this seems to be contemplated from ver. 37.

By the ἄλλοι Grot, Paræus, and Vorst., understand the rest of the congregation, namely, such as were intelligent, and of sufficient abilities to do it. But this is itself very improbable, and cannot be permitted by the article, which (as Beza and others remark) confines it to the Prophets.† Besides, the ἄλλοι just after can be interpreted in no other way. We are, then, to understand “the rest of the Prophets, who are not speaking.” Such is evidently the Apostle’s meaning, which is only rendered obscure by the omission of ἄνα μέρος.

* So Arrian Diss. 4, 8. (cited by Wets.) ὅσα λαλῶς ἐποίουν—οὐ διὰ τοῦθεν θεοῦ ἐποίουν· ἄλλα δὲ ἐμαυτῷ—κάντα ἐμαυτῷ καὶ τῷ θεῷ. Diog. Laert. 9, 64. οὐκ ὁ διὰ τοὺς λαλών· andThem. 366 c. ὁκουρῷ τὰ πολλὰ ἐνδον, καὶ ἐμαυτῷ, φασὶ, καὶ ταῖς Μούσαις ἄδω.

† So Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators.
Διακριτῶσας is by Casaub. explained: “remove any difficulty, or obscurity in the discourse.” But this involves great improbability, and the signification itself is unfounded. Almost all Commentators from Chrys. downwards rightly (I think) interpret it dijudicant, “decide whether the sermon be dictated by the Spirit or not.”* And so also Mackn.† Chrys. aptly compares this with the διάκρισις πνευμάτων in the preceding chapter. Some, as Mr. Slade, think the Apostle is only speaking of true Prophets. An ill founded supposition, and which is at variance with what the Apostle says in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, written a year after, where he cautions them against false prophets.

On the term σφάτω, difficulties are raised by many modern Commentators, as Grot., Whitby, Locke, Pearce, Pile, Doddrr., and Macknight. They think it unlikely that the Apostle would direct the silencing of any one speaking by Divine revelation, because another had something to offer: and they therefore take σφα in the sense: “let him be suffered to conclude his discourse.” But this the usus loquendi does not permit, and the criticism is itself unfounded. The plain sense is: “let the first come to a conclusion;” which involves no difficulty: for we are not compelled to conceive that the conclusion should be so abrupt as to occasion, what those Commentators causelessly suppose, confusion. We need only imagine the speaker’s speedily bringing the thread of his discourse to a termination. And this view of

* Whitby and Doddrr. with less propriety explain: “compare one doctrine with another for the further improvement of all;” an interpretation, indeed, extremely precarious.
† And such is the interpretation adopted by Schoettg., who has the following well digested annotation: “Quoties quis in Ecclesiâ primitivâ aliquid proferret, ali quidam surgebant, quos Spiritus S. singulari judicio instruxerat, et de explicatione et applicatione ejus judicabant, an verbo divino et analogiae fidei Christianâ conformis esset, an veno minus. Vide supra; c. 12, 10. Quae res sanè animos auditorum summopere instruxit, ut in verbo divino longè essent exercitatores.”
the subject is supported by Chrys. and the Greek Commentators,* who have better discerned the scope of the Apostle's direction, which was not (as most modern Commentators think) to prevent the confusion of rude interruption (for that could not decorously be presumed of such inspired personages), but rather of undue prolixity, and the occupying the attention of the congregation to the loss of some more valuable and edifying remarks, which might suddenly occur to another προφήτης. This, as long as human nature continues what it is, may be supposed of any personages, however holy. So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) Εὐταξίαν ἐνταῦθα καὶ τα- τεινοφροσύνην διδάσκει. "Ὅταν γάρ ἄλλω ἐμπνευσθῇ, τὸ πνεῦμα, φθις, οὕτως αὐτὸς πρῶτος εἰ γὰρ ἦδελθαι τὸ πνεῦμα σὲ καλεῖν, οὐκ ἂν ἔκεινον ἐκίνησεν. Ἡτα παραμυθεῖμας ἐκεῖνον, φθις, δύνατον γὰρ καθ’ ἑνα πάντας προφήτευειν.

It is strange that the recent foreign Commentators, as Krause and Rosenm., should understand ἀπο- κάλυψιν not of any inspired revelation, but of thoughts which arose by association of ideas, and were suggested by what the speaker was saying, or by reflection: a most unfounded, nay irreverent notion; for supernatural influence is all along supposed throughout these three chapters; and the term ἀποκάλυψις in this very sense has occurred already two or three times. Besides, the verb ἀποκαλύπτειν is almost always used in the New Testament of supernatural and Divine revelation.† There is, however, one

* Thus Theodoret explains: Ἐὰν ἄλλων παρακείμην ἤ γὰρ τοῦ πνεύματος, παραγγελίᾳ τοῦ λέγειν ἀφέλεμος. And in this sense the word occurs in Acts 15, 13, and often in the Classical writers; as Polyb. 9, 13, 2.
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difficulty, which, though it has not been perceived, or been dissembled by the Commentators, I cannot but propound, in order to remove it. Supposing the first προφήται under an immediate Divine afflatus, on what principle ought he to be expected to yield the discourse to another, who could pretend to nothing more? But, I conceive, that we are not compelled to suppose the προφήται were all under a perpetual and immediate Divine influence. That they were not always so, even when preaching, may (I think) be inferred from the term διακρίνεται. They might at all times be said to enjoy the ordinary influences and assistances of the Holy Spirit, and therefore be very fit to preach to edification. Yet, occasionally, they might (I imagine) perceptibly distinguish a special illness of the Holy Spirit, which might thus be called extraordinary, and would therefore demand to be yielded to by themselves, and attended to by others. The above I find confirmed by Calvin and Par., thus: “Spiritus Sanctus non omnibus dictabat omnia, sed unicique dabatur ad certam mensuram. Pieri igitur poterat, ut Prophetae dono Spiritus sua quadam admiscerent. Id dijudicare aliorum Prophetarum erat.”

The words following are meant to suggest the reason for this direction; namely, for thus all the προφήται will have individually an opportunity of preaching, and the whole congregation will reap the advantage of more diversified instruction and apter exhortation. This use of καθ’ ἕνα, one at a time, Wets. illustrates from the Classical writers.

92. καὶ πνεύματα προφήτων προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται. On the meaning of these words there has been some diversity of opinion. The most favourite interpretation for the last half century has been that which is supported by Rosenm., Schulz, Middleton, and Schleus., who assign to the words this sense: “they who are divinely inspired, are bound, at proper seasons to give place to others who have been gifted with the same inspiration.” The learned Prelate
endeavours to confirm this from his ingenious theory of the Greek article, but (I think) unsuccessfully. It is not clear to me that if the same Prophets were meant as those just before spoken of, the article would be absolutely necessary. It is often left to be supplied: as, for example, at πνεῦματα. Besides, there is no necessity to understand this of the same Prophets; we may understand it of Prophets generally. And it is surely unwarrantable thus to silence the πνεῦματα, which is (I think) a very significant term.* All the Greek Commentators interpret it of the χαρίσματα: and so all the modern Commentators before the time of the recent German School: and this is undoubtedly the true sense. The Greek Commentators, however, are not quite agreed on the scope of the words ὑποτάσσεται προφήταις. Some, as Chrysost., think them meant as a consolation to the silenced; q. d. “If the Spirit within thee be silenced, do not thou be obstinate.” This, however, is very harsh. The true interpretation is, undoubtedly, that of Phot. and CECumen., which is as follows: πνεῦματα προφήτων τιμήσατε, αὐτὸ τὸ πνευματικὸν χάρισμα. εἶτα, ἣν μὴ λέγῃ τις, καὶ πῶς σιγᾶν δύναμαι; αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ ἐπιτελοῦν ἄγιον Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐκόντα καὶ ἄκοντα ἀναγκάζει λαλεῖν, οὐχὶ φησιν ὑποτάσσεται γὰρ τῷ προφήτῃ τῷ χάρισμα, τουτέστιν, εὖ αὐτῷ ἐστι καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ σιωπᾶν. ἀντικροσίας, ἣ ἐὰν τῶν μάντεων ἔκειναι γὰρ μετὰ τὴν παρὰ αυτὸς ἐνθουσίαν, καὶ ἄκοντες οἳ δαιμονιζόμενες λαλοῦσιν ἀλλ' οὐ βούλονται. εἰ τῶν τὸ χάρισμα τοῖς προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται, πῶς οὔκ ἄτοπον ὡμᾶς μὴ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ κοινῷ συμφέρων, ἢν ἢταν τῆς καιροῦ σιωπῆς, σιωπᾶτε; οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεός· εἴτε δείκνυσιν ὅτι καὶ τῷ Θεῷ τούτῳ δοκεῖ, τὸ τῶν πρῶτον σιγᾶν ἔρει μὴ ἐστιν ὁ Θεός ἀκαταστασίας, ἄλλ' εἰρήνης. This view of the subject is supported by Grot., Hamm., Locke, Whitby, Wolf, Pearce, Mackn., Krause, Jaspis, and Slade. It is true that Grot., Calvin, Par., and other Commenta-

* Besides (as Mr. Slade justly observes) it may be doubted whether the spirit of one Prophet can be properly represented as in subjection to another.
tors ap. Pole start objections to this interpretation, but not, I think, on sufficient grounds.

After all, however, I would suggest a remark which seems to have escaped all the Commentators. May not the Apostle have intended this as a general admonition, which all the prophets, whether speaking or hearing, might do well to remember: so that, on the one hand, he who was speaking might not demur at bringing his discourse to a conclusion, on the presence of the overpowering influence of the Holy Spirit; and, on the other, he who was hearing might not interrupt the speaker,* unless for some sufficient reason, nor have to plead spiritual compulsion. This is confirmed by a Scholiast ap. Matth. καὶ πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ἦτοι ἑτέροις, ὡς ἐκαστὸν ἐκαστῷ παραχαρεῖν ἢ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἔκεινοι, ὡς εἶναι παρ ἀυτοῖς καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ σιωπᾶν καὶ μὴ ἀναγκάζεσθαι καὶ ἀκούσας λαλεῖν τούτο γὰρ τῶν ἐνθουσιαστῶν καὶ μανωμένων.

The word ἀκαταστασία properly denotes an unsettled state, and is used of tumults, and those seditions which very often accompany war, and which are fully described by Thucyd. 3, 83—6. See also Luke 21, 9. and the note. So Schoettg. explains it: "tumultus, seditio: quando quis sine omni ordine et institutione superiorm res suas tractat. Tob. 4, 19. Clemens 1. ad Corinth. p. 56." In the same sense the word occurs in Dionys. Hal. p. 865, 38. ἐν τοιαύταις ἀκαταστάσισι τῆς πόλεως οὕτως. Here as being opposed to εἰρήνη, it must mean tumult, disorder, and confusion.

The words ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις are, by most recent Commentators, united with the following words. But I find no authority for so doing in the ancient Commentators, nor the moderns, up to the time of Bp. Pearce, and I see no sufficient reason to adopt this change. The common punctuation, which is rightly retained by Jaspis, seems far

* And to this some Commentators, as Schoettg., confine the sense.
preferable. The words ὁ γὰρ ἐστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ Θεὸς are parenthetical; and in the words, αἰς ἐν, &c. must be understood ὁ νόμος, namely, "for the prophets to have in subjection the spiritual influence, for good." As to the new punctuation, it occasions a very offensive tautology, and derogates much from the weight and gravity with which the direction is brought forward.

This clause has nearly the same sense as that of 10, 16. ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνηθείαν οὐκ ἐχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

34. The word ἀκαταστασίας seems to have suggested to the mind of the Apostle to notice and censure an indecorous practice which was likely to occasion much disorder, namely, that of the women of the congregation arrogating to themselves the office of publicly addressing and teaching the congregation.

34. αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν. This is always rendered "Let your women," &c.; but the word properly signifies wives, matrons; as appears from ver. 35. That virgins should speak, the Apostle did not (I conceive) contemplate the possibility: and, indeed, considering the customs of Greece, and how studiously unmarried females were secluded,* it is probable that they did not often attend the public assemblies.

By σιγάτωσαν is meant "let them keep silence altogether," not only refraining from teaching, but

* The most remarkable proof, I remember, of this is in Eurip. Phæn. 8, 8. ἔπει τῷ μὴν παρθενῶν ἔκλεισεν Μεθύκη, Ξαράνεμι idem Ἀργείων ἱκανίαις σαίς, Ἐπίσχες, ὡς ἂν προδερενήσων στίβον, Μὴ τις πολίτης ἐν τρίβῃ φαντάζεται, κἀμισοῦ μὲν ἄλθη φαύλου, δὲ δούλη, ψόγος, Σολ δ’, ὡς ἄνασσα. So also Synes. 105 δ. μῖαν γὰρ ἀρετὴν "Οσίρις ἤρθε γυναικὸς εἶναι τῷ μηδὲ τῷ σώματι αὐτῆς μητῆ τουνομα διαβηιναι τὴν αὐλιον. Thucyd. 2, 44., where Pericles winds up all that he has said on this subject with the following maxim: τῆς τε γὰρ ὑπαρχοῦσας φύσεως μὴ χείρος γενέσθαι, μὴν μεγάλη ἡ δοσις, καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐπ’ ἔλαχιστον ἀρετῆς περὶ τῆς ψόγου ἐν τοῖς ἄρσει κλέος ὥς ὁποῖα παρά τοῖς ἑξώλογοι εἶναι οὐδένα δεῖ.
interrogating, the former of which is expressly forbidden in this verse, and the latter indirectly in the next. Schoettg. has shown that among the Jews it was strictly forbidden for a woman even to ask questions.*

34. οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτετραπται.

Mackn. renders, "it hath not been permitted." But this, though it may appear a more exact, is, in fact, a less faithful version than our common one "is not permitted." A Translator of the New Testament ought not to have been ignorant of so common an idiom as that by which (especially in commanding) the preterite passive is used for the present tense in its indefinite sense. As to the reading ἐπερέχεται, adopted by Pearce, and approved by others, it is a mere gloss.

The words οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτετραπται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν are, I think, meant to further explain the Apostle's meaning in the preceding words ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις αὐτοῖς. Here, however, our modern Commentators start many difficulties. The question is, are we to understand by these words that the Apostle wholly forbids them to speak at all in the congregation. Many modern Commentators, as Grot., Locke, Dodd., and Benson, think he does; and to reconcile this prohibition with the seeming permission at 11, 5, et seq. for the women προφητέων καὶ προσευχοῦσαι, it is supposed by those Commentators, that they were forbidden to speak only when they had no supernatural impulse and Divine revelation. But (as Mackn. justly remarks) the Apostle has been all along speaking of inspired teach-


Schoettg. proceeds to inform us that to the schools of the Rabbins they were admitted, yet only to hear, and not to propound questions. See Hor. Heb. on Luke 2, 46. It was also forbidden by the Rabbins for women to take the lead in the singing of the Synagogue.

This was quite agreeable to the customs of the Greeks also, in illustration of which Grot. and Wets. adduce numerous Classical citations, the most important of which are these. Plaut. Rud. 4, 4, 70. Tacita bona 'st mulier semper quam loquens. Valer. Max. 3, 8. quid feminae cum concione? Si patrius mos servetur, nihil. Eurip. Iph. 649. γλώσσης δὲ σιγῆν, ὃμια δ' ἤσχον πόσει παρείχων. Soph. Aj. 294. Τίνας, γυναῖξ κόσμον ἡ σιγὴ φέρει. Eschyl. S. C. Theb. 238. ἀνδρῶν τάς ἐστὶ—σὸν δ' ἀφ τοῦ σιγῆς, καὶ καλᾶς ἐμπλέκον ἡσυχίας. The sentiment of Sophocles was imitated by Democrit. ap. Stob. κόσμος ὀλγομυθη γυναῖκι. See also Plut. Num. p. 77. cited by Elsner.
ing and preaching, and, after directions for the orderly exercise of these gifts, subjoin this order respecting the women: the prohibition, therefore, standing in this connection, implies that the Corinthian women were not to pray and prophesy in the Church as teachers, on pretence of being inspired and unable to restrain the motions of the Spirit." Besides (adds he) the reasons mentioned by the Apostle show that the prohibition was absolute and general. Christ had not permitted women to speak in the Church as teachers of the men; neither had the law of Moses permitted them; for it commanded them to be in subjection to the men. He plainly tells them that whatever inspirations of the Spirit they might be favoured with, no inspiration was given them for the purpose of enabling them to teach publicly, or to lead the devotion of the Church." Dr. Mackn. further argues, that the Apostle did not prohibit the women from speaking in the Church, in ch. 11., because his sole object there was to correct the abuse of their officiating with the head uncovered, reserving his correction of the other abuse to this place. And so Dr. Whitby. And, in the same view, others maintain, that the Apostle, in ch. 11., only intended to say how the women should speak, if they spoke at all, but here absolutely to forbid. But (as Doddr. remarks) we can hardly suppose that the Apostle would debate and adjust the circumstances of doing an unlawful action, and (to use the words of Mr. Slade) so far expose himself to the danger of being misunderstood, as to condemn the manner of doing what was wrong, without giving, at the same time, the slightest intimation of its improperity." Upon the whole, (as far as I can presume to pronounce on so nice and intricate a question), it appears to me that the salvo, or exception, propounded by Grot., Locke, and others, is too refined and too limited; and, besides, leaves an opening to other objections and difficulties. And that the Apostle would, at one time, indirectly permit what at another he absolutely forbids, nothing but necessity should induce me to admit. But here there is none. Our learned countrymen have not enough attended to the sense of λαλεῖν, which, in the New Testament, almost invariably signifies, not to speak, but to talk, discourse, and teach. See the numerous examples adduced by Schl. Lex. in v. § 12. In order, therefore, to reconcile the two passages of the Apostle, we have only to suppose that, in the former, he means that sort of prayer and ἐνθύμησις that should not lead the devotions of the congregation. Surely the προενεχθήσαι may there very well denote only joining in prayer; not taking the lead in it; much less are we compelled, with Mr. Slade, to suppose inspired prayer: and προφητεύεσθαι may be understood of the recitation of certain spiritual songs, (whether in reading, or extemporaneously,) or the reading of devotional and edifying compositions in prose; on all which I have treated in the note on 11, 5. Now this would not be any violation of the order of the Apostle, for the woman ἐναντίοσθησαί, to be in subordination.

Mr. Slade would remove the difficulty by supposing that, in the 11th Chapter, the Apostle only alludes to smaller or more private assemblies, in which the women were permitted to exercise their
gifts, and urges that the expression in ver. 16 of that chapter does not forbid this explanation; for, by saying "the churches of God have not this custom," the Apostle does not necessarily discourse of what was done in the Church, because the Church, (i.e. the society of Christians) had jurisdiction of matters without the walls of a general assembly, as well as within." I grant that it does not forbid it, but the conjecture itself is so evidently a gratis dictum, and "made for the nonce," that it cannot be admitted. Nay it is contradicted by the direct words of the Apostle, since, after animadverting on the abuse of the women praying without veils, he says: τούτα συνέγραπτον, ὅτι νῦν εἰς τὸ κρήτην, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ήπτον συνέρχεσθαι. And that by συνέρχεσθαι is meant public worship, is plain from what the Apostle proceeds to say of the Agape and the Eucharist. Indeed there is no instance of συνέρχεσθαι ever being used in the N. T. of private prayer meetings.

Now the Greek Commentators do not touch on the above difficulty; but they evidently suppose that the Apostle here intends an absolute silence. Had the difficulty been started, they would probably have removed it in the manner proposed by Whitby and Mack., namely, that the Apostle did not prohibit the women from speaking in the Church, in ch. 11., because his sole object there was to correct the abuse of their officiating with the head uncovered, reserving his correction of the other abuse to this place." Whether this hypothesis, or that which I have above adopted, may deserve the preference, the reader will decide for himself.

In the words καθὼς ὅ νῦμος there was no need for Krause to raise any difficulty. It is (as Chrys. and almost all Commentators are agreed) an allusion to the words of Gen. 3, 16, "and her desire shall be in subordination to her husband." Chrysost. observes that subjection "implies silence;" yet, I must remark, not absolute silence, but an abstinence from discourse which carries with it any thing imperative, or dictatory.

35. εἰ δὲ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, &c. This is meant to exclude the pretence of speaking for the purpose of interrogation. "No (says the Apostle) let them ask their own husbands any such questions at home (it is, I say, forbidden); for it is indecorous for a woman," &c., i.e. is unsuitable to the custom of the world, ὧν πρέπει. See 11, 6. compared with ver. 13.

36. To the reason deduced from custom the Apostle subjoins another deduced from fact, that the Corinthians have no priority of conversion to plead, or any such superiority over other Churches as should give them a privilege to deviate from the general practice.

The words of this verse have (I think) reference
to the whole of what went before in the two preceding Chapters, and the Apostle seems here to anticipate an objection. All Commentators, indeed, ancient and modern, refer these words solely to what has just preceded: * but I doubt not what is here said was meant to be applied to all those respects! in which the Corinthians held practices different from those of the other Churches, which irregularities the Apostle’s admonitions were meant to repress. See the note on ver. 33.

Some very ancient Interpreters, however, seem to have thought that the words have no reference to what immediately precedes; for, considering ver. 34 & 35. as parenthetical, they have cut them out and placed them at the end of the Chapter. And so in four of the most ancient MSS. and several very early Latin Versions and Fathers, who have been followed by Beza Ed. 3, 4 & 5., and Semler, the latter of whom thinks the verses were written afterwards by the Apostle, and put in the margin. This, however, is very improbable, and I must maintain that the words have reference to the irregularities of the Corinthian congregation in respect to the women teaching, as well as in other respects.

It is rightly observed by Semler, that the η is indignantis et subirati; q. d. “Is yours the mother Church? Went not the word of the Lord from Jerusalem?” There seems an allusion to Is. 2, 3. “Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.” See also Is. 81, 4.

Κατίφροσεν, devenit, pervenit; as Acts 26, 7.; q. d. “Ye are not the first; ye are only among a great number of Churches, and therefore must submit to the custom of the generality, as a part should give way to the whole.” (See Doddridge’s Paraphrase.) I must observe that the Apostle seems to have had in view some teachers who were zealous

* And Mackn. most absurdly (and even ignorantly, as appears from ὑμᾶς ὁδηγοῦν) supposes them addressed to the women.
defenders of these irregularities: and hence he sub-
joins εἰ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης, &c.
37. εἰ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶλαι, ἡ πνευματικὸς. Most
modern Commentators take the δοκεῖ to be elegantly
pleonastic. But though I do not deny that there
are some examples of this pleonasm in the New
Testament, yet here it is not (I think) necessary to
resort to a principle at all times precarious. There
are two significations of the word, either of which
will here be applicable; or both may be admitted.
Thus: “If any one profess himself to be a προφήτης,
be reputed to be a prophet.” See the note on 7, 40.
Πνευματικὸς is rightly understood, by Chrysost. and
Theophyl., of one who enjoyed some other spiritual
χάρις μα besides the προφητεία, namely the λόγος γνώ-
σεως. See 12, 1.

In the words ἐπιγνωσκέτω ἀ γράφω ὑμῖ, ἢτι, &c.,
there is a very common Hellenism for: “let him
know that the injunctions I issue are the commands
of the Lord,” by which we are not to understand any
special precepts of our Lord while on earth. It is
meant that these directions, concerning order, edifi-
cation, decorum, &c. are agreeable to the injunc-
tions and commands of the Lord. So Krause.
Which is very true as far as it goes; but it should be
added, that the directions of one who enjoyed so
plenary an inspiration as the great Apostle, might
very well be said to be the commands of our Lord
himself.

Ἐπιγνωσκέτω is rendered by Schleus. dijudicet:
and by others, cognoscat, know. But this sense,
though supported by the Greek Commentators, is
scarcely significant enough, and not agreeable to
the ἀγνοεῖ following, with which there seems to be an
antithesis. I prefer, with most modern Commenta-
tors, agnoscat, which involves assent and approba-
tion; q. d. “let him acknowledge and receive these
things, and such he will acknowledge if he be endued
with a spiritual gift.”

38. εἰ δὲ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἁγνοεῖτω, “if any one be igno-
rant,” or (as the Apostle, I think, intends by a paronomasia from ἐπιμικρυσκέτω) “if any one will not choose to acknowledge them as such, let him do so, per me licet, suo periculo.” Thus Schleus. renders “call into question,” “make a doubt of;” and he cites Phavorin.: ἄγνοαι σημαίνει δὲ τὸ καθόλου καὶ παντελῶς μηδὲν εἰδέναι, διὸν ἄγνοεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἀμφαγνοῦ τὸ ἐν τοῖς διστάσεω. Some, as Beza, seek a further meaning in εἰ δὲ ἄγνοει, ἄγνοείτω. But it rather seems to be a popular mode of expression, and is best interpreted as above. And this is confirmed by Chrysost., who compares 1 Cor. 2, 16. And so Locke, Doullr., and Mackn., which last paraphrases thus: “If any one pretend not to own these decisions, or call them in question, I shall not debate with him, or take any further trouble to convince him on this head.” He alludes, it is thought, to the false teacher. But perhaps there was more than one such; and the τίς may very well bear that extensive sense.

39, 40. These verses form, as it were, the Coda to the whole disputation in these three celebrated chapters, wherein the Apostle sums up all in one comprehensive direction.

40. πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γενέσθαι. Mack. and Doddr. observe that “this passage cannot have any relation to rites and ceremonies, and cannot, except by a mere accommodation, and a parity of reasoning, be extended to them.” But to this I can scarcely assent. The πάντα must surely have an especial reference to what has been said in these last three chapters, in which there is much that regards rites and ceremonies. It is plain that εὐσχημόνως has reference to the indecorum committed at the Agape, and that of the women praying without veils, preaching, and such other breaches of decorum. The κατὰ τάξιν, it is evident, entirely respects discipline in the observance of rites and ceremonies; since it has especial regard to the ministrations in the congregation. The τάξιν must have reference
to the rites which then prevailed in the Church, including those directions which the Apostle was then issuing, or might afterwards issue. It is not, therefore, by a mere accommodation only that we may apply the words to forms of worship, and to ecclesiastical order and discipline. Upon the whole, it is evidently the Apostle’s intention that the rites and forms of worship should be decorous, and the ministrations orderly, that due attention should be paid to the rules of the Church, and subordination yielded to the authorities exercising the power necessary to the preservation of discipline.

Εὐσεβία properly signifies becomingly (see the note on 7, 35.), and here “with due decorum;” as in Rom. 13, 18.; and this with regard to heathens as well as Christians. See 14, 23. And so I Thess. 4, 22. ἤνω περιπατήτε ἐν αἰεν τῶν ἐξα. This implies a due regard to the customs and ideas of decorum, or indecorum, then prevalent. So Etym. Mag. εὐσεβής ὁ κόσμος καὶ πειθόμενος τοῖς νόμοις. And this is still further confirmed by the classical illustrations adduced by the philological Commentators; as Plotin. Enn. 2, 9, 5. ὅρατες ἐκεῖ μὲν τὸ τεταγμένον καὶ εὐσεβής καὶ εὐτακτον. Plut. Lycurg. p. 58. Ε. εὐσεβής βίον, καὶ τεταγμένης πολιτείας. Aristid. Plat. 2, p. 28, 2. οὐκόν τοῖς γε Ἀθηναίοις εὐσεβής τούτο ἐπράττετο: εἰ δὲ εὐσεβής, καὶ τεταγμένος καὶ κοιμώμενος. Doddr. cites a certain dict of a philosopher exhorting men to consider the exact order and regularity of the heavenly bodies, that they may thence learn τὸ εὐ σεβής καὶ τὸ τετάγμενον. The expression κατὰ τάξιν is properly a military term, yet I remember to have read it applied, in the profane writers, to discipline and forms of religion. And so Coloss. 2, 5. ἐβλέπον ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν. where Schleus. in his Lex. rightly interprets, “vestram ordinem in dispositione et observatione rituum ecclesiasticorum.”

See here the excellent annotation of Chrysost., who, (inter alia) observes: οὐδ' ἐν οἴτως οἰκοδομεὶ, αἰσ
I CORINTHIANS, CHAP. XIV. XV.

We are now come to a chapter, above all others, interesting to us as Christians, and indeed as mortal beings, who have an instinctive horror of death, and an equally instinctive impression of a future state of existence, whether our hopes and fears already precede us. It is no wonder therefore that this chapter should have been handled by Commentators with that studious care and especial attention which so deeply interesting a subject requires. Well has the Poet sung:

“The soul uneasy when detained from home,
Rests and expatiates on a life to come.”

On the plan and disposition of the Apostle’s matter in this masterly chapter, the reader may consult with advantage Dr. Macknight’s Introductory remarks. I know not any one, however, who has traced the plan with so much regularity and exactness as Schoettg, whose analysis I shall now lay before my readers.

“ In this treatise on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead,* three questions are solved. I. Whether there is any resurrection of the dead? ver. 1—35. II. With what body will the dead rise again? ver. 35—51. III. What will become of those whom the day of the Lord will find yet alive? ver. 51—sin.

That there is a resurrection, the Apostle both proves and illustrates. Now he proves it in two ways: 1. by adducing reasons derived 1st from Scripture, ver. 1—4. 2. from eye-witnesses, ver. 5—12. 11. by shewing the absurdities which a denial of this resurrection involves; since thus 1. Christ himself would not have risen again, ver. 13. 2. He is preached in vain, and in vain is faith reposed in him, ver. 14. 3. The Apostles would be false witnesses, ver. 15. 4. The faith of the Corinthians would be vain, ver. 16 and 17. 5. All the faithful who have died in Christ, would be under condemnation, ver. 18. 6. Believers in Christ would be the most miserable of all men, ver. 19. 7. Baptism for the resurrection of the dead would be vain, ver. 29. 8. The Apostles and other Christians would suffer so many persecutions to no purpose, ver. 30—32. He illustrates it by parity of reasoning, ver. 21 and 22.

There is, moreover, inserted, by Prolepsis, an answer to an objection from some one of the adversaries, to the following purport:

* The occasion of which was that certain false teachers among the Corinthians called in question that doctrine, see ver. 12.
"If on the resurrection of Christ depends the resurrection of the faithful, it follows that the faithful have already risen again." But the Apostle replies, that this conclusion, "that the resurrection must have already taken place, is false; that it only follows, that the faithful shall certainly rise again; for that the divine order, described in ver. 23—28, requires that Christ should precede, and the rest in their time follow."

Krause, however, thinks that all that is here said may very well be reduced to two heads, of which the first evinces that a resurrection of the dead is to be expected, ver. 1—35. the second replies to the objection which had been raised against that constant and unvaried doctrine of Scripture; ver. 36—57." So also Jaspis: "Paulus in hoc capite sua versatur, ut primum eos, qui mortuorum corpora reviviscere possent negant, variis argumentis ac imprimis Jesu redivivi exemplo, refellat; 1—34. deinde autem dubitantibus scrupulos ab adversarius injectos examinat, simulque de ratione et modo resurrectionis accuratè disputet, 35—38."

It is plain, that the Apostle means this as a refutation of the opinions of some persons at Corinth, who denied the resurrection; though against whom this refutation is meant to be levelled, the Commentators are not agreed. Some think they were Heathens; and from Acts 18. 32. we may infer that the doctrine in question was by the philosophers accounted as not merely unfounded, but even ridiculous, as involving various absurdities. Others contend that they were Christians, either Jewish Christians, who had formerly been Essenes, or Sadducees. Nor are there wanting those who think they were Gentile Christians; which indeed seems more probable. There can, I think, be no doubt but that the Apostle wrote principally and immediately for Christians, though (as in the case of the Epistle to the Romans) indirectly for Heathens, such as might be induced to read and weigh its contents. By Christians I mean both Jewish and Gentile ones; and the Apostle (I conceive) wrote 1st for the instruction and comfort of sincere believers in the doctrine of the resurrection; 2dly, for the refutation of those who denied, and the confirmation of those who were wavering in opinion. The second class would (we may suppose) be chiefly composed of those Jewish Christians who had formerly been Sadducees, or Essenes, and of such Gentile Christians as had been imbued with the opinions of certain philosophical sects, whose tenets were especially adverse to the doctrine in question,* particularly the Stoics and others. It is not surprising that such converts should have proved in this respect backsliders, and have again openly professed, or secretly fostered,

* These, as Theophyl. observes, πάντα ἀν κατέδεξαντο, ἰ τῆν ἀνάστασιν. And others, as Dodd. remarks, "taught virtue to be its own necessary reward, in such a manner as tended to overthrow the strongest of all natural arguments for a future state; namely, that token from such an unequal distribution of rewards and punishments, as could not otherwise take place under the government of a righteous God."
their former opinions on the subject in question. This heresy was probably maintained, or favoured, by some false teachers at Corinth. For we find by 2 Tim. 2, 17, that, a very few years afterwards it was supported by Hymeneus and Philetus, whose error, the Apostle says, "eateth away as doth a gangrene." And we learn from Tertullian, and other Ecclesiastical Historians, that some of the earliest of the Heretics, as Marcion, Valentinus, Apelles and the Gnostics, followed, in this respect, the errors of the Sadducees. These persons, as we may collect from the above passage of Timothy, and as we learn from the Ecclesiastical Historians and Chrysost. in loc., maintained, that the resurrection promised by Christ was only to be understood metaphorically, of a resurrection of the soul from the death of sin;* and by thus refining on the doctrine, they explained it entirely away in its natural and most important sense. We may observe, however, that the arguments here adduced only apply to sincere believers in Jesus Christ, and are meant only of the resurrection of the just, and not a resurrection in the general.† In this St. Paul seems to have followed the custom of the Jews, by whom (Jasipus observes) that alone was called the resurrection. And he refers (besides the writings of the Rabbins), to 2 Macc. 12, 43. Luke 2, 55. Joh. 6, 39, 44 and 54. Phil. 3, 11.

On the plan pursued by the Apostle, Chrys. has the following admirable remarks: σκόπει σύνεσιν πρότερον γὰρ τούς οἰκείους ἀσφαλισάμενος, τότε ἐπεξέρχεται καὶ περαιτέρῳ τῷ λόγῳ, καὶ τούς ἐξωθεὶν ἐκ περαιτερίας ἐπιστομίζει ἀσφαλισάμενος δὲ τούς οἰκείους, σύν ἀπὸ λογισμῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ τῶν ἡδῆ γιγαντιαίων, καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ κατεδαφίσαντι καὶ ἐκπόνησαν γεγενότα σὺν ἐνέπτυμον, καὶ ἑκάστων αὐτῶν κατασχεῖν εἰ γὰρ ἡ ζωλλήθησαν ἀπιστήκατο μετὰ ταῦτα, οὐκέτι λυτῶν τῷ Παύλῳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἑαυτοῖς ἐμελλόν ἀπυστικὴ ἀπὸ τηλθορᾶ πῶς ἐκείνων τῶν ἀπαξ καταδειμένων καὶ μεταθεμένων· διὰ δὴ τούτο καὶ ἐνέτρεψεν ἄρχεται, δεικνὺς ὅτι ὃκε ἀλλής δεῖται μαρτύρων εἰς τὸ δείκτα, ὅτι ταλανθή λέγει, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν ἁπατημένων.

VERSE 1. γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, &c. The construction (which is

*This resurrection, Grot. observes, they made to consist in not attending to the concerns of this life, and, among the rest, matrimony, but in an exclusive devotion to meditation, like the Essenes, who practised celibacy: they accounted this as a new life, compared with which the former life was death; they therefore called the one death, and the other resurrection; as appears from 2 Tim. 2, 17 and 18. Clem. Alex. Strom. 3., and Iren. and Tertul. de Saturnino." He then cites Tertullian in Apolog. Ex horum semine etiam nostram hanc novioliom paraturam viri quidam suis opinionibus ad philosophicas sententias adulteraverunt, et de unà vià obliquos multos et inexplicabiles tramites sciderunt.

† And indeed the error in question then prevalent among Christians justifies the course here pursued by the Apostle.
somewhat intricate,) is thus laid down by Krause: γνωρίζω δε υμίν, ἀδελφοί, εἰ κατέχετε τιμι λάγω εὐθειε- λισάμην υμῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, δ εὐαγγελισάμην υμῖν. He explains γνωρίζω intransitively, for “certior fieri vellem,” or “scire cupio,” i. e. γνωρίζω (ἐν περί) υμῖν εἰ κατέχετε. But this signification is devoid of all proof, and the ordo proposed is too irregular to be admitted. Neither can I approve of the interpretation of our English Translators declare, or make known, which seems to be too abrupt, and not sufficiently accordant with the scope of the passage, which is (I think) well traced by Chrysost., who explains: “I would remind you;” “I wish you to remember.” And so the other Greek Commentators and Zonaras, also many moderns, as Rosenm. Schleus, and Jaspis.

The scope of the passage is thus excellently traced by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) : οὖδὲν γὰρ ξένου, φησί, λέγω υμῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ζήτῃ γνωρισθὲν υμῖν, διαλαθὼν δὲ, τοῦτο γνωρίζω, τοῦτο ἐστιν, ἐκαθαρισθέν. See also Ecumen. and Phot. In thus reminding them of the Gospel, the Apostle must be understood as meaning to remind them of its doctrines, and, as appears from what follows, especially of the incarnation and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and the redemption as well as resurrection thence assured to the faithful.

1. καὶ παρελάβετε. See the note on 11, 23. Now they had received it not by word only, but by works and wonders; and in order to persuade them to hold it fast, as a sacred deposit, the Apostle adds, καὶ καὶ ἐστάθματε, which words the modern Interpreters qualify in various ways, but with little success. Theophyl. observes, that though the Apostle knew they were wavering, yet he says that they stand, willingly feigning ignorance and to preoccupy them, that they may not be able, however inclined they might be to deny, &c. And in much the same manner (though more neatly), Theodoret accounts for it as follows: τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῆς εὐφημίαν ἀνάμις, προ- λειαίνων τῇ ἀκοήν. In fact, the sense seems to
amount to this: "in which I presume and trust that ye stand fast." The expression ἐν οἵ ἐστίκατε is accounted by Krause as a metaphor derived e palaestra: and he refers to 16, 13, Galat. 5, 1. Philipp. 1, 27. 4, 1. 1 Thess. 3, 8. 2 Thess. 2, 15. Ephes. 6, 11, 13 and 14. But it may be also considered as a military one; in proof of which I need only refer to Thucyd. 8, 23. τὰς δὲ διὰδους τῶν πόλεων αὐτῶν ἐνστάντες ἐφύλασσον.

2. δι' οὗ καὶ σωζομεθε. The force of the term σωζομεθε is wretchedly lowered by Krause, who explains: "qua et salus (tranquillitas, felicitas,) animi vestri promovebatur;" referring to Matt. 1, 21. 10, 22. 13, 11. Rom. 8, 24. Grot. and Rosenm. think the present is here used for the future; referring to 13, 15. 16, 5. 2 Pet. 3, 11. But there is no necessity to resort to any such precarious interpretations. It is sufficient (as Whitby suggests) to take σωζομεθε in the sense, "placed or brought into a state of salvation;" on which see the note on Matt. 2, 23.

On the construction of the following words, Commentators are not agreed. I prefer, with Rosenm., to consider them as a synchysis, for εἰ κατέχετε τῷ λόγῳ εἰπηγελεσάμην υμῖν. At τῷ λόγῳ must be supplied εἰπη, examples of which ellipsis are adduced by Wets. from Galen and Sext. Emp.; and after κατέχετε must be supplied λόγον, from the following λόγῳ. The sense is: "if ye hold this my doctrine in such a way (qua ratione) as I delivered it unto you." The doubt delicately couched in εἰ κατέχετε is further unfolded in εἰκῇ εἴκῃ ἐπιστεύσατε. The force of the expression ἐκτός εἰ μὴ εἴκῃ ἐπιστεύσατε. The q. d. "unless indeed, which I am unwilling to suppose, or contemplate."*

Εἴκῃ ἐπιστεύσατε is, as Theophyl. observes, put

* So Dodd., who thinks it suggests the thought expressed at ver. 17.; q. d. "I preach the same Gospel still, and I hope you will retain it; yet I have reason to fear some of you entertain notions which tend quite to enervate it."
for: "ye are in vain called Christians, since the whole of Christianity rests upon the doctrine of the resurrection." So also Chrys., Òcumen., and Theodoret. Krause thinks that the formula εἰκῇ πιστεύω answers to the formula κατέχειν λόγον του εὐαγγέλιου, and signifies temerè credere; "which those do who apprehend not the reason for any doctrine, or care nothing about it." But this does not represent the Apostle's meaning so well as Theophylact’s interpretation.* Krause, however, aptly cites Xen. Apol. Socr. § 15. ὅμως δὲ υμεῖς μηδὲ ταύτα εἰκῇ πιστεύσητε σὺ δὲ θεῶ, ἀλλὰ καθ’ ἐν ἐκαστῶν ἐπισκοπεῖτε.

3. παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πραίτοις δ καὶ παρέλαβον. The recent Commentators (as Rosenm.) explain the παρέδωκα "I taught," referring to Rom. 6, 17. and elsewhere. But the word often signifies "to communicate to another any information or knowledge derived from some "teacher." And this must be the sense here; since it is suggested by the following words δ καὶ παρέλαβον, which, notwithstanding the refinements of recent Commentators (as Rosenm. and Krause), who refer them to information derived from some of the Canonical Gospels then extant, or others now lost (viz. the Apocryphal ones), must be understood of the information derived by the Apostle from the personal and immediate revelation of Jesus Christ, adverted to at Gal. 1, 12. and elsewhere: though it may include the instruction communicated by Ananias, and then by the Apostles, mentioned in the Acts, on which Grot. especially dwells. Thus all the difficulties involved in the several new interpretations proposed are avoided. Rosenm. indeed refers to 11, 25. as proving that some of the present Gospels were then extant. But this is reasoning in a circle: for the expressions there are the very same as here, and (as I have shown on that passage) cannot be correctly

* Jaspis better interprets it: "Nisi illa omnia prius credita vobis exciderint, aut plane corrupta fuerint."
interpreted of any thing but of the personal revelation of Jesus Christ. This interpretation is supported by all the Greek Commentators, and, of the moderns, by Est., Menoch., Crell., Whitby, Wolf, Doddrr. &c.

At πρώτοις most modern Commentators supply στοιχεῖα τῆς ἄρχης τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ, from Hebr. 5, 12., i. e. "the principal heads of the Gospel." But such a subaudition is somewhat too arbitrary, nor indeed is it necessary to suppose any. It may be sufficient to regard ἐν πρώτοις as an adverbia! phrase, like the Latin imprimis, from which perhaps it was derived: and so, if I mistake not, the Greek Commentators took it.

3. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. The best Commentators are agreed that ὑπὲρ is for ἔκειναι, πελάτι, ἀντι, &c. "for the expiation of our sins," And so Crell., Vorst., Pisc., Par., Est., &c. And certainly this correctly enough represents the sense; yet I think the preposition was selected, to denote more strongly the atonement thus made by his suffering in his own person, for (as the Prophet says becoming a curse for us,) i. e. in our stead. Grot. compares Rom. 4, 25. ἐς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν. Where see the note.

3. κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς. Here the recent foreign Commentators (as Rosenm.) are in doubt to what passage of the Old Testament the Apostle refers; or whether he does not mean some Gospels then in being: an opinion so frivolous, and manifestly false, as to deserve no attention. I will only observe, that had theCanonical Gospels even been then in being, they could not, in so short a time, have obtained such general acknowledgment as to be called the Scriptures; and as to the Apocryphal ones, they would not deserve the name. The ancient Commentators, and all the modern ones up to the last century, were at no loss to what to refer the Apostle's words. It is plain that he has in view the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah generally; as Is. 53, 5—10. Zach. 12, 10. Ps. 22, 15, 7, 40, 7—9. (See 2 u 2}
Mack. and others.) Eckerman miserably enervates the force of these prophecies, so strikingly fulfilled, by referring what is here said to the custom of the Jewish Doctors, viz. of mystically and allegorically "accommodating the words of the Old Testament to any present purpose." But this principle of accommodation, always precarious, and often dangerous, is here wholly inapplicable, as indeed appears from the repetition of κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς. Κατὰ here signifies agreeably to, conformably to, in fulfilment of. And so in the next verse, where there is also a reference to Is. 53. Ps. 16. and other passages pointed out by the Commentators.

5. καὶ ἐς ἀφθη Κηφᾶ, &c. Since the resurrection of Christ is a thing founded in fact, and as facts can be proved by nothing more satisfactorily than by the authority of those who are eye-witnesses of them, therefore the Apostle appeals to several highly worthy of credit, to whom our Lord showed himself, and who all, at the peril, nay even sacrifice of life, bore testimony to the actual resurrection of Christ. And since he is not now taking in hand for the first time to show this, but merely means to recall to their memory what had been before delivered to them, he does not adduce all the witnesses (not, for instance, the women, who were the first witnesses of the resurrection), but only the more important ones. Since too, the authority both of Peter and James was great among the Corinthians, he does not content himself with appealing to the general testimony of all the Apostles (much less mentions himself), but urges by name the authority of Peter and James; (Krause); especially as Peter had, after the women's report, been the first to go to the sepulchre. See Joh. 20, 3. seq. On κηφᾶ see Luke 24, 12 and 34.

5. εἰτα τοῖς δώδεκα, "then of the twelve. Though, by the death of Judas, and the absence of Thomas,

* I would beg to suggest to those who possess the necessary qualifications, that there is room for a small work on the use and the abuse of Rabbinical learning. On the former see a Sermon of Bp. Blomfield.
there were but ten, yet, by a not unusual figure, they are called the twelve, because that was the number of their body at its original institution.\(^*\) So in Matt. "Have not I chosen you the twelve?" As to the reading ἑδεκα, it is plainly ex emendatione.

With respect to the thing itself, the Apostle may be supposed to advert to the wonderful appearance of Jesus Christ to the Apostle, mentioned at Joh. 20, 19. et seqq.

6. ἐπείη ἀφθη ἑτάω πεντακοσίως ἀπελεφοίς ἐφάπαξ. This use of ἑτάω is idiotypical, and not found in the Classical writers. Another instance occurs in Mark 14, 5. With respect to the sense, some ancient and modern Commentators render it supreme, aloft. But this is too harsh. The most judicious Interpreters are agreed that it must signify more than. In the passage of Mark it has a genitive after it, but not governed by it, it having of itself no regimen; indeed it is used, as it were, parenthetically, like the plus of the Latins. Thus Rosenm. instances "interfect plus trecentis," i. e. slew 300 and more. Our word over had formerly a similar signification, which is still retained by the vulgar in the Northern counties. Rosenm. compares the Heb. מעלם.

Ἐφάπαξ, "at the same time." At what time, is uncertain. Whitby and Mackn. think it might have been on the occasion which he appointed with the women, after his resurrection. Matt. 28, 10., in consequence of which the eleven went to a mountain; and it is probable (they think) that many other disciples would hear of the appointment, and assemble at the same time and place. See also Matt. 26, 32. Mark 16, 7.

This circumstance is not recorded in the Gospels, but it is one which of itself is sufficiently probable,

\(^*\) This figure is indeed trite enough, namely, to call any body denominated by its number, by that number, even though it may not be complete at the time; as of corporations. See Beza, Grot., and Glass., Phil. S. p. 9. And so Calvin: "Appellatio Duodecim rex\(\text{-}\)vuln est, nec tam numerum qu\(\text{-}\)am collegium denotat."
considering the seventy disciples, women, and other persons, who had not seen our Lord’s miracles, of whom some must have been converted. For (as Rosenm. truly observes) in Rom. 16. are recorded the names of many Christian Ministers of whom no mention is made in the Gospels. Besides, as Whitby and Lightf. observe, in Acts 1, 15., “it is said that the number of the disciples was only a hundred and twenty; but this could not be the whole number of believers at that time, but only the number of those who had followed Christ continually, ver. 21. They were not all the disciples in Judæa, but only in Jerusalem. In Galilee there was a great number.” There is therefore no need, with some modern Commentators, to suppose here a certain for an uncertain number: indeed the ἔκανο destroys that supposition; since such qualifications can only be used before a definite number. By the term ἀδελφ. applied to them, we must suppose that they were then believers in Jesus, though their belief might be wavering, and require that confirmation, which was thus graciously afforded to them. It is too harsh to suppose, with some Commentators, that they are so called as having afterwards become Christians.

Mένουσι, continue. Here must be supplied ἐν βίῳ;* as in Joh. 21, 22. By remain alive it is suggested that they are ready to bear testimony; and we may observe, with Jaspis, that as to those who were dead, their testimony would be preserved by their children and acquaintances.

Drs. Prideaux and Doddr. urge this as a glorious proof of the resurrection of Christ. “Had it been otherwise (say they) so many false hearts and

* The Philological Commentators illustrate this expression from the following Classical authorities. Plut. μένειν ἐν τῷ ζῷῳ, which is the complete phrase: but the elliptical one is far more frequent. So Arrian, Epict. 3, 24. μέχρι τού ἄ νοι λέγεται τὸ σοφοῦ ἄριστον φωτὸς Ἐστιν οὕπου.
tongues could never have acted in concert; nor would they all have kept a secret, which remorse, interest, and perhaps often torture, might urge them to divulge; especially as there had been one traitor among the twelve; on account of which, had they been conscious of a fraud, a general suspicion of each other's secrecy must have arisen."

6. ἐκοιμήθησαν. An usual euphemism for death, especially the death of the righteous; (see Schleus. Lex.) and here (as Chrysost. observes) it suggests the resurrection.

7. ἔσείτα ἐφθη Ἰακώβῳ. This was (as the Fathers tell us) James the less, the brother or cousin german of our Lord. This appearance is not recorded by the Evangelists, but it is mentioned in a fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, preserved by Jerome. The passage runs thus: "Juraverat enim Jacobus, se non commesturum panem ab illâ hora, quam liberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a mortuis." And again a little further on: "afferte, ait Dominus, mensam ac panem." And again: "tulit panem et benedixit, ac fregit, et dedit Jacobo Justo, et dixit ei: frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis dormientibus." From which it has been by several modern Commentators, as Hamm., Pott, Herder, and Krause, thought probable that this appearance took place soon after the resurrection, and that James was present at the meal of which our Lord partook with his disciples. (See Mackn.) Thus ἔσείτα is thought to have the sense of præterea;* since ἕκα twice occurs here, and seems to denote the order of time. And of this signification they adduce examples from 12, 28. James 3, 17. It should seem safer to assign the sense deinde, then again, without any reference to time. See Hamm. and Hoog. de Partic.

Some may think the repetition of these particles

* And so Pearce, Rosenm., Krause, and Schleus.
an offensive tautology. But the ancients were in that point not so fastidious. Thus Wets. cites two equally remarkable examples from Menander and Homer.

Εἷς τοῦ ἀποστόλου πάσιν. This appearance is said to have been eight days after the other at ver. 6. and which is mentioned at Mark 16, 14.

8. ἐσχατον δὲ πάντων, and after all the rest.

See Acts 9, 17. 22, 13 and 14. "Οὕτως ἐκτρώματι. The word ἐκτρώμα signifies an abortion, or immature birth." So Hesych. explains it ἐκβολή γνωμικός. The Attics called such ἀμβλύμαμα and ἀμβλύμαμα. Yet this term and ἐκτρώμα, are used by good authors; as Philo 54. (cited by Loesner) ἀμβλυβρίδια εἰρήκται καὶ ἐκτρώματα. Aristid. de gener. p. 291. κόμματα ἐκπτίτει παραπλήσια τοῖς κολοκύνθοις ἐκτρώματι. Hippocr. Aphor. 50. 5. ἐκτρώματι. And ἐκτρώμα occurs in Job 3, 16. and Eccl. 6, 3. And so Ps. 58, 3. "like the untimely suit or birth of a woman." With which I would compare Soph. Ὀδ. Τυρ. 26. τὸκείνῳ ἄγουσιν γνωμικούς. By an easy transition, the word came to denote rejectaneus, and was used of vile persons, outcasts, whom society cast off. So Theophyl. explains it ἀπόθεμαν, and also τὸ ἀπελεφθή. There is, however, more than one point of view in which the Apostle may be supposed to have used the term, on which Commentators are not agreed. But before I enter into the question, I must commend the justice of Oecumenius's remark, that this is spoken διὰ τακεινοφορεύσεως ὑπερβολῆς. In which light, too, the words seem to have been viewed by Chrysost., who says little or nothing de ratione metaphorae; and it is obvious that in such a case, it would be very injudicious to press on the sense of the term. In tracing the ratio metaphorae our modern Commentators give the reins too much to their imagination. Wets. thinks the Apostle has reference to his diminutive stature. But this is puerile and truly pigmy criticism. Others, as Hamm., Baronius, Lapide, Lacerda, Schottus, Le Clerc, and others ap. Wolf, think there is an allusion to the appellation given by the Romans to supernumerary Senators, whom Sueton. Oct. c. 35. says, abortivos vulgus vocabat. Some, however, call in question the correctness of the reading, and would emend orcinos. Possibly abortinos is a gloss, but a mistaken one, τοι on orcinos, which, however, (I imagine) must rather be referred to those infants who are brought into the world after the due time, as children with whom the mother has gone ten months. And this would seem very well

* The Philologists do not say how ἐκτρώμακε comes to mean this. I suspect it was that τρώωκε and τρώω had the sense of the cognate τράω, τρέω, terebro, foramen facere; whence the allusion is plain. The ἐκ in this use is strongly intensive, and advert to the force which nature exerts to expel or throw off such abortions.

† Or perhaps it arose from accident; and the degrees of corruption may have been these: orcinos, ortivos, an-ortivos.
suit the Apostle, as not being one of the original twelve. But we

can hardly suppose that he would have been acquainted with this

sense of oρίνυς, still less that, in addressing Greeks, he would allude
to it. Besides, εξωτρύμα, in the Old Testament, never has this sense,

but always the reverse, namely, an embryo which never comes to

light, but is cast off unformed.

Bp. Middleton takes it to mean a last born child. The learned

Prelate, I suppose, had in view the common notion of the reκλιγμα

or uτριγλιγμα, namely, the last born of the family, so called as being

usually the smallest and weakest. This, however, seems a very

groundless notion. The learned Prelate attempts, indeed, to sup-

port it from the authority of Theoiphyl. But the opinion was not

Theophylact’s, but one which he reports in the following words:

τινες δὲ τὸ ὑστέρον γέννημα ἔξωτρυμα ἕνόσιν. I am, however, sur-

prised this nασιλέος homo did not scent out the latent corruption in

this sentence. For by what allusion can the last born child be called

the ἔξωτρυμα? How can it, unless it be born before the time, merit

such an appellation? Now the reading is, I have no doubt, cor-

rupt; though it may be emended by the least possible alteration,

Read νυ for δ, i.e. νυτέρου for νυτέρον, and all will be right. It

will then signify a child born after its due or full time. This, in-

deed, would countenance the reading Oρίνυς in Suetonius. Yet

the interpretation cannot be admitted, because it is contrary to the

very nature of ἔξωτρυμα. So that it is not necessary to resort to the

objection of Slade, that “it does not appear that any prejudice was

entertained against the last born child.” That sensible Commenta-
tor was not, it seems, aware of the common notion of the reκλιγμα,

or rather wτριγλιγμ (for such, in a note in the first part of this work,

I have shown is its orthography, where also I have explained its

meaning).

After all, therefore, the common interpretation seems the best

founded, supported, too, as it is, by the ancient and early modern

Commentators, who prove that an ἔξωτρυμα, or imperfect and dead

born embryo, was a proverbial expression for any thing vile and re-
fuse.* See Num. 19, 11 & 12. The comparison, however, is not

(I conceive) between an imperfect and dead born embryo, and a

mature and live born child; since the Apostle was, at length, spirit-

ually born: but between a child born before its time, and always

imperfect, with one that has come to maturity before its birth.

Now such as the former are observed to be usually smaller than

others, and inferior in bodily and mental endowments. St. Paul,

then, calls himself so, as being not an Apostle formed and perfected

in the way that the other Apostles were, but (as Οeumen. says) μὴ

μορφωθεῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς τῷ κατὰ Χριστὸν παῖνιν, and being made an

Apostle (to use the words of Mackn.) without the having gone

* And so Theodoret: Πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐαυτὸν εὐτελέστερον

ἀποκάλεσαι θελήσας, πάντας καταλείπω τούτ’ ἐν τῷ μήπω τελεσσωρ-

γηθέντας, εἶλα κατὰ τὸν νόμον τῆς φύσεως γεννηθέντας, ἀμβλυβρίδω

ἐαυτόν ἀπεκάλεσε ἐμβρύφω, δ’ τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἀγκατελεκται

καταλόγῳ εἶλα τούτῳ ταῖς αἰτίαις διὰ τείναν.
through that previous and regular course of instruction, experience, and preparation, which the other Apostles enjoyed, who had attended Jesus during his ministry on earth. There may also be an allusion to the extraordinary manner in which the Apostle was converted, and brought into the spiritual life and a state of salvation; since in children immaturity born, life is preserved by art and extraordinary care.

To advert to the conjectures which have been hazarded, some propose ἐστερεῖν ἐκτρώματα. But besides that it would be hard to prove this to be good Greek, the difficulty would not thereby be diminished; and the common reading is confirmed by the imitation of Ignat. Epist. ad Romanos (cited by Grot.) ὦ γάρ εἶμι ἰδίως ὡς ἐσταθας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκτρώμα. For ὃς many modern Critics, as Battier, Carophonius, Ritterhode, and Schles. Lex., would read ὃς for τίνι. But it does not appear that this Atticism ever has place in the New Testament, and when ὃς or τίνι is thus used, it is never (I think) put before a noun in the dative, but after it. The article, however, is not (as Wolf says) used κατ᾽ ἐκκλησίας, for the other Apostles were, in no sense, ἐκτρώματα. It is rightly observed by Bp. Middleton, that there is no emphasis; the Apostle means to apply it to himself. And the learned prelate takes the article here as in Luke 18, 13, ἐμοὶ ὃς ἀναργύρῳ. "For (says he) when any attributive word is placed in apposition with a personal pronoun, that attributive has the article prefixed; the article marking the assumption of the predicate." The true reason (I conceive) is, that there is an ellipsis of the participle of the verb ἐσταθας. Thus the article and participle stand in place of the relative pronoun and verb in the indicative, "me who am."

The ἔστερεῖν is plainly added, to soften the boldness of the figure, and καὶ has the sense of even.

The interpretation above adopted is strongly supported by the words following, which are explanatory.

Of the appearance here adverted to, mention is made at Acts 9, 17. & 22, 12 & 14. The recent Commentators portend that it was not corporeal; and they treat copiously on the subject. But into their unfounded, my irreverent, speculations I shall not enter. The reader will consult the annotations on the passages of the Acts.

9. Here no explanation is necessary. Ἰκανος is used for ἄξιος; as in Matt. 3, 11. Luke 7, 6., and elsewhere. It is rarely found with ὡς εἶμι. Examples from Herod., Dionys. Hal., and Aristæn., are adduced by Schl. Lex. Ἀλεξανδρεῖα is used for ἐλειαν;

* So Vorst., Grot., and Sclater: "Sic se appellat propter nativitatis spiritualis modum: quia conversio ejus subita fuit, Act. 9. similis insipinato alicui abortui: quia non longâ institutione ad Christianismum perductus fuit, quo esset velut naturalis partis, sed vi subitâ; quomodo immaturi partus ejici solent."
like the Heb. ἀριστος in Is. 56. 7, and elsewhere. See Gesen. Lex.

10. χάρις δ' Ἡσυχ εἰμι καὶ εἰμι, "But by the unmerited favour (and free grace) of God I am what I am," i.e. an Apostle. The words following imply: "and not merely an Apostle, but the most useful of them all. This, however, with the same humility as before, he ascribes to the grace of God.

The χάρις here seems to denote not only the favour of God, but, from the adjunct, that gracious assistance, by the imparting of inspiration, miraculous gifts,* &c. which (he says) was οὐ κενά, not in vain,† but (by a meiosis) very efficacious. Thus, it is added, περισσέτερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκπίπτει. Here the Commentators omit to notice the modesty and delicacy evinced by the Apostle. He does not say, "I attained more success than them all," but merely, "I laboured more abundantly," &c. And even that he lowers by the next words, lest he should be thought to hint at the success of his own merit. "Not, however (says he), that I did this, but rather the gracious assistance of God that was with me (for my help!)

The οὐκ—ἀλλὰ is to be interpreted non tam—quàm. For, as Grot. observes, the Apostle speaks by comparison, not so as to exclude himself, and yet to ascribe this principally to the Divine power." And he refers to Matt. 10, 20. Σιν here, as-often, imports help. Thus it is truly observed by Grot.: "Gratia Dei cum aliquid esse dicitur cui favet atque opitulatur. Vide Matt. 28, 20. Quod hic per οὐ explicatur id alibi per άν, Act. 4, 33. per μετὰ 1 Tim. 6, 21. Est hæc explicatio ἀπεριβάλλων."

Several passages on the subject of Divine help being imparted to the obedient are adduced by Gatak. M,

* A sense required by the use of χάρις in the next verse, which is exegetical.
† In illustration of this sense of κενά Wets. cites Demosth. pro Coron. κενάς χαρίς κερατας τούτωσιν and Nonnus Dionys. 47. Δώσ κενάν τόλμην ἵνα φιλήν χάριν.
1 Corinthians, Chap. XV.

A. 9, 40. And Bulkley cites a similar sentiment of Epict. 3, 1. Ταῦτα μοι ἔπικτητος οὐκ ἔφηκε—ἀλλὰ Θεὸς τις τοι' εἴμενης δι' ἐκεῖνον.

11. ἔστε οὖν ἔγα, ἔστε ἐκεῖνοι, &c. Enumeratis sigillatim effectis ac testimoniiis resurrectionis Christi; tandem ea in unam veluti summam colligit, dum ita inquit: "Sive ergo ego, sive illi, ita prædicamus, et ita credidistis." (Crellius.)

By ἐκεῖνοi are meant the other Apostles. For the last verse is parenthetical. Here some verb must be understood. Whitby and Mackn. supply preach. This, however, is uncritical. Grot. supplies respiciuntur, which may be admitted. But the true subaudition seems to be περισσότερον ἐκοπίασεν, from the preceding. And such, I find, is the mode adopted by Theophyl., who paraphrases thus: έστε έγα ἐκοπίασα πλέων, ἔστε ἐκεῖνοι περὶ γοῦν τὸ κήρυγμα ὑμοῦ ἀπαντεῖς. Which well represents the scope of the passage.

The oὐτῶ refers to the resurrection of the dead, the subject in question. Κηρύσσουμεν, "we all preached and publicly testified this doctrine; and this ye all believed;" q. d. "this is the uniform faith of you and all the Churches; so that if you forsake this, and take up another belief, you will condemn yourselves."

12. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται, &c. "But if it be publicly preached by all of us Apostles that Christ hath been raised from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead." It seems that oὐκ εὗτος is used in the sense "is not possible." For that was the opinion of some Philosophers and the Sadducees. Πῶς, λέγουσι is to be taken populariter for: "how can they say? with what face can they pretend; on what grounds maintain?" Theophyl. observes, that having shewn that Christ has been raised, and that this truth is preached by himself and the other Apostles, he proves the resurrection of all, since the rest of the body must follow the head. And Crellius ob-
serves, that in these words is contained the pro-
pounding of the argument; q. d. "If Christ rose,
then the resurrection of the dead must be granted."
Of which proposition the proof is immediately
annexed, in the words of ver. 13. "But if there be no
resurrection of the dead, neither has Christ risen."
The sententia assumptionis is contained in ver. 14.,
where its proof is also added, and is repeated from
the preceding. "But if Christ did not rise, vain is
our preaching," &c.; q. d. "But Christ is raised;
for otherwise vain were our preaching, and your faith.
But this is absurd, and so must that be."

As to the impossibility of the thing (which the
philosophers pretended), it is (as Mr. Slade observes)
ably shown by Bp. Sherlock, vol. 1. Disc. 7. p. 220.,

* The plan of the argumentation is yet more ably laid down
in the following annotation of Krause, derived from the acute and
learned Jehne. "Cum ea sit constans et perpetua omnium
testium auctoritas, miratur Paulus, quâ perversâ opinione ducti
nonnulli resurrectionem negare sustineant, acutèque docet, quàm
per se repugnans quamque contradictoria ipsorum sit sententia.
Nam si satis constet Christum mortuum resurrexisse; negari re-
urrectionem non posse cum quid factum est, id fieri potest.
Contra ea si quis resurrectionem omnino negare audeat: ei ne-
gandum quoque esse resurrectionem Christi. Quam qui neget
aut leves ac credulos fingere debere Apostolos, qui, quod verum a
falso discernere nescirent, specie aliquâ inani decepti essent, aut
cum hoc ob insignem testium consentientium multitudinem cogitari
absumum sit, scleris et mendacii adeo arguere divinos legisatos, ut
qui id commentum, quo aliis fucum facerent, frivolo excogitari, et
vel adversus Deum mentiri non erubuerint. Utrumque vero, vel
mendacem dicere divinum vatem, vel divinum virum facere in Deum
mendacia fingentem absurdum esse patet. Falsi enim testis, non
possunt esse a Deo constituti. Si vero divinam auctoritatem praæ
se tulerunt et publicè multis magnisque factis testam fecerunt,
fingi jam non potest, ipso in Deum mendacia fundere: nisi quis eo
inconsequentiae proregre velit, ut contendat, Deum non modo ad
nequitiam audacia comprobanda, suam operam atque virtutem
commodasse, sed vel ipsum sibi adversatum esse." And so Mackn.
oberves, that the Apostle has not expressed the ideas by which the
consequent in this hypothetical proposition is connected with its
antecedent. Christ promised repeatedly, in the most express terms,
that he would raise all mankind from the dead, Matt. 8, 16, 27. Joh.
5, 28 & 29. Wherefore, if there is to be no resurrection of the dead,
Christ is a deceiver, whom no person in his right senses can suppose
God to have raised, and to have declared his Son."
that there can be no more difficulty in giving life the second time, than there was at first. If there be any contradiction, therefore, in the notion of a resurrection, there must be the very same in the notion of creation."

14. κεν δ' αυτ' το κηρύγμα—ύπερ. Some interpret the κεν δ' vain, useless, as not obtaining the end, even eternal life. So the Greek Commentators, almost all the early moderns (and among these Crellius) and our English Translators. And so also Jaspis, who paraphrases: "Utrique operam perdunt, vel doctores profitingo, Christo credentibus per hunc ipsum spem veniæ peccatorum æternæque salutis nactos esse, vel auditores credendo, nam frustrata est eos spes et exspectatio, nullum fidei suæ fructum percipiant." In this sense μάρτυς is used in a parallel passage at ver. 17. Grot., however, and almost all Interpreters since his time, assign to κεν δ' the sense false, fraudulent, &c., comparing the Heb. קַשׁ, and referring to Ephes. 5, 6, Col. 2, 8. And Schleus. observes, that in the Sept. it is often employed to express various Hebrew words signifying lie, or deceit. Grot., then, has the following remarks: "Id ideo quia hoc præcipue argumento usi erant Apostoli, ut evincerent verum esse Christi dogma, quod Deus eum, si falsa docuisset, non resuscitasset e mortuis." And Mackn., in the same view, the following: "If Christ has not been raised, the Gospel being stripped of the evidence which it derives from the resurrection of its author, the whole of the preaching of the Apostles, as is observed ver. 14. is absolutely false, and the faith of the Corinthians in the divine original of the Gospel, and of all Christians, from the beginning to the present hour, is likewise false." Perhaps in the κεν δ' both senses may be united: but the κεν δ' must, I think, be taken in the former sense.

By πίστις is meant faith in the doctrine of Jesus,

* Thus Theophyl.: κεν δ' έκπόλαμεν ημείς, καί ημείς δέ κεν δ' ἐκπολέσατε.
and especially concerning the resurrection of the dead.

15. εὐρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ Θεοῦ. There is here (I think) a sort of climax, which has alone been seen by Chrysost. and Ccumen., who thus paraphrase: καὶ οὐ μόνον μάταιοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλως ἀνώ-
σιω. So Theophyl.: ἁνόσιοι εὐρισκόμεθα, ὦτι ἐσυκο-
φαντήσαμεν τοῖς θεοῖς, ὦτι ήγειρεν ὅν οὐκ ἡγεῖρε. The sense, then, is: “Nay we are even found to be,” &c. The Commentators remark that εὐρισκόμεθα is for ἐσμέν; as often. But though this is in some mea-
sure true, yet it must be remembered that εὐρισκε-
σθαι is a much stronger term than ἐσμέν, and signifies to manifestly be, or appear.

The expression ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ Θεοῦ deserves at-
tention. Casaub. renders de Deo; Mackn., “con-
cerning God;” Grot., “nomine Dei.” And Ros-
scenm. (after Semler) thus paraphrases: “Nos igitur havebeatis oportet scelestos et flagitosos homines, qui graviter mentiri audeant, Deum sæpe appellantes mendacii testem.” Some modern Commentators, as Krause and Schleus., explain thus: “essems autem falsi sic dicti testes Dei,” i. e. a Deo consti-
tutti. But this seems too harsh, and is not accordant with the words following, which seem to be expla-
natory.

15. ὡς ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. Here the Commentators are not agreed on the sense of κατὰ. Most early Translators and Commentators render it de, concerning. So the Syr. and Arab. And this interpretation is adopted by Palaret, Raphel, Wolf, and Schleus., who adduce some examples. But these are very rare in the Classical writers, and not one is to be found in the New Testament. Beza would take it for ἀπὸ or ἐκ; a signification, however, precarious, and not here applicable. Whitby ren-
der it per, by, and subjoins several examples. But κατὰ is so used only with verbs of swearing; as Matt. 26, 63. Heb. 6, 3., and many other passages
of the Old and New Testament, which may be seen in Schleus. Lex. After all, the best signification seems to be the common one *against*, i.e. to the prejudice and dishonour of God. For (as Grot. observes) every testimony is *kata tou Theou*, which represents God as having done that which he has not done; and (as Mackn. observes) such a testimony, on the supposition that Christ was not raised, would be a witnessing *against* God, because to testify that God raised Christ, whom he did not raise, was to testify that he had confirmed the pretensions of an impostor with the highest possible evidence; which were a blasphemy against God.” Grot. has the following popular illustration: “Si quis Regis monetam adulterat, gravissimè punitur; quanto magis qui Dei? Miracula enim Dei moneta.”

This last detailed interpretation, which is supported by the Greek Commentators, has also been adopted by Le Clerc and Wets., the latter of whom appeals to Cic. de N. D. 8, 34. Harpalum, qui temporibus illis praedó felix habebatur, contra deos testimonium dicere, quod in illâ fortunâ tam diu vive-ret. He also adduces two examples from Joseph. and Philo of *kataxeidethai tou Theou*, as said of the impostors and pretended prophets.

15. *oik eyleastos.* A popular mode of expression for: “are not to be raised.”

16. Here we have a repetition of what was said at ver. 13.

17. *e i de Xristos oik eyleastei, mataula h khotis dmuon.* Sequitur jam altera capitis primi disputationis Paulinae pars, vv. 17—38. qua efficitur ex Christi resurrectione rectè colligi restaurationem hominum omnino omnium. Cui demonstrationi ut viam sternat, rem contrarió illustrare incipit jubetque fingere Christum non esse a mortuis resuscitatum. Exinde continuo sequitur unam esse quoque nostram omnem resurrectionis fiduciam. Qui enim ipse se e vinculis mortis expedire non potuisset, de eo neque speran-
dum esse, eum alios e morte liberaturum atque in vitam restiturum esse. (Krause.)

Of the expression ἢτι ἐστέ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις our recent Commentators most manifestly pervert the sense. Some take ἁμαρτία for error of opinion. Others (partly from Bengel and Schoettg.) take the phrase as equivalent to ἁμαρτῶλον ἐλνα, i. e. to be a Pagan; q. d. "ye are no better off than Pagans (as ye were)." And this sense Krause labours to establish, but to little purpose. If the words were ἁμαρτῶλοι ἐστε, that would alter the case; though even then the article would be indispensably requisite, as also ἐστε or the like. As the case now stands, it is wholly a gratuitous assumption to take ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐλνα for ἁμαρτῶλον ἐλνα. Nay there is no instance of ἁμαρτία in the sense heathenism. Those Commentators, indeed, endeavour to prove their point from what they call the contrary expression ἐν ἁληθείᾳ ἐλνα, to be a Christian, at 3 Joh. 3, 3 & 4. But there we have not ἐλνα, but πεπιστεύουν, which quite alters the case. Besides not a few of the Corinthian converts were Jewish Christians. This interpretation, therefore, must be abandoned, and the common one retained, which is supported by all the ancient Commentators, and the modern ones up to the last half century.

The expression is plainly idiotical, and perhaps Hebraic. We may compare 1 Tim. 2, 14. ἐν παραβάσει γένοι. By sin is meant the penalty of sin; and the ἐστε is used for ὁ, i. e. "subject to, liable to the penalty of sin, and even liable to punishment, notwithstanding we have repented of our sins." Here there is (as Chrys. points out) an evident allusion to the atonement made for our sins by the death of Christ. And it is rightly noticed by Doddr. and Mackn., that this observation shows that something more than reformation and liberation from the power of sin (which many of the Corinthians no doubt had experienced) was necessary for the deliverance of penitents from the punishment of sin, even that
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Atonement, the sufficiency of which God attested by raising our great surety from the grave."

18. ἄρα καὶ οἱ κομβητές ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀνάλογα. The ἄρα is here conclusive; q. d. "Hence it follows," &c. The οἱ κομβητές ἐν Χριστῷ are those that have died in the faith of Christ, and the belief of his Messiahship, like the οἱ αὐτοψιστὲς ἐν Κορίτι at Ap. 14, 23., and the οἱ μεταϊς ἐν Χριστῷ at 1 Thess. 4, 16. The term κομβ. is, (as I before observed,) an euphemism, especially applicable to the placid death of true and sincere Christians, only a sleep, to be broken off at the morning of the resurrection.

Such is, I conceive, the true sense of the expression; yet the interpretation of Chrysost. and the other Greek interpreters merits attention, namely, "those who have suffered martyrdom for Christ’s sake, i. e. in the profession of his religion." See vv. 20 and 51. 1 Thess. 4, 13—15. 2 Pet. 3, 4. And this view of the sense is adopted by Schleus., who adduces several examples from the Greek classical writers which may serve to show that κομβ. was also used by them, and sometimes of a violent death. Such, too, is the interpretation adopted by some modern Commentators, as Grot., Mackn., &c. Possibly, however, these interpretations may be united, since it would be true of both, that ἀνάλογα. It will only be necessary to accommodate the verb to each of the two cases; in the latter, that they had perished in vain by the profession, even to martyrdom, of falsehood, and could not expect any greater hope

* No Commentator has so successfully illustrated the force of the phrase ἐν ἀμαρτίας εἶναι as the great Chrys. 504, 20. Εἴ γὰρ οὐκ ἤγραφη, οὐδὲ ἀπέθανεν· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ἔλυσεν· οὐ γὰρ θάνατος αὐτοῦ, τῆς ἀμαρτίας λύσις. "Εἴ δὲ γὰρ, φησιν, ὃ ἄμως τού Θεοῦ ἀἱρὼ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, τὸς δὲ αἵρεις; τὸ θανάτῳ. διό καὶ ἄμουν ἔγινεν, ὡς σφατόμενον· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἀνέστη, οὐδὲ ἐσφάγη· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐσφάγη, οὐδὲ ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐλύθη· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐλύθη, ἐν αὐτῇ ἔστε· εἰ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔστε, εἰκὼν ἐκρύβατον· εἰ δὲ εἰκὼν ἐκρύβατον· εἰκὼν ἐκτισθησάτο, ἄλλος δὲ καὶ οἱ θάνατος ἀθάνατος μένει, εἰ μὴ ἀνέστη· εἴ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς κατεχόμεθα ἕκτο τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ οὐκ ἔλυσεν αὐτοῦ τὰς ὠδίνας, πῶς πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπῆλθατε· εἰ τούτο κατεχόμενοι;
hereafter; in the former, that there was an end of them, and all their hopes; all their labour, toil, and suffering for Christ's sake would be thrown away, and perish; they would be disappointed of their hope; and be no better, in a worldly view, than if they had not encountered them. That the ἀπάλοπτοι may be thus applied is plain, and this is confirmed by the authority of Theophyl. (from Chrysost.), who, after noticing how it applies to those that have died as martyrs to the truths of the Gospel, adds: καὶ πάντες δὲ ἄπλωσι, οἱ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Χριστὸν πίστει, καὶ διαγωγῇ τῇ στενῇ καὶ τεθλημένῃ καμικάτεστε, ἀπάλοπτο, τῶν τεπτῶν τοῦ κόσμου στεφθεῖστε, καὶ μηδὲ μετὰ ταύτα μέλιώτες τινος ἀγαθοῦ ἀπολαύσατε, ἐπερ ἀνάστασις σοὶ ἔσται. So also ΟΕcumen. 562. A. οἱ διὰ τῶν Χριστῶν, φησιν, ἀπεδάνωτε, οἱ τοὺς πολλοὺς διανύσαντες καμάτους, καὶ τοὺς μυρίους ὑπομεμεμηκότες κινδύνους ἀπαλόπτο. ἐπερ ἄτοπον ἦν. And so also Jaspis.

19. εἰ ἐν τῇ δει ταύτη ἡλικίατε—ἐσμέν. This is evidently meant to limit and explain the preceding. In the interpretation of the words, our modern Commentators are somewhat wavering. Some unite the μάνων with Χριστῶ; others, with δει ταύτη. The latter mode is adopted by all the antient, and most modern Commentators, and is the only one that will bear examination. There is a trajectio of μάνων. The recent Commentators tell us that ἡλικίατε ἐσμέν is for ἡλικίσαμεν. But (if I mistake not) the former has far more meaning and energy; q. d. "If we who are reposing our hopes in Christ look, as to the end of these hopes, to the advantages of this world only," &c. There is an ellipsis of ἡλικίσαμεν.*

* The passage is best explained by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) εἰ ἄχρι τῆς ὡς ἐστι τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ εἰς ταύτην μόνην περιστάμεθα οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ ἡλικίατε, τυπότερην, οἱ τά ἐκλείδαι εἰς Χριστὸν ἔχοντες, καὶ οὐκ ἐστίν ἐκεί ἀλλή δεί, ἀβλιταρεῖ πάντων ἐσμέν, ὅσ ἀνποτε τῶν παρόντων ὑπολαύσαντες, καθὼς καὶ ἀνωτέρω εἰρήται καὶ τὰ μελλόντα οὐ χρόνος ἔχοντες, διότι οὐδέ ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ λέγοντι τινας. So also ΟΕcumen. 562. B. and Theodore 269. A. Μεδὰ παντοδαπῶν γὰρ κινδύνων τὸν βίον ἱδόμενος, λείφ πειδόμενοι, καὶ ἐνεκοῦς.
Some eminent modern Interpreters, as Est., Grot., and Mackn., refer the ἵππος to the Apostles: and they deduce from thence a strong argument to prove that the Apostles must either have been madmen, or sincere believers. Which is very true: but it was not, I think, the sense intended by St. Paul. As nothing has lately been said of the Apostles, it would be unwarrantable to refer the ἵππος to them. It must be referred, with the antient and most modern Commentators, to Christians in general, to whom (though, of course, not in so great a degree as to the Apostles) this would be applicable, since in that age the profession of Christianity was exposed to numerous persecutions, trials, self-denials, and sufferings, more indeed than we can conceive. Whether this is applicable to Christians of every age, is another question, in treating on which some Christian writers, both of the Roman Catholic and Protestant faith, have made, I think, indiscreet concessions, and occupied very insecure ground. I was (I think) true only of the first ages of Christianity, since, in fact, the Gospel exacts no restraints and observances but such as are, in the long run, favourable to happiness even in this world. It is, at least, (as Doddr. observes) quite foreign to the purpose to argue from this text, as some have done, that "if there were no future state, virtue would make men more miserable than they would otherwise be."

Whitby ably traces the meaning of the Apostle thus: "If Christ is not risen for our justification, we are yet under the guilt of sin, ver. 17.; and if so, both soul and body must perish after death, ver. 18. and then the hope of Christians must terminate with

αικιδώμενου, καὶ τὰ δεσμωτηρία τῆς οἰκουμένης ἄμελβοντες, ἀνέστως, καὶ μεταναστεῖ, καὶ κλαδωκοὺς διηνεκεῖσα κολαλοῦντες.

So Jaspis: "Omnes veri sectatores Christi, Apostoli maxime, tot odii, incommodis, periculis, miserisque pressi, morte adeo conenitæ extincti, admodum miseri erant, si falsa spes immortaliæ erat, quam cum resurrectione Paulus arce nectit. Apostoli rationae nonem simillimam vide Maccab. 12, 44 and 45."
this life, which being more especially to them a life of misery, by reason of the sufferings to which their faith doth here expose them, they would of all men be most miserable."

19. ἐλεεινώτεροι, "most pitiable, or miserable." The comparative is used here for the superlative, after the manner of the Hebrew. Wets. compares a similar expression of Sext. Emp. a. Eth. 215. πάντων ἀνθρώ-πων κακοδαμονέστερος γίνεται.

20. νῦν δὲ Χριστός—ἐγένετο. The νῦν has great force; q. d. "But as things now are,* this is not the case." For, as Theodoret observes, ἐπὶ ἀγαθοὶ ἐλπίδος ὄχομεν, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου σωτηρίας ἀνάσ-τασιν ἐξέγυον τὴς ἡμετέρας ἐχόμεν ἀναστάσεως. I would render: "But now Christ is risen from the dead." It is truly observed by Doddr., that it is a great mistake to imagine that the Apostle is employed throughout this chapter in proving the resurrection.† The proof (continues he) lies in a very little room, chiefly ver. 18—19. and almost all the rest of the chapter is taken up in illustrating, vindicating, or applying it. The proof is indeed very short, but most solid and convincing—that which arose from Christ's resurrection. Now that not only proved a resurrection to be in fact not impossible, but what was much more, as it proved him to be a Divine Teacher, it proved the doctrine of a general resurrection, which he so expressly taught."

With respect to the expression ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκο-
many regard it as signifying no more than ἐπίκοτος and they appeal to Theophyl. and Theodoret.* And they might have added Οقسام 562. D. ἀπαρχή γαρ ἐστι, τὸ ἑκ πολλῶν ἐνα τινα τὸδε ἃ τὸδε ποίησαι, ἐμέλλουσι καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ποιεῖν. And so the Schol. ap. Matth. Yet it would, I think, be difficult to prove this signification by any examples from the classical writers. There is (as Theodoret and our earlier modern Commentators have rightly suggested) an allusion to the first fruits, or the sheaf of the first ripe corn offered to the Lord, and which, being accepted by the Priest, was, as it were, an earnest and pledge of the ensuing harvest.† See Levit. 23, 10 and 11. “In allusion to this rite, (says Mackn.), Christ, who arose on the very day on which the first fruits were offered, is called the first fruits of them who have fallen asleep, because he is the first who was raised from the dead to die no more, and because his resurrection to die no more is an example and an earnest of the resurrection of the righteous.”

When it is said that he is the first, it is meant (as Par., Grot., and Schoettg. remark) the first of them who died and rose again so as never afterwards to die: and therefore, those raised by Elisha and our Lord do not come into the account. Thus Christ is elsewhere called πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.

By κεκοιμη. are meant the dead that die in the Lord. See Mackn.

21. ἐπείδὴ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄνθρωποι—νεκρῶν. Jam Paulus porro jubeat concludere sic: ut mortiendo necessitas omnibus eadem est, ex quo unus moriendi fecit

* Yet he subjoins: τῇ ἀπαρχῇ δὲ πάντως ἀκολουθησαι τὸ φώραμα.
† So Krause: “Cum vero primitiae frugum non signum messis proximè instantis modo esset, sed vel ipsam messem incoarent, eleganter Paulus hoc vocabulo utitur, ut indicaret, gloriosà Christi resurrectione, mortuorum ac mortuentium omnium restauracionem, non ut futuram modo speravi, sed nunc jam re vera initium ha-buisse, statuendumque Deum, quod in primitiae cæperit, id in totâ segete completurum, consummaturumque eum esse in membris singulis restauracionem, jam in capite ipsorum et princepe, felici omine inchoatam.”
initium its eadem ratione, ex quo unus resurrectionis initium fecit, omnibus una eademque est resurrectionis spes atque fiducia certa. (Krause.) Aitian prostatici dii ἡς πιστεύω τὰ εἰρημένα ἔδει γὰρ, φησι, αὐτὴν νικήσαι τὴν ἑπταθέαν φύσιν, καὶ τῶν καταβληθέντα, αὐτῶν ἐκκινήσασα. (Theopyl.) And so ÒCumen.

Most modern Commentators take ἀνθρώπος to mean a man, one man; which may be admitted: but our common translation man (meaning human nature) seems to yield a sense more worthy of the Apostle; and this is confirmed by the authority of some antient Commentators, as Theodoret, who traces the connexion between this verse and the next, by observing, that the Apostle, to make the discourse plainer, now passes from nature to persons. Indeed the words following seem to be exegetical, and the γὰρ has the sense of exempli gratid. It is truly remarked by Rosenm., that ἐδώρος here, and all along throughout the chapter, is put for mortalitas, the moriendi necessitas.

22. After Ἄδμ and Χριστός a participle, or infinitive, must be supplied from the respective verbs; i.e. "For as by Adam’s dying all die, (all mankind,) so by Christ's returning to life all will be raised to life." Adam, though not the first to suffer death, yet was the first that introduced it, by sin. In which view I need not remind my readers of a passage of Milton's Paradise Lost. It is well remarked by Theodoret, that as Christ was the προτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, so Adam was the πρωτόόλιπος.

Whether the πάντες, in the next clause, is to be referred to all men without exception, or only to true Christians, may seem doubtful. The latter opinion is maintained by most of the earlier Commentators, especially Grot. They take ἰωσκονδησωται and ἀνάστασιν in the preceding verse to denote a happy resurrection; as in John 5, 21. and 6, 63. Rom. 4, 17. and 8, 11. And so Irenæus, cited by Slade. Most recent Commentators adopt the former opinion, especially Morus (cited by
and accomplishing the purpose of it. Thus, for instance, if a king commits to his son the management of a war against nations that have rebelled, when the war is finished, and the nations again reduced to subjection, then the son is said to deliver up the war to his father, i.e. show that he has accomplished the work committed to him."

Very different views are adopted by some recent Commentators, as Jehe. However, the interpretation of Theophyl. is, upon the whole, well founded, and is nearly the same with that adopted by most judicious modern Commentators. The kingdom here mentioned is (as Sclater observes) economicum, the mediatorial kingdom and government of Christ, and the dispensation of God with men by Christ. See the note of Mackn. Grot. illustrates the delivering up of the kingdom to God, by comparing it with that of Presidents sent out by the Roman Emperors to govern provinces, and on the expiration of the period of their government restoring their power into the hands of the Sovereign.* So, to use the words of Morus ap. Rosenm., "Christus desinet Doctrinam per ea adminicula propagare, per quae nunc propagat, et sic homines præparare futuris. Quum enim non amplius una sætas alteri succedet per propagationem subolis, nec homines ab his ipsis, quibus nunc utuntur, institutis pendebunt: sane non erit amplius talis societas ecclesiastica, qualis nunc est, aut talis ratio discendæ tractandæque religionis, qualem nunc videmus."

---

* This is illustrated by the following Classical citations in Wets. Strabo, 851 v. Δάναλα ὑπὸ τὸν σύλλογον ἑποίησαντο Πομπηῖος το καὶ Δευκολίδε, ὁ μὲν ἡσυχ ἐπὶ τὴν τούτῳ πολέμῳ διαδόχος, ὁ δὲ παραδιδόν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ ἱκανοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θριάμβου. Curt. 5, 9. Auspicium et imperium alii trade interim, qui tamdiu rex appelloletur, donec Asia decedat hostis, victor deinde regnum tibi reddat. —Bessum regem temporis gratiâ statuamus. Compositis rebus justo regi tibi fiduciarium restituet imperium. Wets. also appositely cites a very similar sentiment from Pirke Elies. 11. nonus rex est Messias, qui regat ab extremitate unà mundi ad alteram. Decimus Deus S. B. tunc redibit regnum ad autorem suum S. D.
24. οὖν καταργήσῃ πάσαν ἀρχήν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν. These words describe more clearly the object of that kingdom, namely, of vanquishing all enemies, temporal and spiritual, and of removing all impediments in the way of the salvation of his faithful servants.* The terms ἀρχή, &c. seem intended to suggest the great power of the opposers (namely, evil angels and wicked men. See Eph. 1, 19—23.), and the formidable nature of the obstacles to be removed.

Καταργήσῃ is well explained by Gregor. ap. Cæcumen. παύσῃ, νικήσῃ. And so Zonaras.

25. δει γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν, ἀχρις οὗ ἀν βῆ—αυτοῦ. For the confirmation of this assertion, that Christ would put down all enemies, and remove all obstacles to his reign, Paul now appeals to the testimony of Scripture.

The words are derived from Ps. 110, 3. Here βασιλεύειν corresponds to the sitting at the right hand, in the Psalm, ver. 11. It is plain that in this expression, and that of putting his enemies under his feet, there is, by ἀνθρωπαπαθεία, an allusion to the Oriental custom, by which the heir apparent, or the next in rank to the monarch, sits at his right hand,† and to that by which vanquished enemies were, as it were, triumphed over by being trampled under foot by their conquerors.

It is strange that most recent Commentators should refer the words solely to the removal of all

* So Jaspis: "Intelligitur, h. l. quicquid operi Christi adversetur, v. c. ignorantia et vitia omnis generis; homines imperantes et Christi doctrinam impugnantes; hoc sensu hostes intelliguntur, etiam ob nexion v. 25 & 26. Hostiam ergo nomine comprehenduntur omnia vitae quoque hominum inimica, v. c. morbi, vitae varia discrimina, senectus, mors, quae omnia ac singula tantis nominibus insigniuntur, vel ob imperii sui universalitatem, vel ob efficaciam." This, however, is taking too limited a view.

† And thus βασιλεύειν implies that kind of reigning which is included in a participation of the royal dignity (just as, in the early Greek authors, ἄραγ is extended to all the royal family), or by the exercise (however delegated) of authority and rule.
impediments in the way of Christianity. So Rosen: "Christus igitur regnat, dum morale bonum et ejus adminicula inter omnes homines, adversus impedimenta multa et continua potenter conservat, et divinam vi propagat, tandemque tribuit salutem." The words τῶν ἔχρονως include persons as well as things, namely, the Devil and his angels, i.e. those Demons, and also all wicked men, and opposers of Christ's religion.

26. ἐσχατος ἔχρος καταργεῖται ὁ βάνατος. Death is here, as frequently in Scripture, and in the Classical writers, personified as a tyrant exercising despotic power over the whole human race. The words may, I think, be thus rendered: "And, lastly, the enemy Death is to be destroyed." Now as difficulties are generally encountered in the order of difficulty, this suggests an idea of Death being the most formidable enemy.* So Est. and Tirin.: "he will subject all his enemies, and therefore Death." There is no reason to suppose, with Chrys., that ἐσχατος is meant to indicate the order in which death came into the world, viz. after the Devil and sin. Indeed that would require the article. Still less is it to be imagined (with Mr. Hallet) that Death is so called, as being, literally, the enemy to be destroyed last.

Jaspis remarks: "Mors ultimus hostis omnis operis Christi dicitur. Etenim quamdiu mors generi humano dominatur, tam diu miseria peccati premitur, nec frui potest liquidâ, plenâ, et ab omni parte perfectâ felicitate."

27. πάντα γὰρ ἵνταξέν ἕκτ᾽ τῶν πάπας αὐτῶ. These words are derived from Ps. 8, 7., mystically understood, as they are also taken by the Apostle to the Hebr. 2, 8. For Christ is that second Adam, in whom

* Yet Mackn. has been too bold in rendering it, "the last and greatest enemy." Though Wets. seems to have been of that opinion, since he cites Tych. 259. "Ἀνδρά μὲν Ἀργελουν ὄρφελον εἶ μὲ σιών, τρῶν δὲ κυψῆρα καὶ δοτέος εἰ μὲ σαῦρες, Δαρδανήθ σκητῶν, καὶ έστατον ἐχθρόν 'Ἀχαῖων' and II. c. 312. ἔχρος δὲ μοι κεῖνος ὤμως Αἴδαο κύλησιν.
all things are greater and eternal. (Grot.) What is true of man in general, is much more so of Christ, the first man of the new creation.

The sentiment intended is this: “Christ is superior to all, God excepted, who was pleased that he should be superior to all. (Rosenm.) See Joh. 17, 2 & 24. 5, 26 & 27. This declaration concerning the Father’s not being subject to the Son, was intended to prevent us from interpreting what is said of the extent of the Son’s dominion, in such a manner as to fancy that he is in any respect superior to the Father. By inferring from the words of the Psalm, that the Father did not subject himself to the Son, the Apostle insinuates, not only that the supreme dominion of the Father is asserted in the Psalm, but also, that when the Son’s government is no longer necessary, the Father will resume the kingdom, and govern it for ever in person. (Mackn.)

The last words may be rendered: “it is plain that (this must be) with the exception of him that put all things under his government.

28. ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα. In the preceding verse the Apostle speaks of God’s constituting Christ universal Lord; in this he speaks of his actually subduing all things to him: this distinction the Apostle himself has made in Heb. 2, 8. (Mackn.)

28. τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ὅλος ὑποταγῇσεται, “Then shall the Son also himself be subject, i. e. subject himself (the passive being here, as often, used in a reciprocal sense) to him that had put all things under him.” Now the Father committed to the Son the province of delivering men from the power and tyranny of the Devil, sin, and death. When this shall be accomplished, and no enemy shall remain against whom Christ must exercise his power, then this reign of the Son will be ended; the Son will even subject himself, and all that he has acquired in this reign, to him who had put all things under him. (Rosenm.)

This subjection of the Son to the Father is to be
understood of his subjection in the human nature wherein he formerly governed the mediatorial kingdom. See Hebr. 1, 1. It is plain (says Slade) that the words are to be understood of the Son as being the head of his mediatorial kingdom, which shall continue till he comes to judgment, at which time he will be subject, as mediator and king, to the Father; he will renounce his office, and all things will be under the same dispensation and government as they were before the fall."

28. Ινα γὰρ Θεὸς ῥὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, "so that God may be all things in all respects and businesses." This is the literal sense of the phrase, which is an idiomatic one, but used by the best writers to denote complete influence with or power over any one.* For an explanation of the mode in which this applies to Christ and Christians I must be content to refer my readers to the able annotations of Whitby and Mackn., subjoining the following from Rosenm. : "Ita ut Deus sit, i. e. esse cognoscit omnia apud omnes creaturas, i. e. ut imperium ejus solum valeat, quia non opus est porro Christi mediatoris regimine. Apparabit, propriè Dei hoc opus fuisset, et esse, et futurum esse; Deum esse eum, qui partem regni sui per alium administraverit." Theophyl. offers the following explanation: "Ινα γὰρ Θεὸς, &c., τούτεστιν, ἵνα πάντα ῥὰ τοῦ

* Wets. expounds it thus: "Πάντα ἐιναίς aliculc distlur, qui omnia apud eum potest, a quo omnia expectat, et in quo omnes suas spec opesque sitas esse existimat." And he cites Liv. 40, 11. Demetrius is unus omnia est. Vellej. Pat. 2, 103. Id unam dixero, quam ille omnibus omnia fuerit. Lucan. 3, 108. Non consili sacra fulserunt sedes, non proximâ lege potestas Praetor adest, vacueque loco cessere curules: omnia Caesar erat. Gruter. Inscr. p. 92, 2. Te tibi una, quae es omnia, Deus Isis. Ovid. Epist. Her. 12, 161. Deseror amissis regno, patriaque, domoque, Conjuque, qui nobis omnia solus erat. Herodot. 3, 157. ὃς δὲ καὶ τοῦτο κατέργασο, πάντα δὲ ἢν ἐν πάσι Βασιλείωσι Ζωντέροις, καὶ σφαλέτα ἤκο αὐτοῦ φιλο Ἐμήνων ἰδευτε χαῖρε Ἦλθενος. Numerous other passages are cited by the learned Commentator, many, however, of which are not to the purpose; as that of Thucyd. 8, 95. Ἐξόδοι αὐτοῖς πάντα ἢν. I add Themist. 275 c. τὰ πάντα ἐν ἀνάρχῃ μελετή, "is all in all," i. e. precipua, chiefeus. Arist. 3, 31. πᾶσαι ἐν πάσιν οὕτως, ὃς ἐκοτ. I omit the many other passages which I had collected.
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Πατρὸς ἤργημένα, ἵνα μὴ δύο τις ἄρξῃς ἀνάρχους ὑποτευχή καὶ ἀπεψυχιμένας· ὅταν γὰρ οἱ μὲν ἐξήρωσι ὑπὸ τοὺς πῶς ἀσί τοῦ θιόλ, ὅ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρχην ὕστασιας ἐπέλεξε τὸν Πατέρα, ἀλλ' ὅς πρέσει Τίο, ὁ Θεός ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Πατρὶ, πάντως ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ ἐσται τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι. Τίνες δὲ τὴν τῆς κακίας ἀναλέσην διὰ τῶν ἄπαντων ἀπόλουσαν φασιν, αὐτὸς πάντως ὑποτευχημένων· ὅταν γὰρ ἄμαρτια μὴ ἦν, εὐθεῖαν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἐσται τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν· ὅταν μετετολθοὺς ὁμοιοὶ ἐν τοῖς κενήμασι καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι, μηδὲν ἄλλως ὑποτασσόμενοι· ὅπλα ὁλοὶ ὑπειδεισίς, ὁλοὶ ὁμοίοι ἐστιεῖς· ἀλλ' ὁλοὶ ἐστισιεῖς, ὁλοὶ κατῃτωτικῶς ἐστισιεῖς· ἀλλ' ὅπλοι ἐστισιεῖς, ὅπλοι κατῃτωτικῶς ὑποτασσόμενοι καὶ καὶ μόνοι· πάντα γὰρ Ἰησοῦ ὁ Θεός ἐσται, καὶ βραχύμα, καὶ πόμα, καὶ ἐνδομα, καὶ νόημα, καὶ κίνημα.

By ὁ Θεὸς Hamm. and Whitby understand the Godhead, consisting of the three persons, without any distinction of office or kingdom. Schoettg. thus paraphrases: "In vitâ æternâ non erit alter alteri subditus vel subdelagatus, quemadmodum in regno gratiae, ubi auditores sunt sub Episcopos et Pastoribus, Pastoros sub Christo, Christus sub Deo Patre: sed in vitâ æternâ omnes beati erunt sub uno Deo."

29, 30. οὖν τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, εἰ δὲ ἄλλος νεκρὸν οὐκ ἔγειρον ὅταν ὑποτάσσεσθαι.

It is plain that after the digression contained in the last eight verses, the Apostle resumes the subject he was treating of at ver. 22. But the sense of the words has been exceedingly debated; and perhaps there is no passage in the New Testament on which opinions have been more contradictory. Calvin and Schoettg. say that the various interpretations are almost as numerous as the Commentators. These are detailed by Schmid, Calov., Wolf, Gerdes, Altman, Heuman, and recently by Krause and Slade. Deterred, as it seems, by which diversity of opinion, some, (as Schoettg.) do not venture to adopt any interpretation. "Verba conjuncta quem sensum exhibeat, Non ligere diximus," says Schoettg. There is an allusion (he thinks) to some rite or custom unknown to us, but what, he cannot say. It is impossible for me to review, or even detail one tenth part of the opinions; neither is it necessary. I shall content myself with detailing three of the most probable, especially one which I have no doubt is the true one.

The most ancient and indeed common opinion is that adopted by De Dieu, Michaelis, &c. and countenanced by Tertull. and Ambrose, who tell us that it was the custom then at Corinth for dead persons to be baptized vicariously. And Grot., who decidedly adopts that interpretation, compares this with some other superstitious customs
of the early ages, as that of administering the Eucharist to the dead: and he thinks that this custom was introduced, of admitting the vicarious baptism of a dead person, in order that prayers might be offered up for his soul. That such was the custom of some of the early Heretics, as the Marcionites, we learn from the information of Epiphanius, Chrys., and others: but, besides that there is no proof of its being so ancient as to be here alluded to, it is impossible to suppose that the Apostle would give countenance to so simple a superstition, especially by introducing it on so serious a subject.

The most favourite interpretation for the last half century is that of Knatchbull, Light., Pearce, Homburg, Noesner, Ziegler, Rosen., Jaspis, Krause, and others, who take ἐπιτεθέντος in the sense to be immersed in sufferers, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι; referring to Mark 10, 33 and 39. Luke 19, 50, νεκρόν (they say) is to be taken for οἰκον, and τῶν νεκρῶν for death; as Rom. 11, 15. The complete sense of the words is (they think) this: "Those who have undergone martyrdom, and suffered death for the Christian religion." And indeed this interpretation is very suitable to the context. But the ellipse is much too harsh to be admitted, especially when coupled with so extraordinary a sense of τῶν νεκρῶν. Neither is it necessary, since the interpretation itself may be engraved on that which I shall now proceed to state, and which, as it is one of the most antient, so I have no doubt it will be found the true interpretation. It is that of St. Chrysost., Theoph., Oecumen., Phot., and Theodoret, and it has been supported by Hamm. and Wets. The phrase, then, seems to be idiomatic, and there is (populari more) an ellipse of ἀνάστασεν. Thus the sense will be: "baptized in the confidence and expectation of a resurrection from the dead." Of course, by dead are meant the dead that die in the Lord; and by the resurrection, the resurrection to happiness. (See Phil. 3, 1.) This interpretation is established beyond all doubt by Chrysost., who has examined the passage at considerable length, and with his usual ability. He and the other Greek Commentators notice, but with the strongest censure, the interpretation which makes this an allusion to the Vicarious baptism of the dead. They all agree that there is an allusion to the form in Baptism, "I believe in the resurrection of the dead," to which is added: "Wilt thou be baptized in this faith—it is my desire." "After which, and other confessions," says Chrysost., τότε καθήμενος εἰς τὴν πηγήν τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων θείων. Very excellent is the following exposition of Theophyl.: ὅτι ὅπως ἐκ νεκρῶν νεκροὶ ἐκαθημένος ἀνάστασας, καὶ βαπτισθὲντες ἐκ τοῦ θάνατος ἐκείνης, τι ποιήσωμεν ἀπατηθέντες; τί δὲ ἄλλῳ καὶ βαπτίζοντων ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνης ἀνάστασας, τούτων, εἰπὶ προσοχῇ ἀναστάσεως, εἰ νεκροὶ ὅπερ ἐγείρονται; So Chrysost : καὶ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο βαπτιζόμεθα, τῶν νεκρῶν ἱερῶν, αὐτοὺς ἄνασται πιστεύοντες, διότι οὐκ εἶναι νεκρῶν, καὶ οὐ μόνον νεκρῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων λεγεῖς νεκρῶν ἀνάστασας. And Oecumen. 667. D. εὐθείαν γὰρ ὅτι εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν πιστεύοντες, βαπτιζόμεθα, ὅσιοι λεγεῖς, τι ποιήσωμεν οὐκ εἰς ὅπερ νεκρῶν μᾶλλον ἐν ἀναστάσει καὶ πιστεύοντες καὶ βαπτιζόμεθα, ἦσθε δὲ τῷ θείῳ, καὶ ἄλλο τι εὑρεσίας παρὰ προσοχήθεντα; χόρα,
I CORINTHIANS, CHAP. XV. 689

φησὶν, ἀδημοσίους καὶ ἀποκλαύονται, καὶ τὴν πίστιν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ἐν ψευδῇ λοιπόν τίτιν, τοῦτο λέγει τί ποιήσουσιν τοιοῦτον, αὐτὰ ποιήσουσιν ἀπερ ἐκεῖνον. And Phot. ibidem, 574. τι ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτίζόμενοι, ὃστε μὴ εἰσίν διαπανή νεκροὶ, καὶ τῷ ἅθεται κατέχεσθαι; οἷον, τῇ ἀναστάσει, φησί, μὴ υπάρξῃ, ὅτι εἰς τοιαύτης ἐκεῖνοι βαπτίζομεν, ὃστε κατὰ δίκαιον ἀναστῆναι, τί ποιήσουσιν; Εἰ δὲ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, τί καὶ βαπτίζομαι ἣν ἀναστῶσιν; Chrysost., too, as also Knatchb. and Le Clerc rightly think there is an allusion to the ancient mode of baptism, by immersion, which represented a state of death. τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζονται καὶ καταδύονται, εἰς ἀνανεωθῆναι, τῇ εἰς ἄδοι καταβάσεως ἐστιν σύμβολον καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ἄδοι διὸ καὶ τάφον τὸ βαπτίζωμα ὁ Πάυλος λαλεῖ λέγων, Συνετάφθης οὖν αὐτῷ δια τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν δίκαιον. So also Theodoret, 275. ὁ βαπτίζόμενος, φησι, τῷ Δεσποτῷ συνάδεται, ἵνα τοῦ δίκαιου κοινωνήσας, καὶ τῆς ἀνασάτης γένηται κοινώνος.

This interpretation is undoubtedly the true one, and it is ably supported by Wets. in the following paraphrase. "Cur doctores vestri, qui resurrectionem negant, baptizant, et cur discipuli ipsorum ab illis baptizantur? et quomodo vitam suam instituere debent, qui ita baptizati sunt? Nos quidem baptizamus in resurrectionem mortuorum, quam catechumeni se credere profinentur: At si vera est doctorum vestrorum sententia, si post hoc vitam nihil est expectandum, si mortui ita mortui sunt, ut in aeternum mortui maneant, cujus rei gratia baptismus apud vos et administratur et suscipitur! An aliquod commodum in hac vitâ in baptizatos redundabit? An vero in alterâ vitâ? An mollius mortui isti jacubunt, suavius dormient? An jucundiores, reperient sodales inter mortuos? Rom. 6. 7.

30. τί καὶ ἥμεις κυδουνέομεν πάσαν ὀφθαν; the scope of this verse is excellently pointed out by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) thus: "If ye receive not the confession of words which the baptized make for a demonstration of the resurrection, admit at least the voice sounded forth in deeds. We, for instance, and all the Apostles, are perpetually in perils, and unless there were a resurrection, for what have we encountered dangers? For the sake of some gratification? Vain glory might indeed induce any one to run into danger once or twice: but to do this perpetually (as we do) is the greatest proof that we are persuaded of the resurrection." See the note on ver. 19. Wets. compares a very similar sentiment of Cic. Tusc. 115. Nescio quomodo inhæret in mentibus quasi seculorum quoddam augurium futurorum, idque in maximis ingenii altissimisque ani-
mis et extitit maxime, et apparat facillime. Quo quidem demto, quis tam esset amens, qui semper in laboribus et periculis viveret?

The ημεις does not (I think) denote, as some suppose, all Christians, but the Apostles and first preachers of the Gospel. In πᾶσαν ἀφαν there is an hyperbole not unfrequent.

31. καθ' ημέραν ἀποδήσκω—ημῶν. These words are somewhat obscure, and their sense is not a little controverted. It is rightly observed by Theodoret, that having spoken of the dangers of the Apostles generally, St. Paul adverts to his own case, and (as Theophyl. remarks) after speaking of the being in danger, he proceeds to show the nature of the danger. The words are indeed meant to further unfold and explain the preceding.

Many modern Commentators, however, have strangely mistaken the sense; as, for instance, Beza, who renders: "By the rejoicing which is common to you all, which ye also feel." Some, as Doddr., conjecture ὑμετέραν, and render: "I protest by the joy and glory of all Christians, in which I participate, which I feel in Christ Jesus." This, however, is harsh and frigid. Yet more so is the sense assigned by Locke, Wells, and Hardy. The only interpretation that is at all justified by the words, or agreeable to the context, is that of Chrysost., Theophyl., and the other Greek Commentators, which is almost the same with that propounded by Est., Mackn., Grot., Kypke, Pearce, Bengel, Rosenm., Krause, and Jaspis, who assign to ὑμετέραν καύχησιν the sense "my boasting concerning you."

But, to examine the phraseology of the whole sentence in detail, καθ' ημέραν is another hyperbolic expression, with which Wets. compares Liv. 29, 17. Quotidie capitur urbs nostra, quotidie diripitur. And P. Syrus: quotidie damnatur, qui semper timet. See also Ps. 44, 23. 'Αποδήσκω is well explained by Theophyl. τῇ προδημίᾳ, καὶ τῷ πῶς τὸτο παρασκευάθαι, καὶ τῷ τοιούτα πᾶσχειν, ἀ θάνατον ἐφερέ. And so the best modern Commentators; "I
am prepared to suffer death, and do daily encounter perils of life, and endure such calamities and hardships as bring life into danger. See 2 Cor. 1, 8 and 10. 4, 6 and 12. Rom. 8, 36. Kypke and Wets. compare a similar sentiment in Philo Flacc. T. 2. p. 542, 35. ὡς ἔτι ἀναμένουσι με αἱ ποιναὶ, καὶ οἱ ἀλάστορες ἀσπερ ἐπὶ λαβών ἐστάσεις ἡη, καὶ φονῶντες ἐγκεῖνται, καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην ἤμεραν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὠφαν, προσανθηκὼς, πᾶλλος θανάτως ὑπομένειν ἄνθ' ἐνος τοῦ τελευταίου. And Liban. Ep. 1920. ἔτι γίνετε τεθηκα-μεν.

Kypke notices, that the particle of swearing and asserting, νῦ, has usually joined with it the name of some God, or Goddess. And he instances from Epict. νῦ τὴν Καίσαρος τόχην. This, however, is not very apposite; since Καίσαρος τόχην is nearly equivalent to Καίσαρα; as in the well known words Καί-σαρα θείαις καὶ Καίσαρος τυχήν. I remember something similar in Longinus.

With respect to the use here of ὑμετέρων, Kypke observes, that the possessive pronoun is not unfrequently so employed: and he cites from Thucyd. φόβῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πολεμησίοντας. Dionys. Hal. p. 501. διὰ τῶν σων πόδων. Joseph. Ant. 1, 4. ἐξορριζέων εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἑυσεβείαν. The truth is, that in such cases the possessive, standing in the place of a personal pronoun, is used in the Genitive, that Genitive having the not unfrequent sense of propter.* This signification of ὑμετέρων was distinctly seen by the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl., who well explains: νῦ τὴν ὑμετέρων προκοπῆν, ἐφ' ἥ καυχώμαι. And he adds: καυχήσεις γὰρ τῷ διδασκάλῳ ἢ τῶν μα-θητῶν προκοπῆ. See also 1 Cor. 9, 3, 11, 10. and especially the note on 1 Cor. 4, 8. It is also noticed by Theophyl., that the Apostle ascribes the whole to Christ Jesus. And he acutely observes, that this is meant to remind them that he expects them to

* After writing this, I find the remark has been made, nearly in the same words, by Grot.
maintain with constancy this their faith; q. d. "If I boast on account of your improvement, so shall I be ashamed if, at last, ye so wretchedly act as to disbelieve the resurrection."

32. ei kata áνθρωπoν εθηριμάχησα εν 'Εφέσῳ.

On the sense of these words our modern Commentators have moved no little controversy. Many, as Beza, Grot., Raphel, Pearce, Schoeig., Dodd., and Rosenm., contend that ἐθηριμάχησα is to be taken in a figurative sense, as referring to a contest with brutal men. Of this they adduce several examples. Yet, on close examination, there is hardly one to the purpose. The following will be found somewhat more so. Liban. Ep. 606, 1. ἐκ τούτων ἐν περὶ Σωκράτην, εἰ κατὰ Σωκράτην ἐγεγόνειν, ὅτε αὐτῷ τὰ θήρα ἐκέεστο, εὐφοβάται τρεῖς. Still the proof is weak. Neither (I think) will κατὰ ἄνθρωπον bear such a sense as "to speak after the manner of men." Yet this interpretation of the passage is somewhat confirmed by its being adopted by Tertull., de resurr., C. 48., by Theophyl., and also by Ignat. ad Rom. § 5. (if that Epistle be genuine.) Yet it, nevertheless, seems very precarious. So that the best founded interpretation, and that liable to the fewest difficulties, is the commonly received one, which assigns to the ἐθηριμάχησα a physical sense. It is, too, supported by the authority of all the Greek Commentators, except Theophyl., by almost all the Greek and Latin Fathers, and many modern Commentators, as Pisc. Zeger, Lightf., Hamm., Locke, Elsner, Whitby, Wolf, Wells, Mackn., Krause, Schleus., Slade, and Jaspis. It is, unquestionably, the more natural and obvious one. For, the sense of the passage evidently shows that there is reference to some imminent danger and signal trial of faith; and this is confirmed by the very strong language of the Apostle at 2 Cor. 1, 8—10., in reference to some extreme peril encountered at Ephesus. Neither is the fact in itself improbable. That the early Christians were not unfrequently exposed to such contests, is proved by the records of Ecclesiastical History; and Profane History informs us that such a kind of punishment for criminals was common in that age.

The phrase κατ' ἄνθρωπον is well explained by Hamm., "As far as men's purposes would go," quantum ad homines; as 1 Pet. 4, 6. And this sense is confirmed by Chrys.: ὅσον τó εἰς ἄνθρωπον ἐκον: and Phot. ὅσον ἤκε εἰς ἄνθρωπον: and also Theodoret, κατά ἄνθρωπον λογισμόν θηρίων ἐγεγόνει βορὰ, ἀλλ' παραδόξω ἐκάθων. It does therefore seem, that the Apostle was exposed to some wild beast at Ephesus; and, κατ' ἄνθρωπον, he would have been a prey, but that the animal harmed him not, as in the case of the viper at Melita. In this there is nothing improbable. As to the argument, that the Apostle's privilege as a Roman citizen would have preserved him, it is a sufficient answer, that the laws were at that time but little security against the malice of Heathen persecution; and, as Jaspis observes, by the crimen perduellionis, of which, under Nero, the most innocent Christians were often accused, the jus civitatis became of no force. That such a circum-
st ance should have been omitted by St. Luke, may seem strange, and be really unaccountable. But, in general, no conclusion can be drawn from the silence of an historian; and least of all the sacred historians, since they wrote often not for general, but particular purposes; with which such omissions are easily reconciled. The story of the penitent thief (as Mr. Slade observes) is omitted by three of the Evangelists; and that of the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem, by Josephus. And it is justly remarked by Elsner, that many important circumstances must have taken place during St. Paul's abode at Ephesus besides those recorded in Acts 19. Nor is it (as Dr. Whitby observes) any objection, that St. Paul does not expressly mention this in his enumeration of his sufferings at 2 Cor. 11, since the language there is only general, and this ἐν τοῖς μαχαί might very well be comprehended under the clause "in deaths oft." Besides (as Mr. Slade observes), "he would have fewer reasons to particularize this circumstance in the second Epistle, if he had noticed it in the first."

Upon the whole, therefore, this interpretation seems by far the best founded, and, as far as regards any objections hitherto urged, inmoveable. I must not omit to advert to a method of taking the passage proposed by Mackn. (and, as it seems, approved by Slade), by which he thinks the difficulty may be removed. He would render τοῦ ἐπιστ. "if I had fought." But of the examples he adduces only one is in the first aorist, and even there an έν occurs in the sentence; which quite alters the case. Besides, here there would be this additional harshness, that the had must have a strong emphasis, and it would seem to refer to something that had been before mentioned; which is not the case. This method, therefore, however ingenious, cannot be admitted. And it is not (as Mr. Slade would represent) uncertain whether the Apostle was actually exposed to a wild beast, or whether he was only in peril and expectation of it.

32. The punctuation τοῦ ὀφελοῦς; proposed by Pisc., Crel., and Bp. Atterbury, and adopted by Bengel, Griesb., and most recent editors, is confirmed by the authority of Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, and is (I think) undoubtedly the true one. There is an ellipsis of ἔστι, or ἔσται, "what better shall I be;" as James 2, 14. Τὸ ὀφελός appears to have been a sort of proverbial phrase, of which Wets. cites several examples; as Arist. Plut. 1153. τὶ δὴ οὖν ἐλέες ὀφελοῦς ἥμιν ἐνδέακα οὖν; Demosth. Phil. 3. τὶ τοῦτον ὀφελός αὐτῷς; Arrian Epict. 1. 4. καὶ τι σεῖ ὀφελοῦς; Maxim. Tygr. 7. 6. τὰ γὰρ ἐμοὶ ὀφελοῦς τῶν πολλῶν λόγων;

32. φάγωμεν καὶ πίμαμεν·· αὐριον γὰρ αἰτθήσκομεν, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The
words are taken from Is. 22, 18., but, as Theodoret observes, are very applicable to the present case, q. d. "Fasting is unnecessary, and temperance superfluous; let us enjoy the pleasures of the present life, since there is no future reward held out to the lovers of virtue." The sentiment was, as we may suppose, familiar to the Heathen writers, especially the poets, and such of the philosophers as, like Epicurus, thought pleasure, (i.e. animal and sensual pleasure,) the sumnum bonum.

33. μὴ πλανᾶσθε. The Apostle now (as Theophyl. observes) turns to exhortation; or (to use the words of Phot.) leaving the argumentatio ex absurdo, applies himself to admonition.

I would compare Arrian Epict. 2, 22. μὴ ἄπαξατοσθε. 4, 6. μὴ πλανᾶσθε. Marc. Anton. 3, 14. Μήκετι πλανεῖ. It is well observed by Theophyl., that while the words are meant to gently censure their levity and folly, they also hint that some persons had been drawing them thereto.

The words of the admonition are supposed to constitute an iambic senarius, which is by Socrates Eccl. Hist. 3, 16. ascribed to Eurip.; by Jerome, Euseb., and others, to Menander, in his Thais; and which is expressed by Terent. Eun. 2, 2. It is


Indeed the works of the antient poets are full of such disgusting examples of undisguised sensuality, expressed not only in letters but by typical actions. Thus Herodot. 2, 78. mentions a custom of the Egyptians of carrying round among guests at a banquet a little figure of a dead man in a coffin, with the words: ἐς τοὺς νόμον ὄρθων πίνε τε καὶ τέρκων, ἐσεϊ γὰρ ἀποθανόν τούτοις. And Wet. says he saw at Amsterdam an antient gem with obscene figures and the following inscription: πάρδαλα, πίνε, τρίφσα, περιλάμβανε θανεῖν σε δεῖ ὁ γὰρ χρόνος ὀλίγος Ἀχαι Ἴθασι.
probable that Menander imitated Eurip. This is usually accounted a quotation. Yet had that been the case, χρηστός would have been written, which indeed is read in some MSS. But it seems little probable that the Apostle would introduce a regular quotation. In fact, the gnome had been expressed in such various ways, that it had grown so familiar as to become a sort of proverb. Slade indeed urges that the inverted form argues a quotation; but it may be replied, that metre would preserve the gnome in that form, even after it had ceased to be a quotation, and become a proverb *.

83. ὀμιλίαι signifies close intercourse, and not conversation only. Χρηστὰ is by Chrys. and most ancient Commentators, as also Hamm., taken for ἐνέκαπάτητα, which is a very Classical signification, (see the examples in the note,) and may have been that intended by Menander; but not, I think, had in view by the Apostle: and the signification πόνηρα is confirmed by some examples in the note.

There seems to be no doubt but that the expression is levelled against some false teachers who had encouraged the Christians to promiscuous inter-

---

course with the Heathens, the same, it may be sup-
pposed, that had maintained the innocence of fre-
quently the idol feasts: and perhaps their doubts on
the resurrection might have partly originated from
frequenting Heathen society.

34. ἐκνήψατε δικαίως. The Apostle here follows
up, and presses closer home his admonitions.

'Εκνήψαω properly signifies to awake up, i. e. from
a deep sleep, and is generally used of those who
awake, or become sober after drunkenness. It is found
in the physical sense in Gen. 9, 24. ἐξένεψε δὲ Ναὸς
ἀπὸ οἴνου. 1 Sam. 25, 37. Joel 1, 5. Schleus. refers
to Aretæus 4, 3. ; and Krause, to Plut. Dem. 20.
But it is also frequently used in the sense resipiscere,
to return to a right mind. Schleus. cites Aret. 8, 6.
ἐκν. τῆς δυσθυμίας. To which may be added Joseph.
1231, 14. So ἀνανήψαω is employed; as Habak. 2,
19. It is explained by Est.: "Ab erroris et volup-
tatum ebrietatem exerrecti jam sapite, et ad ea quæ
justa et recta sunt animum applicate." (See also
Doddr. and Mackn.) There must be reference
chiefly to the latter. So Theodoret: ὃς ἀποβούκο-
λθεῖται, καὶ τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ μεθύσωσι, τὸ ἐκνήψατε εἰρρηκεν.
The term seems to have been suggested by the idea
contained in φάγαμεν καὶ πίναμεν.

Δικαίως. This is plainly a use deviating from the
Classical one. There is an ellipsis, which most early
modern Commentators supply by γινομεν. But this is
too irregular. It rather seems to be for ὃς δικαίως δεῖ,
"as it is just and right you should do." So Erasm.,
Cas., Vorst., Sclater, and most of the recent Com-
mentators. And this is confirmed by the Arab. Ver-
sion: "vigilate vigilatione debitâ." Theophyl. ex-
plains it συμφέροντος, as opposed to ἐὰν κακῶς. But
this seems not the right idea. Of the above sense
of δικαίως an example is adduced from Luke 23, 41.
καὶ ἦμεῖς δικαίως. And Alberti and Palairot cite
some from Arrian E. A. 5, 10. Ælian H. A. 8, 24. I
would add Thucyd. 4, 6, 2. and Æschyl. Ag. 779.
where it is opposed to ἀκαίρως. Here Wets. compares Liv. 1, 41. nunc expurgiscere vérè.

34. καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε. On the sense of this word Commentators are not agreed. The antient and earlier modern ones explain it: “Do not give yourselves up to sin,” meaning especially Epicureism. Most recent ones think there is an ellipsis of τὰς ἁληθείας, “do not fall into error,” namely, in respect of the resurrection, and the doctrines conjoined with it. And of this absolute sense of ἀμαρτάνει the Commentators adduce examples from Arist. and Pindar; and of the complete phrase, from Dionys. Hal. p. 102. To which it may be added, that examples both of the complete and elliptical phrase often occur in Thucyd. But the latter is very rare in the New Testament. Schleus., however, adduces Tit. 8, 1., where, of an heretic, it is said ἀμαρτάνει. That doctrinal error is here meant, is plain from the words following, which are added by way of explanation. However, ἁμαρτ. may have the same extent of signification with ἱκράσατε, and denote not only error in opinion, but that immorality in practice which often results from it. So true is it that these mutually generate each other. On which Chrys. has some excellent observations.

34. ἁγνωσίαν γὰρ Θεῶν τινες ἔχωσι. Some modern Commentators understand this as denoting that there were concealed Atheists among them; these being by the Hebrews called persons who know not God. Others understand it of practical Atheists, persons living without God in the world, i. e. as if there were no God. But neither seems very probable. The Greek Commentators rightly (I think) explain it; “know not God aright,” namely, on the article of the resurrection. For, as Theophyl. and Æcumen. remark, they assuredly know not the power of God, who disbelieve the resurrection. And Theodoret excellently observes: “He that professes to know God, believes him to be just. Now to justice belongs retribution; but a just retribution in
the present life, we do not see. It is necessary, therefore, for him who professes he believes in God, to expect a resurrection." Schleus. well translates: "destituuntur enim adhuc quidam vestrûm verâ Dei cognitione." And he compares Sap. 18, 1. ὁς παρῆν Θεοὶ ἀγνοεῖ.

34. πρὸς ἐντρωπὴν ὑμῖν λέγοι. This seems to be a formula of admonition, and occurs supra 6, 5. where see the note. The Apostle especially means shame at having been so careless, as to the company they kept, or the religious opinions they maintained. That by this ignorance of God is especially meant disbelief of the resurrection, is clear from the Apostle's taking occasion just after to treat on that doctrine.

Jam sequitur altera hujus capitis pars, quà Paulus, postquam idoneis erat testimoniiis evictum, Christum re verâ in vitam rediisse; etsque re non modo factam esse nobis fidem nostri reditûs in vitam, sed etiam spem futurâe faclicitatis nostrâe versusque virtutis studium niti, docet eam omnem doctrinam nihil quidquãm continere, quod non omnino féri posse credibile sit, iisque respondet, quibus argumentum illud a resurrectione Christi petitum, non sufficietbat propterea, quoniam mente non assequentur, quomodo corpora, qualia nunc gestamus, in vitam redire possint. (Krause.)


In treating on this passage the Commentators are somewhat divided in opinion. The ancient and the early modern ones think that two different questions are here proposed: the first, πῶς ἐγελοῦται; "how are they to be raised again; q. d. "how can all the different parts of our bodies, which have been resolved to dust, or apparently annihilated by fire, or devoured by beasts, or become so mingled with and converted into the nature of other animals, nay of
trees, plants, &c., how can these, after having been for so many ages thus dissipated, be at length re-united, and coalesce into one body? That exceeds all human conception and belief!” The second comes from those who, little solicitous about the former subject, but curious to know what would be the future condition, habit, and form of those restored to life, desired these points to be exactly delineated and foreshown to them.

Most recent Commentators, however, as Morus, Krause, and Jaspis, think that both these questions, in fact, merge into one and the same; so that the ποίῳ δὲ σῶματι is a reciprocation of the former, except that in the former there is reference to the coalition of the dead to be recalled to life; in the latter, a reference to the particular kind and form of body. Morus renders thus: “Sed quonam modo dicat aliquid mortui resurrect? sive quonam corpore instructi prodibunt?”

But the former mode of taking the passage seems to be preferable; for though the two may, in a certain sense, merge into each other, yet the Apostle, in his answer, considers them distinctly:* the sense is well laid down by Cæcumen. thus: ηὔτα δῶο ἀπορα αὐτοῖς εἶναι δοκοῦντα, ὡς εὕτε ἀντιθέσεως λύει ἀμφέβαιλλον γὰρ τῶς έγείρεται τὰ ἀπαξ διαλυθέν σώμα, καὶ ποίῳ σώματι ἀναστάται, τούτῳ ἢ ἔτερῳ τινὶ τα ὡν δῶο αὐτοῖς ἐπιλούει, διὰ τοῦ παραδείγματος τοῦ κόκκου. The sense is: “How are the dead to be raised,” i. e. how is it possible. This sense of the present indicative is frequent in the New Testament. The latter clause ποίῳ δὲ σῶματι is, in some measure, an appendage to the former; q. d. And, supposing that they do not rise with the same body, which is plainly impossible, with what body, and what kind of body are they to rise?” There is (I think) a clause omitted. And the whole may be expressed thus: “How is it possible for the

* “If we will allow St. Paul to know what he says, it is plain, from what he answers, that he understands these words to contain two questions.” (Locke.)
dead body to be restored (i.e. its parts, so very widely dissipated to be restored) so as to form one body? This is plainly impossible.* Then again, as the former is impossible, with what body will they rise? Another body? and what kind of a body? Animal, mortal, and terrene, or celestial, or mixed?† The argument contained in the latter clause is thus stated by Grot.: "Suppose they shall return in the same body, why should this be? for they will neither eat, nor drink, nor procreate. If in another, they will not be the same persons." To which the Apostle answers, that it will be, in some measure, the same, and, in some measure, not: and this he illustrates by a similitude.

Mr. Locke paraphrases the words Πῶς ἔγειρονται thus: "How comes it to pass that dead men are raised to life again? would it not be better they should live on? Why do they die to live again?" But this seems to proceed on misconception. From the forw in which the objector is supposed to state the difficulties in the way of this doctrine, it is hardly probable that he would advert to this.

For an explanation of the mode in which these objections are answered, it may suffice to refer my reader to Dr. Mackn.‡

* The πῶς, as Schleus. observes, si nulla sequitur particula negativa, absolutè negat; as Matt. 12, 26, &c. (See his examples.)
† Mr. Valpy observes, that one of the most specious arguments against the resurrection of the dead seems to have been founded on the unfitness of our gross body, and especially of some of its members, for eternal life. "In like manner (continues he) the Sadducees had attempted to silence Christ. (See Matt. 22, 24—28.) But the adversaries of the doctrine of the resurrection at Corinth made use perhaps of other arguments, and, on the principle that evil derived its origin from matter, contended that a re-union with sinful matter could be of no advantage to a pure and intellectual soul."
‡ Rosenm. gives the following statement: "Hoc ut refellat Apostolus, ostendit: Posse nobis olim corpora, ab his, quibus nunc indidi sumas, tribui diversa: corpora ab his, que nunc nostra sunt, diversa, nobis olim tribui debeb: corpora illa ab his nostris revera diversa fore: corpora illa ab his nostris sic diversa fore, ut longè prastantiura, nimimum interitus plane expertia sive immortalia sint.
36. ἀφοπος, συ δι σπείρεις-ἀποδάνη. Mackn. thinks this is meant for the false teacher, who is here called fool, in the same sense, and for the same reason, as the Pharisees are so called, namely, on account of their ignorance, and wickedness. But the appellation may, with the Greek Commentators, be more simply considered as given with reference to neglect of what fell under common and daily observation.* And the singular is used in conformity with the τις just before, from which, however, we are not to suppose that there was only one such objector, namely, the false teacher; since ἄλλο ἔρει τις is a common formula, where many objections may be supposed to exist, though one only is represented by the formula.† On the ἀφοπος it is well observed by Grot.: "Meritos sic est vocat qui miracula fieri non credunt, cùm natura ipsa plena sit miraculis, sed quae sui frequentiā migrant in nominem aliiud." I would compare Aelian de Provid. p. 1052. Συ δὲ λέγεις, αὐτούς μη ἄμιν προσέχειν, ὡ μᾶρπε.

The whole of the comparison is popular, and therefore we are not to seek refinements. Thus ἀποδάνη is not to be understood by utter death, but that appearance of destruction by irruption which is

Ac primo quidem fieri posse, ut olim nobis corpora, ab his, quæ nunc gestamus diversa tribuantur, comparanda rerum natura ostenditur."

necessary to the reproduction and future vegetation of the grain. Rosenm. (after Jehne) explains ἀπόθαρσις, "till after it has come to an end of vegetation on the germ where it grows." But although maturity is necessary to the production of that mysterious process which is, by the Providence of God, carried forward in the buried and rotting grain (the germ or bud, as it were, fed by the corruption of the root springing up into new life), yet this does not seem to have been in the Apostle’s mind. The true scope of the passage has been most distinctly pointed out by the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl., Theodoret, and Ecumen., after remarking that the Apostle had changed the names, saying, not φώεται, but θαυμάσχομαι (in order, by assigning our names to theirs, to show from them our resurrection), adds, that he εἰς τοῦναντίον περιέτρεψε τόν λόγον ἐκεῖνος γὰρ εἴδοκε ἀπορον, πῶς μετὰ τὸθανάντιν ἐγείρομεθα: αὐτὸς δὲτοῦναντίον φησίν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο ἐγείρομεθα, ἐκεῖθεν ἀποδιδόκομεν, ἀσιν εὐν ἄλλως θαυμάσχομαι, εἰ μὴ ἦν θάνατος. An ingenious and very just remark. Nor did this escape the acute penetration of Locke, whose words are these: “The Apostle answers, that it is fit that men should die, death being no improper way to the attainment of other bodies.” Truly, no more improper, nor at all different from, that mode which is pursued in the vegetable world.

Any other obscurity will be removed by recurring to the instructive note of Dr. Mackn. on this verse. There is the same comparison in Joh. 12, 24.; and indeed (as Grot. observes) it appears to have been usual with the Rabbins* to compare a buried body with a grain committed to the earth.

37. καὶ δ' στείρεσιν—στείρεσι. Morus and Rosenm. need not have stumbled at this use of σοῦμα, as applied to the produce of seed sown in the earth, since

* So Cetuboth (cited by Wets.) R. Chija dixit justos resurrecturos vestitiose, idque probavit argumento a minori ad majus a tritico. Ut triticum nudum sepelitur, et multis vestibus ornatum prodit, ita multè magis justi, qui cum vestibus sepeliuntur, vestiti resurgunt.
the Apostle adopts it for the same reason that he, in the last verse, employed ζωτοείται for ζωείται, (where see the note.) Besides, it is so used by Mackn. Tyr. D. 40. (speaking of plants) καὶ φυτὰ ἔπαινεις, καὶ γη-δάκη μὲν αὐτῶν τα σώματα, μένη δὲ τα σπέρματα.

Theophyl. (after Chrysost.) has excellently illustrated the scope of the passage thus: "After adverting to two difficulties: 1. How are the dead to be raised, the Apostle solves it, and replies by dying, as does the grain. He now proceeds to remove the other difficulty, namely, 'with what kind of body.' And he says, that the very same body is raised, i. e. what is of the same substance, though more glorious."

"By affirming (says Mackn.) that the grain produced from the seed sown, is not the very body which is sown, the Apostle (I think) insinuates, that the body to be raised is numerically the same with the body deposited at death, but something of the same kind, formed by the energy of God. Having such an example of the divine power before our eyes, we cannot think the reproduction of the body impossible, though its parts be utterly dissipated. Farther, although the very numerical body is not raised, yet the body is truly raised, because what is raised, being united to the soul, there will arise in the man thus completed, a consciousness of his identity, by which he will be sensible of the justice of the retribution which is made to him for his deeds. Besides, this new body will more than supply the place of the old, by serving every purpose necessary to the perfection and happiness of the man in his new state." See ver. 44. note.

According to this view of the subject, the objection taken from the scattering of the particles of the body that dies, has no place; because it does not seem necessary, that the body to be raised should be composed of them. For the Scripture no where affirms, that the same numerical body is to be raised: What it teaches is, that the dead shall be raised. See also Mr. Slade's note.
37. γυμνὸς κόκκον, "a mere grain, destitute of those ornaments which afterwards spring from it," namely, the blade and the ear. Ei τῷ χοίρῳ, exempli gratiā. See the note on 14, 10.

38. ἢ δὲ Θεὸς, &c. Nempe ex uno quodque genere seminum aliud genus fructuum enascitur, culmis, aristis, foliis, granis diversum. Quod quotannis fieri videmus tot seminibus, id fieri potest etiam corporibus humanis, terrae conditis et corruptis. Omnia hic ad Dei potentiam et sapientiam redeunt, qui, quicquid vult, efficere potest. (Rosenm.)

The τὸν σῶμα is explained by Doddr. thus: "The Apostle seems more directly to speak of that as its proper body, which is peculiar to that species of grain; yet undoubtedly each ear has a peculiar reference to one individual as its proper seed, in such a manner as another of the same species has not; and what follows plainly suits such a view.* God is said to give it this body as he pleases, because we know not how it is produced; and the Apostle's leading thought is, "That it is absurd to argue against a resurrection, on a principle which is so palpably false as that must be, which supposes us to understand all the process of the divine works." To me it appears, that the τὸν σῶμα is meant to further explain σῶμα καθὼς ἴθέλησε, on which the whole sentence seems to turn; q. d. "God hath ordained that each particular seed should reproduce its own body, but one far more glorious, and the form thereof is such as it hath pleased the Almighty to assign to it." No Commentator has seen the sense so well as Theophyl. (whose matter is chiefly derived from Chrysost.) in the following exposition: "If then God giveth a body, why do ye curiously pry into the matter, and enquire with what kind of body we are

* And so Mr. Valpy. "As the corn that is sown, be it of whatever grain, contains in it, though upon the minutest scale, the very form and substance of the future produce, so it is plain that we shall rise with the same bodies, though not identically and numerically which we now possess, but infinitely exalted and improved."
to be raised; why do ye disbelieve the resurrection, having known the power and purpose of God? For God doth indeed raise the dissolved body, but far more beautiful and spiritual; as we find in the case of the plant, which springeth from a seed cast into the earth."

Rosenm. subjoins the following illustrations. Si-cuti tritici in agro sati et putrescentis german servatur integrum ac vivificum: ita etiam facile ser-varí potest aliqua corporis nostri particula essentialis, quá novarum partium accessione in renovatum cor-pus crescat, eidemque animo juncta hominem partim eundem, partim novum efficiat. Thus some think that this is meant to teach that there is a *seminal principle* which is not destroyed by death, and which, at the appointed season, will reproduce the body, and that in a more excellent form than before. But see Dr. Mackn.

39. ὁ πᾶσα σαρᾶς, ἢ αὐτής σαρᾶς, &c. Even from this economy of nature, by which the universe contains many different kinds of bodies, it may be inferred, that God, the Author of all things, can also produce another kind of body which all who rise from the dead shall assume. (Krause.) There are various kinds of bodies, and yet they are equally *bodies*. Since therefore God (as we see before our eyes) could make, and still can make so many various bodies, who would doubt that he can also *transform* human bodies, and restore them to a more perfect state. (Rosenm.)

As in the preceding verse, the Apostle directs us to consider the greatness of the power of God, displayed in the production of that endless variety of vegetable substances for food to man and beast with which we are surrounded: so in this verse he directs our attention to the same power of God, displayed in that wonderful diversity of animal substances which it hath formed into different sorts of organized bodies, each with members properly adapted to the
by various degrees. (Rosenm., from Grot.) The inference drawn from this by Rosenm. is this: "Who then can doubt but that God, who created all those celestial bodies so various in form and beauty, can also restore human bodies to life, and invest them with greater beauty and perfection." And so Jaspis, and also Bp. Pearce, who introduces ver. 39 thus: "And that ye may the better conceive this difference of the body that is buried and the body that shall arise, consider, that even now there are several sorts of flesh," &c. Mr. Locke, too, thinks it evident that St. Paul's meaning is as follows: That God has given to the several sorts of animal bodies, in shape, texture, and organization, very different one from another, as he has thought good; and so he can give to men, at the resurrection, bodies of very different constitution and qualities from those they had before. And finally Mr. Valpy remarks: "Surely it is not more incomprehensible that a glorious, immortal body should arise from a mass of corruption, than that all this vast variety of forms and splendid beauties should arise from nothing." I would not deny that this may be the chief meaning of the Apostle, but under this is (I conceive) couched an allusion to the great individual difference in the condition both of the righteous and the wicked in a future state.

42. οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. There is not a little difficulty connected with these words and the following σπειρεταὶ ἐν φθορᾷ, &c. In the οὕτω καὶ—νεκρῶν there is an ellipsis. Mackn. would remove the difficulty by supplying, "is possible," which he thinks is required by the context. And this is somewhat countenanced by Rosenmuller's exposition.* But the ellipsis is too harsh to be ad-

* Which is as follows: "Quemadmodum nempe magna est varietas tot corporum celestium séquæ ac terrestrium, ita etiam alium et melius corpus alius usibus prospicere nobis potest Deus." And he adds: "Adduxerat hæc exempla Apostolus, non ut doceret, quid
mitted: neither is there any necessity to recur to it. Dr. Mack, indeed objects, that the common translation, so also is the resurrection of the dead, represents the resurrection as a matter of the same kind with those mentioned in the preceding verse, which it is not. But this is a misconception. We are not compelled to refer the words to what immediately precedes. The words may simply be rendered, “So is it with the resurrection of the dead.” And I think, with Mede, Disc. 23, that the Apostle means there is a difference of glory even in the celestial, which forms the subject of the forty-first verse, and therefore οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν is to be connected with it; and for the sake of clearness, the whole verse would be better in a parenthesis. Then at the words of ver. 42. Σταυρωθηται, it is sown in corruption, he resumes the subject of ver. 39 and 40, to show that there are different kinds of bodies. So also Bp. Pearce, who well paraphrases thus: “In the same manner will there be a difference in the bodies at the resurrection of the dead.” And so, long before him, Crell: “Ita etiam illi, qui ex mortuis resurgent, eorumve corpora differunt ab iis, qui ante resurrectionem habuerunt, tum qualitatum, tum ipsius etiam nature praestantia.” Or the expression may, he thinks, be thus explained: “ita etiam se habebit res in resurrectione mortuorum; habito nimirum respectu, ad corpora quae vel ante, vel post eam homines habeant, aut habitari sint.” Whence, he observes, there rightly follows σταυρωθηται et, &c. This view, too, is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators.

At σταυρωθηται there is an ellipsis, which Bp. Pearce would supply by taking σώματα out of the σωμάτων understood after the preceding word νεκρῶν. But

fieri necessario debat, sed ut doceret non absurdum a vero esse quod adversarii negarent; posse potius fieri. Ostendit nunc Apostolus, id certo etiam eventurum; fore autem illa futura corpora nostra longè diversissima caducis, fragilibus, sepultis et destructis, quandoquidem natura etiam multas corporum classes habeat.”
this, however ingenious, cannot be admitted. It is far less harsh to subaud sôma from the context, especially as both it and sôpè preceded. And this subaudition is adopted by the best modern Commentators. With respect to the term itself, it is (as in the case of ζωοντας at ver. 35.) adapted rather to the seed committed to earth, than to the body buried.

The best Commentators are agreed that the phrases ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐν ἄφθαρσία, &c. are, by Hebraism, sentences standing in the place of adjectives of a signification cognate with the nouns: as, for ἐν φθορᾷ, understand φθαρτῶν. The ἀτυχία has reference to that state of death, which, as being the punishment of sin, stamps disgrace upon it. (See Mackn.) Or it may be taken in a physical sense. For, as observes Theophyl., τὰ νεκρῶν ἀτυμοτερήν.

Most recent Commentators take συνερταὶ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ—δυνάμει as expressing the same with the preceding clause. But it should rather seem to denote the manifold frailties, weaknesses, and liabilities to sickness which flesh is heir to. The ἐν δυνάμει may be understood of that exemption from sickness as well as death which our glorified bodies shall enjoy: and Grot. thinks it may allude to new senses, of which we have now no conception. Upon the whole, however, no very clear ideas can we, at present, have on the exact difference between our earthly and our glorified bodies. Indeed no language could have made us comprehend that difference.* Let it be sufficient for us, that we are enabled to say, in the

* It is well observed by Dr. Mackn.: "The alteration to be produced in the contexture of the bodies of the righteous at the resurrection, described in this and the following verse, is indeed great and wonderful. But it is far from being impossible. For, to illustrate great things by small, we have an example of a similar, though inferior transformation in the bodies of caterpillars, which in their first state are ugly, weak, and easily crushed, but in their second state become beautiful winged animals, full of life and activity. This shews what God can do in greater instances."
words of the Divine Psalmist: "When I awake up
after thy likeness, I shall be satisfied with it."

44. σπείρεται σώμα ψυχικόν. The best Commen-
tators are agreed that ψυχ-, as being opposed to
πνευμ., (and especially as the expression is used with
a reference to the words of Moses respecting the
body of Adam, (ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχήν ζώσεως), must sig-
nify animal (literally that which draws in the breath
of life, necessary to the existence of all animal
bodies), that is endowed with faculties of sense, and
has need of food, drink, and sleep for its support.
It is plain (as Krause observes), per naturam dis-
junctorum, that πνευμ. signifies the reverse of all this,
i.e. not animal, and that requires respiration, but what
is accommodated to a spirit; and therefore must
denote what has no need of food, drink, sleep, &c.,
as not being meant for the transaction of worldly
affairs. Rosenm., too, observes that the body, which
at ver. 42. was called ἀφθαρτὸν, is now called πνευμ.,
as being accommodated to a spirit, and far excelling
all that is required for the transaction of earthly and
terrene affairs. "For in the notion of spirit (con-
tinues he) there is comprehended the idea that it
has in itself the cause of living and moving, and is
not dependent upon any thing else. Thus therefore
ψυχ. is what has from some other quarter the cause
of life and motion: πνευμ., what has in itself the
vis vivendi. Πνευμ. is by nature ἀφθαρτῶν; and ψυ-
χικῶν is, by nature, φθαρτῶν."

The words following ἐστε σώμα ψυχικόν, &c. con-
tain a repetition of the foregoing sentiment, and
that from earnestness, and to prevent misconception;
for after them must be supplied "to every such
human being so sown in corruption." Dr. Mackn.
has here a very long and able paraphrase, in which
he embraces and defends the sense assigned to the
words by the Greek Fathers and Commentators,
who by an animal body understand a body to the
animation of which the presence of an animal soul is
necessary; and by a spiritual body, a body of so fine
a contexture, that it will be supported merely by the presence of our rational spirit: yet notwithstanding this great difference, the body to be raised will, in a sound sense, be the same with the body that was buried." For the proofs and illustrations I must refer to the note itself.

Here Wets. aptly cites Psell. in Orac. Chald. δύο χιτώνας ἐπενδύωσι τὴν ψυχὴν οἱ Χαλδαῖοι καὶ τὸν μὲν πνευματικὸν αἰνόμασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ ἐξυφαιδεντα αὐτῷ.

45. οὕτω καὶ γέγραπται, "And so it is written;" namely at Gen. 2, 7. But only the first clause is there found: the second, namely ἐσχάτος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεύμα δωσοτοῦ is from the Apostle, and ought properly to have been introduced by some particle. Whitby well supplies whereas. The Apostle has indeed, as it were, formed an apodosis to the words of Moses. It is observed by Theodoret: τὸ πρῶτον ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν ἀνέγγυμεν, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγγυμεν. Yet Schoettg. would elicit both from the Hebrew words: and he remarks: "Allegatio autem haec tota ad morem Judæorum instituta est, ut illos eo melius de veritate propositionis suæ convinceret, idque ex principiis, quae ex religione pristinâ jam concesserant, Nemo vero putet, hoc sapientiâ Dei indignum: nam et argumenta κατ' ἂνθρωπον formata maximam subinde probandi vim habent."

By ἐσχάτος Ἀδὰμ is undoubtedly meant Christ. On which all Commentators up to the last century were agreed. The recent objections to this interpretation are so frivolous, that I think them not worth detailing. As to the new interpretations that have been proposed, that of Harduin makes ἐσχάτος ἂνθρωπος denote any man when brought into his glorified state. But this is exceedingly harsh. Very specious is that of Jehne (adopted by Krause and others), who understands the ἐσχ. Ἀδὰμ of man in his glorified state after the resurrection. But it is not near so natural an interpretation as the common one; indeed it is liable to many objections which
have been well stated by Slade as follows. "This sense is not foreign to ver. 44, 46., but it does not agree with the natural construction of ver. 47, 48.: indeed it can hardly agree at all, unless, with some MSS. we omit ἄ Κύριος. And even then, since the phrase, 'as is the earthy,' must refer to some prototype, viz. Adam, it seems to follow, that the corresponding phrase, 'as is the heavenly,' must also refer to some prototype, viz. Christ. And therefore ver. 47. may be regarded, in its natural and proper import, as a direct confirmation of the pre-existence of Christ. Compare Joh. 3, 13 and 31." Besides, nothing was more common with the Jews than to use these very expressions of Adam and the Messiah. (See Schoettg.)*

In the εἰς ψυχήν there is a Hebraism for ψυχή, and the εἰς πνεῦμα ἣν ἔσωσεν is adapted to it. In the latter clause ἐστι, not ἐγένετο, is to be supplied. The sense of ψυχή is what has been explained in the last verse. Christ is said to be a vivifying spirit.

It has been, I think, rightly remarked by Mackn., that the words ὁ ἐγενετος Ἄδαμ εἰς πνεῦμα ἣν ἔσωσεν are formed on what our Lord said at Joh. 5, 26. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so he hath given to the Son to have life in himself." And he adds: "As the Apostle is speaking here of Christ after he received his glorified body, he calls him a vivifying spirit, because the presence of his spirit in his glorified body is all that is requisite to preserve it alive for ever; and because he will communicate the same power to the spirits of the righteous, with respect to their bodies after the resurrection." See also the note of Locke.

The opinion of the antient Commentators on these

words is detailed by Whitby. It seems entitled to the attention which he evidently pays to it.

Γενά μήτης εἶτι, διὰ τι το ψυχικὸν σώμα καὶ χεῖρων νῦν ἔχομεν, τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν μέλλει; φησιν, ὅτι καὶ ἂρχαι ἐκατέρων ὅπως διετάγησαν καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀδὰμ πρῶτος ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὦστε ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἀεὶ τὰ ἑυμέτερα πρόεισιν καὶ πίστευε ὅτι καὶ τὰ νῦν ἐν σοι φθαρτά καὶ χεῖρα, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀφθαρτὸν καὶ κρύττον μεταστοιχειωθῆναι. (Theophyl.)

46. ἀλλ' ὁ πρῶτος τὸ πνευματικὸν, &c. sub. σώμα ἔστι. "That, however, was not first which is spiritual, and most excellent, but that which is vile and subject to disease; and then that which is spiritual." For God, in all his works, so orders it, that the more imperfect shall precede; the more perfect follow. Therefore, as God was pleased to assign to man a two-fold nature, one mortal, the other immortal, it was not expedient to assign this superior nature to him first, and make him, as it were, fall into a state of deterioration, and degradation; nay, indeed, it were against the nature of things for a mortal nature to succeed an immortal one. (Rosenm.)

The words ἔστιν τὸ πνευμ. might have been dispensed with; but they are added to determine the sense with greater certainty. So at 44. ἔστι σώμα ψυχικὸν, καὶ ἔστι σώμα πνευματικὸν.

47. ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπως ἐκ γῆς, χρυσός—ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. The first and the second man are here opposed to each other, as at ver. 45., the first and last Adam; and as, in the former case, the second Adam is Christ, so is here the second man (at least the same arguments that prove one prove the other); as is acknowledged even by Semler and Morus, both sufficiently prone to innovation in exposition. And as the former expressions, first and second Adam, are illustrated by numerous Rabbinical citations to be seen in Schoettg., so also are the present. I shall therefore take it for granted.

I must observe, that there seems to be no reason
for omitting Ἐὰν; as many Critics would do. I cannot, however, enter into the reasons for and against.

The words ἐκ οὐρανοῦ may either refer to the heavenly and Divine origin of Christ (as many ancient and modern Commentators understand them), or, as others, both ancient and modern, suppose, to the appearance of Christ from heaven at the last day. But the former opinion seems by far the better founded, and is ably supported by Bp. Bull, in his Jud. Eccl. Cathol. 5, 5. Theophyl well remarks, that the Apostle denominates the first man ἐκ τοῦ Χειρωνος; the second, ἐκ τοῦ κρείττονος.

48, 49. I would paraphrase thus: "As (was) the earthy, such also are (in origin) those that are earthy (i.e. they live in an animal body as he did); and (on the other hand) as is the heavenly, so are also they that are (to be) heavenly (i.e. to have shining and immortal bodies)." This exposition is confirmed by the Greek Commentators, and, of the moderns, by Whitby and others.

49. καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκώνα—ἐπορευόμενων, "And as we have borne, and do bear (for ἐφορ. may signify both) in our bodies the image, or characteristics of the earthly, (in frailty, sin, sorrow, and death,) so shall we bear the stamp of the heavenly, resembling Christ in our glorified and immortal frames (Phil. 3, 21.), and live in all purity," &c. It has been much controverted whether φορέσαμεν or φορέσομεν be the true reading. The latter is supported by many MSS. and Fathers, who would hence make the sentence hortatory. But that would be somewhat harsh; yet I doubt not the Apostle intended a sort of exhortation by inference; though he literally only predicts what we (i.e. all true Christians, such as we should aim at being) shall be. The future is supported by powerful MS. authority, and is confirmed by the context: for, as Whitby observes, from ver. 48. to the present verse, the Apostle passes on from what we were, to what we shall be; and having said, as is the heavenly, such are, i.e. shall be
literally are to be. Edit.], they that are heavenly; he proves this, because, as we have borne the image of the earthly Adam, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly.

Indeed, the reading φοβερομεν is susceptible of the same sense, viz. "we must bear," i.e. we are to bear, shall bear. The force of εικόνα is well pointed out and illustrated by Kypke, as used properly of statues, pictures, or other things formed after an archetype, and which represent it. (See his examples, or Schl. Lex.) Whitby has adduced some curious passages from Philo, where that spiritual Jew speaks on the same subject with the Apostle, and in terms strikingly similar. Philo had, no doubt, borrowed the comparison from his Jewish masters. For Schoettg. has adduced from the Rabbinical writers many passages containing very similar ones.

50. τούτο δὲ φημὶ, ὅτι σαρξ—δύνανται. Thus far the Apostle had taught that it was possible for God to give us bodies different from our present ones; now he teaches, that it must necessarily be that these shall be different from those. (Rosenm.)

The force of the formula τούτο δὲ φημὶ I have before illustrated. The expression σαρξ καὶ αἷμα is derived from the Heb. רַם, and denotes our earthly, frail, continually changing, and mortal* frames. These (it is said) cannot καλονομησαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, on which words it is not necessary to refine so much as do the Foreign Commentators. The sense is simply: "attain to, occupy, and enjoy that state of spiritual blessedness laid up in heaven for the just, that happy place (as says Mackn.) which Christ hath gone to prepare for his people." (Joh. 14, 2.) "In that place (adds he) bodies composed of flesh and blood cannot live, because, as is said in the commentary, it affords no objects suited either to the senses, or to the appetites of a fleshly body." So Rosenm.: "Quum autem constet, in hac felici-

* Thus Theodoret explains it: θνητὴν φύσιν.
tate nullum locum fore alimentis (1 Cor. 6, 13.) nullum machine, digerendis cibis aptæ, nullum procreandæ suboli (Luke 20, 54.) hoc est, nihil tale, quale est corporis carnosi succulentí et ad animales, quae dicuntur actiones facti: necessario sequitur, ut Deus σάρξ καὶ αἷμα, res non sempiternas, sed interiur- turas, nec sine alimentis duraturas, exsulare jubeat hoc suo regno." Perhaps by οὗ δύναται may simply be understood "it is impossible, in the nature of things, that flesh," &c. This is further explained in the words following, οὔτε η δοθή τὴν ἀθανασίαν κλη- ρονομεῖ, the sense of which may be best expressed by paraphrase; thus: "It is not possible, I say, for those fleshly, corruptible, and mortal frames, to enjoy a place fitted for incorruptible and immortal beings.*

51. ἵδον, μυστήριον ὅμως λέγω, &c. The scope of the Apostle in these words is strangely misunder- stood by many recent Commentators: which is the less excusable, since that had been well pointed out by Chrys. and the Greek Commentators, and also by our earlier modern Interpreters, especially Crellius. He observes, that the words are meant to encounter a tacit objection; q. d. "If this opinion, which you have so far defended, is to be admitted, it will be necessary that all the faithful should die, and lay down that body which they now bear, so that there may be place for another. But if you deny that men are to die, the bodies of all will not be changed. For how can they put on a new body, unless, by death, they lay down that in which they are now dressed?" To which the Apostle answers, "that all will not die, and yet all will be changed, i.e. these corruptible bodies will be changed for incorruptible ones." So Theophyl.: οὗ πάντες μὲν, φησίν, ἀποθα-

* So Mackn.: "A spirit clothed with a corruptible body, like our present bodies, cannot enjoy objects that are incorruptible. They are not capable of enjoying the divine vision, nor of perform- ing the exalted services, nor of relishing the pure pleasures which constitute the glory and felicity of the kingdom of God."
With respect to the μιστήριον, it is well observed by Rosenm., that it was not this, namely, that at the last day men would be living, for who would doubt that? but rather, that all men must undergo the change in question. Now this was a mystery, having been hitherto unknown, or not as yet revealed. The words may be rendered: "Behold, a mystery tell I you. We shall not (it is true) all die, but yet (on the other hand) we, i. e. such as are alive at the last day, shall (i. e. must) all be changed, i. e. put on that incorruptible and glorious frame in question (before we can enter the kingdom of heaven)." The Apostle plainly speaks in the person of those who shall be alive at the last day.

52. ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιτῇ—σάλπιγγι. The Apostle now indicates the mode and duration of this change. The expression ἐν ἀτόμῳ scil. χρόνῳ, and ἐν ῥιτῇ ὀφθαλμῷ were, it seems, both of them familiar and hyperbolic expressions denoting the shortest conceivable time. So Theodoret: τὸ σύντομον τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἔδειξεν. And Theophyl: οὗτῳ ταχέως ἔσται ὡς οὐδὲ ἐστίν εἰπέν. On the ῥιτῇ ὀφθαλμῷ. Wets. aptly cites Nyssen. ῥιτῇ δὲ ὀφθαλμῷ ἐπιμαινεῖ βλεφάρων ἔστι, καὶ τοιοῦτον ἔστι τάχυς, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἔτερον ὀφθαλμὸν γενόετο. Wets. has several other examples, but none with the ὀφθαλμῷ. The following elegant passage
of Eurip. Bacch. 746. will be found not inapposite: Θάσσεν δὲ διεθνοοίσιν σαμικάς ἐνυστά ὦς ξυναπεῖς βλέ-
φαρα βασιλείας κόρας.

52. ἐν τῇ ἐγχάτῃ σὰλπιγγί, "at the sound of the
last trump."

So almost all the Translators render. This, however, would imply
that several trumpets had been before sounded: and the Commenta-
tors refer to the seven trumpets said in the Revelation to be sounded.
But it is not well judged to regulate the sense of a plain prose pas-
sage like the present, with that of the sublimely metaphorical and
half poetic language of the rapt vision of a Prophet. Others advert
to the stories in the Rabbins,* where mention is made of seven
trumpets. Dr. Mackn. thinks there will be two sounds of the
trump. The circumstances of that awful period he ventures to put
down in order as follows: "At the descent of Christ from heaven,
a great noise, called the trumpet of God, 1 Thess. 4, 10., will be
made by the attending angels, as the signal for the righteous to
come forth from their graves. And this noise being made at Christ's
command, it is called by himself his voice, Joh. 5, 25. After the
righteous are raised, the trumpet shall sound a second time; on
which account it is called here the last trumpet. And while it sounds,
the righteous who are alive on the earth shall be changed." But
the "great noise" of the trumpet of God, mentioned at 1 Thess.,
may be the same with this. And I think there is no proof that St.
Paul, or any of the sacred writers, make mention of more than one
such.

I prefer taking ἔσχα, with Vat., in the sense "novissimo illo die."
And he paraphrases thus: "In novissimo illo die dederit tuba Dei
clangore suo signum Judicis instantis." Though, indeed, it would
be the last trumpet for judgment sounded in this world. And so
Crell: "Cum ultimo demum tempore tuba exaudietur."

52. σαλπίσει γὰρ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθοῦσιντω. The
Commentators are not agreed on what nominative is
here left to be supplied. Some, as E∑cumen., pro-
pose σαλπιγγέ: others ἀγγελος; as 1 Thess. 4, 16.;
or Θεος from Zach. 9, 14., which comes to the same
thing. But I prefer, with Rosenm., to suppose it

* So (as cited by Wets.) Jonathan f. Uziel Targum in Ex. 20, 19.
totus populus audiebant vocem tubae, quomodo resuscitaret mortuos. Othioth R. Akiba, f. 17, 3. Quomodo Deus S. B. mortuos in
seculo futuro resuscitat? Docemur, Deum magnam tubam, mille
ulnas, juxta ulnas Dei, longam, in manum sumpturum, eamque
inflaturum esse, ejusque sonum ab una extremitate mundi ad alte-
ram auditurum iri. Primo suo totus mundus commovetur. Se-
cundo pulvis separabitur. Tertio ossa conligentur. Quarto membra
incalcsent. Quinto capita tegentur cœta. Sexto anima et ani-
mae in corpora reducentur. Septimo reviviscit, et stabant vestiti.
put absolutely; as βροντάν and ὑεῖω, and other such words; just as we say: "It thunders." Thus it is not necessary to suppose any nominative. Though here, if a person be supposed, it may be indifferently either God, or the Lord, or one of the holy Angels. The chief question, however, is, what idea is to be formed of this sounding of the trump. Is it to be considered (with some Commentators ap. Pole and most recent ones,) simply metaphorice de preceptis et voluntate Christi? Certainly not. This would be too great a liberty. And yet the best Commentators tell us that there is here reference to the rites and customs of the Jews, as we find them in the Old Testament; among whom judgments were held, and solemn meetings convened by sound of trumpet. See Grot., Wolf, and Olearius *. And indeed the use of the trumpet for such purposes (especially the Olympic games) extended to the Greeks and Romans. Yet as σάλπιγξ and σαλπίζω are often used in the Scriptural and the Classical writers, of the pealing of thunder, so it may here be understood of some exceedingly violent and unusual crash of thunder, or perhaps of the awful roar produced by subterraneous convulsions, averred by travellers (as Humboldt,) to be a louder noise than that produced by a whole park of artillery. So the words μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης at Matt. 24, 31. may be understood. And this (I conceive) is undoubtedly the sense in Hebr. 12, 19. ώ γὰρ προσέλθατε ψηλαφωμίνῳ ὥρᾳ, καὶ κεκαυμένῳ τυρί καὶ γυάφῳ, καὶ σκότῳ, καὶ θυελλῇ, καὶ σαλπίγγος ᾦχῳ. In this sense (I find) it is taken by Schleus. in his Lex., who adduces several other examples from the Old Testament. This awful crash will, it is probable, be the sign by which the Almighty will issue his fiat for the end of all things as solemnly as, at the beginning, "He spake the

* And so Theophyl. on Matt. 24, 31. says the trumpet is mentioned πρὸς ἐπλείονα ἐκλήσιν. But this proceeds on a somewhat dangerous principle.
word, and they were made; he commanded, and they were created." For, as Theophyl. observes, ἵνα σάλπηγξ, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ τὸ κέλευσμα καὶ τὸ νείμα τοῦ Θεοῦ θελεῖ, τὸ διὰ πάντων φθάνων.

Thus it is not necessary to sink this tremendous and awful circumstance* into mere metaphor; which is cautiously to be avoided †.

52. καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐγερθοῦνται ἄ. Some modern Commentators say that the καὶ has the sense of statim. It rather signifies "and then" (immediately)." Thus it often denotes celerity of action. See Ps. 33, 9, 148, 5. Judith 16, 14. Joh. 5, 20. Genes. 1, 3. OEcumen. well explains, ἐγερθοῦνται ἀνακλάγμενοι καὶ ἄφθαρτοι.

Καὶ ἀναγγέλωμεν. The καὶ may be rendered "and then." By the we the Greek Commentators, and the earlier and more judicious moderns understood "we who are then alive." For the Apostle here (as often) uses a μετασχηματιζόμενος, and speaks

* To which I would apply the solemn language of Ἑσυχιλ. Pers. 401. Σαλπηγγίζετε δ' αὐτῷ πάντα ἐκεῖν' ἐπέφλεγεν.
† And here I may be permitted to introduce a passage from a sermon which I preached, ten years ago, at the Primary Visitation of the late Bishop of Peterborough, p. 17 & 18. "What subject can be more awful than the change which awaits us at the day of judgment? But how does the Apostle describe it? In a moment—in the twinkling of an eye—at the last trump!—for the trumpet shall sound! where, you perceive, the 'last trump' is the last and great circumstance which he introduces, and upon which also he insists; for the trumpet,' he says, 'shall sound.' The learned and the unlearned reader, the poet, and the painter, when the day of judgment is the subject, are alike struck with the circumstance of the last trump awakening men from the slumber of death, and summoning them to the tribunal of their heavenly Judge. In this gorgeous imagery, the Apostle seems to have had in view the well-known blast of the trumpet sounding the signal to start, when, at the Corinthian games, the chariots rushed impetuously from the barrier toward the goal." As an instance of this, I would adduce a passage of almost unparalleled beauty in Soph. Elect. 709. Στάντες δ' ἐν τοῖς οἱ τεταγμένοι βραβεῖς Κλήρους ἐκπιάν, καὶ κατέστησαν δίφρους, Ἀλκής ὑπὲρ σαλπηγγός ἔδωκεν. And that trumpets are used on the more solemn religious occasions, we find from Thucyd. 6, 32. τῇ μὲν σαλπηγγῇ αὐτῇ ὑπεσμάνθη, εὐχαὶ δὲ τὰς νομισμένας ὑπὸ Κλήρους ἐπιοίητον.
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not in his own person, but in theirs.* (See the note of Grot. and Mackn.) OEcumen. admirably observes: Εἴ τοῦτον γὰρ οὐκ ἐστιν ἔγερσις, τῶν μηδὲ κοιμηθέντων, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἐναλλαγῆ, ὁι μὲν νεκροὶ οἱ προστεθοῦντες, ἔγερθησονται ἀφθαρτοὶ, οἱ δὲ ζῶντες τὸ τὰς ἐγερθήσονται; μόνον οὐς ἐν ὑπη ἀλλαγῇσονται εἰς ἀθανασίαν.

55. δεὶ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, &c. It is rightly observed by OEcumen., that these words are meant to explain the nature of the ἐναλλαγῆ, or change just before mentioned, viz. ἐκ φθαρτοῦ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ ἐκ ζησοῦ εἰς ἀθανασίαν. He and the other antient Commentators all regard the τοῦτο (which the modern translators and Commentators overlook) as said δεικτικῶς. And when we connect this with the ημειώσ just before, it will appear, that the Greek Commentators (and, of the moderns, Mackn.)† have done well in understanding the last words of those who shall be alive at the last awful trumpeting. Rosenm. and other Commentators refer them to the 50th verse, as if this were a repetition of what was there said: and such was formerly my own opinion, and I considered ver. 51, and 52. as parenthetical. But I now see that that position is untenable.

The expression ἐνδύσασθαι has (I think) been unwarrantably employed by all the antient and some modern Commentators to countenance the notion, that our corruptible body shall have an incorruptible

* Considering the frequency of this μετασχηματισμὸς (which is here recognised by Chrys.) in St. Paul, I think Doddr. was right in not admitting the inference, so often drawn from hence, (and unwarily conceded by Grot. and Rosenm.), that the Apostle expected he should live till Christ appeared for judgment.

† His words are these: "The righteous who are alive at the coming of Christ, instead of dying and rising again immortal, shall, by the power of Christ, have their corruptible mortal bodies changed in a moment, into incorruptible immortal bodies, and by that means be fitted for inheriting the kingdom of God, equally with those who are raised from the dead incorruptible."
body put over it for a covering; which I think (as Mackn. observes) would be incongruous. However, on so mysterious a subject I desire to pronounce no certain opinion, since no certainty can be attained. *ead. may be taken (as often) in a *figurative* sense, for *invest, confer on, bestow*, of which Krause adduces examples from Job. 8, 22. 29, 14. Jef. 41, 9. and Hom. Il. a. 149. 'Ω μοι, αναιδείν ευλ ειμεν, &c.

54. Jam absolutam suis numeris omnibus perfectamque resurrectionem sætissima facie depingit: Si quando universum genus humanum restauratum, ab omni periculo et metu mortis liberatum, naturam immortalem æternamque consequutum fuerit; tum demum plenum exitum habebit illud oraculum Jesaiæ 25, 8. (Krause.)

Τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, &c. "then shall be fully accomplished the words of the prophecy of Is. 25, 8., &c. in this quotation, which agrees with Theodotio, though not with the Sept, (and both differing from the Hebrew) the words *eis νῦν* have caused no little perplexity. They answer to *τῆλι*. All the Greek Commentators explain the *eis νῦν* by *eis τέλος*, i. e. *eis τὴν αἰώνα*. And thus many modern Commentators, as Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Pyle, Rosenm., Krause, and Schleus. And this sense is frequent in the Sept. (See Schl. Lex.) Yet the common signification of *νῦν* may be equally well maintained, and is learnedly and satisfactorily vindicated by Bp. Marsh on Michael. T. I. p. 127, to whose admirable note I must refer the reader. The learned Prelate has completely proved that *eis τέλος* may here be very well rendered *with triumph, victoriously*. And the very same sense I would apply to it at a difficult passage of Matt. 12, 23.

After all, it is a matter of little consequence *which* sense be adopted; since both *come to the same thing*; as has been shown by Crel. whose note contains more valuable matter than I have found in all the other modern commentators. He has here most
successfully reconciled the words of the Prophet and of the Apostle.*

* It is indeed a model for annotation on such passages of the New Testament writers as are quotations from, or allusions to, the Old Testament, and as such I shall (though it be long) lay it before my readers. "Absorpta, vel perdidit, intellige, Dominus, mortem in sempiternum: quod hic habemus, absorpta est mors in victorian. Sensus planè idem est. Verba prophetæ sunt satis clara. Id enim sibi volunt, Deum ita absolutum mortem, ut in sempiternum nullum amplius locum in suo populo, de cujus felicitate ibi vaticinatur propheta, sit habitura, id quod non aliter fiet aut vi divinæ sapientiae fieri potest, quæm nobis immortalibus effectis. Nam si nos naturā immortales ac incorruptibles non feremus, necesse esset, Deum perpetuā singularique curā singularum fidelium vitam ac corpora tueri adversus res omnes, quae vitam nobis eripere possent. Atque longè Dei sapientiae convenientius est, ut, si nolit nos in ætternum mori, semel nos natura immortales effectis, quam ut ejusmodi sustentatione et perpetua, ut ita dicam, vite nostræ custodia sit opus.

Non est quidem negandum, hæc ipsa prophetæ verba alium pati sensum, coeque quem exposuimus, imperfectiorem, quem siteri vocare solent: sed sacræ litterae novi foederis mysticæm vaticiniorum sensum et nuleum, non corticem; corpus ipsum non umbra; spectare solent. Et hic quidem verba ipsa adeo sunt praegrantia, ut propriè mystico tantum sensui conveniant; impropriè tantum literali. Neque enim semper mysticus figuratus est, literalis proprius, et ab omni tropo semotus; sed sœpe contra; id quod non paucis scriptura locis ostendi posset, si eâ re nunc opus esset. Sed aliud nunc agimus.


In autem apud Paulum his expositur verbis: absorpta est mors in victorian. Primum quod apud prophetam actiæ propositur, ut ipsa agentis persona indicetur, tanquam ἀρὸ κοινων repetenda; id hic passivè, agentis personâ suppressâ, dicitur, absorpta est. Sed interea facilè intelligi potest, a quo debat illa mors absorberi, seu penitus deleri. Quoniam enim, nisi a Deo? Deinde quod hic dicitur, in victorian, id ibi est in perpetuum, seu in ætternum, idque propter eam, quod vox nozah ab eo descendat verbo, quod vincerae significat. Unde veteres interpretantes non semel idem nomen cum
55. τού σου, δόκασαι, τὸ κέντρον—νῦν; The words here rise above the plain and simple language of an epistle, and resemble an hymn, into which the Apostle breaks out, filled with an inward feeling of beatitude, and, as it were, triumphing at the utter abolition of death. (Krause.) So Theophyl. And thus Theodoret: οἶδα παιαίσαν κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων τὴν προφητικὴν ἔλευθερον ἀδημ. And also Æcumen.

The words of the Apostle are, according to the opinion of all the ancient and most modern Commentators, taken from Hos. 13, 14. Sept., with some slight alteration, proceeding (as Rosenm. thinks) from the citing memoriter. And he thinks that the Sept. read ἐπὶ for ἐν.

Many recent Commentators, however, as Dodd, Krause, and Jehne, deny that the words are taken from the Prophet; and Krause thinks the Commentators have most unsuccessfully laboured to prove that point. He possibly had not read the able annotation of Crellius, who (I think) has entirely proved the point in question.

On the import of Hades, Slade refers to Bp. Pearson on the Creed Art. 5., and Barrow on the same, as also Archbishop Magee on the word ἔνωθι Illustr. No. 41. I have myself treated upon the subject at large on the Gospels. It is observed by Theophyl., that the difference between ἄδημ and δόκασαι is, that the former holds fast the souls, the latter, the bodies only of men, their souls being immortal.

On the allusion in κέντρον, Commentators are not agreed. Some think it one derived from hunting. Others think there is reference to the notions of the
Jews, who represented the angel of death with an uplifted dart, or spear.* But to this Krause objects, that the sacred writers represent the destroying angel with a sword; as 1 Paral. 21, 15 & 16., Gen. 3. 24., and that κέντρον is never used to denote a sword, but only a goad, with which to drive cattle (in which sense Schoettg., absurdly enough, takes the word here) ; as Prov. 26, 8. Sir. 38, 26 Acts 9, 5. The κέντρον, however, was properly used of the spear or dart, which would very well correspond to the representations of death by many poets, ancient and modern.

But the Greek Commentators have (I think) best discerned the force of the metaphor, which seems to be derived from the sting of serpents, scorpions, or other venomous monsters. So Theophyl. on the next words, τὸ δὲ κέντρον τοῦ δανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία, remarks: Δι’ αὐτῆς γὰρ ἵσχυν, ὅπως τινὶ καὶ κέντρον ταύτην χραμένος. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ σκοπίως αὐτὸς μὲν ἐστὶ βασίλειον τι μικρόν, ἐν δὲ τῷ κέντρῳ τῷ ἵσχυν ἔχει. Examples of this signification of κέντρον would be superfluous. Suffice it to say that it occurs in Apoc. 9, 10. καὶ ἔχουσιν υἱὸς ὁμοίας σκοπίων, καὶ κέντρα ἤν ἐν ταῖς ωφαῖς αὐτῶν, where it is probable St. John had in view the above passage of Hosea. This mode, too, of taking the κέντρον, is adopted by Grotius, Vorst., Crell., and Krause. Now the sting of such creatures constitutes (as Theophyl. observes) their strength; and when that is taken away, they cannot hurt if they would. So is it with death and the grave.

As δανάτος and Ἀϑής are personified † in this spirited apostrophe, we are warranted in taking the

* So Milton, Par. Lost, 2, 666., where, after describing Death as "A shape formless, fierce as ten furies, terrible as hell;" he proceeds, "And shook a dreadful dart." And so also in the fine Epitaph of Pope: "Death his dart shook, but delay’d to strike."

figure in the foregoing manner, and understanding it of some monster of the serpent tribe. Though, after all, the κέντρον can only be really understood of that power in death and the grave, of exciting corporeal or mental agony. Thus Krause compares the use of κέντρον in Aristoph. Nub. 449., where the Schol. explains it φρυτὴν, χαλεπον.

56. τὸ δὲ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου, ἡ ἁμαρτία, &c. This sentence, the whole structure and air of which is Hebrew, I would render: "Moreover it is sin* that is the sting (i.e. the cause) of death; and it is the law that is (i.e. causes) this power of sin, which imparts this power to sin," namely, of producing the bitterness of death, and the horror which we feel of it. With the δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας Commentators compare the κράτος θανάτου in Heb. 2, 14.

Now the more remote cause of this is ascribed to ἰ νώμος, which most recent Commentators, as Rosenm., and, of the earlier ones, Tirin. and Est., take to denote the Mosaic law. "The Apostle (says Rosenm.) shows that by the Mosaic law neither is the power of sin broken, nor the penalty of death removed." True; but was the Apostle addressing himself to Jews? No. To Greeks. Indeed, I can never cease to protest against the error into which so many Commentators run, by almost invariably confining νώμος to the law of Moses. Surely, when there is nothing to limit its signification, it must denote law in general. And that this sense should be ascribed to it here, is required by the acknowledged circumstances of the Corinthian Church, which consisted chiefly of converted Gentiles; though some of its members were Jews. In this way, it is plain, the ancient Commentators understood the word; and so did many eminent early modern Commentators, especially Grot. and Crel. Examples of

* Of course, by sin must be understood both original sin, derived from that of our first parents, and actual sin. This I should not have thought it necessary to mention, but that almost all Commentators omit to notice it.
this sense of νίκας are adduced by Grot. from Rom. 3, 20. 4, 16. 5, 13. 8, 2 & 7. I Cor. 9, 21. (See the notes on those passages, especially the first.)

The ancient Commentators, I must observe, (to whom Grot. and Crell. have here been much indebted), clearly point out on what pivot the understanding of these words turns. Thus Theodor. cites Rom. 5, 13. ἀμαρτία γὰρ οὐκ ἐκλογεῖται µὴ ὄντως νίκας (where see the note). And so Rom. 4, 13. "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." Theoph. admirably explains thus: ὅτι τοῦ νίκας μὲν µὲν ὄντως, ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ ἀμαρτάνοντες, οὐχ οὕτω κατεκχομένες. ὅτι δὲ νίκας φανερώτατα αὐτῶν, κατέχουν µᾶλλον ἡμᾶς, αἰς ἐν γνώσει ἀμαρτάνοντας· καὶ ἵσχυρὰν αὐτὴν ἑποίησεν, οὐ παρὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ῥαβδομαλίαν, τῶν µὴ καλῶς χρησιμότατος τῶν δοθέντι φαρμάκω. And so Ὁκεμ. 581 Λ. ὅτι ἐκτὸς νίκας ἀσθενής ἐν ἡ ἀμαρτία κατὰ ἀγνοσίαν γενομένη· ὅτι δὲ νίκας αὐτῶν φανερώτατα, κατέχουν µᾶλλον ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐνεργῶν καὶ ἱσχυρὰν ἑποίησε καὶ ἡμᾶς, οὐ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν ἡμῶν κακίαν. It is scarcely necessary to add more. The most complete explanation may however be found in the able note of Crellius.

57. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάριν—Χριστοῦ. This Raphel and Wolf interpret: "who giveth us a sure promise of victory at the last:" and the former cites Xen. Cyr. νικῆν διδόσας. And he observes: "Nos frui quidem hac victoria jam nunc ex parte, sed plenē perfectēque eam nobis obtingere, quando Christus etiam corpora nostra, a morte liberata, ad vitam immortalem traduxerit." Which Wolf approves. It depends, however, on the sense in which ἡμῶν is to be understood: if of all who profess the religion of Christ, God may be said to be the giver of that which he offers to all, through the medium of Christ's atonement; if of true Christians, God may be said literally to give that which, by the merits of the Redeemer, they will receive. The Apostle (I conceive) means the latter.

By the τῷ νίκας, the victory mentioned in the verse
preceding, is to be understood that over death, the grave, and sin, which occasioned them, and im-
parts to them their peculiar bitterness. And this "victory" is given us by the Lord, θεὸς Κυρίου, which
does not mean merely what our recent Commenta-
tors interpret it, "by the doctrine of Christ, and
that of the resurrection of the dead." It must surely
include the atonement procured by the death and
sacrifice of Christ.* The most sound and judicious
exposition I have yet seen of the verse is that of
Theophyl. (partly from Chrys.): Τοῦ μὲν Κυρίου
Ἰησοῦ ὁ ἀγαθόν, ἡμῖν δὲ τὸ νῖκος δέδοται: οὐκ ἐξ ἄμαρτης,
οὐδὲ κατὰ ὑθελήν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χάριν, καὶ φίλανθρωπίαν
τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός, ὃς ἡμῖν ἐποίησε νικάν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθὸς
τοῦ οὐκ οὕτως. It would be inexcusable if we Chris-
tians should forget that salvation is the χάρις τοῦ
Θεοῦ, when we find even the Pagans using the ex-
pression χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ on comparatively trifling oc-
casions. So Epict. 4, 4. p. 382. Τότε καὶ ἐγὼ ἡμᾶς-
tανον, νῦν δὲ οὕκει, χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, "At such a time I
was apt to fall into such a fault, but I am free from
it now, thanks to God.

On sin, here alluded to, Grot. observes: “In
Novo Fœedere plerumque significat aut consuetudini-
num peccandi, aut etiam malefacta ἐκ πρωτέρεσιν. 
Sic, qui natus est ex Deo, non peccat.”

It is well observed by Theophyl., that this im-
portant chapter on the resurrection is made to end,
as it were, with a hymn in praise of the Giver of it.
And Mackn. truly remarks: “The victory over
death and the grave the saints shall obtain by their
resurrection to an endless life in the body; and the
victory over sin, and over the curse of the law, will
be given them by their acquittal at the judgment.
For their trial being then ended, there shall, from
that time forth, in the kingdom of God, be neither
sin, nor law, with the penalty of death annexed
to it.”

* So Jaspis: “qui peccatum, unde humano generi omnis mi-
seria et ipsa mors profecta est, expiavit, mortemque superavit.”
58. ἀπε, ἀδελφῷ μου ἁγιαστα, ἐδραίοι γίνεσθε. The ἀπε has an illative and conclusive force.

The Apostle concludes this most important and interesting discussion, on the resurrection of the dead, with an exhortation to that firmness in the faith which might be expected to result from such important disclosures, on these points of mystery, as he had imparted, and also such steadfast perseverance in virtue, and holiness of life, as might be expected from those who had such hopes of resurrection and glorification, and without which, all faith, however firm, would be vain and fruitless.

On the force of the terms here employed, not much needs be said. In ἐδραίοι there is, perhaps, an allusion to a statue.* (See the note on 7, 37.) Wolf, however, thinks both terms, ἐδραίοι and ἀμετακίνητοι, have an allusion to wrestling, and denote the standing one's ground. Cyrill, in his Lex. explains: ἐδραίοι, σταθερόν, ἀσάλευτον, στερεόν. Hesych. ἐδραίοι, σταθερόν, ἀσάλευτον. There is here a climax, and not (as Grot. says) a repetition of the same thing. The ἀμετ. is a still stronger term: and yet it cannot be taken in the full sense implied in immovable, and (as Grot. and Mackn. observe) can only mean unmoved; and such forms in τοῖς denote either what may be done, or what is done.† Slade, indeed, maintains that "this is weakening the spirit of the exhortation, which he thinks imports that they should aim at perfection;" appealing to Matt. 5, 48. But this remark is not justified by the authority of any Commentator, ancient or modern, and is unworthy of the good sense which commonly characterizes his annotations. It would have been more to the purpose to have remarked, that in these terms

* So Simonid. (ap. Grot.) calls a good man χερσί τε καὶ ποσί καὶ νοῦ τεράγων. So Young: "On reason build resolve, that column of true majesty in man."

† In a popular sense the latter may be tolerated. Hence the ἀμετακίνητος is sometimes, by climax, added (as here) after a term denoting firmness; as Dionys. Hal. 8, 74. (cited by Schleus. Lex ) βίβαλον τε καὶ ἀμετακίνητον ἐν τοῖς κριθείσιν.
the Apostle had (as the Greek Commentators tell us) especial reference to the doctrine of the resurrection. For, as Theophyl. observes, ἐπεξεύοντο ἐν τοῖς πεῖρασματίσεως λόγοις. And so Jehne and Krause.

58. πειρασματίσεως ἐν τῷ ἐργῳ τοῦ Κυρίου. In the explanation of these words, many modern Commentators dwell too much on the πείρασμα, which Grot. interprets: "doing more than any one would venture to require of you." And in much the same manner it is understood by Bp. Pearce; who renders it excelling. And so Beza, who renders it: ut cæteros exsuperatis." But though the word has sometimes this sense, yet I do not see how it can here be thought of.* And Grotius’s interpretation would favour the Popish notion of works of supererogation. Theophyl. has well expressed the sense by οὐ μόνον αὐτὸ ἐργαζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ πειρασμάτων αὐτὸ ποιοῦντες, "endeavouring continually to make a greater progress." And so Οὐκεμην.: οὐ μόνον αὐτὸ ἐργαζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πειρασματίσεως ἐν χρησταις πράξεωι. (See also Theodoret.) So also Schleus. Lex.; who explains: "exacte præstate quæ Deus a vobis postulat."

But, with respect to the ἐργον τοῦ Θεοῦ, it does not signify (as many Roman Catholic Commentators explain) almsgiving, nor, as many Protestant Commentators seem to think (see Doddr.), "doing what may especially further the spread of the Gospel;" still less (as Jehne and Krause) "a fuller knowledge of Christ’s resurrection." But, as the exhortation is

* In this, indeed, there is something harsh and frigid; as if the Apostle had meant no more than what is expressed in the Homeric couplet: πέμπε δὲ μ’ ἐς Τροίην, καὶ μοι μάλα πολλ’ έπέστελλεν ἁρπαγέωιν, καὶ ἐπεροχόν ἔμμεναι ἐλλων. Such a principle as ambition or emulation, the Apostle no where deigns to inculcate. And though Milton sings:

"Fame is the spur that the clear spirit doth raise,
(That last infirmity of noble mind)
To scorn delights, and live laborious days,"
Yet by the term "infirmity," the Christian Poet hints at the inferior nature of this stimulus.
general, and the motives general, so the sense must be so: “doing all that the Lord would have us do as Christians,” including virtue of every kind. So the Greek Commentators and Vorst. Fiscat. would introduce faith. But that is out of place. It is of good works the Apostle here speaks, which, it seems (out of disbelief or distrust of the resurrection), many had neglected.

The πάντωσε has great force, and yet more, as being placed last in the sentence.

58. εἰδότες ἐστι ὁ κόσμος ὑμῶν, οὐκ ἐστι κενὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ, “knowing, and being well assured (as ye well may) that your labour is not (will not) be vain in the Lord.” Theophyl. well paraphrases: “firmly expecting that there will be a resurrection, and that whatever ye labour after, ye shall by no means lose.” Formerly they had, it seems, neglected the moral virtues, not believing in the resurrection, and therefore not caring to labour in vain.

Theophyl. rightly takes the ἐστι for ἐσται. The word κόσμος suggests the idea of great activity in good works; q. d. “though you labour ever so much in the performance of good works, it shall never be vain.” In ω κένον Grot. and others notice the Li- totes; q. d. “it shall be abundantly productive.” But I am inclined to think that the Apostle purposely made use of the expression, to hint at that modesty which all human works should ever be spoken of with reference to any reward.

Grot. here draws the inference: “Si verum est dogma de Resurrectione, nullus labor gravis videri debet. Quid enim suavius vitâ, sâque immortali ac beatissimâ.”

Finally, the words ἐν Κυρίῳ admit of at least two explanations. Either we may suppose an hyperbaton, and take them with ὁ κόσμος, i.e. “your labour, done in the service of the Lord, and in obedience to his commands;” which is supported by the best ancient and modern Commentators; or ἐν Κυρίῳ may be taken for παρὰ Κυρίῳ, “apud Domi-
num," "in the sight of God;" which is countenanced by some ancient and modern authorities, and is somewhat more significant. Theophyl. and Bp. Pearce explain it: "in dependence on his help, and his having, by his resurrection, obtained resurrection for us." But this seems harsh. Nor is the Apostle here adverting to the resurrection.

CHAP. XVI.

Chrys. and Theophyl. connect this with the last Chapter, thus: "The Apostle having finished the subject of doctrines, and now proceeding to treat of moral duties and virtues, leaves the rest, and enters upon that of the queen of virtues, almsgiving." This, however, seems too formal and systematical.* Yet there is (I think) little doubt but the mention of the ἐργαν τῶ Κυρίου brought into the Apostle's mind the collection for the relief of poor Christians.

VERSE 1. περὶ δὲ τῆς λαογιας τ. ε. τ. ἀ., "the collection." By the use of the article, it is plain that the Apostle refers to it as to something of which he had already spoken to them.† The word λαογια, which seems to have been Hellenistical and idiomatic, is nowhere else met with in Scripture, and rarely in the Classical writers; though that it was sometimes used

* As much in the other extreme is the remark of the recent Commentators. that the Apostle, as usual at the end of his Epistles, assembles together several minuter directions on which to give his opinion, and commences with this. See Mackn. and Dodd.

† Mackn. observes, that during his eighteen month's abode at Corinth, he had exhorted the brethren to undertake that good work (as, indeed, he did the brethren in all the Gentile churches), with a view to establish a cordial union between the converted Jews and Gentiles every where. (See 2 Cor. 9, 14.) And so desirous were the Corinthians of the proposed union, that, on the first mention of the collection, they agreed to make it. But the divisions in the church at Corinth, it seems, had hitherto hindered them from beginning it. The Apostle, therefore, in this letter, requested them to set about it immediately, and directed them how to do it," ver. 1—4. I would add, that such collections for poor and learned Palestine Jews had been in frequent use.
appears from the gloss of Hesych. λογια, καρποφορια. So that there is no occasion, with Downes and Grot., to read ευλογία. Bp. Pearce rightly observes that "it is nothing rare for simples to bear the signification of their compounds." None of the Commentators, however, seem to have discerned the true force of the words, or the reason why St. Paul used it instead of another and more common word, as συλλογή, which seems to be as follows. As λέγω was often used for ἀναλέγω (So often in Hom. See Damm. Lex. Hom.), to pick up, and, from the adjunct, to gather (like the Latin lego), so λογία seems to have denoted a gleaning, or gathering; as is certain from the gloss of Hesych.; for καρποφορια and ἐυλογία signify this, and ἐπιλεγέσθαι is often used in the sense to glean. The word, therefore, seems to be employed out of modesty, and to hint to them that it is only a slight gleaning, or gathering, collected from the whole body, and therefore not burthen some to any individual. This is (I find) confirmed by Theophyl. in loc.: λογίαν δὲ καλεῖ τὴν συλλογήν, κοῦφον εὖδος τὸ πράγμα ποιῶν ἐκ προομίαν. It may very well be rendered contribution.

1. εἰς τῶν ἁγίων. The preposition here denotes destination for, for the use of, relief of; and after τῶν must be supplied some verb from the context. By τῶν ἁγίων is undoubtedly meant simply the Christians.* and not saints, as in our English translation. These were (as we learn from other quarters) the Christians in Palestine, who, living among such bitter persecutors as were the Jews, were often spoiled of their property, or, at least, were, in many ways, impeded in their endeavours to gain a livelihood: on which subject see Zorn's Opusc. Sacr. 1. 693. And on the mode of distribution of alms pursued by the Jews, (who would, perhaps, be here a model), see Vitring. de Vet. Syn. Jud. p. 814.,

* So Wolf and Schoettg., the latter of whom refers to J. C. Hebenstreit's Christianismum πολυφυρμον.
Carpzov. de Eleem. Hebr., and other works referred to by Wolf.

1. διέταξα. The sense of this word is, by some, very unwarrantably pressed upon, as if it meant commanded. It simply implies directed, enjoined, appointed, ordained, by ecclesiastical authority. Thus 1 Cor. 7, 17. (where some MSS. have, by a gloss, διδάσκω) 9, 14, 11, 34. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ὡς ἂν ἐλθὼ, διαιτάξομαι. The sense, then, is: "as I directed to be done by the churches of God." At διέταξα must be supplied ποιήσαι, or ποιεῖσθαι, from ποιήσατε. It is rightly observed by Krause, that this seems added in order to excite the rich Corinthians to follow the example of other Churches far inferior in wealth: and also (it may be added, as Schilting suggests,) that they might not think themselves alone burthened.

2. The Apostle now tells them the order pursued in the churches of Galatia, which they were themselves to observe.

2. κατὰ μίαν σαββάτου. The Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that this signifies "on the first day of the week," μίαν being used, by a Hebraism, for πρῶτον; as Matt. 28, 1. (where see the note), and other passages, which may be seen in Schl. Lex. The truth is, that σαββάτος was sometimes used in the sense week; so that one may literally render: "on the first (of the days) of the week," i.e. of each week; κατὰ being used distributively. Thus Theophyl. explains: τὴν πρῶτην τῶν τοῦ σαββάτου ἡμέραν τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἡμέραν, i.e. (he adds) τὴν Κυριακὴν. Grot. remarks, that the Jews made collections in the week,* and distributed them on the Sabbath; but the Christians made these collections principally on the Sabbath and Lord's day; though, as the Jewish Christians, observant of the Jewish customs, transacted no money concerns on the Sabbath,

* Yet, as we learn from Schoettg., they were permitted by the law to do this on the Sabbath. "And this (says he) the Apostle not only permits, but also enjoins."
therefore the day following was more suitable to this purpose." On the almsgiving of the early Christians Rosenm. refers to Just. Mart. Apol. 1, § 88.

It is truly observed by Whitby, that this text is an evidence, that the first day of the week was particularly set apart by Christians for sacred purposes; this the Fathers testify, as Just. Mart. Apol. 1, 98, 99. ed. Thirlby. Ign. ad Magnes. § 9. Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 744, ed. Lutet. Orig. contra Cels. 8. p. 392. ed Spencer. "No good reason (adds he) can be given, why the day should have been so particularized, but that it was appointed for the worship of our Lord; and since it was a commemoration of his mercy and love, works of charity were on this day peculiarly appropriate."

2. παρ' ἐαυτῷ τιδέτω, i.e. "at home." Röe compares the French chez lui. And Krause cites Joseph. Ant. ⅩⅠ, 10. where οἰκᾶς and παρ' ἐαυτῷ are joined, as synonymous. Plut. Alcib. Ⅳ. ἐκείνους οἰκᾶς καμίμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, and Philo p. 116 Α. ταμευσάμενοι δὲ παρ' ἐαυτῶς φυλάττετε θησαυροῦ. Τιθ. is for ἀποτιθ., seponat.

2. δ,τι ἀν εὐδοκαί. Here δ,τι is for καθ᾿ ὅ ἢ καθ᾿ ὃς. See Matth. Gr. Gr. Εὐδοκεῖται signifies properly "to be set forward on one's way," and figuratively "to be prospered," as in Rom. 1, 10. εἰσιν εὐδοκησομαι. and 3 Joh. 2. εὔχομαι σε εὐδοκήσοι. The Philological Commentators compare several passages of the Classical writers, most of them, however used, of a thing, not, as here, of a person. So Herod. c. 78. ὁς τῷ Κλέομεν εὐδοκοῦν τὸ ἐς τῶν Δημαρχῶν πτῶγμα. Loesner and Krause observe, that in the New Testament the word is used in the middle voice; though in the Classical writers generally in the active. But in the New Testament the passive is used, and there is a tacit reference to the Almighty. We are therefore to understand ὑπ᾿ τῶν Θεῶν. So Theophyl. ἐπὶ αὐτὸς ἐκ τῆς πέμψῃ. And so ÓEcumen. Krause refers to similar expressions, as καθὼς ἡπορεῖτο τις in Acts 11, 29, and καθὸ ἦν ἔχῃ τις in 2 Cor. 8, 12. But the
difference is, that in those no reference is made to the help or blessing of God.

The antient Commentators remark on the admirable judgment shown in the direction, "to lay it up by little," lest it should happen that they might, at the final collection, be able to contribute a comparatively small sum. Besides, as Wet. observes, any one is sooner persuaded to contribute small sums often, than a great deal at once. Here I cannot omit to notice a difficulty which the modern Commentators make (though, I think, causelessly,) at θησαυρίζων. Locke, Doddr., and Mackn., would have it understood of the common treasury; since, if the money were only laid up at home, there would still be, what the Apostle wished should be avoided, a collection when he came. To avoid which difficulty, they render πας έκτεταί by itself. But this the usus loquendi will not permit. Bp. Pearce would read θησαυρίζανεν, which he renders: "that he may bring it to the treasury." But I very much doubt if this would be good Greek, and I know no instance of θησ. in this sense. The Bishop thinks that the layings up were weekly, and the contributions to the common treasury were monthly; and he cites Ter- tull., to prove that monthly contributions were made. Dr. Wells and Mr. Slade do not indeed read θησαυρίζανεν, but interpret θησ. so as to unite both the expositions; which, however, cannot be admitted. So many scruples need not have been raised on this difficulty, had the Commentators reflected, that the Apostle only meant that there should be no έλοχίαι, or private and petty gatherings then first to be made, when he came, but only one συνεισφορὰ containing all the sums which had been laid up by each in private. So Theophyl. αις έκ' οφειν αυτοῦ μελλούσης έσεαθαι τῆς συνεισφορᾶς. And this method was also calculated to produce a much larger general sum. It is not, however, impossible but that there was more than one συνεισφορὰ, perhaps several, before Paul came; though the words do not express this.
so what Bp. Pearce has said on the payment of monthly contributions to the common stock may be well founded; and it seems confirmed by Theophyl., whose words are these: οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, εἰδὸς φέρε, ἵνα μὴ ὁλγον τις ἔχον αἰσχύνηται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ σεαυτῷ σώαγε, καὶ ὅταν ἄξιολογον γένηται, τότε φέρε. Though, after all, the Apostle only means, that petty gatherings might not have to be made when he came. So Theophyl.: ἵνα μὴ (φησιν) ὅταν δὲν ἀναλίσκεις, τότε συνάγητε. And so Cæcumen.: ἵνα μὴ ὅταν καιρὸς έσται ἐκφοράς, τότε συνάγεις ἀρξήται. At all events, the propriety of our common version is thus completely established.

In this very same sense θησ. is taken by Grot. and all the best recent Philologists and Commentators.

It is here observed by Schoettg., that every Jew who wished to seem of any esteem in his religion, kept a certain purse, or little bag, in which he laid up alms.

3. οὐς εἶπεν δοκιμάσῃ, δι' ἑπιστολῶν τούτων πέμψαν.

There has been no little difference of opinion as to the construction, and, as dependent thereon, the sense of these words. Luther, Est., our common Translators, Mill, Doddcr., Mackn., Slade, and many others, connect the words δι' ἑπιστολῶν with the former δοκιμάσῃ: which seems the more natural mode. But it is liable to serious objections. “There could be no occasion (says Grot.) for the Corinthians to signify by letters to the Apostle, their approbation of their own messengers, as the Apostle was to be present at their appointment.” Bp. Pearce, who adopts the construction in question, would obviate the difficulty by interpreting δοκιμ.: “whosoever ye shall have approved by your letters to me as fit,” &c.: understanding it of their letters sent to St. Paul between the time of his writing this Epistle and his coming to them. But this sense cannot fairly be elicited from the words; and moreover it leads to an absurdity; for if the choice were theirs, why should they not choose at the time when the Apostle would be at Corinth, and the general συνεσφορά made. Mackn. thinks it certain, (seeing the Apostle was to take these messengers with him to Jerusalem,) that they would have no need of any letters from him. He therefore is of opinion, that the letters of which the Apostle speaks, were neither to nor from himself, but from the Corinthians to the brethren in Jerusalem, informing them, that the persons who presented these letters, were appointed by them to attend the Apostle when he delivered the collections at Jerusalem.” But it is not true that the Apostle was positively to accompany the messengers. The Apostle, in this verse, plainly supposes that they would go alone. In the next verse he advert to his
accompanying them, but only as a contingency, ἐν δὲ ἥ ἄξιον, &c. As, therefore, the Apostle here first supposes that they would go alone, there was great reason why he should send letters with them. Considering the part St. Paul had in promoting the contributions, and his own authority as an Apostle, and, in some sense, Bishop of Corinth, there would be a peculiar propriety in his sending letters by the messengers; mentioning, no doubt, the sum total committed to them, and showing the authority with which Paul had invested them, to expend it in such a way as should seem best.

This interpretation, therefore, is utterly untenable, and we must construe δι' ἐκπιστολῶν with the words following, namely, with πέµψω τούτους. I am not aware that this is liable to any objection, and it is supported by the authority of all the antient Commentators and Translators, and the most learned of the modern ones, as Beza, Pisc., Hamm., Gron., Knatchub, Locke, Whitby, Wells, Wolf, Le Clerc, Hardy, Griesb., Krause, Rosenm., and Schleus. Dr. Mill indeed doubts whether δι' ἐκπιστολῶν πέµψω be good Greek. But surely of this Chrysost. and other Greek Fathers and Commentators were far better qualified to judge than any modern Critic.

The διὰ is for ἐν or σὺν; of which Wolf cites an example from 1 Tim. 2, 15. διὰ τῆς τεκνογνασίας. Schleus. (more appositely) compares Rom. 2, 27. 4, 11. 8, 25. 14, 20. Hebr. 12, 1. He renders: "unà cum epistolis." Δοκιμάσητε is to be taken in a popular sense, for: "whom ye may think proper to be chosen;" as in 1 Thess. 2, 4. And so in the Classic writers. Thus (as cited by Wets.) Plut. 1, 971 μ. ἐκπεµφθέκασαν οὐν ἄνδρας πρὸς αυτόν, οὐς Δίων ἔδοκιµαξ. Lucian Scythea. S. ἐφίλουν, οὐς ἐκεῖνος δοκιµάζοι, καὶ ἐπιστηνον ἄριστον ἄνδρας εἶναι. Joseph. Ant. 13, 2, 3. οὐ δ' ἐν αὐτὸς δοκιµάσῃ πιστοὺς καὶ φίλους, τούτοις ἐν αὐτῇ φρονεῖν καταστάσεως. 2 Macc. 4, 3. See Cic. pro Cluent. 19.

Almost all the modern Commentators treat χάριν here as synonymous with ἐλεημοσύνη; as 2 Cor. 8, 3. And Krause observes, that the Sept. render the Hebr. יִתְנָה sometimes by χάρις: sometimes by ἐλεημοσύνη. This may, in some sense, be true; yet the criticism is too dry and formal. Far more judgment and taste will be found in the remark of Theophyl. (derived from Chrys.) χάριν δὲ τὸ πράγμα καὶ μεγάλων, τούτοις, συγκεκριµένη, ίνα δεῖ ἂν αὐτὸν μὲγά τι ποιήσῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἐκ λίπης, ἦ ξέ αὔγεσθαι τοιοῦτον τὰ χάρια τὸ γὰρ ἐλεηµοσύνην εἰπέσθαι, ἄναξιον ἦν τῶν μελλόντων λαµβάνειν ἅγιον. See Wolf.

The Greek Commentators and Grot. well remark on the delicacy exixed in οὖν δοκιµάσητε, and in the words of the next verse, as also the caution shown by the Apostle to afford no room for suspicion of malversation, to avoid scandal, and to give no occasion of offence. Thus, as Theodoret neatly expresses ἰδιὸς ἄλλοις παραχεῖ πρῶτος ποιεῖ, καὶ ἀπρόσκοπον γίνεται καὶ 'Ιωνδαῖος καὶ Ἑλλησσικῶν, καὶ τῷ ἐκλεξθήναι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

4. ἐὰν δὲ ἥ ἄξιον. Some modern Commentators simply render this "si res postulat." But this is
wrapping up matters too briefly. It is plain that there is an *ellipsis*, which Theophyl. fills up by τὸ συναγάμενον, scil. χρήμα. But this is evidently too arbitrary and precarious a subaudition. I prefer, with ÓEcumen. and Grot., πράγμα. The word ἄξιον must be taken in its *popular* acceptation.

The sentence is well paraphrased by ÓEcumen. thus: ἐὰν τοσοῦτον αἰῶν καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς δείκται διακοινὰς ἀπελεύσομαι. By Theophyl., more simply, thus: ἐὰν ἤ ἄξιον τῆς ἐμῆς διακοινάς. Both these Commentators have *alone* seen the force of σὸν ἐμὸν πορεύονται, which (by a sort of Hebraism) is simply this: "they shall have my company;" i. e. "I will accompany them." The ἄξιον τοῦ, &c, principally, but not entirely, relates to the amount of the sum collected; and the antient Commentators and Grot. rightly observe, that the Apostle thus covertly excites them to liberality.

Jaspis excellently paraphrases the passage thus: "If the sum of money collected be considerable enough, or any other occasion require it, I will accompany them."

5. ἐλευθερώσει—διέρχομαι. Here the Apostle fixes the time when he shall visit them, viz. on the occasion of his passage through Macedonia. Doddr. and Mackn. need not, therefore, have been so scrupulous as to render: "when I have passed through." It is sufficient to render "when I shall pass; i. e. when I pass through."* The words following explain this, and are meant to intimate that he intends to pass through Macedonia in his way to Corinth, and, after having left it. Διέρχομαι, "I (mean to) pass." The whole of this sentence is idiomatic, or popular.

Of this journey St. Luke makes no mention in the Acts: for what is mentioned at 20, 3., can have no reference thereto. On this question, which I

* So Theophyl., who observes: "He does not say, 'when I go to Macedonia,' but 'when I pass through Macedonia.' q. d. 'I visit them in haste, and *en passant*, but with you I shall remain:' a mark that he prefers them to the Macedonians; and with reason; for great was the celebrity of the Corinthian Church."
cannot here treat, see Est., Lightf., Beza, Grot., and others, who, however, bring nothing to any certainty. Probably there was nothing material to record, it being one merely of ordinary visitation and spiritual confirmation.

6. πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμένω, "And with you I may perhaps abide (some time), or even stay the winter." Παραμ. imports more than sojourning, even a sort of abiding: a signification which occurs in Hebr. 7, 23. James 1, 25. Joh. 1, 10., and of which examples are adduced by Wets. from the Classical writers. The chief difference between the Scriptural and Classical use is, that in the latter some word or phrase more fully unfolding the idea is added, chiefly words expressive of duration of time, as χρόνος.

The τυχόν is an adverb formed from the second aorist participle neuter, with a subaudition of κατὰ τὸ, occurring in Xen. Arab. 6, 1, 12. It exactly corresponds to our per-haps. There is no occasion to press on the term, as do some of the antient and early modern Commentators. It imports contingency of every kind, and thus implies uncertainty. Chrysost. observes that the term is used ἵνα πάντα ὑπ' ἐργαίς Παύλος, καὶ συμφερόντως; at least he knew not how the Holy Spirit would determine, whether for his stay, or departure.

The ἵνα is very ill rendered in all our English Versions, and indeed in most others. The truth is, ἵνα is here, as often, used, not τελικῶς, but ἐκβασικῶς, and denotes simply what shall happen; a signification frequently occurring in Scripture.

The purport of the words ἵνα ὑμεῖς—πορεύομαι is well laid down by Chrysost. thus: καὶ τοῦτο ἀγαθὴς καὶ φιλοστοργίας. Οἰκumen. says there are εἰς παράκλησιν καὶ παραμολογίαν. And these two expositions united represent, I think, the full force of the words. They are, indeed, like the former, expressive of great affection.

It may be proper to observe, that this sending, and, in some degree, accompanying forward the
teachers of Christianity was an established custom in the first ages, and especially when the stay was of any duration; which the Apostle here contemplates. But I have treated on this subject in various passages of the Acts.

The use of ἔδω for ἔδω, which occurs here and elsewhere in the New Testament (see Schl. Lex. and Weiner’s Gr. Gr.) appears to be a vestige of the ancient usage yet lingering in the common dialect, long after it had been filed off by Attic refinement. After πορεύωμαι: the Paraphrasts add: “into Judæa,” whither, as appears from 2 Cor. 1, 16., the Apostle departed when he left them. But this anticipating the event, and thus making the Apostle’s words prophetic, seems little necessary, nay, somewhat irrational.

7. οὗ θέλω γαρ ὑμᾶς ἁρτί ἐν παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν. It is truly observed by Cæcumen., that this is an ἑρμηνεία τοῦ εἰσημένου ἀνθρώπου, i. e. is exegetical of the preceding. The ἁρτί is meant to be emphatical, and is not well rendered nunc, now, as it is done by all the Translators. It rather signifies then; q. d. “now that I have delayed so long.” 'Εν παρόδῳ exactly corresponds to the French en passant, signifying “in transcurso, in transitu.” Casaub. renders it obiter tantum et perfunctoriē, as Vorst. adds. Ιδεῖν is here used in the popular sense so common in our see, i. e. visit, convenire; as in Luke 8, 20. Rom. 1, 11. (where see the notes.) 1 Thess. 3, 6. 3 James 14. In the same popular sense must the words χρῶν τοια be taken, viz. of some considerable time. So Paley.

7. ἐκκίνησε δὲ, &c. Grot. observes that the Apostle here evinces his accustomed Christian diffidence in speaking of the uncertain future; as in Rom. 1, 10. 1 Cor. 4, 19. Nor was this manner of speaking concerning future actions unknown to the Pagans themselves, from whom he cites examples. It is especially enjoined by James 4, 15. and was (as Mackn. observes) always practised by the first Christians, as expressing how deeply they were affected with a
sense that all events are under the direction of God. The *Heathens*, we may suppose, used such expressions rather as *mere phrases*, to which little meaning was attached.

Est. observes, that *ἐπιτρέπω* signifies not only *permitto*, but *concedo*, i.e. give a power of acting. This, however, seems an unnecessary refinement. The expression may be simply rendered: "If it shall please God."

8. *ἐπιμενῶ* δὲ ἐν Ἑφέσῳ ἔως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς, "I intend to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost." It is well observed by Chrysost., that these words indicate affection and confidence, by revealing his plans. Grot. remarks that other occasions obliged him to make greater haste than he then intended; (Acts 20, 16.) *ita ambulatoriae sunt hominum voluntates.*

On the words ὁς τῆς πεντηκοστῆς some early modern Commentators (as Erasmus) trifle egregiously. They will not allow this could be the *Jewish feast*; for what did the *Gentiles*, whom the Apostle was addressing, know about that? or what had *Christians* to do with it? since that, together with all the other parts of the ceremonial law, had been abrogated. But, as Est. rightly observes, the two principal feasts of the Jews, the Passover and Pentecost, must have been well known to the Gentiles, because of the Jews dispersed among them; and (he might have added) must have been familiar to all *Christians*, from the Scriptures of the Old Testament. But the truth is, the Apostle speaks not so much of the *Feast itself*, though he might, and perhaps did observe it, as of the *Feast-time*; just as we all mark the distinction of times and seasons, after the manner of our Popish ancestors, by *Christmas*, *Michaelmas*; though we do not, on that account, profess our belief in the *mass*. Nay the terms are used by unbelievers in revelation itself.

On *Ἑφεσῷ* it is not necessary to dwell. It may suffice to refer the reader to the Introductions to the Ephes. by Wets. and Koppe.
9. θύρα γὰρ μοι ἀνέφγε. By θύρα is meant metaphorically an occasion, or opportunity of doing anything. It seems to be a Hebraism; for Schoettgel cites a Rabbinical passage where ἡ θύρα a door (whence περάω) is so used. And in Hos. 2, 17. πρὸς is rendered by Symm. εἰς θύραν ἐλπίδος. And yet from the philological illustrators it appears that θύρα was sometimes so used by the Greek writers, and fores by the Latin ones. Thus Plut. Symp. p. 636. ὅρας ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν ἀνοίξας. Cic. Ep. 13, 10. amicitiae fores aperiuntur. (See more in Wets. and Schleus. Lex.)*

In the same sense it occurs in Acts 14, 27. where see the notes. Nor is this use without example in our own language. Theophyl. well illustrates the force of the term thus: πολλοὶ μέλλουσιν εἰς τὴν πίστιν προσελθεῖν, καὶ πλατείᾳ ἀνέπαιρα γε εἰς τούτων εἴσοδος, ἵτε ἀκμαζώσῃς τῆς διακοινίας † αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν πίστιν.

'Ἀνέφγε is for ἀνεώχθη, which some of the Atticists thought a solecism, but others justified. (See the copious citations from the Grammarians in Wets. and Kypke.) Yet it does not appear to have been in use with the earlier writers. Such is, in all languages, the case with verbs which, like this and our to open, may be used either in an active or passive sense. So we say a door is opened, or open.

9. ἐνεργῆς is well interpreted by the Gloss. Alb. ἐνεργῆς πρὸς ἐργασίαν. It is well observed by Krause, that the word is adapted rather to the idea of occasion implied in θύρα. The term signifies effective. So the Syr.: plenum operibus. See Wetstein’s Classical citations, the most apposite of which is Thucyd. 3, 17. πλεῖσται δὴ νῆς ἐνεργῆ κάλλει ἐγένετο, on which passage, in my forthcoming edition, I shall adduce many examples illustrative of this use. Thus there is no occasion to read ἐναργης.*

* To which I add Plut. Alcib. § 10. μεγάλου δ’ αὐτῆς κλείσας ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἀνοιγόντος τοῦ γένους καὶ πλούτου. Arrian Epict. 1, 24. τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον μένις; δί; ἡ θύρα ἀνοίγεται.
† Read διανοιάς, from the conjecture of Lindsell, which is rendered certain by Οἰκουμεν. and even Chrysost., from whom both derived their matter.
To proceed, however, from the consideration of words to that of things, Krause and Rosenm. think that the Apostle adverts to what is mentioned in Acts 19. 1—5. of the disciples of John, of the separating of the Christians from the Jews, ver. 9. seq. and of the favour of certain Asiarchs, ver. 31. Mackn. observes, that about the time this letter was written, the Apostle’s success was greater than common: for many who used curious arts, the arts of magic and divination, were converted, and burned their books, containing the secrets of these arts, Acts 19, 17—20.: which so enraged the idolaters at Ephesus, but especially the craftsmen, that they raised the great tumult described in Acts 19, 23—41.

9. καὶ ἀντικεῖμενοι πολλοὶ. Many recent Commentators would render the καὶ although, or yet. And so Hilary and Vatab. But it does not seem necessary to resort to this significaon. The θύρα εἴρηται denotes that there was an opportunity for effecting great things; but that implied great exertion; and these words καὶ ἀντικεῖμενοι πολλοί seem to express the especial reason for it; q. d. “for there are many opposing me.”* This opposition (as Doddr. rightly remarks) rendered the Apostle’s presence more necessary to preserve those that were already converted, and to increase the number, if God should bless his ministry. Accordingly, a celebrated Church was planted at Ephesus; and so far as we can learn from the tenor of his Epistle to it, there was less to correct and reprove among them, than in most of the other Churches to which he wrote.”

10. εἰς δὲ ἔλθη Τιμόθεος, &c. “If Timothy should

* It is without reason (I think) that some fancy throughout this sentence an agonistical metaphor, and without necessity that the antient Commentators call in diabolical intervention. Though Chrysost. truly observes, that this opposition is often a sign of the spread of the Gospel; since the two principles of good and evil, being brought into closer contact, cannot but disagree.
come, or be come." (See 4, 17. and the note.) Now there was some doubt of this. For (as Grot. observes) though it appears from 4, 17. that Paul had sent him forward thither, yet he had many Churches of Macedonia to visit by the way.

10. ἀφεσθεῖς γενήσαι seems an idiotical phrase, in which γενήσαι appears to have the sense of εἶναι, by which it denotes to live. In ἀφεθ. the effect is (as Est. observes) put for the cause. It signifies, then, unmolestedly. Now this is referred, by Grot. and others, to the scorn of the wealthy, the contempt of the learned,* the perverse opposition of the schismatics (especially the Anti-Pauline faction), and such other repulses as, being a young man, he might experience.† The ὥμας can, of course, only extend to Christians.

The words τὸ γὰρ ἔργον—ἐγὼ seem meant to anticipate the undervaluing him on the score of his youth and inferior spiritual gifts. It is not necessary to anxiously dwell on these terms, which simply import: "He discharges the office of teacher and preacher of the Gospel even as I do," i. e. he is as much a divinely commissioned minister of God as myself. So Theophyl.: κηρύσσει καὶ διδάσκει. On this Chrys. beautifully observes: ἀντὶ πάσης αὐτῷ καὶ εὐγνώμονας καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡμικλίας καὶ σοφίας ἀπόχρει. **

11. μὴ τίς οὖν αὐτῶν ἐξισθενήσῃ. There was, as Theophyl. observes, reason to fear this, as he was young, alone, and had the charge of so wealthy and proud a people.

* Grot. borrowed the remark from the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl.: ἀφεσθεῖς αὐτῶν (I conjecture αὐτῶν, i. e. Timothy.) τὰ μὲ ἐπαναστάτωσιν αὐτῷ οἱ πλούσιοι σοφοὶ. I conjecture οἱ πλούσιοι, οἱ σοφοὶ, or οἱ πλούσιοι οἱ τε σοφοὶ. This is confirmed by Oecumen. 384 a. Οὐκ ἐν μὴ τις αὐτῷ ἐπισιενίων τῶν πλουσίων, ἀ ν σοφία πεποιθότων and also by Chrys., from whom both derived their matter.

† It is possible that there is a meiosis in ἀφεσθεῖα. In which view Jasps has not ill explained: "non modo nullas ei facessite molestias, verum etiam summo curate opere, ut laetam vitam apud vos transigat."
By ἐν εἰρήνῃ is meant affectionately: but it seems to refer to the Ἰωάννῃ at parting.

11. ἐκδέχομαι γὰρ αὐτῷ μετὰ τῶν ἄδελφων. It is not clear who these brethren were. Grot. understands, others who had gone on the journey to Corinth (through Macedonia) with Timothy, namely (as Mackn. thinks) Erastus, who had been sent with Timothy to Corinth, Acts 19, 22. and Titus, who carried this letter, and another brother, whose name is not mentioned; (see 2 Cor. 12, 17 & 18.) perhaps, also, some of the Corinthian brethren, whom the Apostle had desired Titus to bring with him to Ephesus, having need of their assistance there."

12. περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλών— ἄδελφῳ. The Latin Commentators are of opinion, that Apollos, displeased with the behaviour of the faction, had left them, as incorrigible, and had returned to Ephesus, from whence he had been recommended to the brethren of Achaia, Acts 18, 24 & 27. 19, 1. But the messengers from Corinth, arriving with a letter to the Apostle full of respect, he answered it by Titus, and requested Apollos to accompany him, in the hope that he might be useful in assisting Titus to settle the disturbances in that Church. But Apollos refused to go, knowing the violent temper of the faction. (Mackn.)

Krause and Rosenm. regard the opinion as highly probable, but yet not certain. It is, I think, little less than certain.

12. καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἐν θέλημα. This appears to be an idiomatic mode of expression, in which αὐτῷ must be understood. The καὶ has the sense of but. One may literally render: "there was not, upon the whole, to him an inclination to go now." It was not his inclination. "Ὅταν εἰκασθῇ, "when he shall have leisure, and opportunity;" as Acts 17, 31. (where see the note) and elsewhere. The Latin Fathers, as Hilary and Jerome, have preserved a tradition that he did afterwards visit the Corinthian Church, when the religious differences had been settled.
18. γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἀνδρίζεσθε, κραταῖον. The Apostle (Theophyl. observes) concludes with a suitable admonition (which, as Krause says, is to be extended to the whole Epistle) namely ὅτι ὅπι τοὺς διδασκάλους τὰς ἑλπίδας ἔχειν δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. The words may indeed be understood of Christian watchfulness generally; but, when taken in connection with what preceded, I cannot but think, with Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators, that they are to be understood of steadfastness in the faith (στήκατε), watchfulness against the arts of seducers, even false teachers (γρηγορεῖτε), and a manly firmness in maintaining what they conscientiously believed to be the truth.

Γρηγορ. is perhaps a military metaphor; στήκ. a military and agonistical one. See the note on 15, 1. Theophyl. observes that γρηγ. is used διὰ τῶν ἀπατωτῶν, and that it supposes them to be nodding.

18. στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει. Theophyl. seems to take πίστις as emphatical; q. d. “and not in the Gentile wisdom.” For in that (he adds) it is not possible to stand, but we must be carried about to and fro. This (he observes) supposes them to be wavering. But I apprehend that the Apostle had here in view rather the doctrines of the false teachers than of the Gentile Philosophers.

18. ἀνδρίζεσθε and κραταῖον are both of them military expressions. Thus Grot. compares, from an old Latin Poet “nunc fiti viri,” and the Homeric ἄνδρες ἔστε. Wets. compares Heliodor. Ath. 5. ἀνδρίζον, and other passages. Such expressions indeed are frequent in the Classical writers. ἄνδρ. is often so used in the Old Testament. (See Schleus. Lex.) The sense here intended is very obvious. See the Paraphrasts.

Κρατ. is a word which, as far as I remember, occurs nowhere in the Classical writers. The Commentators say it is a passive for a reciprocal. But it rather seems to be a middle verb. The word is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament; as
Ps. 30, 25. ἀνδρίζεσθε καὶ κρατιώσθω ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν, and 1 Sam. 4, 9. κρατιώσθε καὶ γίνεσθε εἰς ἄνδρας, both of which passages seem to have been in the mind of the Apostle. It is also conjoined with ἀνδρίζεσθαι in 2 Sam. 4, 9., and in Ruth 1, 18. and elsewhere it is used of perseverance in opinion, or determination. Κρατιώσθαι seems to have been originally a gymnastic, or agonistic term, and literally signifies to string up one's nerves, to excite oneself to any undertaking. So our word strength, corresponding to κράτος, comes from the verb to string. And so the Hebr. פָּנִי, strength, from פָּנָי to string. Thus a strong man is one whose nerves are well strung. So the Poet: “toil strings their nerves.”

In both the above terms there is evidently an admonition to perseverance in sound doctrine. A very similar one occurs in Ephes. 4, 14. “That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine.” It is observable how much vigour is imparted to the sentence by the Asyndeton, a finer example of which can no where be found. On that figure see the masterly observations of the prince of critics Περὶ ὁμος.

14. τάντα ὑμῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ γενέσθω. It is, I think, deserving of remark, that exhortations to constancy in doctrine are often, as here, followed up with an admonition to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. This (I find) is confirmed by the Greek Commentators,* and also Grot. and Mackn. Compare 8, 1. 13, 1. 14, 1. 2 Cor. 2, 4. and 8, 6, 6. Most Commentators (less correctly, I think) understand it generally of love unto God, and unto men for

* Thus Theophyl.: τούτο πρὸς τοὺς σταυάζοντας καὶ διάσκοντας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Εἰτε γὰρ φθονὶ διδάσκει τις, εἰτε μανθαίνει, εἰτε ἐπιτιμᾶ, τάντα ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἔστω καὶ οὐκ ἔσται φυσίωσις, οὗτο διακαταστάσις, ἀγάπης μετατενούσης. And Theodoret: πρὸς τοὺς διελθόντας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ τὴς φιλαρχίας δεκαμένοις τὸ πῦθος, καὶ τοὺς τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων μεταλαγχάνοντας, καὶ τῶν σκανδαλιζομένων καταφρονοῦντας.
God's sake, like the ἄγαργι on which the Apostle pronounces such an eloquent eulogium at C. 13.

15. ὅβατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ—τοιοῦτος. The construction is here somewhat involved, yet such as may be called popular. Many recent Commentators endeavour to clear the embarras by throwing the words ὅβατε—τοιοῦτος into a parenthesis. And so the antient Commentators, who say there is an hyperbaton, and a parenthesis. Mackn., in his translation, places the words in the natural order, as follows: “Ye know the family of Stephanas, that it is the first fruit of Achaia, and that they have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints. I intreat you therefore,” &c. But the present order may be retained, by simply supplying a particle after ὅβατε, thus: “Now I entreat you, brethren, that for as much as ye know that the family of Stephanas is,” &c. In ὅβατε τῷ οἰκίᾳ Σ. ὃτι ὅτι there is a common idiom for ὅβατε ὃτι ὥστε Σ. ὅτι.

In ἀπαχή τῆς Ἀχαίας we are to subaud eis Ἰησοῦν, which is supplied in Rom. 15, 16, where see the note. The sense is plainly those “first converted to the Christian religion.” See Acts 17, 12, 19, 21. and the notes, as also Schleus. Lex.

In treating on ὅβατε the Commentators seek a distinction between it and γιγνάσκετε. But this seems an ill founded and precarious criticism. Others, with less judgment, take the words as hortative. The sense is best pointed out by Theophyl., who paraphrases: “Ye yourselves know, and therefore, have not to learn from me.”

15. εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἐκαύτος, “they have applied themselves to, devoted themselves to, the ministering of the saints.” In ἔταξαν there is, I think, a military allusion, the force of which is well illustrated by Kypke and Wets., the former of whom observes: “Latet notio illos eusmodi amoris officia sibimetipsis injunxisse, eaque sponte nemine jubente aut impellente, suscepisse.” And so Wets., who laconically remarks ultro. And so also Theo-
phyl. : οὕτωι πάροι ἄλλωιν καταστάντες ἄφθογην, ἄλλοι ἐκκοιτοῦσιν παρ' ἑαυτῶν. And CEcum. explains: ἀφεύρισθαι, τούτον τὸν βίον εἰληφτὸ. That it is a military metaphor, the examples of Wets. prove. The most opposite is Arrian Epict. 3, 2. διατείχοις τῆς καράν ἑαυτῶν κατατεθείσης, ἀπετε μάντις εἶναι. So also Demosth. de Chers. p. 43. (cited by Krause) oὐδὲ ἐφ' ἐν τούτον ποιοῦτο ἐμαυτῶν ἑταξαί οὐ καὶ προϊσχὴν, τούτῳ ὑπὲρ κέρδεως οὐδ' ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίαν. The διακονία is variously interpreted. By some (as Vorst.) it is understood of the ministry of the Church. But that cannot be what is meant. Beza (with more probability) thinks it has reference to the offices and duties of Deacons. Others explain it of charity to poor Christians. But that interpretation is justly considered by Kypke as too limited. He thinks that it signifies the offices of affectionate care, and kindness towards the saints. By the saints he understands, not the Christians of Corinth, but the stranger Christians, who were received by Stephanas at his house, and there hospitably entertained. And this is confirmed by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl.: εἰς τῷ ὑποδέχοντα τοὺς πιστοὺς πενήτας καὶ διακονοῦν αὐτοῖς. And also by 1 Tim. 5, 10. Hebr. 13, 2. 3 Joh. 5. Yet I see no reason to exclude the Corinthian Christians. As to the reason given by Kypke, that the Apostle would thus have written ὑμῖν, it is frivolous. It seems that all the members of this invaluable family devoted themselves to the ministering to the wants and promoting the comfort of all their fellow Christians, whether strangers or countrymen.

16. ἤνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑποτάσσομεν, &c. "The exhortation is, that you (on your part, as a return for such devoted benevolence) show respect to them, and to such:" which is plainly the meaning of τοὺς τοίουτοις; as ver. 18. τοὺς τοίουτοις. For by τοίουτοις the family of Stephanas and such like must be understood; as the antient Commentators and most modern are agreed, and not τοὺς ἀγίους; as most re-
cent Commentators (after Kypke) maintain; which would be very harsh; for ὑποτασσ. cannot be applicable to the offices of hospitality and kindness. Though Kypke refers to Ephes. 5, 21. 1 Pet. 5, 3. These passages, however, are not to the purpose; nay, they are adduced by Grot. to prove the contrary. Moreover, the words following, καὶ παντὶ συνεργοῦσιν, &c. forbid this. The τοῖς τούτοις must, then, be referred to such as the family of Stephanas. As to the ὑπότασσον, it is not necessary to press on its sense. It is explained by Grot. revereri, homorem et obsequium deferre, "to show them all due reverence, deference, and respect." So Theophyl.: οὐ δὴ χάριν καὶ τούτοις, καὶ τούς τὰ ὑμαία προαιρομένους, πάσης τιμῆς ἄπολαίειν παρακαλεῦμεν.

It is, however, probable that ὑποτασσ. has some reference to the ἐπαξένοι just before, and that the metaphor is carried forward; q. d. "range yourselves under, and co-operate with them, and such like," viz. by aiding them in their benevolent offices. So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) συναντλιαμβάνεσθε καὶ ἐν διακονίᾳ χρημάτων, καὶ ἐν διακονίᾳ σωματικά, καὶ γὰρ (says Chrysost.) ἐκεῖνοι ὁ κόσμος ἦσσαι καύσος, ἵσταν ἐκεῖνοι συμμάχοι, καὶ τὰ τῆς εὐεξίας ἐστὶ πλείονας διαβηθήσεται. So also Cæcumen. All these Commentators, however, include in the ὑποτασσ. the sense εἰς πάντα πείθεσθε. It may be understood (as was shown above) of deference and yielding to their suggestions.

By the συνεργ. and κοπ. seem to be meant labourers of a higher order, ministers of the Gospel, especially in their peregrinations, as Timothy and Titus. See 1 Thess. 5, 12, and 13. In συνεργ. the συν must not be pressed upon. The word is well rendered by associate.

17. On Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus it may suffice to refer to the Commentators, as Dodd. and Mackn. Ὑπὸ τὸ ὑμῶν ἱστέρημα ὑπὸ τοὺς ἀκεπαλάθησιν. The sense of these words is somewhat obscure, perhaps on account of this being an idiotical expression:
In fact, the word ἄντεπ. is nowhere found in the Classical writers; and seems to have been only an Hellenistical one; for it occurs often in the Sept. Chryst. and all the antient Commentators explain: ἀντὶ πάντων Ἑλθόν; q. d. "they have taken this long journey, to act as your representatives." But this seems too harsh. Mackn. renders: "they have supplied what was wanting in your letter," viz. (adds Grot.) "by informing me of your disorders." But this the Apostle could not mean. I prefer, with Beza, Rosenm., Schleus., and Jaspis, to render: "they have supplied your absence," i. e. "supplied the deficiency occasioned by your absence (as in Philip. 2, 30.):" or, (to use the words of Doddre. in his paraphrase) "gave me by their converse and friendly offices that consolation which I might justly have expected from you all, had I enjoyed an opportunity of conversing with you." This mode of interpretation is also adopted by Menoch., Ernesti, Vatab., and Est., and is perhaps what the antient Commentators had in view. And it seems correctly to represent the sense of this idiomatic expression, which Bp. Pearce and Mr. Slade involve in tenfold obscurity by awkward attempts to explain it. After floundering in the mud for some time, Mr. Slade concludes with conjecturing (in a manner unworthy of his usual good sense) that the meaning of the sentence might be left purposely indefinite, as thus conveying a more delicate censure.

18. ἀνεπακοσμχ γὰρ τὸ ἔμων πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν. The sense of these words is strangely misunderstood by most of the modern Commentators. See Doddre., Mackn., Rosenm., and Krause, whose explanations are extremely harsh, and miserably frigid, though all founded on Grot. and other early modern Commentators. The only one who has distinctly seen the scope of the words is Chrysost., who evidently regards them as explanatory of the preceding: τὸ ὑμῶν ὡστίχημα ἀνεπλήρωσαν. So Oecumen. 586.
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οὕτως ἔτι εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἰδέας συμέτειν τὸ ἀναπαύοντος τὴν ψυχήν τοῦ Παύλου, ἀναπαύοντος γὰρ τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα φησὶ, τὸ ὑμῶν ἀνέπαυσαν, τούτοις ἤμαι τῷ διδάσκαλον ἀναπαύοντος, ὑμᾶς τοὺς μαθητάς μου ἀνέπαυσαν. And so Theophyl., Est., and Tiren. This use of ἀναπαύοντος is quite Hebraic, and perhaps the sense of the words may be simply this: "By thus, supplying your absence, they have benefited us both." For Paul gained information of the state of these absent, and they gained in the counsel afforded to them by the Apostle.

The Apostle therefore adds: ισχυσάσκετε ὑπὸ τῶν τοιῶν τοιῶν τοιῶν. Now by τοιῶν is meant those, and such as those, as τοῖς τοιῶν τοιῶν at ver. 16. Ἰσχύει is here used in a sense partly Hebraic, derived from ἰσχύειν to love and reverence. So Theophyl. ἐν τοῖς αὐτῶν ἤκτεν.

19. ἀποκάλουται, &c. Here Chrys. beautifully remarks: συνήχει καὶ συγκολλά τὰ μέλη διὰ τοῦ ἀσθενοῦς. And so Theodoret: Ἐξήλεξε τὴν διάστασιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἰγίου φιλοματος ἀλλήλους συνέδρειαν. The sense of the words ἀποκάλουται, ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, is not (as Mackn. interprets) "they wish you all felicity," but, "they wish and pray that all Christian blessings may be vouchsafed to you." On Ἀσία see Schles. Lex., and on Aquila and Priscilla, see Paley, Hor., Paul, and the note on Rom. 16, 3.

19. σὺν τῇ κατ’ οἷκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. It is strange that most modern Commentators, as Hamm., Erasm., Beza, Est., Menoch., Grot., Dodd., and Whitby, and, of the recent ones, Krause should explain this of "all the Christians in their family." Grot., thinks it may signify, "a family consisting wholly of Christian converts," as the jailer's house, Acts 16, 31 & 32. and that of Crispus, 18, 8. "When it was otherwise (says Whitby) and the family were not entirely converted, the Apostle alters his style, speaking of 'them of the household,' Rom. 16, 10 & 11. Phil. 4, 22. or 'those that are with them,' Rom. 16,
14 & 15. But this mode of interpretation is manifestly harsh and improbable. And it is quite gratuitous to add (as does Dodd.) "for you know their family is happy in a large number of Christian converts." Far more natural is the sense assigned by Chrysost. and all the Greek Commentators, and, of the moderns, Mede, Wells, Bp. Pearce, Slade, and Jaspis, namely, "the congregation that was accustomed to meet, for divine worship, at their house." And this sense has the advantage of including the other. I need not, however, enlarge on this subject, having fully treated on it at Rom. 16, 5, to which I refer the reader.

20. διδάσκων τις οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες. It is observed by Mackn., that, "as in this passage, the brethren are distinguished from the church, or common people, it is probable the Apostle meant his fellow labourers in the Gospel." But nothing can be more absurd and ill-founded. The opposition between all the brethren and the congregation which met at the house of Aquila and Priscilla, turns upon a point which I have explained at Rom. 16, 5., namely, that as the Christians probably had yet no large church for general assembly, they worshipped κατʼ ἐκκοι, in private houses, to which there is an allusion in Acts 21, 20. Lightfoot thinks that their house was a Beth Midrasch, or school for Rabbinical disputa tion. But there seems little foundation for the opinion, which is like some others of that Commentator, too hypothetical and visionary.

20. διδάσκων τις ἀδελφοίς εν φιλήματι ἀγίω. See the note on Rom. 16, 16. Here Krause appositely cites Justin Ap. 1, 85. ἀδελφοίς φιλήματι διδάσκεσθαι παν σάμενοι ταύτης εἰς ἐκκοι. Constitut. Apost. 2, 37. εἶτα καὶ διδάσκεσθαι ἀδελφοὶ εἰ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἀδελφοὶ εἰ γυναῖκες, τοῦ ἐν κυρίῳ φιλήματι καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο προσευχόντων ἐκ διδακῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀκαίρας. Μετά δὲ τούτων γινέσθαι ἡ δυσί, ἐστιντος παινὸς τοῦ λαῶν. By the ἀγ. is (I think) meant such as becometh Christians, i.e.,
both sincere and decorous. So Beza and Doddr. Vorst. explains it "the kiss usual among Christians." But this would require the article. It may be referred to the general Oriental, and especially Jewish custom, which Schoettg. thus illustrates: "Osculandi ritus apud antiquos Judeos tam pervulgatus erat, ut ad quotidiam alios salutandi humanitatem referretur. Exempla in sacris ubique sunt obvia. Primi vero Christiani, quoties coetus ipsorum dissolveretur, osculo semet invicem excipiebant, quae tessera erat concordiae et charitatis." And, for this reason, it was very properly enjoined by the Apostle. And, as Grot. observes, "recte osculum pacis iis imperatque in periculo erant ne per schismata abripientur."

Chrysost. offers the following excellent illustrations: Σφόδρα διεστήκεσαν ἁλλήλων τῷ λέγειν, Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰμι Παύλου, ἡγοῦ δὲ Απολλώ, ἡγοῦ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἡγοῦ δὲ Χριστοῦ τῷ. Τῶν μὲν πεινῶν, τῶν δὲ μεθυόν τῶν, μάχας καὶ χηλοτύπιας καὶ κρίματα ἔχειν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν καρισμάτων πολὺς ὁ φθόνος ἂν, πολλῆς ἄτερφηνίας.

21. δ ἀστασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. Rosenm. (from Schoettg.) rightly remarks, that there is here an ellipsis: and he lays down the following as the sense: "Restat salutatio a me, quae est adscripta a me ipso, propriâ manu." He adds, that we may suppose what was written by Paul with his own hand, though he had dictated the rest to some scribe. Krause observes, the Apostle was accustomed to dictate letters, and at the end add a sentence with his own hand, that there might be no room for fraud. And he refers to Rom. 16, 23. Gal. 6, 11. 2 Thess. 3, 17. Philem. 19.

Of the sense here of χειρ. Wets. adduces an example from Hyperid. ap. Pollux, 2, 152. οὔτε τῇν ἐαυτοῦ χειρα δωνατόν ἄφησανος. And so the Latin manus is perpetually used. With the construction εἴμι χειρι Παύλου, Wets. compares Philo, p. 554, 14. εἰμίν ἐστιν Μάκρωνος ἐργον Γάιος.
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22. εἰς ως ὑμεῖς τῶν Κ. Ἰ. Χ. Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) well annotates thus: τῷ ἐν τούτῳ λόγῳ πάντας ἐφάπαξ, τους πόρους, τους διχομοιοῦς, τους τὰ ἀπεικονίσασης ἐσθιόντας, τοὺς τῇ ἀναστάσει ἀπεικονίζομεν, καὶ πάντας ἀκούεις τοὺς παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἔχω τῆς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας καὶ παραδίδωμεν διάγνωσι.*

On ἀνάθεμα see the note on 12, 3. and Slade in loc. Mackn. observes, that with the words Anathema Maran-atha the Jews began their greater excommunication, whereby they not only excluded sinners from their society, but delivered them up to the divine Chereim, or Anathema, i. e. eternal perdition.

22. μαραθεῖ αὕτη is a Syr. Chaldee expression. It is interpreted by Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, and Jerome, ὥς κρίνει χαλκε. But the best modern Commentators are agreed that it signifies, “the Lord cometh,” i. e. is to come, will come, viz. “to take vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the Gospel.” And this sense is here far more apposite. Rosenm. observes, that in the 2d Epistle of Clemens. it is explained thus: “Hæc, qui non custodierit, sit Anathema usque ad adventum Domini.”

23. ἡ κόρη τοῦ Κ. Ἰ. Χ. μεθ’ ὑμῶν. It is well observed by Theophyl.: Τοῦτο διδασκαλίαν, τὸ μὴ μόνον ταφοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐχερεῖας, καὶ διάλεις στηρίζειν, τῆς διδασκαλίας, καὶ τῇ τῆς ἁμαρτείας βοηθεῖαι διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ἐπιχορηγήσῃ. Rosenm. explains thus: “Ego propter Christum vos omnes sincerè diligo.”

24. ἡ ἀγάπη—Ἰησοῦ. Grot. and Rosenm. from Chrysost. and Theophyl.) remark: “Dicuntur amicitiae dissolvì intervallis locorum. Hoc negat apud se fieri. Se animo ipsis esse presen tem; res eorum curare.” Krause, however, remarks, that it was unnecessary for the Apostle to say this; for the expression ἡ ἀγάπη—ὑμῶν seems to have originated in the

* It is rightly remarked by Dr. Owen, that by love the Lord Jesus Christ is meant obey him; and that this is directed not to Jews, but to Christians.
preceding formula ἵ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. παθ' ἐμέν· and ἵ ἐγκύρη μην περι πάντων ὑμῶν simply denotes "amore vos complector singulos."

"Thus (observes Mr. Slade) the Apostle assures the Corinthians, that, notwithstanding the malvolence of many of them towards him, he ceased not to love them all, and that his reproofs actually proceeded from an affectionate concern for their welfare."

END OF VOL. VI.
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