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phyl. observes, is meant to excite them to union; since those who are split into factions are no ecclesia, that suggesting the idea of one united assembly. Συν τοις ἁγίοις πάσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὧν τῇ Ἀχαίᾳ. By this is meant simply all the Christians in Corinth and Achæa. The term ἁγ. was employed to designate Christians, as hinting to them what their solemn engagements oblige them to be; and if some individuals were otherwise, it must be remembered, that the Apostle is addressing them in a general way. He conjoins the Achæans, in order to do honour to Corinth as the capital of Achæa, and to excite them to a common federal Christian union. So Chrysost. and Theophyl.

2. χάρις—Χριστοῦ. The same form as in Rom. 1, 7. I Cor. 1, 3. where see the notes.

3. εὐλογηθεὶς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τ.κ. η. I. X. Doddr. and Mackn. render: "praised be the God and Father of," &c., which interpretation may be defended; but I prefer the common version, "blessed be God, even the Father of," &c., which is supported by the authority of the Fathers and antient Commentators, and several eminent modern Critics. (See the excellent note of Whitby.) Grot. observes that this is an usual formula of thanksgiving; and Doddr. says it occurs in eleven out of the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul. On which he remarks, that as soon as the Apostle thought of a Christian church planted in one place or another, there seems to have been a flow of most lively affection accompanying the idea, in which all sensibility of his temporal affliction or theirs was all swallowed up, and the fulness of his heart must vent itself in such cheerful, exalted, and devout language."

Most sagacious are the following observations of Theoph. on the scope of the clause: Ἐπηγγείλατο ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐλθεῖν· εἶτα βραδύνας, σφόδρα ἠπαίτησε λυπεῖσθαι αὐτοῖς, αἰτὶ ἀλλὰν προτιμηθέντων αὐτῷ. Θέλων ὄν τολμοῦσι σασθαι, καὶ δεῖξαι ὦτι πειρασμάτων πολλῶν αὐτώ περιτεθέντων κεκαλυται, εὐφυῶς ποιεῖται τὴν
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ἀπολογίαν. Εὐχαριστῶ γὰρ, φησί, τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς, οἷς ἔσωσάς με ἀπὸ κινδύνων· διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας αἰώνιο-μένος, ὅτι μεγάλα τινὰ ἴππα τὰ κακῶντα αὐτῶν ὃν ἔλευ-θεροθείος εὐχαριστεῖ.

3. πατρὶ τῶν ὦκτισμῶν, καὶ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλή-σεως. Grot. observes that these genitives are used for adjectives of cognate signification with the substantive. This, however, seems but tasteless criticism. The truth is, though the phraseology may seem Hebraic, yet it is such as is used in other languages, and has more of energy and spirit than if adjectives had been employed. Theophyl. truly observes, that God is so named ἐκ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος. And Theod. admirably paraphrases: οἱ τῶν ὦκτισμῶν πεπληρωμένοι, καὶ τὸν ἔλεον ἀναβλύσας, καὶ πατρικὸς ὦκτισμός περὶ ἡμῶν κεχρημένος. And Theoph. thus: οἱ ὦκτισμοὶ τοιούτους ἐπιδεικτάμενος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ διανό- τοι παλαί ἡμῶν ἀνασκευαστικὰ, καὶ παρακλήσεως πάσης ἀξίω-σαι ἐν ταῖς θλίψεις.

Wets. remarks that the Jews in their prayers used the expressions our Father, our merciful Father.


4. ὁ παρακάλων ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ πάση τῇ θλίψει, "who comforteth us in all our tribulations." This sense of παρακαλεῖ, which has occurred (at least conjointly) at Acts 16, 40, 20, 12 and several times in the Gospels, and which indeed is frequent in the New Testament (as 2 Cor. 2, 6, 7, 6. Eph. 6, 22. Col. 4, 8. 2 Thess. 2, 17. 2 Cor. 13, 11.) is supposed to be Hellenistical, as it is never found in the Classical writers. It signifies literally "to bid any one take comfort, by suggesting such motives and reasons for it as are calculated to raise the spirits of the sinking sufferer;" and, from the adjunct, it denotes every sort of comfort, support, and assistance by which he is revived in spirit, and restored to happiness.

It is observed by Grot., that the Apostle, not with-
out reason, said this in opposition to those who supposed the afflicted to be objects of God's hatred. And he refers to Rom. 5, 3. 8, 35. Theophyl., too, has the following remark: "he does not say 'who doth not suffer us to be afflicted,' but 'who comforteth us in affliction.' For He suffers us to be afflicted, that we, by patience, may obtain the reward."

4. εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τ. ἐ. π. θ., "that we may be able to comfort those in any affliction." By the ἡμᾶς, I think, with the antient and most modern Commentators, the Apostle meant himself. There is sound judgment and fine taste in the following remark of Theodoret: Τοὺς συμβεβηκότας αὐτῷ διηγομένους πεισμούς, τὰ τῶν πεισμῶν ἀλεξιφάρμακα πρέτερα τέθεικε· καὶ δείκνυσι τῶν τῶν ὣλων θεῶν ἰσομέτρους τοὺς πεισμούς τὰς παραμυθίας προσφέροντα. (See Ps. 98, or 94, 19.) And a little further on: Συνῆθως δὲ τῷ μετρίῳ κεχερεμένος φρουρίατι, οὐ δὲ εαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς λαοὺς ἐφι τῆς πυραποφίας τυγχάνειν. Yet (to use the words of Dodd.) this does not seem to have been, by any means the Apostle's aim, nor is there any appearance of art in it; but all is the genuine overflowing of a heart which rejoiced in the consolations of the Gospel felt by itself, and communicated to others. Theophyl. and Οἰκομ. with far less judgment, press on the εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι. But it is merely indicative of the Apostle's accustomed modesty; and is meant to hint to other preachers of the word of God what was their duty.

The παρακαλοῦμεθα must not, I think, be understood (with some) of the comfort which the repentance of the incestuous person gave the Apostle, after the affliction he had endured on his account; nor, with others, (as Grot,) merely of the gifts of the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to him, (though the possession of such would be a source of great consolation) but also of that spiritual support breathed into his soul by the Great Comforter, the Paraclete, sent from God, and who is God; or, as Dodd. says, the general consolation arising from the pardon of
sin, an interest in God, an assurance that nothing should separate him from Christ, that afflictions should co-operate for his advantage, and that a crown of glory, heightened by these trials, should close the scene.

5. ἃτι καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα, &c. The recent Commentators explain the περισσεύει happen. But the Greek Interpreters treat the word as a very strong expression. It must, at least, denote abundantly happen; which sense has place also in Rom. 5, 15.

At τοῦ Χριστοῦ Glass, Est., Vorst., Menoch., and most recent Commentators think, there is an ellipsis of ὑπὲρ; and they render, “propter Christum,” for his glory.” And Schleus. adduces examples from Lysias, p.110. τιμωρία τῶν θεῶν, πονέων διὸ violatos Deos; and Cic. pro Rosc. Amer. C. 24. πονεῖν parentem, i. e. πονεῖν ob parentes. And in this view the sentence may be Englished thus: “As sufferings for Christ abundantly happen to us, so by means of Christ is comfort abundantly imparted to us.” Yet the genitive (I conceive) is meant to express something more,* as the Greek Commentators and some early moderns suggest. Thus Theophyl. τοῦ Χριστοῦ γὰρ ἐστι παθήματα ταῦτα ἡ ὑπερίς πάσχομεν, καὶ κοινώναι αὐτῶν γενομένα τῶν παθημάτων. And so Beza, Scaler, and Whitby, who observe, that the sufferings of Christ’s members for his sake are styled his sufferings, because they are evils inflicted on his members out of enmity to him, and by reason of their mystical union to him, and the sympathy he has with them in their sufferings; as Rom. 8, 17.† which surely suggests the strongest motives for con-

* And that something more is required, Semler and Jaspis acknowledge.
† If this be thought too refined an interpretation, try that of Semler, which is adopted by Jaspis, namely: “calamities suffered after the example of Christ;” since at 2 Tim. 3, 12. Paul says that all those who will live godly in Christ, will not want afflictions. And in Phil. 3, 10. he mentions the κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων.

The word πάθημα is of frequent occurrence in St. Paul's Epistles, but is no where met with in the Gospels. It is rightly remarked by Vater, that the εἰς ἡμᾶς is meant for both clauses.

Διὰ is explained by Rosenm. "from the happy success of Christ's religion." Thus, Semler observes, Christ is put for Christianity. But this is a most unwarranted paring down of the plain sense, which was distinctly seen by Theophyl., who remarks: τὸ πᾶν γὰρ τῷ αὐτῷ ἀνατίθησι. The sense is very well expressed by Tirin., Menoch., and Est. ap. Pole, but most fully by Mackn., in the following admirable exposition. "The consolation of which the Apostle speaks, was derived from the presence of Christ with him in his affliction; from a sense of the love of Christ shed abroad in his heart; from the joy which the success of the Gospel gave him; from the assured hope of the reward which was prepared for him; from his knowledge of the influence of his sufferings to encourage others; and from the enlarged views which he had of the government of God, whereby all things are made to work for good to them who love God; so that he was entirely reconciled to his sufferings." See also Whitby.

6. ἔπε πε ἐνθιβομαι—σωτηρίας. The connexion here is no means obvious, and is very unsuccess-fully traced out by the Commentators, both ancient and modern, especially Dodd. This and the scope of the passage have (I think) been best laid down by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) as follows: Διὰ τοῦτο, φησιν, οὖ δει ἡμᾶς θιμωβεϊσθαι εἰπ' ταῖς θλίψεις μου, διότι ἕπε τῶν ἡμῶν σωτηρίας καὶ παρακλήσεως θλισθέμαι. See the paraphrase of Hamm. Jaspis very well expresses the general sense as follows: "Si solatio erigor, vos quoque optima sperare potestis; si vero constanter calamitates me urgent, me patientia ex-emplar intueri potestis, et est vel jam hac de causa ali-
quod solamen miseris, socios habuisse malorum; ergo sive miser, sive felix sim, hoc vobis est solatio et emo-
lumento.”

6. ὑπὲρ, useful for, tends to. Σωτηρίας, “spi-
ritual welfare, and tending to salvation.” Τῆς ἐνεργο-
μένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τ. a. π., “which is efficacious, ef-
fectual, operative in the endurance of,” &c. Ἐνεργ. is a passive taken as a reciprocal; as is frequent
in verbs which in the active voice have either an ac-
tive or neuter sense. Ὅν is for ἀ, on account of the
genitives preceding.

Here there is a great diversity of various readings,
but which make little difference in the sense; but
that in which the clause τῆς ἐνεργομένης—πάσχομεν is
transposed (as in Griesbach) seems to deserve the
preference.

6. καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαιὰ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, “and our
hope of you (de vobis) is sure and stedfast.” These
words are by Grot. and some others put into a paren-
thesis.

Of ἐλπὶς with βεβαιὸς examples are adduced by
Wets. By ἐλπὶς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, the Apostle means a hope
of their constancy in enduring evils. Theophyl. ex-
plains: θαρροῦμεν ἐφ’ ὑμῖν βεβαιῶσ. ὅτι οὐ περιτραπ-
θεσθε ὑπὸ τῶν προσπιτῶν ὑμῶν πειρασμῶν τολλῷ
οὐ μάλλον οὐ παρακληθῆσθε ἐφ’ οἷς ὄρατε ἡμᾶς πάσχο-
tas. If the sentence καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς be not taken as pa-
renthaletical, εἰδότες must be taken for εἰδότων: a sort
of syntax sometimes found in the best writers (from
whom examples are adduced by Schmid on Matt.
10, 4.), especially Thucyd.; but which seldom (I
think) occurs in St. Paul.

The words following are well paraphrased by
Theophyl. thus: αἰστέρ, ἕστι, διακομένων ἡμῶν ἄλ-
γειτε, ὡς αὐτῷ πάσχοντες τούτῳ ὁτι εἰς ὰμεν ὅτι καὶ πα-
ρακαλομένων, αὐτῷ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἀπολαύειν νομίζετε.
I would render: “not doubting, i. e. for I do not
doubt (the participle being put for the verb) that as
you are partakers of the sufferings which attend the
Gospel, you are partakers of its consolations derived.
from faith in the promises, and the comforts of the Holy Spirit. So Rosenm.: "Scire se dicit, Corinthios tangi sensu ut adversorum, ita et bonorum, quae ipsi, dante Deo, contigebant. Nam sine dubio multi inter Corinthios Pauli caussa et ipsi dolebant, metuebantque, participes quodammodo omnium ærumnarum, quibus tanti magistri ministerium obruebatur. Eosdem igitur etiam solatii, gaudiiique novi participes esse et velle et debere, hic occupat." It is plain that at καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως the preceding ἐστε must be repeated, and not ἔστεσθε, as in our common Version and Mackn.

Theodoret ably traces the scope of this whole passage thus: ἔπειδη δὲ τῆς ὑμετέρας προμηθεύμεθα σεωτηρίας, παρὰ μὲν τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν τῶν σκυθραπτῶν δεχόμεθα προσβολήν, παρὰ δὲ τῶν Δεσπότου Θεοῦ τῆν ψυχάν γιαγίαν καρπούμεθα, ἢστε καὶ τῶταν κοικεῖαν διὰ ὑμᾶς ἀπολαῦμεν κοινωνεῖτε δὲ ἡμῖν ἀμφιτέρων, ἀτε δὴ τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν οἰκεῖομενοι.

8. οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. A formula frequent in St. Paul; as Rom. 1, 13. 1 Cor. 10, 1. 12, 1. 1 Thess. 4, 13. and elsewhere. It is a kind of meiosis for, "I would have you know," or "I cannot but make you informed." Τπέρ ὑ. is for περὶ ὑ., which indeed some MSS. and Fathers read, but it seems a gloss. For ὑπὲρ is frequently used by St. Paul in the place of περὶ. It is observed by Theophyl., that as he had before mentioned tribulation generally, so he now adverts to it particularly.

8. τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ασίᾳ. To what circumstance the Apostle adverts the Commentators are not agreed. Theodoret and some moderns understand, the riot of Demetrius, when they suppose the Apostle was thrown to the wild beasts. But it is observed by Whitby and Mackn., that as he did not go into the theatre then, (Acts 19, 50.) but kept himself concealed from the rioters, he ran no such risk of his life, on that occasion, as to justify the strong expressions in ver. 9 & 10. To this, however, I can scarcely assent. Yet I am inclined to think, with Whitby and Mackn., that there is reference to
his actual exposure to wild beasts at Ephesus, mentioned at 15, 32. (where see the note.) Chrysost. and Theophyl. refer it to 16, 9. But that would not justify the strong expressions used just after. Selmcr thinks it relates to some plots of the Jews, glanced at in Acts 20, 3.; though these might involve imminent peril to the Apostle. Others think that some circumstances are alluded to which have not been recorded by St. Luke. But the second opinion is far the most probable. See, however, Dodd. 8. καθ’ ύπερβαλλήν is for ύπερβαλλόντως; as in Rom. 7, 19. "Εβαριθήμεν, “weighed down by calamity.” I would compare Aristoph. ap. Zon. Lex. p. 1785. ιππόμενος ταῖς συμφοραῖς. "Υπὲρ δύναμιν, “beyond our strength.” Much the same as παρὰ δύναι, which often occurs: and both are the opposite to κατὰ δύναμιν, which occurs in Thucyd. I, 45. 8. ἀστε ἐξαποφεύγοναι ἦμας καὶ τοῦ δήν. Theophyl. well paraphrases: περαιμὲς ἂν μέγας καὶ ἀβάστακτος, καὶ τοσοῦτος, ἀστε ἐξαποφεύγοναι, &c. The sense is: “so that we even despaired of life.” Thus Theophyl.: ἀστε μηδὲ προνοούσκειν ἦμας ἐτε δήν. And so Theodoret. Some would interpret: “insomuch that my life was despaired of.” And Rosenm. thinks this sense is supported by the words following. That, however, cannot be admitted by the usus loquendi; neither will it be necessary, if those words be properly interpreted. The term ἐξαπ. is a very strong one; the preposition being intensive. This is well illustrated by a parallel passage infr. 4, 8. άριστομενος ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι. It signifies “to be reduced to an utter ἀπορία, or consilii inopia, and despair.” Thus in Ps. 88, 18. it answers to the Hebr. פָד, “prorsus perplexus fuit.” Wets. compares Job. 10, 1. 9. ἀλλὰ οὕτως—εὐνοῦσ. This sentence is very ill rendered by our English Translators, especially Mackn. The ἀλλὰ plainly signifies nay, quinetiam:*  

* It well remarked by Schirling: “Rem illustrat per contrarium: quasi dicat, pro spe aliquá vitam habuimus ipsi in nobis ipsis decre- tum mortis. Non tantum aili me habebant pro jam mortuo, sed ego ipsae, quamvis alioquin nemo facile de ipso desperet.”
and the words following, which are exegetical of the preceding, contain a very strong and figurative mode of expressing utter despair of life; as we say, "the having nought but death before our eyes." I cannot think that there is any prosopopoeia, in ἰάνατος; as some recent Commentators suppose.

Ἀπόκριμα is a somewhat obscure word, which some explain κατάκριμα. But as τὸ διὰ πνευματος is added, that would occasion a causeless pleonasm. Chrys. rightly explains it τὴν ψῆφον, τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν προσδοκιάν, which is approved by Schleus.* The Apostle means to say that he was like one who lies under condemnation to death, over whom the execution of the law is continually suspended.† The exposition of Theophyl. (formed from Chrysostom's copious matter) is as follows: τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν ψῆφον, τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ἢν εἶδοι τὸ πράγματα μᾶνον οὐκ ἦν ἁπλῶς ταύτης, μέχρι τῆς ὑπονοίας τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐστιν ἢ τοῦ διὰ πνευματος προσδοκίας, καὶ ἡ ἀπόκρισις, ἢν ἦν τῶν πραγμάτων φύσις ἐποίησε τερατεύοντος ὅσον προέβη. And so Οἰκουμ., and also Grot. and Casaub. See also Phot. ap. Οἰκουμ., who takes the expression for τὸ τέλος, άκομας.

The word ἀπόκριμα generally signifies no more than a response, or answer. But it may have a special sense, according to the persons who return the answers. Thus, when used of the Roman Senators, it

* But I am surprised the learned Lexicographer did not perceive that the words τὴν προσδοκίαν are corrupt. Read τὴν προσδοκία (in my expectation), and all will be right. Theophyl., in compiling his exposition from Chrysost., seems to have been perplexed with the words, and omits them: but it is here better to heal than to amputate.

† So Thucyd. 2. 53. speaking of the people of Athens during the pestilence, says that they set all laws at defiance, from having death continually suspended over them as a sentence of death already denounced, and which they might continually expect would be carried into execution. His words, which are most affecting, are these: ἀκομῇ δὲ μεῖζω (scil. τιμωρίαι) τὴν ἡδίν καταψυχησθέντας σφόν ἐπικραμαθήναι. And so Philostr. Vit. Ap. 7, 28, p. 305. fin. δοκεῖτε μοι προσποτινοτέστιν τοῦ τούτου καταψυχησθέντος ἢ τοῦ ψων, ὅπειρον, διὰ πνεύματος. And in Soph. Elect. 782. Clytemnestra says (in reference to the threats of Orestes) ἀλλ' ὁ προστητός χρῶνος διῆγε μ' αἰέν ὡς θανατομένην.
denoted a decree; as in a passage of Joseph. cited by Kypke, and in Suidas, cited by Wets. Again, when used of judges, it meant verdict, or sentence (see Acts 15, 19. Eng. V.), whether of condemnation, or acquittal; and therefore it requires (as here) the addition of some other word to qualify it.

9. ἵνα μὴ πεποίθητε ἀμέν, &c. These words have been ill understood by our modern Commentators, which arose from not adverting to the ellipsis of a clause which must be supplied, in order to make the sense clear; though it is in some degree implied in the ἵνα. The following, then, seems to be the sense: "And this was not done without cause, but for the purpose of showing us and making us feel that we should not trust in ourselves." &c. So Theophyl.: διὰ τι δὲ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, φησιν; ἵνα, &c. And so Phot.: γέγονε δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ παρ’ ἐπίκλασ ἐξήγαμεν. Theodoret explains thus: ἀλλὰ μέχρι τῆς ἤμετέρας ἐστησεν ὑπονοίας τοῦ βαρέτου τῆς ἀπειλῆς. ἵνα μὴ, &c.

The πεποίθητε ἀμέν may be regarded as a participle and verb substantive for the verb. Yet it seems to have been used by the Apostle as better adapted to express continuity of action and custom. By trusting in ourselves is meant having regard to our own strength only, and human probabilities.* It is excellently observed by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) that the Apostle says this, not that he had then to learn this lesson (for who ever better knew and practised it than he?) but, in speaking this of himself he means to form others to his example, that they may exercise the same edifying humility.

9. ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκροὺς, "who raiseth the dead." Grot. remarks that by the Hebrews those are said to be dead who are quasi mortui; and those who are liberated are said to be resuscitati. And, as Phot. well observes, Paul was, as it were, dead, being so

* To which purpose Wets. aptly cites Philo de Leg. T. 2. p. 574, 43. τὰ μὲν οὖν ἐς ἀνθρώπων πάντα καὶ ἐφή καὶ ἐσθεν, μενέτω δὲ ἐν ταῖς λύσεις ἀκαθαρσεις η ἐκ τῶν σωτηρία θεων ἐλπὶς, δ οὐ πολλάκις ἐς ἀμηχάνως καὶ ἀπόρων περιέσωσε τὸ δόνοι.
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ςω τῇ δυνάμει αυτοῦ, so far as depended on any power of his own. Hence we see the propriety with which the Apostle has subjoined to Θεός the epithet "who raiseth the dead."

10. ἐκ τηλικοῦτον βανάτου ἐφρύσατο, "who hath delivered us from so great and deadly a peril, and is still delivering us from perils." Θάνατος here denotes a peril of life.* So 11, 23. ἐν βανάτοις πολλάκις, (ἡν.) This indeed savours of Oriental hyperbole; yet it is sometimes found in the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Alberti and Palairet.

I would place a comma after ἧμᾶς; and I would observe, that it is not necessary, nor indeed proper, to repeat ἐκ τηλικοῦτον βανάτου, but we may merely understand deliverance in general, viz. from the snares and dangers, with which the Apostle was, doubtless, continually encircled by his relentless adversaries the Jews. The omission of the words καὶ ποιεῖται in some MSS. Syr., Vulg., and some other Versions, was not accidental, but from intention, and to remove the difficulty, though very needlessly, and to the destruction of the figure. The reading of some other antient MSS. and Versions, ποιεῖται, arose from the ποιεῖται just after. That ποιεῖται must be taken of deliverance generally, is plain from the ποιεῖται in the next clause of this antithetical sentence. For the ἐφρύσατο ἧμᾶς, καὶ ποιεῖται, and the ποιεῖται, form a beautiful chain.†

10. ἀλλικαίμεν. Erasm. and Vatab. render speravi- mus. But it is better rendered in the Vulg. spera-

* A deliverance of this kind may, as Chrys. and Theophyl. beautifully observe, be called a sort of resurrection: for when a man is, by the help of God, as it were, brought from the gates of death, his deliverance, or recovery, is a kind of resurrection from the dead. "So (says Theophyl.) we are accustomed to say of such persons "we have seen the resurrection of the dead.""

† And Theodoret seems to have felt this: for, after remarking on ποιεῖται, he has the following observation: εἰπὼς ἐκ διδόν θείνα τῶν ἐπιμένων τὰ γεγενημένα, ἐπήγαγε, &c.
mus: and in most modern versions the present is adopted; and rightly, except that perhaps that sense of the aorist may here have place by which it denotes custom, i. e. "sperare solemus." And this seems more significant.

"Eri, "yet again."

11. συνεσχηματιστων καὶ ὕμων, &c. i. e. "you also co-operating with us in prayer in our behalf." The verb συνεσχηματίζω. sometimes occurs in the Classical writers, and properly takes a dative dependent on the συν; here δεικνύει is not governed by the verb, but depends on a preposition understood, ἐν or ἐνῷ.

One cannot but admire the deep humility, and exquisite modesty* evinced in these words, which must, too, have been calculated to impress the Christians with a very favourable opinion of Paul.

The words following are obscure by reason of the imperfect construction of the sentence, all which may fairly be attributed to extreme pathos, and perhaps haste. For the whole Epistle bears the marks of being far more hastily (and perhaps suddenly) written than any of the rest. Ἐσθ., too, is here used in a sense rarely occurring in the best writers, namely, "cum gratiarum actio celebrari," "to be returned thanks for." For though Polyb., Diod. Sic., Joseph., and the Apocryphal writers sometimes use εἰχάριστεῖν in the sense "to give thanks," yet of the passive in this sense I can find no example. The construction is (as was just observed) perplexed: and Roseim. endeavours to clear it by supplying a κατὰ at τὸ εἰς ὕμως ἔκθεσις. He then offers the following explanation: "respectu habito ad beneficium in me collatum, vel propter beneficium, &c. Similis ellipsis τοῦ κατὰ est infra C. 6, 18. 1 Cor. 11, 2." The διὰ τολῶν he explains in the same manner as διὰ βοηθῶν in Hebr.

* The καὶ very delicately seems to suggest the necessity of their co-operation with him in prayers for future deliverance.

On the duty and benefits of prayer for others, see the Greek Commentators and Mackn.
13, 22. But it does not follow because such a use prevails in διὰ βραχέων, that it must be admitted to have place in every adjective. A positive example of διὰ πολλῶν would be requisite, which I suspect will not easily be found. The subaudition, too, of κατὰ is here too arbitrary, though it is adopted by our English translators. And as to the sense of the passage laid down by Ros., which is as follows: "Ut pro illo in me collato beneficio, quod simul ad multos pertinet, etiam gratiae Deo pro me agantur," I do not see how it can be fairly elicited. If I am not mistaken, the antient Commentators have been here more successful in tracing the construction of the passage and the scope of the Apostle. Thus Theophyl. ἐρώσατο, οὖσιν, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ῥύσεται διὰ τῶν ὑπερετῶν εὐχῶν ἵνα τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα, τὸ διὰ πολλῶν, τούτεστιν, ἦ εἰς ἐμὲ γινομένη χάρις διὰ πολλῶν, τούτεστιν, ὑμᾶς ὑπερευθαμένων μου, ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων εὐχαριστήσῃ, ὑγοῦν ὑμῶν. Τὴν σωτηρίαν γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν διὰ τῶν εὐχῶν ὑμῶν γινομένην πάσιν ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσατο, ἵνα πολλὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶ εὐχαριστήσῃ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. And this exposition is supported by Chrys. and more or less by all the antient interpreters.

Ἐκ here signifies "on the part of," "procured by the prayers of." And so Rosenm. assigns to it the sense of a, denoting the efficient cause; as infra S, 5. 5, 1. Rom. 13, 5. On πρόσωπων, see Kypke in loc.

In the words τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα, there is an ellipsis of a participle; which is very frequent in the popular style. Χάρισμα seems to signify "the preservation of, or deliverance, graciously vouchsafed to us." So Schliting and Wets. The next words, διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστήσῃ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, signify "might be acknowledged with thankfulness by many." "Τερ ἡμῶν, which belongs to τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς, signifies "for us," "on our behalf." And so Schliting, and, upon the whole, Doddr. and Mackn., the former of whom subjoins: "as nothing is more reasonable than that mercies obtained by prayer should be owned in praise."
12. ἢ γὰρ καύχησις, &c. The connexion here is not very obvious, and few attempt to trace it. Schilzing lays it down thus: "Causam adsert cur velit pro se orari et gratias agi: quasi dicat, quia de hoc gloriar in possum ac debeo." This, however, seems formal, and frigid. I should rather suppose it (with Dodd.) to be as follows: "And this confidence which we have both towards God and you, is much emboldened, as we have an inward assurance of our own integrity, however men may suspect or censure us." Certain it is, that clauses are occasionally left to be supplied by γὰρ in all the antient writers.

It is not necessary to press on the sense of καύχ., which may be explained "a cause of just boasting and rejoicing," "something on which one may reasonably pride, and comfort oneself," * i. e. towards men: which perhaps is implied, especially as the words ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ occur further on, and seem to have been in the Apostle's mind here. Or it may signify towards himself. In which view Theophyl. paraphrases thus: "as my former consolation and comfort was from God, so this is from the purity of my conscience." And he rightly remarks, that the Apostle uses the strong term καύχησις, to denote the complete confidence he had in the purity of his conscience. See also Phot. ap. ÓEcumen. and Theodoret.†

The τῷ μαρτυρίων is in apposition, i. e. "even the testimony." "Ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινεία Θεοῦ. The ὅτι signifies "It is this, that," &c. Of the terms ἀπλ. and εἰλ. the former is well explained by Theophyl. ἐν ἀποφθεγμα γνώμῃ; and by ÓEcumen. ἀνευ δόλου. Dodd. explains the terms, "not only meaning well on the whole, but declining an over-artful way of prosecuting a good end. The εἰλικρινεία Θεοῦ, most recent Commentators (after Schilzing) interpret

* So Theophyl. παρακύβλεα ἡμῖν ἅφορη εὕστε.
† Here Bulkley cites a fine passage of Phaed. "Si livor obtrectare curam voluerit, non tamen eripiet laudis conscientiam."
"summâ sinceritate," adventing to that idiom by which the name of God added to a noun or adjective has the effect of raising its quality to the highest pitch. But this does not apply to all nouns, or adjectives; and here there is no need to resort to that precarious principle. It may be interpreted, with Theophyl (from Chrys.) thus: καθαροτήτι διανοίας καὶ ἀδολάτητι, οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν συνεκκιασσένων καὶ ὑπολογοῦν, οἰκὶ τὸ Θεὸς ἀπεδέχεται.* So 1 Cor. 5, 8. ἐν αἰζόμοις τιλκρινίας καὶ ἀλθείας. And Wets. compares the following beautiful sentiment of Plutarch de anim. tranquill. p. 477 A. οὐτε οἰκία πολυτέλης, οὐτε χρυσός πλῆθος, οὐτε ἀξίωμα γένους, οὐτε μεγέθος ἀρχῆς, οὐ λόγοι χάρις, οὐ δεινότητι, εὐδίᾳ παρέχει βίω καὶ γαλάζῃν τοσαύτων, ὅτιν ὑπακοή καθαρέως πραγμάτων καὶ βουλη-μάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ βίου πηγῆν τὸ θῆσος ἀτάραχον ἔχουσα καὶ ἀμίλανον.

12. οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ. Theophyl. well explains this: οὐκ ἐν δεινότητι λόγων καὶ πλούσῃ σοφηματῶν. For that (he adds) was the usual wisdom on which they prided themselves, but which the Apostle rejects. So Cæcumen. οὐκ ἐν δεινότητι καὶ στροφῇ λόγων συνεκκια-ζούσῃ τὴν ἀλθείαν.

'Ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι Θεοῦ. Here again the sense is miserably curtailed by the recent interpreters, who render: "sapientiâ Deo gratâ." The true sense seems to be that assigned by Chrys. and the Greek

* Cæcumen. explains it ἐνε ὑπαρκισεως καὶ ὑποκαλύμματος. And this interpretation is supported by Est., Sclat., Tiren., Menoch., Grot., Beza, and others. Rosem. compares Ps. 51, 19. ὅτι ἐγώ οὐκ. That the sense I have adopted is the one meant by the Apostle, is clear from the paranthetical words following, which are plainly exegetical of the preceding, and which (I think) justify the opinion of Theophyl., that the former words are levelled against the false teachers. And so Cæcumen. and Chrys.

Grot. thinks this was meant to anticipate an objection, as though the Apostle had promised a return, and not kept his word. Thus he means to say, that he is just as he was at Corinth, viz. not double-minded, but that events over which he had no control have altered his counsels. Grot. compares Senec. Omnia debent eadem esse que fuerint cum promitteres, ut promittentis fidem teneas. This, however, seems too strained and hypothetical.
Commentators. Thus Theophyl. ἐν τῇ παρ' αὐτῷ χαρισματική σοφία, καὶ ἐν σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν, ἀ χάρις Θεοῦ ἵσαν (or, as ΟΕcumen. explains, χαρίσματα.) And so Beza, Grot., Menoch., Tiren., Est., and others.

Ἀνεστράφημεν, “we have conducted ourselves.” So versuri in the Latin. The word is properly one of middle signification, and in the Classical writers is chiefly used of worldly business; as in Arrian, Polyb., and the later writers. It is, however, used in the Old Testament in a moral sense; as Prov. 20, 8. Sir. 38, 28.; but chiefly in a good one. In the New Testament it is used both in a good (as here and in 1 Tim. 3, 15. πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι. and 1 Pet. 1, 17.) and in a bad sense; as Eph. 2, 3. 2 Pet. 2, 18. It here has reference not only to the Apostle’s moral character as a man and a Christian, but also to his conduct as a minister.

Ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, “every where in the world where I have been.” Περισσοτέρας δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, “and especially towards you.” It is well remarked by Theophyl. ὅτι μετὰ τῶν σημείων, ἔτι καὶ ἀδάπανον παρ' αὐτῶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκήρυξεν. And so ΟΕcumen.

13, 14. οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἄλλα ἡ ἀναγιμνώσκετε, καὶ ἐπιγιμνώσκετε. The sense of these words is by no means clear. Hence Commentators differ in opinion. Most modern ones adopt the interpretation of Beza: “I write no other things than what ye read, or may understand.”* And so Rosenm., who paraphrases (chiefly from Wets.): “Etandem animi integritatem, quam iu vitâ meâ exprimere soleo, etiam in epistolis meis agnosceatis. Non opus est mihi occulto et ancipiti scribendi genere; non scribo alia, vel diversa ab iis quæ animo cogito; sed apertè scribo, ut quivis epistolam legens vel statim

* Wets. paraphrases thus: “Nihil occultò, non ambigüè sed apertè scribo, ita ut quivis epistolam legens vel statim intelligere possit, vel, si aliqui hæret, post secundam aut tertiam lectionem, attento animo factam, sit intellecturus.”
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intelligere possit, vel, sialicubi hæreat. post secundam aut tertiam lectionem, attento animo factam, sit intellecturus."* This mode of interpretation, however, seems very harsh and far-fetched, (not to mention that the Apostle is never observed to advert to such a subject as the obscurity or perspicuity of his language, which would, in a great measure, depend on time and circumstances). Still more so is that of Storr Opusc. p. 100. The one most natural, and agreeable to the context seems to be that of Theophyl. (from Chrys.), who traces the scope and details the sense of the passage as follows: Ἐκεῖθε μεγάλα ἑδοξὲ λέγειν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἣν μῆτις εἰκῇ κόμπων ῥημάτων εἶναι ταῦτα, Φησὶν, ὅτι ἐκείνη γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἢ ἀναγινώσκετε μὲν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τούτοις, γινώσκετε δὲ προφθάσαντες καὶ ύμεῖς. Οὐ γὰρ ἐναντίον τοῖς γράμμασι μοι ἡ ὑμετέρα γνώσις, ἢν ἔχετε προλάβουντες περὶ ἑμοῦ. And so Theodoret: Οὐ γὰρ, ἂς τινες ἡμᾶς διαβάλλειν, ἐπιχειροῦσιν, ἔτερα μὲν φρονοῦμεν, ἔτερα δὲ κηρύττομεν, καὶ μαρτυρεῖ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ πείρα· ὅ γὰρ παρόν ὑμᾶς ἔδιδαξα, ταῦτα καὶ ἄτων ἐπιστέλλω, ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τῶν ἐξής ἀπαντα χρόνου κηρύξειν ἐκπίθοι. And this is adopted by Doddrit, who cannot well be suspected of having borrowed it from that source. His exposition is as follows: "I speak of the integrity with which I have conducted myself among you, with great freedom; for we write no other things to you on this head, but what we well know, and must be obliged to acknowledge; and I hope that ye will have equal cause to acknowledge them even unto the end." And, in his note, he remarks: "The word ἀναγινώσκω is ambiguous, and may signify either to acknowledge, to know, or to read; but I think the sense here plainly determines it to knowing."

There is here a beautiful paronomasia, which is

* And in the same view Mackn. observes: "It seems the faction had affirmed, that some passages of Paul's former letter were designedly in ambiguous language, that he might afterwards interpret them, as it suited his purpose."
destroyed by the Critical conjectures that have been hazarded on this passage, which may be seen in Bowyer.

'Εκείνος δὲ—μέρους. In conformity with the mode of interpretation adopted in the preceding words, to these is assigned by Theophyl. the following natural and suitable sense: ἐπιτίθη, φησίν, εἰς τὸν Θεὸν δηλαδή, ὅτι τοιούτους ἡμᾶς ἐπιγνώσεσθε, οὕτως καὶ αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ ἡμῶν θηλώσει, καὶ ὁ παρελθὼν βίος ἐγγυάται. Ἐκ μέρους γὰρ ἐπέγνωτε ἡμᾶς, τοιῶστιν, ἐπειράσθητε, ἡμῶν ἐπιδείξα-μένων ὑμῖν ἐκ μέρους τινὰ ἐναρέτοι βίον τεκμήρια.

"Οτι καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν—Ἰησοῦ. The sense is: "You will find and acknowledge (I say) that we are your rejoicing, as also you ours in the day of the Lord." The force of these words is admirably illustrated by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) He explains καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν thus: "I am such as may give you an occasion of being proud of me, namely that ye have such a teacher, a teacher instructing you in what is not merely of human discovery, nought ἐποικον or δολερον." Then (adds Theophyl.) that he may not seem vain-glorious, he makes the boasting common to them both, subjoining: "also, ye will be mine: for I shall be proud of having met with such disciples, not wavering, or shaken by false teachers." The following words ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου I. X. seem to fix the period of their rejoicing. Hence many modern Commentators render the ἐσμεν in the future. But the Apostle and the Corinthian disciples would be respectively a matter of rejoicing to each other, both in that day and the day of the Lord. Others adopt the present. But this cannot suit the day of the Lord. It should seem that the sentence is highly elliptical, and may best be interpreted in a close paraphrase, as follows: "You will find (I say) and acknowledge, that we are your boasting, even as ye are ours (and will, I trust be,) in the day of the Lord."

15. καὶ ταυτῇ πεποιθήσει, &c. "In this confidence, and reliance on your being well affected to us," &c.
For that I think with Paul is the sense intended; though Theophyl. and Curaumen, extend it to all the foregoing particulars from ver. 12. The word ἀνεπεμφάνισθη is one of later Grecism, and not approved by the Anticritics. Yet examples of it are adduced by the Commentators from Hermog., Sert. Emp., Simplic., Joseph., and others. Ἐκεῖνος ἦσας ἔπλασεν συνεργὴν, "I was minded to come unto you before," viz., when I wrote my former Epistle." (See 1 Cor. 16, 5.) The Apostle means to say, that it was his first intention to have visited them before the Macedonians. He then shows that he did not abandon this intention from levity or sickness, but for sufficient causes.

Ἀνεπεμφάνισθη is well explained by Theophyl. "a double praemium... viz., that by the first Epistle, and that by my present." And so Paul, who says that ἐπισκόπησον is for ἔπλασεν: as in Phil. 1, and Tob. 7, 20. See several Classical examples from Pind. Polyd., cited by Schleus. in his Lex., who adopts this interpretation, as does also Wolf. And it is confirmed by ver. 24, and 2, 1 and 2. Yet many modern Commentators assign to the word the sense gift, benefit. But this, though it may be justified, is not so natural a sense.

16. καὶ ἥν ἔπανα, &c. Here the Apostle clearly indicates the plan of the journey he had first formed; but, as impediments had intervened when he wrote his former Epistle, he there mentions only one passing through Corinth. (Rosenm.)

Ἤν ἔπανα is a popular and colloquial mode of expression for "your city and province." On ἔπανα. I have before treated, at Rom. 15, 24, and elsewhere. Rosenm. thinks that the Apostle meant that the Presbyters, or Deacons, should accompany him and be his associates in the conveyance of the alms; a business he had previously settled with the Palestine Jews. (Gal. 2, 10.) But this seems an incorrect view of the thing. The Apostle did not then contemplate being an associate in conveying the alms: nay
even in his first Epistle that is mentioned only as a contingency. See the note on 16, 4. and Est. on the present passage.

17. τούτο οὖν βουλεύομενος, &c., "This, therefore, being my intention (then), did I, forsooth, use (or show) levity? Can I be accused of levity? namely, because I took this journey alone."* Theophyl. explains τὴν ἐλαφρίαν ἐκεισάμην ἐξ ἐλαφροῦ καὶ εὐρύπιστος, καὶ ἀλλοτε ἄλλα φρονών. So Theodoret: καῦσθος εἰμι, ἐξυρρήτορός ἐσμεν μεταβολᾶς. The interrogation, it may be observed, carries with it a strong negation. So Theophyl. οὐδ' ἤμεν. See Grot. and Casaub. Here Wets. compares Phaedr. prol. 5. Cum destinássem terminum operi statuere—Consilium tacito corde damnavi meum—non levitas mihi, sed certa ratio causam scribendi dedit.

17. ἢ ά αναβείνωμαι, κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύομαι. At a subaud kατ'Α. The κατὰ σάρκα Rosenm. explains perfidid. But it rather seems to denote the being influenced by his own private and human views and passions, without regard to the motions of the Spirit. So Theodoret: οὔτε μην πάθει δουλεύω. And so Theophyl.: ἀνθρωπίνως βουλεύομαι καὶ οἰκεία γνωμή διωκόμαι. And Phot. ap. Ócumen. takes κατὰ σάρκα for αὐτεξουσίως, αὐτοκελεύστως, αὐτοδεσπότως. Many modern Commentators interpret it of avarice, ambition, and other such carnal affections. And so Rosenm., of perfidy. But such the false teachers probably did not impute to the Apostle. At least, here are only two charges adverted to, namely, levity and inconstancy; and the being guided solely by his own private and worldly views, without regard to the Spirit of God. So Theodoret.

The words following, ἵνα ἢ παρ' εἰμι τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ, are plainly exegetical of the former, and must be interpreted in accordance therewith. But on the sense of the words, which even Chrys. acknowledges are obscure, the Commentators are not

* Mackn. thus paraphrases: "Was the alteration of my purpose a proof that I formed it without due consideration."
agreed. Casaub. offers the following exposition:
"Non ita delibero ut solent homines, suae fragilitatis
immemores, ut Etiam sit apud me Etiam, et Non
Non, h. e. ut, cum aliquid me facturum dico, id certò
affirmarem, quasi omnino facturus; aut cum nego,
id certò negem, quasi omnino non facturus. Nam
apud me sit aliquando ut Etiam sit Non, et Non sit
Etiam: ut quod dixi venturum me ad vos, id erat
Etiam; at idem nunc factum est Non, quoniam non
veni: non enim permissit Deus, penes quem sunt
actiones nostrae, ut nihil ipsi de nobis certò affir-
mare aut negare possimus." And Erasm. the fol-
lowing: "Naì apud Graecos est affirmantis, quò ne-
gantis. Ergo qui non faciunt quod affirmant se fac-
turos, iis Non est Non: et qui faciunt quod affirmant
se facturos, iis Etiam est Etiam." Others, as Beza,
Grot., Bengel., and Schleus., suspect that the true
reading is τò vol, kal τò oò, as adopted by the Syr. and
Vulg., and found in some MSS., which Schleus.
renders: "ut apud me sit ita est, et mox, non ita
est," i. e. ut ego fallax sim et mendax et inconstans.
See also Grot., who cites Fest. on the word nauci,
"Quidam ex Greco quod sit vol kal oò Xê, levem ho-
minem significari volentes. Levem ελαφρòν." And
the very same idiom is in the mouths of our vulgar,
who call a whimsical, fickle person, a yea-and-nay-
fellow. But there is no sufficient authority for that
reading (versions being, in cases of great difficulty
in phraseology, no direct evidence), and if there
were, it could not be received, being plainly not
agreeable to the words preceding, which regard, not
inconstancy in forming or following up plans, but a
headstrong spirit in following the dictates of passion,
caprice, or, at least, worldly policy. For this rea-
son I cannot approve of the interpretation of Ro-
sehm.: "ut τò vol vol apud me etiam sit τò oò oò, ut
affirmatio et negatio ejusdem rei apud me idem valeat.
Non sum tam inconstans, ut eodem tempore affirmem
loquendo et scribendo (ut dicam ore: vol vol), et
eodem tempore aliter cogitem (animo et mente quasi
dicam: oū oū, minimē).” This is neither agreeable to the preceding words, nor, indeed, to the usus loquendi; and is resting too much meaning on an insignificant particle, like val. As to the interpretation of Wets., it comes to much the same thing, and therefore is liable to the same objection. And so is the interpretation of Schllting and Jaspis. MacKnoth too has entirely missed the sense. The true scope of the passage, upon which the sense of this idiomatic expression depends, has been best seen by the Greek Commentators, of whom Theodoret admirably traces it as follows: Δύο τέθεικεν εναντία, διν τὸ μὲν πρότερον ἐστὶ τούτο, οὔτε καώφος εἰμι, οὔτε ἐξυφρό-

γως ἔχω τὰς τῆς γνώμης μεταβολῶς, ὅστε νῦν μὲν τούτο,

νῦν δὲ ἕκειν αἰρεῖσθαι· τὸ δὲ δεύτερον τούτο, οὔτε μὴν πάθει

δουλεύσα, ίνα ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας πληρασων
tοῦτο γὰρ λέγει, ἢ ἡ βουλεύσωμαι, κατὰ σάρκα βουλεύσωμαι,

ίνα ἢ παρ’ ἐμοὶ τὸ ναλ ναλ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ; ὃ γὰρ ταῖς τῆς

σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμίας ἐπόμενος, ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων σύρεται λο-

γισμῶν, κἂν λιαν τὸ ἁτόκον ἔχωσιν· ὃ δὲ σαφρόνως βου-

λεύσωμεν, κἂν ἀγαθόν τι βουλεύσηται, συνῆδε δὲ τούτο μὴ

συνώσειν μέλλουν ἑτέροις, οὐκ ἐπιτίθησι τῇ βουλῇ τὸ πέρας.

So Theophyl.: ἀστε δ’ ἀφορίσω παρ’ ἐμαυτῷ, τούτῳ καὶ

πλῆρῳ, κἀγὼ ναλ, κἀγὼ οὖ; Οὐκ ἔστων οὐδὲ τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ
tῷ Πνεύματι ἄγομαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ἐξουσίαν ὅπου θέλω
ἀπείναι, ἀλλ’ ὅτου ἐκεῖνο προστάσει. "Ωστε τολλάκις

παρ’ ἐμοὶ τὸ ναλ οὐκ ἔστι ναλ, διὰ τὸ μὴ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι
dόξαι τούτο· οὐδὲ τὸ οὐ, οὖ, διότε ὅπερ ἐγὼ ἀπανίσσομαι,
tοῦτο κελεῦει τῷ Πνεύμα. So also Chrys., Eceumen.,

and Phot. The idiom was, I think, a proverbial one
to denote a headstrong, self-willed spirit, which will
either do things, or not do them, as it pleases, with-
out giving any reasons. The force of the repeated

val and oū may be illustrated by the usual expression

of such positive persons, ὃ γέγραψα γέγραψα, ἀ πέ-

ραχα πέραχα. The ἵνα ἢ τὸ ναλ ναλ refers to any

purpose to be effected; the τὸ οὐ οὐ, to what is not
to be done; as Theophyl. well shews, who also re-

marks on the skill with which the Apostle turns off

what was matter of accusation into a ground of
praise, namely τὸ μὴ ἐξουσιάζειν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλ' ἀγέρθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος. For, as Chrys. observes, St. Paul did not know, or pretend to know all things; so that sometimes he prayed for ἀσύμφορο; as in the case of the thorn in the flesh. Phot., too, has some very masterly discussions, to which I can only refer the reader.

I must not omit to observe that the interrogation here involves a strong negation.

18. πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς, ὥστε ὁ λόγος—οὐ. Theophyl. and Ecumen. (after Chrys.) rightly observe, that this is meant to anticipate and answer an objection, such as: "If what you say be not firm and stable, and you often say ναῦ, and it is found οὐ, may we not fear lest your word, doctrine, and preaching be found such?" viz. ναῦ ναῦ and οὐ οὐ, i.e. unstable and wavering. To which the Apostle answers: "My promising, or purposing to come, was my own, wherefore I attained it not. But my preaching is of God, and what is such, cannot deceive. Now God is true (πιστὸς, verax); so that, as he is true, neither is his word to you, which we preach, inconstant and unstable." This is (I conceive) the true sense of the passage. The same has been deduced from the words by some eminent modern Commentators, as Beza, Rosenm., and Storr. The chief difficulty (which they, however, do not notice,) centers in ὥστε, which Beza renders quia; and Theophyl., ὥστε. It will be well expressed by the English wherefore; a signification not unfrequent, and of which examples may be found in Schleus. Lex. Most modern Commentators take it in the sense of certainly, and regard the πιστὸς ὁ λόγος as a formula obstestationis. But that is destroying the construction of the sentence, the true ratio of which was alone seen by the Greek Commentators.

It is so plain that λόγος must mean doctrine, that it is strange it should have been taken by Mackn. (and, I suspect, Doddr.) for the promise sent to them by Timothy and Erastus: which, indeed (as Jaspis
remains) is contradicted by what follows. With the πιστος ὁ Θεὸς we may compare Heb. 10, 23, 11, 11. 1 Joh. 1, 9. Deut. 32, 4. This use of πιστος is sometimes found in the Classical writers; as Thucyd. 8, 51. (cited by Schleus.) δύδας δὲ ὁ Α. ὥς πιστὸς εἶναι· and Demosth. 1475.

19. ὁ γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲν Ι. Χ.—οὐ. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed that by Jesus Christ, is here meant his doctrine. So Theodore: ἀντὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος αὐτὸν τὸν κηρυκτόμενον τεθείκε. And so Theophyl.: λοιπὸν λέγει ποῖος λόγος οὐκ ἔγενετο καὶ καὶ οὐ· τουτέστιν, οὐ νῦν μὲν τούτῳ ἐκπρύττετο, νῦν δὲ τούτῳ. ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐγένετο, τουτέστι, ἐβεβαιώσα καὶ ἀπαρασπασμένας ἐκπρύτθη. The reason why οὐδὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ι. Χ. is used for the doctrine of Christ, may (I think) be on account of the πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς just before. But then the words ἐν αὐτῷ will occasion some difficulty; unless, with Beza, they be referred to God, Christ being the constantissima Patris veritas: which, however, seems harsh. The αὐτῷ must (as most Commentators are agreed) be referred to Christ, and the sense be “apud eum;” as is required by the words following ὅσαι γὰρ, &c. The former interpretation, however, may very well be included in the latter; thus, “The Son of God, Jesus Christ, and his doctrine;” for the Apostle seems to have had both in mind. In considering the doctrine as included, the ancient Commentators, and some eminent moderns, notice that an argument is suggested of the truth of Paul’s doctrine, by its being the same with that of Sylvanus and Timothy; since the multitude of preachers renders their testimony (if agreeing) credible. But this seems very fanciful and precarious.

19. ἀλλὰ νὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν may be rendered: “but (all) in him was yea,” i.e. most true and consistent. On Silas (the same with Silvanus,) see Macknight.

20. ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελία Θεοῦ. Those who interpret the I. X. in the preceding verse solely of the
doctrine of Christ, are here compelled to take ἐστι in the same manner. Thus Theophyl.: Ἐστὶ τὸ κρύματι τοῦλα ἡττὶ τὰ ἐκπεφεύγεται, ἀπώστασις ἐκεῖνον, νικηφορία, καὶ ἐκλογή, ἀλλὰς τοῦ μείξοντος αἰῶνος φησιν οὐδὲ ὁ ἀπὸς ἑκείνη ἃ εἰς ἐκείνης ἐγένετο, καὶ ἑβαίνει ἐκρύβη, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκπεφευγαί τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ εἰσὶν ὡσα ὡς ἐν πρόσχεσι ὁ Θεὸς, ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ καλόν καὶ τὸ Ἀριστήν, τοῦτο ἐν τῇ ἑβαίνει ἐν γὰρ ἐν τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠπεφεύρεται, ἀλλὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ Θεῷ ἐστε ἑβαίνει ἑαυτῶν. And so Chrys., Rosenm., and Jaspis. But this seems to be somewhat harsh. I therefore prefer, with most modern Commentators, to refer ἐν αὐτῷ to Christ; though it may also include the Gospel, and the new covenant introduced by Christ. And this is supported by the authority of Theodorot, in the following excellent annotation: Προλαῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ αἱ ἐκπεφευγαί, νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις, σάματος ἀφαρασία, ἥν ἀπελεύησεν, ύπομονὴν βασιλείαν ἀλλὰ οὐκ ὁ τῶν Ἰδαίαν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς οὐκ ἐκφεύγηκεν οὐ ἢ χάριν, καὶ τί αὐτῶ τὸν τῆς εὐχαριστίας αὐτῶ προσφέρομεν οὐκοι. It is here admirably observed by Doddr. “Nothing can really render the promises of God more certain than they are; but God’s giving them to us through Christ, assures us that they are indeed his promises, as in Christ there is such a real evidence of his conversing with men, and as the wonders which God hath actually wrought in the incarnation, life, resurrection, and ascension of his Son (facts in themselves much stranger than any of the glorious consequences to follow), tend greatly to confirm our faith, and make it easier for us to believe such illustrious promises as those which are given us, the very greatness of which might otherwise have been an impediment to our faith, and have created a suspicion, not whether God would have performed what he has promised, but whether such promises were really given us.”

At διὰ must be supplied εἰς: an ellipsis frequent after ἵσως. The force of the article (here improperly overlooked by our common Translators) is
thus expressed by Bp. Middleton; "For how many soever be the promises of God, in him (in Christ) is the yea, and in him the amen, i.e. whatever God hath promised, he will, through Christ, assuredly fulfil."

The words τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν δι’ ὑμῶν are undoubtedly a trajectio for πρὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, "unto the glory and praise of God." So Οἰκουμ. : εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ δι’ ὑμῶν.

The δι’ ὑμῶν is susceptible of more than one meaning. Some, as Rosenm. and Mackn., explain; "by us his ministers;" q. d. "in whom is no diversity." And so Dodd. But this seems somewhat harsh. Teophyl. and Chrys. interpret it of all Christians, explaining διὰ τῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εὐεργεσίας. Theophyl., however, reports another interpretation, by which there is supplied τὴν προσαγωγὴν (an evident corruption. Read προαγ.) "For (adds he) δι’ ὑμῶν δοξάζεται." And, upon the whole, I think it most probable that some participle to that purport is omitted. Thus Whitby supplies one. Indeed, there is nothing more frequent in the idiomatic style than such ellipses.

21. ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ὑμᾶς — Θεὸς. The connexion here is ably traced by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) as follows: "Having before said that God fulfils his promises, the Apostle now proves it. This very thing (says he), that you stand in the faith in Christ, and that I am your teacher. He himself giveth, and He himself hath anointed and sealed us," &c. I conceive that the chief scope of the whole passage is, to refer all to God, as the author both of their original conversion to the Christian faith, and their confirmation in it. And this is confirmed by Theoph. : Μὴ τούτων γνωστεῖτε ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι ὑμῖν, καὶ ἵσως ἑυσεσθεναί ὑμῖν ἐσμεν, καὶ ἑτοὶ ἑσπερομένοι, οὔτε γὰρ οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ στηρίζοντες ὑμῶς, ἀλλ’ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐπαγγελλέται καὶ στηρίζει καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς γὰρ ὁ Αὐτὸς οὗν μέλλει τὰ πάντα πληρεῖν. So also Theodoret: ὁ Θεὸς δὲ τούτων αἰτίος τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτῶν γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν βεβαιῶν περὶ τῶν Χριστῶν εἰδωρήσατο.
We are to remember that the persons here especially meant had been pronounced unfit for the extraordinary affluences of the Holy Spirit in various ways, received and illustrated in three very interesting Chapters of the former Epistle. To them, therefore, the expressions are highly applicable in their full extent, but to us, unless with qualification, or by way of accommodation. For, although
in Eph. 1, 14. we have something like the present use of σφαγ: and ἄρραβανά, as applied to the Ephesians (yet see the note there), no instance, I think, can be found of χρίεω used of Christians in general, nor, perhaps, of any of its derivatives. For though Rosenm. and others appeal to 1 Joh. 2, 20. καὶ ὑμεῖς χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀν τὸν ἅγιον, καὶ οἴδατε πάντα, and 27. καὶ ὑμεῖς τῷ χρίσμα ὅ ἐλάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, εὖ ὑμῖν μένει, καὶ ωδ χρείαν ἔχετε ἵνα τις διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ χάρισμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων. Yet here surely we cannot but recognize another instance of the extraordinary gifts of the spirit imparted in the Apostolical age; and therefore this will not prove the point in question. I am inclined to think, then, that by an accommodation of these strong terms, (the first and chief of which, χρίσις, is no where else used of Christians in general,) the Apostle had reference to the supernatural χαρίσματα of the Corinthian congregation.

Mackin. perceiving, it should seem, the strength of the terms, understands the ὑμᾶς of Paul only. But this is very harsh, and irregular. Such kind of interpretations would tend to make most parts of the New Testament mere riddles, and, moreover, riddles which never could be solved. I must repeat that χρίεω would not have been applicable to Christians in general; it was only applied to the mode of inaugurating Kings, Prophets, and Priests.

As to σφαγ: I have before treated on the force of the metaphor; and it will here be the less necessary to dwell upon it; indeed it may suffice to refer the reader to the instructive annotation of Whitby.

21. δοὺς τὸν ἄρραβανα τοῦ π. ε. τ. κ. η. The most eminent Philologists are agreed that this Greek word ἄρραβαν, and the Latin arrhabo (sometimes, by Syncope, arrha) were derived from the Hebr. בְּרָע, pledge, from בָּרָע, to pledge. See Genes. 44, 22. It denoted that (usually small) part of the agreed price of any article purchased, which was paid down by the purchaser as an engagement, pledge, or security for ratifying the agreement; called by us earnest, or
handsel, from German handgeld. See Hesych., Suid.,
and Voss. Etym. Lat. The force of it here is well
illustrated by Theodoret as follows: διὰ τῶν ἄρρα-
βανος ἵνα τῶν δοθησόμενων τὸ μέγεθος ἡ γὰρ ἄρρα-
βαν μικρὸν το μέρος ἐστὶ τοῦ παντός. It occurs also in
Eph. 1, 14. There is (I think) at this word a clause
omitted, which Theophyl. has well supplied thus:
ὅτι ὁ τάδε καὶ τάδε ποιήσας Θεὸς, πληρῶ τὰς ἑπιστεύεις.
23. It is rightly observed by Rosenm., that here
the second chapter ought to have begun. And thus
Chrys. commences his next Homily with these words.
Ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τῶν Θεῶν ἑπικαλοῦμαι, &c. "Now
I call upon God, as a witness against my soul (if I
speak not the truth.)" Such is the sense assigned
to ἐπικαλ. by the best modern Commentators, which
was first fully unfolded by Schliting; and, I think,
considering the elliptical nature of the Apostle's style
and the turn of the passage, it is the true one. And
Rosenm. compares the Hebr. רוח. Theodoret
took ψυχή for mind, thought. But this sense seems
too feeble. Beza and others render it caput. But,
though caput in that sense meant the same as life,
the context, plainly, requires soul. The Commenta-
tors account for the oaths of asseveration so frequent
in this epistle, from the circumstances in which the
Apostle was placed; his authority being questioned,
and his sincerity doubted by some of the Corinthian
congregation. It is truly observed by Doddr., that
nothing but the great importance of St. Paul's vin-
dicating his character to such a church, would have
justified the solemnity of the oath.
Wets. adduces examples of similar expressions
from the Classical writers; as Galen. τῶν Θεῶν
ἐπικαλέσασθαι μαρτύρας. Polyb. p. 874. ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸτὲ
τῶν Θεῶν ἐπικαλεσασθαι μάρτυρας. Heliodor. 1. p. 46.
Θεῶς δὲ συνεκαὶ ἐπικαλομένους μάρτυρας. I add Thuc-
cyd. 1. p. 78. Θεῶς μάρτυρας ποιομένου. And so like-
wise not unfrequently in that author.
24. οὖχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως. It is re-
marked by Beza, Grot., and others, that there is
here an ἄδυντοφοβός; since the term φειδ. might have seemed somewhat αὐθεντικοτηθήνων, or to savour of a domineering spirit, which, therefore, the Apostle disclaims. The figure in question is frequent with an οὐχ ὅτι, which is very elliptical. (See Viger. and Matth. Gr. Gr.)

In the words κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως there is a difference of opinion as to the construction. Some, as Phot., Theodoret, Erasm., Est., Mackn., and Schleus. think that πίστεως depends upon an ἐνεκα understood, in the sense “in matters concerning the faith.” Most Commentators, however, from Chrysostom and Theophylact downwards, take the τῆς πίστεως to depend upon κυριεύομεν; which indeed seems the more regular syntax, and occurs both in the Scriptural (from whom Dr. Middleton gives several examples,) and in the Classical writers, especially Thucyd. The sense is nearly the same in both cases, namely, “domineer over your faith.” It has, however, been debated what is the sense of τῆς πίστεως. Most interpreters assign to it that of faith, belief: others, the “religion you profess.”

The former sense is supported by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) in the following exposition: ὅτι εἶπον, φειδεσθαί ὑμῶν, οὐ διὰ τὸ ἐξουσιαν ἔχειν τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν προαιρέσθαι γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις, καὶ οὐδὲς ἀναγκαζεῖ πιστεύσαι τῷ μὴ βουλόμενοι. And so Grot. and most Commentators. And this is supported by the τῆς χαρᾶς ὑμῶν just after. The latter mode is espoused by Calvin, Est., Schleus., and many modern Commentators, and seems confirmed by τῇ πίστει in the next verse. Probably both significations may be united,* and the word denote the religion, namely, including matters of faith, (as of the resurrection) or practice, as in that of the moral duties. See Chrys.

"Ἀλλὰ σωμεργοὶ ἐσμεν τῆς χαρᾶς ὑμῶν, "but are (rather) helpers and promoters of the spiritual consolations which the Gospel is calculated to minister."

* So Theodoret: τούτου χάριν ἐπιστούσαμεν, ἵνα δουλεῖαν διεξάγωμεν, καὶ δεσποτικῶς παρὰ σοῦ παιδευώμεθα;
14. The sense of these words is uncertain, from the extent of significations in which the terms faith and are may be taken. That sense will most depend upon the one previously assigned to the passage. Hooker observes that 'the ancient means understanding; and the ancient commentators and most modern ones seem to think that the word faith is meant to be very emphatical; i.e. 'in the faith we upon the whole, stand, though in matters of practice we have erred, and in sin.' Others make it in the religion, and interpret 'we are still firm in your profession of the religion; only of your heart be consistent.' Others, again, and some recent Editors, place the words in a parenthesis: which I cannot approve. To me it seems to have been not enough attended to, that the words 'faith properly' refer immediately precedes; i.e. 'And this faith you are most qualified to state, for upon the whole, we have stood, and do stand firm in the faith, in the profession and practice of the religion, and are therefore in a state of salvation.'

By Middleton paraphrases the clause thus: 'we have your word, and that by your faith alone, that faith which we seek to strengthen in you, can be said to salvation.' This 'faith alone' is a natural and reasonable vindication, not only of the threat already employed, but of any severities to which the Aposle might afterwards be driven in the discharge of his duty.

CHAPTER III.

Verse 1. Hence is explained. In the interpretation of this verse it is best to consider it as expressed popularly, and elliptically. The sense seems to be this: 'I determined with myself (in Homer, and we' énimè) not again to come to you so as to give myself over to the pain of correcting irregularities.' For all this seems to be included in
the words ἐν λύπη. The τάλιν is emphatic, and is meant to hint that he had before suffered that pain.

This mode of considering the sentence is partly supported by the authority of Chrys. and Theophyl., and seems preferable to that of most modern Interpreters, who (as Grot.) think that two words are put for one. The sense (Grot. says) is: μη ἀνελθεῖν πρὸς ύμᾶς ἐν λύπη, non redire ad vos ita ut reeditus meus navorum vobis adferat. But in this, as in most of the expositions of our Commentators, too confined a sense is ascribed to λύπη. It refers (I think) to the Apostle as well as to the Corinthians; as is plain from the next words. (See the note.)

2. ei γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶν ύμᾶς—με. Here we may observe great delicacy. Yet there is some obscurity; as Ecumen. acknowledges. And it is shrewdly and truly remarked by Semler: "Non parum obscura est hujus versus sententia, licet verba sint satis clara." This obscurity the antient Commentators endeavour to remove by considering the ei (as Ecumen. says) for εἰτε (I would read εἰγε) quanquam. And Theophyl. (from Chrys.) offers the following paraphrase: Εἰ καὶ λυπῶν ύμᾶς, ἐν τῷ ἐπιτιμῶν ύμῖν, καὶ ἀποστρέφομαι ύμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὄμως δ' αὐτὸ τὸύτο εὐφραίνομαι, ὅτι, αἰσ ἔσκε; τέρε πολλῷ με τίθεσθε, ἀποτέλεσθαι ἤτοι ἀποστρέφομαι ύμᾶς, καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν ύμῖν. Oudels γὰρ εὐφραίνει οὕτως αἰσ ἔκεινος, ὥς λυποῦμενος ὅτε βλέπει με θυμίζομαι· εὔφραίνει γὰρ, ὅτι οὐ καταρθονεῖ μου. "Othum καὶ ἐξίδια δίδωσι διορθώσεως, καὶ κατὰ τούτο εὐφραίνει με. But this seems too harsh and far-fetched an exposition. The modern Commentators have been more successful in tracing the sense: yet their interpretations are discordant, and little satisfactory. Various opinions may be seen detailed in Pole, and Semler, the most probable of which are those of Beza and Justinian, the former of whom thus paraphrases: "Nam si vos ego molestià affecerim, idque meo cum maximo maëore, quis queso supersit, qui me exhilarat? Vos sane ii estis uni, ex quibus nunc possim voluptatem coepere, quibus iterum molestia
affectis, non est, quod aliunde gaudium sperem. Nam ego gaudium aliud alià ex re majus nullum capio, nisi cum quæmpiam video objurgatione mea ad meliorem frugem redire.” Semler offers the following exposition. “Sed, jam vero, kal τις ἐστιν ὀ εὐφραινῶν με, quis tandem (istis mœroribus, si ita agere pergat, et infamiam doctrinæ meæ conciliet,) putabit me exhilaratum iri? Ecquid gaudii e vobis capiam, nisi corrigatis istam pravitatem, quam vobis exprobrabam? Si igitur dolet et pœnitet: agite, avertite reprehensionis meæ causam; tum redibit mihi vera lætitia.” But both these interpretations contain far more sense than can be fairly elicited from the words of the Apostle.

The simplest, most natural, and least exceptionable interpretation is that of Grot., Rosenm., and Jaspis (and, as it seems, Doddr. and Mackn.); though they do not thoroughly establish the sense, and clearly show how it arises. Rosenm. explains thus: “Quis me exhilarare potuisset, efficere potuisset, ut jucunda apud vos esset commoratio mea, sicut inter amicos fieri solet? Et vos tristes fuissetis, et ego. Nisi vos, a me tristitid affecti.” Ac proinde nemo. Vos uni estis, qui me Corinthi exhilarare potestis; si autem vos ipsi Aristes estis, hoc non poterit fieri. Quomodo enim tristis alium exhilarabit?” Jaspis thus: “Vi muneris coactus essem, hunc vel illum duriter tractare; tunc, qui me consolaretur, haberem naminem; nam ipse tristis ac solatio indigens alias dolorem consolari non potest.” It was Grot., that first discerned the ellipsis of a clause, such as “ac proinde nemo.” Indeed an obels is often left to be supplied after a τις with an interrogation. The kal has the sense of quaeso. (See Glass.) Beza compares from Virgil: “Et quinam Numen Junonis adorat Præterea?” The present indicative is used populariter for the imperfect subjunctive. The τις ἐστιν ὀ εὐφραινῶν is also a popular mode of expression for “and who then is there (i.e. would there be) to soothe my sorrows but the grieved
person," i.e. the grieved persons, for the singular is, as Rosenm. observes, put for the plural; as in collectives. Here that designation might be said, in some degree, to embrace both the sound and the unsound part of the congregation; for the former would so sympathize with the latter as to afford the Apostle but little cordial consolation; and the latter could not be expected to do it, unless in the event of entire repentance, and thorough reformation, which the Apostle would not stay to see put to the proof. And thus his comfort with them could be but small.

Such, upon the whole, appears to be the sense of the words, which seem to have been intended to explain the obscure expression ἐλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ in the preceding verse.

3. καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν τὸῦτο αὐτὸ—χαῖειν. This, again, seems intended to explain the preceding; for it refers to the omitted words: "I should have no one to comfort me; I should have no consolation."

In the words τὸῦτο αὐτὸ there is a great obscurity; and Commentators are at a loss whither to refer them. The ancient ones, and some moderns, refer them to the present Epistle, and they render ἔγραψα "I have written." But this seems utterly unfounded. (See Sémler.) The best modern Commentators, more rightly, refer them to the former Epistle; and they take τὸῦτο αὐτὸ to relate to the order given to excommunicate the incestuous person, and the general admonition to reform their morals. There is indeed some harshness in ascribing so much meaning to τὸῦτο αὐτὸ; but it seems a mode of interpretation which involves the least difficulty, and may be tolerated by considering this as a sort of idiomatic or popular form of expression. It may, too (I think) be somewhat softened by supposing an ellipsis of κατὰ, i.e. "to that effect (which I did)." This brevity of expression has here the same effect as an euphemism; since the Apostle forbears to mention what might have given them pain to hear.

3. Ἰδεί μὴ ἔλθειν λύπης ἐκείνῳ ἐφ' ἓν ἐδει με χαῖειν, i.e.
“that I might not have sorrow on account of you from whom I ought to rejoice.” Here the Commentators trifle egregiously. The sense of the former clause να μὴ ἔλθων λίτπν ἐγὼ is sufficiently clear from the preceding; and in the latter clause ἐδε need not be pressed upon, but simply be interpreted “from those of whom it is only reasonable to rejoice.” For the teacher, in return for his labour, ought, in reason and equity, to have joy of his disciple.

3. ἡποιθὼς ἐκὶ πάντας—ἔστιν. These words are not devoid of obscurity: and hence Interpreters and Paraphrasts differ in opinion on their sense. The obscurity has here, as in many other cases, been occasioned by excessive brevity: and this (which so perpetually occurs in St. Paul’s Epistles) may, I think, be best attributed to the Apostle’s limited power of expression, his thoughts being cramped by a foreign and difficult language. In such a case, no mere translation can do justice to the sense. Now this will, I think, be best expressed by referring the ἡποιθὼς to the χαίρειν preceding, as is done in the following paraphrase and exposition. “I wrote to you (I say) in confidence that you would be reformed, and that I should have occasion to rejoice; for my joy is (i.e. would be) the joy of you all; since if ye saw me rejoice, ye would rejoice, and if ye saw me grieve, ye would grieve.* This was especially meant of the sounder, and by far the greater part of the congregation. On the sense of πάντας and πάντων it is not necessary to press.

4. ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς ἰδίσεως—δακρύων. Here, again, the connexion is not very clear. It is (I think) best traced by Theodoret as follows: Σφοδρότερον αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς πρατέροις καθήσατο γράφμασι, διδάσκει τοῖς, οίς οὐχ ἀπλῶς λυπῆσαι θυμόμενος ἐκεῖνα γέγραφεν, ἀλλά

* The sentiment is beautifully adapted to the one a little before. For the Apostle means to say that as their humiliation and grief would be a grief and sorrow to him, so would his joy (for their reformation) be a source of joy to them.
The thought seems to have been suggested by the foregoing words, ἵνα μὴ λύπην ἔχω. And the sense seems to be this: "For the grief I should myself have felt at being compelled to reprove your irregularities Thus, for example, when I wrote to you, it was with much tribulation and agony of heart, and with many tears I penned the reproofs I did. (The purpose, however, was) not that ye should be grieved and pained, but that (sensible of the motive which had urged me so to write) ye might know and recognize in this my love, which (I assure you) I bear very abundantly towards you."

Συνοχή signifies properly an affection of the heart, by which the patient feels tightened and constrained there; and hence it denotes metaphorically, great anxiety, sorrow, and agony of mind. The Philologists cite as examples Luke 21, 25., and Joh. 30, 8. συνοχή καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν. And Ps. 24, 17. But there καρδία is not found, which seems to point out the origin of the metaphor to be what I have indicated. The term may denote the being hemmed in on all sides, so as not to know where to turn oneself.

The force of the other terms is sufficiently clear from the above paraphrase. Περισσοτέρων signifies very abundantly; as in Gal. 1, 14. and often in Scripture. See Schleus. Lex.

5. εἰ δὲ τίς λεπτήκεν—ὑμᾶς. "Now if any of you hath occasioned grief to the rest, he hath not so much grieved me as, in some measure (that I may not bear too hard upon him) all of you." By the

* Here Theophyl. has the following beautiful simile: "Ωσπερ εἰς ταῖς λατρεῖς τέμνων ἢ καλῶν τὸ λατ. χαίδα, δι᾿ ἄμφοτέρων λυπεῖται, καὶ ὡς νοεῖ, καὶ ὡς ἀναγκάζεται αὐτὸν τέμνειν· καὶ ἄλλον δὲ τρόπον εὐφραίνεται, διὰ τὴν τῆς γνήσια εὐλαβᾶ· οὕτω αὐτὸ κάνω ἀμαραγάντας γνῶμι λυκαν, λυπούμαι καὶ ἄλλον δὲ τρόπον εὐφραίνομαι, λυπομένων γνῶμι, διὰ τὴν εὐλαβᾶ τῆς διαφθόνες γνώμων."
γεγονός. Most Commentators are agreed is delicately hinted at the incestuous person, against whom punishment was denounced in the former Epistle. So Theophyl: "He means by this that charity may be shown towards the incestuous person; for they had all, by the order of Paul, rejected him as abominable." Some, however, as Grot., regard the γεγονός as put for τις ἐκλυσία, meaning the Corinthian Church, κατὰ τὸ σώματιν: for this, he thinks, the words following prove. But the view taken by the ancient Commentators seems preferable. (See the notes.)

The ὡκ—ἀλλὰ signifies here (as often) non tam—quid. 'Εξί μέρους, signifies "in some measure," and is opposed to πάντας ὧμᾶς, i.e. (as Ros. explains) "his offence was so great as to have thrown disgrace, in some measure, on all your society." And this seems evidently the sense, which was distinctly seen by the ancient Commentators, and of the moderns, first by Hamm., who paraphrases thus: "For he hath not grieved me alone, but all you in part (i.e. a little, or in some degree,) that I may not say, he hath altogether grieved you; or in plain words, the truth is, he hath grieved you in like manner as me, but yet that I may not overburthen him that was guilty of that incest, or aggravate the matter against him, all that I say is, that in part, (or in some measure) ye were grieved by him." And he translates the whole verse thus: "But if any have caused grief he hath not grieved me, but in part (that I may not aggravate, or lay weight on him) you all." In this he is followed by Whitby and by almost all recent Commentators.

The ἡδὲ μὴ ἐπιθαράν, is (I think) rightly rendered "ne quid gravius dicam," Angl. "be too hard upon." So also the Syr. version. Wets. illustrates this from Appian: οὐδὲ ἐπιθαράντων τοῖς ἐπέραν ἐπιθαράναι: and 978. οὶ μὲν ἐπιθαραί τοῖς ἡτυχηκοσίν αἰδούμεν. The formula, however, is indefinite in its sense, and may bear the signification assigned to it by Theodoret, who makes it allude to the disgrace thrown upon all
Christians. But the former seems the truer interpretation. "Ica μὴ ἐπιθαρapist may be rendered "without being hard upon him, I will say," &c. It is acutely remarked by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) that thus the Apostle skilfully brings them all in as parties to the injury, that he might have them all parties to the absolution, and thus he be absolved from any charge of inconstancy and mutability.

Here the greater part of the Commentators, as also Mackn. most egregiously mistake the sense.

6. ἵκανον τῷ τοιούτῳ εἰπιτιμίᾳ α. η. υ. τ. π. The Apostle now, humanely, suggests reasons for showing mercy to the penitent criminal. When he says ἵκανον, we are to understand with repentance: and this indeed seems implied in the τῇ περιστοίχωρα λυπη just after. Τοιούτῳ is taken by some antient and most modern Commentators as equivalent to τοιοῦτος, i. e. the incestuous person. And undoubtedly the Apostle, by a peculiar delicacy, has that person chiefly in view; yet I think the expression is adopted to supply a rule by which to act in similar cases, when the punishment of offenders has been already severe, and their penitence undoubted.

Ἡ ἐπιτιμία, though in the Classical writers used to denote honour, yet sometimes, as in Athenag. cited by Wets., signifies what is imposed as the punishment of any crime; suggesting thereby that it was the valued reimbursement for the injury to the party and to society; and this, whether by pecuniary (as often) or corporal punishment, or some signal disgrace; as here. So Sapient. 8. 10. οἷς ἀνεβείς καθὰ ἐλογίσαντο ἐχώσων ἐπιτιμίαις. Thus there is a book of Philo on rewards and punishments, inscribed περὶ ἀθλῶν καὶ ἐπιτιμίαις. And in Chrys. and the Acts of the Councils, canonical punishments are (it should seem from this passage) termed ἐπιτιμίαις and ἐπιτιμίαι. See also Grot., Beza, and Suic. Thea. in v.

The αὐτή suggests the addition of "without more." And the same is implied in ἵκανον, by an ellipsis frequent in this word. So Lucian, Tim. 10. (cited by Wets.) πλὴν ἴκανον ἐκ τοιοῦτον καὶ αὐτῇ
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τὰ μετακαταργήσαι αὐτοῖς. Demostr. c. Eubulidem. μηδε-
μᾶς, οὐ γὰρ δικασταλ, τοὺς πέντες ἀνήμαζετε· οὐκ οἷον
gὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ πέντεςας κοινῶ. At ὅσ τῶν πλειώνων,
many Commentators stumble. Some, as Grot., Au-
gust., and Vales, interpret it the Presbyters. But
these were but few in number. Others, therefore,
as Hamm. and most recent ones, would render it
many, and understand it of the multitude assembled
together at the excommunication. (See Hamm.
and Rosenm.) But the bystanders had no partici-
pation in the act of excommunication, which (as
Hamm. admits) was transacted solely by the Pres-
bytery. See 1 Cor. 5, 3. and 4. It should rather
seem that τῶν πλειώνων must (according to the usus
loquendi) mean all, i. e. all the rest besides the per-
son. And if it be enquired, how could the ἐπιτιμία
be said to come from all—I answer, that the ἐπιτιμία
here designates the punishment itself, as it were,
carried into effect by all. That Theodoret so took
the passage, is plain from his remark: πάντες γὰρ
αιτήν ἀπεκτάφησαν αὐτῷ ἐκέλευσεν. And so Menoch.
and Wolf. Some, as Mackn. and Jaspis, aiming at
being very literal, render it “the great number,”
as if there had been a strong party that had no hand
in the excommunication; which is improbable in
itself, and has not the least countenance from either
Scripture or Ecclesiastical history.

7. ὅστε τοῦνατόν μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς χαίρεσθαι—τοιοῦτος,
"So that (so far from continuing the punishment) ye
ought, on the other hand, to forgive and comfort
(such an one), lest, by excessive grief he be, as it
were, swallowed up." At τοῦνατόν there is a clause
omitted, which is to be supplied by some such words
as those above adopted. (See Grot.) There is also
an ellipsis of some verb. Rosenm. supplies velim.
But that seems too arbitrary an ellipsis. I should
prefer δει. Indeed the infinitive is, as it were, taken
for the imperative; as often. The sense of μᾶλλον
is strangely mistaken by Mackn., who renders it
"more willingly," i. e. "ye ought more willingly to
forgive than I punished." But this is quite erroneous, and arose from not discovering the ellipsis of a clause after τούναρτιν μᾶλλον, than which nothing is more frequent, and which Theophyl. thus supplies: μὴ μόνον λύσατε τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν, ἀλλὰ τι καὶ πλέον αὐτῷ χαρίσασθε.

On χαρίσασθαι it is ingeniously observed by Theodoret, that by being called a χάρις or favour the idea is suggested, that the sin was greater than the repentance. Yet this seems too refined a notion; since, by directing the excommunication to be repeated, the Apostle plainly conceived that the punishment and the repentance had covered the sin; and this is evident, too, from his adding παραμαλέσας, "and even comfort him," by which I would understand "receive him again into favour." Theophyl. explains it ἀνακτήσασθε, θεραπεύσατε: and he adds: ἀπερ εἰ τις μαστίζων τινα, μὴ μόνον ἄκολουθαι αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πληγας θεραπεύσαι προτραπῇ.

Some, as Grot., understand this forgiveness, &c. as indicating no more than prayer that the disorder inflicted upon him as a judgment for sin, might be removed. And he refers to Matt. 18, 18. and 2 Macc. 4, 32. But there is no proof, nor even probability, that the disorder had continued thus long. A much shorter visitation than that which would serve the purposes intended, namely to mortify the lust of the delinquent, evince the power of the Apostle, and be an awful example to the people.

7. μὴ πασὶ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύσῃ καταπόθη τοῖς ρωσ. It is strange that many Commentators, nay, even Theodor. should interpret καταπόθη of his abandoning the Christian faith; for which notion there is no support in the force of the word itself; nor in probability. For the Apostle could not in propriety employ that argument. There is here evidently the familiar metaphor by which we say any one is overwhelmed with grief, drowned in grief. The nature of the metaphor seems not to have been well conceived by the Commentators. Thus, for instance, Rosenm. com-
pares Hom. Od. 9, 75, ὑμῶν καμάτερ τε, καὶ ἀγέρτι ὡμῶν ἔστρεν. And Grot. thinks the term answers to the Heb. יִלְיַה, to swallow up, which is used for ἔξωλλειν. But יְלִי signifies merely to swallow up, as a monstrous beast would a human being. So ἀναρράξω frequently in the Old Testament. And see Ps. 51, 6. Symm. Yet the ratio metaphoræ is not such here, but rather seems what I have above suggested. I might cite several examples in proof of this; but I forbear, because (upon reflection) I think it probable that the Apostle had both the foregoing metaphors in view. So Theodoret. ἄπερ ὑπὲρ ἦλθον τινὸς, ἔν ὑπὲρ χειμῶνος, καὶ κλώσων, τὴς λύτης. Indeed, if I am not mistaken, he had in mind the beautiful passage of the Psalmist, 124, 2, 3, and 4. “They had swallowed us up quick: when they were so wrathfully displeased at us. Yea, the waters had drowned us: and the stream had gone over our soul. The deep waters of the proud had gone even over our soul.” And Ps. 69, 1. “Save me, O God: for the waters are come in even unto my soul.” And Lament. 3, 54. “Waters flowed over my head; then, I said, I am cut off.” See also Job 30, 14. The destruction here alluded to by St. Paul may be considered as death from over-affliction, or self-destruction from despair.

8. ἀδικακαλό—ἀγάπην; “Therefore I exhort you to confirm your love to him.” So most translators render. But confirm is not a suitable term; for they had as yet done nothing towards restoring him to their love. Κυρῆ proper signifies to corroborate, to make firm: and so here the context and circumstances of the case require the sense “make him sure of your love,” “assure him of it,” namely, by some public testimony of it, i.e. the annulment of the act of excommunication, “make sure that reconciliation.” Such is undoubtedly the sense of this seemingly idiomatic phrase. Thus Theophyl. explains it: ἔβεβαιωσαί ἀγάπην, καὶ μὴ ἀπλῶς, καὶ ὅσ ἔτυχεν, ἀυτὸν παραδέξασθαι.
9. ἔστω γὰρ—ινήκοι ἐστι. The sentence may be thus paraphrased: "You may forgive him: for I have indeed already answered the chief* purpose I had in view, namely, to put your obedience to the proof." "Ινα γνω τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, literally, "that I might know the proof of you." So Phil. 2, 22. τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αυτῶν γνῶσκετε. The Apostle’s meaning is further unfolded by the words following: "whether ye are (i. e. were) in all things (i. e. altogether) obedient." It is rightly observed by the ancient Commentators, that by dwelling on this last circumstance the Apostle hints, that he expects their obedience also by restoring the excommunicated person to the church.

10. ἐὰς δὲ τι χαριζεσθε—ἔγω. It is not proper to press on the sense of these words, which may be taken without limitation. The sense is well expressed by Jaspis as follows: "in omnibus judiciis, quæ sequitatem et lenitatem animi producunt, nemo liberius vos sequitur, quàm ego." Mackn. introduces the sentence thus: "Now to encourage you to do this, I assure you that," &c. But this is very precarious, and seems at variance with the Apostle’s meaning. For I agree with the ancient and some modern Commentators, that it may be inferred from these words, that the Corinthians entertained a wish for the restoration of the person, and perhaps had signified that wish to the Apostle by Timothy and Titus. So Theodore.

10. εἰ τι κεχάρισμαι. The sense is well expressed by Rosenm. as follows: "For whatever I have hereby forgiven any one, if I can be said to have forgiven, I forgive it for your sakes, and to testify my regard for you." Ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ. This is ill understood by most Commentators. Theophyl., after observing that the Apostle uses the expression, that he may not seem to have conceded the forgiveness

* By the words "for this cause write I," we need not understand "for this cause only," but chiefly. An idiom frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.
on account of men, or from human motives, explains it as equivalent to κατὰ Θεὸν, ἐνάστιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀσανεὶ ἐκείνου τοῦτο κελεύστως, καὶ οἰς ἄντι προσώπου. But this last gloss is, I think, erroneous. The rest may be admitted, and is greatly superior to the exposition of some recent Commentators, religiosē. Rosenm. explains: "as in the presence of Christ, the Lord of the Church, so to weigh what should be accepted by him; and therefore not from levity, or empty joy at your obedience."

11. ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ—ἀγνοῶμεν. On the interpretation of this sentence Commentators, both ancient and modern, are little agreed. Theo-doret and some moderns take it to imply: "lest the person in question should be overcome by the wicked thought (namely of self-destruction), which the Devil suggests." But this is very harsh, and such a sense cannot be elicited from the words; neither would it be suitable here. Rosenm. explains thus: "ne circumveniamur a Satanâ, cujus machinationem non ignoramus;" and he observes: "Verebatur nempe Apostolus, ne, incerti receptione in aliud tempus differendâ, bene erga ipsum affectis Corinthiis, aliquod vulnus imponeretur, unde infirmiores reddi possent ad criminationes repellandas, quibus Satana per suos ministros voluntatem ecclesiae a Christo alienare molebatur. Quâ de causâ restitutionem excommuni-catī non modo concessit amicis, sed etiam suasit et commendavit." And this seems, upon the whole, to be a correct view of the sense. (See also Jaspis.) The Apostle means to adduce a reason why he should concede the recal, and they lose no time in carrying it into effect, viz. "that we may not be circumvented by Satan, who (as Mack. paraphrases) under pretence of duty, tempts us to pass severe censures, to drive offenders to despair, and to deter unbelievers from receiving the Gospel." Under the words ὁ γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ νοηματα ἀγνοῶμεν there is (I think) couched an admonition: "for we are not, I trust, and ought not to be, ignorant of his contri-
vances and devices to entrap us.” (See Grot. and Mackn.) It is well remarked by Theodoret, that having inserted or thrown in this reflection, the Apostle resumes his narration. Thus, having related what had happened to him in Asia, he was compelled to say how sincerely he preached the Gospel. Then he sets forth his love towards them, telling them that he wished to see them before the Macedonians. Then, having acquainted them with the causes of the delay, and made mention of his sorrow, and taken measures for the re-admission of the excommunicated person, he resumes the thread of his narrative.”

12, 13. ἐλθαίν ἰὲ εἰς Τρῳάδα—ἀδελφόν μου “Having gone (namely after writing the first Epistle) to the Troad for the Gospel of Christ (i. e. for the purpose of preaching it).” By the Troad is meant the country of Troas. (See Schleus. Lex.) Rosenm. remarks that there is a reference to what is related at Acts 20, 6. 2 Tim. 4, 13.

12. καὶ θύρας μοι ἀνεπηρμένης ἐν Κυψέω, “and an extensive opportunity of spreading the Gospel being afforded to me.” See 1 Cor. 16, 9. Grot., Hardy, and Rosenm. would render the καὶ quamvis, which sense, Grot. says, is required by the sentiment and the change of construction. The sense will then be: “although an occasion was offered me,” καὶ being put for καλεῖ. And this interpretation is supported by the authority of OEcumen. Ἐν Κυψέω is variously expounded, either “in the business of the Lord,” or, which I prefer, “by the Lord, through his powerful operation, through his providence.”

13. οὐκ ἐσχήκα ἀνειν τῷ πνεύματί μου, “I had no rest to my spirit.” This Rosenm. interprets of impatience till he saw Timothy and Titus, and knew how his Epistle would be received. And so Dodd. and Mackn. But that seems too much lowering the sense. Other modern Commentators give but a vague and unsatisfactory account of this point. The
ancients seem to have had a far clearer perception of the sense. The feeling of the Apostle was, doubtless, regret at the absence of Titus not affording him the means of making the most of that door, or opportunity, which was offered of spreading the Gospel. So Theodoret: ὁδορὰ τὴν ἡμιάθην, στελ- λών μὲν ἄρα τῷ κηρύγματι προσέταξα, συνεργοῦν δὲ τῇ τυχίται ἐπιμελείας οὐκ ἔχων" οὔτως γὰρ ἀφύκτῳ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ Τίτος, ὃν τῆς ὑπερέταις προμηθεύμενος αἰφελείας ἐπιστειλά πρὸς ὑμᾶς· οὐ δὲ χαρίν αἰς τῶν πόνων οὐκ ἔχων τὸν κοιμᾶναι, καταλπάν αὐτοῦς ἔξεδήμεσα. And so Theophyl.: ἐθλίβην, αἰδοεἴθην διὰ τὴν ἀνομοίαν τούτων —ἐνεποδίζετο τὸ ἔργον ἐκείνου ἄποντος. It is observed by Theodoret, that the Apostle, not without reason, makes this mention of Titus, since such a way of speaking would be the strongest recommendation of him to the Corinthians.

The τὸ μὴ εὑρέω depends upon ἔτι understood, i.e. "by my not finding:" a construction, of which Rosenm. adduces examples from Polyb. 10, 96. & 9, 17. I would add that it is frequent in Thucyd., and, indeed, every good writer.

13. ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς. Mackn. renders ἀλλὰ therefore, i.e. because I had no helper. And this is supported by the authority of Theodoret just cited. But it seems to proceed upon insufficient grounds, and is not doing justice to the Apostle. Other Interpreters lay little or no stress upon the ἀλλὰ, but treat it as a particle of transition; which I cannot approve. It rather seems to me to carry with it much meaning, which may be thus supplied: "But, however (effecting what I could without the benefit of his assistance), I bade adieu to them (i.e. the Trojans; for that is what is meant by αὐτοῖς, the construction being what is called the πρὸς τὸ σημαίνε- μενον), and went away into Macedonia." Wolf treats.

* Theophyl. supplies: οὗ διέτρεψα πλεονα χρόνον ἐκεὶ στενοχω- ρομενοι.
this as a vox praegnans; q. d. "excessi Troade, et profectus sum in Macedoniam." The complete phrase occurs in Joh. 4, 48.

14. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάριτι—Χριστῷ. The connexion here is not well traced by our modern Commentators, especially Doddr. Some treat the δὲ as a particle of transition; which is convenient enough, but not justifiable. The connexion is admirably traced by Theophyl. as follows: "Having enumerated many griefs and troubles, that in Asia, that in the Troad, that arising from his being prevented from coming to them; in order that he may not seem to reckon up all these, as if in a bewailing spirit, he adds: Thanks, however (δὲ) be unto God," &c.

14. τῷ πάντων θανατών διαβαίνειν. ημᾶς εἰς τὸ Χριστόν. These words show the ground of the thanksgiving, namely "because he causeth us to triumph." This Hiphil sense of the verb has been rightly assigned by Theophyl., the Syriac Translator, Ambrose, and, of the moderns, by Gataker, Grot., and most Interpreters since their time. Grot. compares the Heb. יְבָרֵך, and a similar use of βασιλείᾳ in 1 Sam. 8, 22. 12, 1. 15, 35., of εὐσκεδεῖν in Esth. 6, 14.; and of postulare in Rom. 8, 26. Schleus. compares a similar use of the very verb in question in Eurip. H. E. 1596., of αὐτοφάνειν in Deut. 52, 9., καπνοφόρειν in Jos. 17, 14., and of δίν in Ps. 119, 50. Chrysost., however, and Cæcumen., Drus., Kypke, Witz., Wets., and others, would retain the usual neuter sense, "to lead any one in triumph as a captive." But this is far less suitable, for those who are led in triumph are entirely passive;" and Beza observes, that they are led ignominiae causae. Indeed that interpretation of the sentence involves great and needless difficulty: for nothing is more common, both in the Greek and Latin, and even modern languages, than such changes as the one in question.

Wetstein's paraphrase, founded upon the usual sense of διαβαίνειν, is most frigid and far-fetched. Mackn. renders it: "carries us along in triumph.
with Christ." And he thinks there is here an allusion to the custom of victorious generals, who in their triumphal processions carried some of their relations with them in their chariot. But this is surely not a little absurd: besides, ἐν cannot here signify with. The ancient Commentators, however, had by no means a clear idea of the sense of ἔρημός. They explain it by display, make famous, &c.; which is very frigid. Perhaps they were led to adopt this interpretation from a scruple lest the term might not be justifiable; since the Apostle does not seem to have every where been triumphant and successful; and yet τέωτον is added. But it is not necessary to anxiously press on the sense of τέωτον, nor of ἐν τειρί τάξον just after, nor indeed of ἔρημός. The sense may be thus expressed: "thanks be unto God who, upon the whole, blesseth our labours, notwithstanding great obstacles, with glorious success and eminent usefulness." Indeed where the Apostle was least successful, there was always some kind of victory obtained over the kingdom of Satan and sin.

Ἐν Χριστῷ plainly signifies "by the assistance of Christ."

14. καὶ τῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως αὐτῶς φανερῶνι, &c., "and who diffuseth, by us, every where the odour of his Divine knowledge." I cannot assent to some modern Commentators, that the ἔρημος contains an allusion to perfumes with which the High Priest was scented, or to the sacred incense, or (as others suppose) to the union of Christ and the Church, as typified under the image of a bride and bridegroom, Cant. 1, 3. I rather accede to the opinion of those who think there is an allusion to the fragrant odours scattered about near the conquerors at a triumph. So Theophyl. : "Ανὴρ ταύτων εἰσαί, ὡς τέωτον θριαμβεύοντα, κόλιν φησιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τιμῇ εἰσδιάομεν τῶς ἄκραπτως. Yet it must be observed that there is no more than an allusion; and therefore it is not of much consequence that the consistency in the metaphor is broken in ἔρημῳ φανερῶνι. It is sufficient
that there is an allusion to the wide-spread diffusion of odours so scattered, and also to the grateful and salutiferous influence of the Gospel everywhere disseminated.

Theophyl. paraphrases thus: Ὡσανεὶ οὐν θυματικῶν ἐσμένει βασιλικῶν, καὶ οὗτοι οὐκ ἀπέλασαμεν, καὶ τὴν ἐσμένα τοῦ πνευματικοῦ μισθον περιφέρομεν, τούτωσι, τῆς θευματικῆς.

15. τι: Χριστοῦ εὐωδία—ἀπολυμένους. Here we have a continuation of the figure, though with some change in the application. Oecumen. paraphrases thus: οὗ μάσον εὐωδίαν ηπτόμουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ Ἀπόστολοι εὐωδία ἑσμέν, &c. Some modern Commentators interpret: “Our Apostolical office is grateful and acceptable to God.” And this mode of interpretation Rosenm. adopts. But it seems to me that τοῦ Θεοῦ cannot very well (at least here) be taken for εἰς τὸν Θεὸν; though it is so taken by many modern Translators; as the authors of our English Version and Doddr. The ancients (I think) rightly interpreted it “by God,” “by means of God:” εἰ καὶ being understood. (See Theophyl.) The sense may (I conceive) be thus expressed: “We are those through whom God spreads and propagates this odoriferous, delightful, beneficial, and salutiferous Gospel of Christ.”

Now this is said to have place both ἐν τοῖς σωζόμενοις and ἐν τοῖς ἀπολυμένοις. Here there seems to be an ellipsis; q. d. “We are a sweet odour to all, both to,” &c.; and the words are explanatory of the weighty and awful truth. Theodoret and Theophyl. well paraphrase thus: “We indeed bear the sweet odour of Christ’s Gospel to all, but all who participate in it do not experience its salutiferous effects. Thus to diseased eyes, even the light of heaven is noxious; yet the sun does not bring the injury. And to those in a fever honey is bitter; yet it is sweet nevertheless. Vultures, too, it is said, fly from sweet odours of myrrh; yet myrrh is myrrh, though the vultures avoid it. Thus if some be saved
and others perish, the Gospel retains its own virtue, and we, the preachers of it, remain just as we are; and the Gospel retains its odoriferous and salutiferous properties, though some may disbelieve or abuse it, and perish." It is, I think, a misconception of Dodd. to suppose that there is here an allusion to the different effects of strong perfumes to cheer some, and to throw others into violent disorders.

There was no necessity for some of the early Commentators to anxiously discuss the terms τοῖς σωζομένοις and ἀπολλα. They may simply be taken (as they are by the Greek Commentators), the former to denote those who believe and embrace the Gospel, and, by faithfully fulfilling its requisitions, are saved; the latter, those who either disbelieve and reject it, or at least neglect to fulfil its requisitions. It is truly remarked by Grot., that the terms are applied to them respectively, ex eventu.

16. οἱς μὲν, σωμὴν θανάτων, &c. q. d. "We have done our part, whatever be the consequences, though to the one," &c. The Commentators dilate much on these words, but (I think) to little purpose. The sense is, upon the whole, pretty obvious. It is sufficient to consider θανάτων and σωμῆς as genitives of a substantive in the place of the cognate adjective. The words eis θανάτου and eis γαμοῦ are exegetical, and meant to strengthen the sense. The eis denotes tendency.

In employing this mode of designating the Gospel, the Apostle is thought to have had in mind similar expressions, probably in use among the Jews. This is, indeed, established by a vast number of Rabbinical citations, of which the most important are the following. Taanith fol. 7, 1. Quicunque operam dat Legi propter ipsum Legem, ei fit lex aroma vitae, S. D. Prov. 3, 18. 8, 36. qui verò non dat operam legi propter ipsum, et fit aroma mortis, S. D. Deut. 32, 2. Schir. R. 2, 3. Verbum legis, quod ex ore Dei processit, fuit διποίεσσων, odoramentum vitae Israelitis, odoramentum mortis gentibus.
16. καὶ πρὸς τῶν τὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τίς λεγότας; The words of this spirited exclamation are not well expounded by most modern Commentators. Vat. and Hardy render: "who indeed is fit, except Titus?" Which is absurd. Grot. has written far more to the purpose, by paraphrasing thus: "Quam difficile est hoc quod nos præstamus, qui et tot adversa et pessimos ne nobis rumores Christi causâ contemnimus?" And he adds that an answer to this question is subjoined further on at 3, 5.; all that comes between being explicatory of the difficulty." The clause is, by Wolf, Locke, and others, rightly regarded as parenthetical; ver. 17., alluding, not to what immediately precedes, but to ver. 15 & 16. There is, however, a difficulty connected with the sentiment, inasmuch as it seems to admit that the Apostles were not qualified to preach the Gospel (that being the manifest sense of πρὸς ταύτα, where is an ellipsis of των ὦν). To obviate which (as I suspect) some ancient corrector inserted ωτως, which crept into the Vulg. and several Versions; and this reading was received by some Fathers, and is approved by Dr. Mill, Ellis, and (as it seems) Dr. Mackn., who supplies "as we." But that ellipsis can by no means be admitted. There is neither authority to justify the insertion, nor necessity to plead in its defence. For though the words do imply the insufficiency of the preacher, yet that is only insufficiency as a man, without reference to Divine assistance. Thus Jaspis supplies ἀφ' εὐαυτοῦ. No authority from the Greek Interpreters has been found for the ωτως, since they invariably perceived the true sense of the passage, already laid down, by which the difficulty above adverted to will vanish. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrys.) admirably annotates as follows: "Having spoken of great things, as εὐαυτία ἐστοι ταῦτα, &c., and ὅρια μεταφάνει, the Apostle μετριοφάνει, and says that for these things our "own strength, or rather weakness, would never suffice, unless there were superadded the power of God as our aid." So Theodoret: "We do not
achieve these things, but the grace of the Holy Spirit by us.”

17. οὐ γὰρ ἐστε, οὐ οἱ παλαιοὶ, καταφέρεστε τ. Α. τ. Θ.

The Greek Commentators regard these words as an explanation of the immediately preceding, εἰς τὰς τῶν τῶν θεῶν; And this may be defended; but it is not necessary. I agree with several eminent modern Commentators that these words are parenthetical; and that these refer to what preceded in ver. 15 & 16. The connexion may be thus traced: “(We are indeed so favoured by God, that we are caused to triumph, and permitted to scatter the odours of the Gospel; and we do this both with zeal and sincerity,) for we are not as the many,” &c.

Kαταφέρεστε εἰσερ, Roamam. observes, is for καταφερμενε. I have, however, before remarked that this use of the participle and verb substantive for a verb, is meant to denote habit and custom.

Kαταφέρεστε τῶν λόγων. The force of this expression will be clearly understood if we bear in mind the physical sense of the word κατήλειω, which is here used metaphorically. But first it will be necessary to consider the real meaning of κατήλειος: and this is distinctly shown by a passage of Plato 531 c., which has escaped all the Commentators: ἕγα αὐτός παραδεχόμεθα, δεύτερον παραλώσας τάλιν εἰ κατήλειος. So also Plato, p. 600 c. And this is what Hesych. means, when he explains κατήλειοι: by μετακαλεῖ. Most Commentators explain the κατήλειον “making a gain of.” And to this purpose I find noted down in my Adversaria Clem. Alex. 60 ο. ἀμίανθοι σου δείχθηται δ. θεός, οὐ καταφέρεται ἡ ἁλοθέλη. Thus the schools of the Sophists were called by some κατήλειοι. (See Wets.) And so campanus is often used in the Latin, both with and without addition. We may compare, too, our old word to chafer.

Here, however, as is shown by the context, something more is meant, namely, corrupting for the purpose of gain. So 4, 2, δε-λούστε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Of the numerous Classical citations adduced by Wets., the most apposite are Ἀσχυλ. Theb. 541 Blonf. Τίθεν δέ ἢ κατάλειται μακροιν, which I would render, “will not fight by retail;” “will not do things in a peddling way.” Here the learned Editor refers to Alberti on Hesych., Toup. in Suid. 3. p. 189., Schleus. Lex. N. T. in v. Hippionact. apud Tzetz. in Lyco. 579., Monk on Eurip. Hippol. 956., which last passage, however, is scarcely apposite, the word there signifying to cheat. I would subjoin the following interesting passages which have escaped all the Commentators. Max. Τύγ. D. 28. 2, 57 κυβήλειον τὰ ἀληθή; Julian Ep. p. 300. εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἄλλο μὲν φρονίμης, τὸν ἐνάτον δὲ ἢν φρονεὶ διδασκεῖ, τῶν οὐ τοῦτο ἔκειν κατάλειον ἔστιν. Jambl. Vit. Pyth. § 76, ὦ γὰρ ἐνεπορεύετο λόγος.

I cannot conclude without advertting to the origin of the word in

* Hence may be supplied the true root (on which the Etymologists wander far and decide nothing) of the Latin camillus in the sense σφειτεῖν. And so our cavil, which means properly to haggle.
question, on which the Philologists have not well treated. I would derive it from καρπός, which (in common with the Caup of the Latin, the Chap, Kop, and various cognate words of the Northern languages,) signifies to vend or sell by retail. The other part of the word comes from πηλός, which, as we learn from Hesych., was an old word signifying wine; and likely enough; for both words express two of the most notable properties of fermented drink, swelling and bubbling. The usual derivation from κακονείν and πωλὸς is perfectly anile. Such persons could not be so called except in derision. The truth is, the word, according to the above derivation, at first meant petty chapmen in wine, persons who retailed wine, as being the article most in request in retail traffic; but afterwards was extended to petty traders in any article; and especially designated what we call hucksters, persons who buy up an article to sell again; and, in some degree, was common to all retail venders. But as petty dealers are always the greatest corrupters of any article; and as wine, above all other things, offers the greatest facilities to such tricks, so the καρπονείς (in the proper sense of the word, namely wine venders) have in all ages and all countries been accused (and perhaps not unjustly) of this trickery. The most ancient evidence is Is. 1, 32. οἱ καρπονείς σοι μισοῦσι τὸν οἶνον ὢνδα. See also Arist. Plut. 435., cited by Schleus. To which may be added Æschyl. Eumenid. 690. αὖνον πολίνων ἔν πικανόντων (Wakel. conjectures εἰκράγοντων). And no wonder that of such tricks hucksters in provisions have, in all ages of the world, been guilty.

The sense, then, is clearly this: "corrupting the Gospel, in order to make a gain of it, by representing its doctrines and requisitions, as otherwise than what they really are, to make them more popular and therefore more gainful." We cannot doubt what these admixtures were; though they, no doubt, varied in different teachers; sometimes consisting of Jewish superstitions; sometimes of the philosophical fancies and dreams of the Sophists.† Perhaps, too, they might hold relaxed opinions on the subject of divorce, fornication, and association with Heathens.

As to the reading of some MSS. ταλαντεύοντες, it is a mere gloss. I must not omit to observe that the reading of λοιποί, for οἱ πολλοί, supported by many MSS. and Fathers, and adopted by some moderns, cannot (as far as I see) be maintained on any just grounds; and as the two words are (as I have before observed) perpetually confounded with each other, the error is the less to be wondered at. Οἱ πολλοί (or, as Theopyl. reads, πολυοί) need not, however, be interpreted the greater part, but very many. The Apostle is, by all Commentators, ancient and modern, supposed to have had in view the false teachers at Corinth.

* So Rosenm.: "Non solum ex ipsa doctrinæ tractatione lucrum quaerebant, sed et ineptis fabulis eam corrumpabant (Judeororn afliciendorum causâ) mendacis Insignibus de instante fine mundi, de novo regno Christi per mille annos, homines concutiebant, atque bonis fortunisque suis non invitò exuebant."
† So Chrys.: ὅτι τὰ αὐτῶν ἀναμγνώσα τοῖς Θεόσι.
The idea is further unfolded by the following words, ἄλλος ὁς ἐκλειπεῖαι, which are by Theophyl. well explained ἐκ καθαρᾶς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἔννοιας, "with purity, truth, sincerity, and integrity." See the note on 1 Cor. 5, 8. The next words ᾧ ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς are elliptical, and λέγοντες, or the like, must be supplied. Theophyl. well explains them: ὃς ἐκ θέου ἔχοντες ἀπὸ λαθοῦντο καὶ ὁ θεός οἰκοθεν ἀπὸ καταρθοῦντες. The καταρθοῦντες τοῦ θεοῦ signifies "as in the presence of God, and with a view to his approbation only." Thus Theophyl. observes that it is said ὡς δειξῃ τὸ εὖθυ τὴς καρδίας καὶ εὐπαθήσιαστον. With respect to ἐν Χριστῷ, it may be rendered "in the name of Christ, as his legates." So Grot. and most Commentators. Or it may signify (as others explain) "conformably to the doctrines of Christ."

CHAP. III.

Verse 1. Ἀρχῶν ἐκατωτῶς συμπαθάνει; It is well observed by Theophyl., that this is meant to meet an objection; for, since he had been speaking in his own commendation, some one might say, "How is this, Paul, thou art magnifying thyself by saying these things!" Which the Apostle refutes in the following words.

The interrogation is equivalent to a strong negative. The πάλιν refers to what he had said at 1 Cor. c. 5, 9 & 14. From the words following it appears, that with the negative we must supply need; q. d. "No; we need not."

The next words are, as Theophyl. observes, said μετὰ βαρύτητα, since πληκτικὰτης κοινὶ τῶν λόγων. Here there is a Var. Lect. which merits attention. For εἰ μὴ some eleven MSS. and a few Versions and Fathers read ἢ μὴ, which is preferred by many eminent Critics, and is received by Griesb., and is adopted by all our Translators; but, I think, on unsufficient grounds. Not to mention the weakness of MS. evidence, the reading in question exceedingly enervates the vigour of this cutting sentence. To receive it would be contrary to the most certain of Critical canons, since it is plainly the easier reading, not to mention that some doubts might be raised as to the correctness of the Greek. Besides, it may easily be ac-
counted for, considering that the sense is somewhat obscure by the omission of the clause which, on the best authorities, I have supplied. Then again, an interrogative particle was likely to be introduced after an interrogative sentence. The ancient reading, then, (which is confirmed by Chrysost.) is undoubtedly the true one, and is adopted by Jaspis. The sense may be thus expressed: “Unless (indeed) you will say, we need as some do,” &c.

By the τινες all the Commentators agree are meant the false teachers at Corinth, who had originally introduced themselves to notice by commendatory letters both there and elsewhere: οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες (as Theophl. says) ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων γνωριζομέναι, διεκδικοῦν οἷς ἂν ζήδελον, διὰ τότεν συνιστώμενοι καὶ γνωριζομένοι.

These commendatory letters were much in use in the primitive church, and were derived, as some think, from the tesserα hospitalitatis of the Greeks and Romans. But it has been proved, that the custom was in use among the Jesus also; as it would be likely to be in every country where letters were known, and personal communication not very frequent. Now these are more properly termed Epistles commendatory than letters of recommendation, as Mackn. renders. They were properly letters of introduction (which is the import of the term), though they, no doubt, often had recommendatory matter. Some of the finest specimens are from the pen of Cicero and Pliny. They were called by the name ἐπιστολαῖς συντακτικάς, or γραμματικά συντακτικά; as in a passage of Arrian Epict. 2, 3, appositely cited by Wets.: καλῶς ὁ Διογένης πρὸς τὸν ἀξιώματα γράμματα παρ' αὐτῶν λαβέων συστάτως; ὅτι μὲν ἀνθρωπός, φησίν, εἰ, καὶ ἵδον γνωστέως. εἰ δ' ἀγαθὸς ἢ κακὸς, εἰ μὲν ἐμπειρὸς ἐστι διαγνώσται τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ κακοῦ γνωστέως. εἰ δ' ἀπειρός, οὐδ' ἀν μυριάκις γράμμων αὐτῶ. Schleus. adds references to Diog. Laert. 5, 18, and Stob. Serm. p. 408. It is here remarked by Rosenm.: “Fortassis
auditores nonnulli Jacobi et Petri, insciente utroquà Apostolo cum litteris aliarum ecclesiarum, quas per-vagati fuerant, Corinthum venerant; deinceps vero per sectatores suos Corinthios eorumque litteras mirè disseminarunt de suis in rem Christianum meritis, quæ ab ipsis demum constituota fuerit Corinthi.”

Συμπτάνειν is falsely rendered by Mackn. “establish ourselves; prove our Apostleship.” The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed in interpreting it commend, praise. And so further on, 5, 12, 10, 12 & 18. 4, 2, 12, 11. See Schleus. Lex.

2. ή ἐκπολολὴ ήμῶν ὑμῶν ὑμεῖς ἔστε, &c.

The last verse, it will be remembered, concluded with an interrogation implying a strong negative. Thus Theodoret has well introduced the words of the present verse as follows: ἦμεῖς οἱ δεόμενα γραμμάτων αυτὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν τά πράγματα μαρτυρεῖται. Then is added the cause, in which there is an elegant turn, scarcely inferior to any thing of this kind in the best Classical writers: and the words are thus paraphrased by Theophyl.: “That which commendatory letters introducing and making us respected would have done, this ye yourselves do when seen and heard; and wherever we go we bear you about.” The words, however, of this and the following verse involve some difficulty on account of the harshness of the metaphor, to remove which Dodd. would read ἵμων for ἵμων, from some few MSS. and Versions. And so Bp. Barrington. Now this might be admitted, were it not for the following words, in which the Apostle further unfolds the metaphor, though, at the same time, he varies the application. Besides, it would be in the lives rather than the hearts of the Corinthian converts that this letter would be legible to the world at large. It is not easy, however, to explain the sense of ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις. Mackn. thinks that the difficulty may be lessened, and the jarring of metaphors removed, by supposing that the Apostle calls the Corinthians, not Christ’s letter of recommendation in favour of him, but a copy of that letter; and that the letter itself was written on the Apostle’s heart, but the copy of it on the hearts of the Corinthians. But this device only exchanges one difficulty for another more serious, and would convert obscurity, and somewhat of harshness, into inexplicable nonsense. The difficulty (I repeat) solely rests with the words ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν; so that, if these were absent, the sentence would be one of the most intelligible as it is the most elegant I know. But as they are supported by all the MSS. and by the next verse, retained they must be, and explained as we can. The best expositions are those of Oecumen. 615 b. ἐν ὑμιν γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἔχοντας, φησιν, ὡς καὶ ἐγγεγράφασιν ἡμῖν δοκεῖ τὸ ἄνεξλειπτὸν, καταχων περιφέρομεν ὑμᾶς: and Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) “Ωστε ἐπειδὴ ὑμᾶς ἔχω ἐκπολολὴν συνίστωσαν με πρὸς ἀλλούς, οὐ δέομαι
The Epistle here meant by St. Paul was plainly the reformed morals and good conduct of the Corinthian converts, which might be said to be read and known of all men; since the extensive commerce of the Corinthians carried the inhabitants of that city every where, and dispersed every where a knowledge of what was there done: and all this would be an Epistle Commentatory* of the Apostle; since, as Chrysost. and Theophyl. say, τῶν μαθητῶν ἡ ἁρετὴ τῶν διδάσκαλων κοσμεῖ. Now this reformation was indeed not known to all men; but it must have been especially imprinted in the mind and heart of the Apostle: and this therefore he would bear about with him every where, just as the knowledge in question was disseminated every where.

Such is (I conceive) the true sense: and thus every difficulty and harshness seems removed.†

3. ἡμῶν. The same metaphor is continued, though somewhat altered and differently applied.

The words φαν. οὗτι ἐστε are, by a well known idiom, for οὗτι φανερῶς ἐστε, "being plain that ye are;" i. e. "it being plain that ye are," &c. The οὗτι, however, has a force which no Commentator has seen but Theodoret, who thus ably paraphrases: καὶ τὰ λέγων ἡμῶν; αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐστε τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιστολή; αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὰ βήματα τοῦ κηρύγματος, ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν γραμμάτων διάκονοι. There is here a kind of climax.

When, however, it is said that they are even Christ’s Epistle, the latter must be understood in a

* For, to use the words of Theodoret in his paraphrase, they would see τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἐμετέραν, τὴν πανταγοῦ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἀδοκίμασιν ἐρείς γὰρ ὑμᾶς τῇ κλάσει ἀπαλαξαντες τῷ τῆς διαθήκης φωτὸς προσηγάγομεν.

† Here Bukeley cites a passage of Plato Phædr. Op. p. 213, who speaks of knowledge, as being written in the soul of the learner.
different sense to the former: and this sense (which the Commentators appear not to have clearly discerned) may (I think) be thus traced: "Ye bear the commands of Christ on your heart, and transcribe them into your practice. This is, as it were, a letter dictated by Christ to me, and by me written on your hearts." The above, which appears to be the true sense, is supported by all the antient Commentators, and by Grot. and Rosenm., the latter of whom observes, that διακονεῖν signifies to use any one's ministry in performing any thing.

In some sense, too, it might be said, that they were a letter commendatory of Christ and the Gospel to the heathens.

Now by "the Epistle of Christ" is meant the Gospel; and to this ἐπιστολή is very applicable, according to that sense which the word bears frequently in the antient writers, and in which it is here employed, namely, mandatum. The term, indeed, is applicable to any revelation of God's will to man. Thus the law of Moses might be called an ἐπιστολή τοῦ Θεοῦ and διακονθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Μωϋσέου. The Gospel was, as the Apostle says, an ἐπιστολή τοῦ Χριστοῦ διακονθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου.

The remaining part of the verse is (I think) meant not only to further unfold the meaning of ἐπιστολή, but (as the antient Commentators and Grot. suggest) to show the superiority of the Gospel of Christ over the law of Moses. And this Theophyl. thus illustrates; "As Moses was the minister of the Law, so are we the ministers of your faith in the Gospel. He cut the stones; we cut the hearts. The law was written with ink; the Gospel was written upon you by the Spirit. As far as the Spirit is superior to ink, and the heart to stone; so far is the new Dispensation superior to the old. And so Theodoret: ἤμεν γὰρ πλάξιν ἐνεκολάφθη λιθίναις, ἦ δὲ τοῖς λογικαῖς ἐνεγράφη καρδίαις. The point (it should seem) in which the Apostle especially intended to represent the superiority of the Gospel over the Law was this, that
in the Law there was a bare comment; in the Gospel the injunctions were rendered more effectual by the ministry of the Holy Spirit, as often manifested in the miraculous gifts to believers, and by whose sanctifying graces on all occasions the truths of the Gospel were especially impressed on the hearts of men. We may also add from Grot., "in lege veteri scriptum præcipuum est; vocalis institutio ei servit: In Evangelicâ vocalis institutio præcipua; scriptura ei custodiendæ servit."

The words ἐν πλατεὶ καρδίας σαφέσταται are, as Theophyl. observes, to be taken as an hyperbaton for ἐν πλατεὶ σαφέσταται καρδίας, and that for "on fleshy tablets," namely, those of the heart, i. e. "on the heart itself." So Theodoret. η δὲ ταῖς λογίαις ἐνεγράφη καρδίαις. Rosenm. indeed explains the words: "pectoribus hominum, eorum nempe, quibus innotuit, vos mea opera ad Christianam religionem esse perductos:" for, he adds, the minds of the Corinthians, who were themselves ἐπιστολῇ Χριστῷ, cannot here be understood. But this interpretation proceeds on an imperfect view of the expression ἐστε ἑπιστολῇ Χριστῷ, and would involve the whole into greater obscurity than ever.

Here Grot. aptly compares Jerem. 30, 33. where God promises, under the new covenant, to put his laws in the inward parts, and to write them in the hearts of his people. And he compares the following Classical passages. Plutarch. (speaking of Lycurg.) τὰ μὲν οὖν κυριώτατα καὶ μέγιστα πρὸς εὐθαυσολογὸς πόλεως καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐν τοῖς ἱβησιν, φησὶ καὶ ταῖς ἀγαθοίς τῶν πολιτῶν ἑγκατεστηκαμένα μένειν, ἀκινήτα καὶ βεβαιαί ἐχοὺς τοῖς προαίρεσιν, δειμὼν ἰδίωροτατον τῆς ἀνάγκης, καὶ ἧν παρετείς ἐποίειτο τοῖς νεόις, νομοδέτου διάθεσιν ἀπεργαζομένη περὶ ἐκαστοῦ αὐτῶν and Di Chrysost. in a Discourse in which he maintains the preference of custom over law: Ἐκείνοι μὲν (οὶ νομοὶ) ἐν σάνισιν ἡ στήλαις φυλάττομαι, τῶν δὲ ἐκαστῶν ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς ἀπὸ θαλάσσων ἐκαστῶν ἦν καὶ κρείττων ἦ τοιαύτη φυλακὰ. I add Theophyl. Simoc. 125. D. ταῦτα τῶς
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τῆς καρδίας τερέσσες ἐπιστολῆς, γραφὰς ἐγγυαίτων ἐγγυαίτων — an evident imitation of the present passage, and of Ἀeschyl. P. V. 814. ἐγγυαίτως σὺ μὴρώσεις δέλτους φρέναν.

4, 5. ζευγάρια, ἡ τοιοῦτος ἐχίνης ἐνα τῷ X. ἑαυτῷ τῷ Θεῷ. The connexion here is not very obvious. Many early modern Commentators, as Zeger, Est., Menoch., and Tirin., take the words to refer to those immediately preceding, namely, “ye are our epistle,” &c. And in this view Rosenm. paraphrases: “Multum omnino est, quod vobis tribuo; sed confido per Deum et Christum hoc ita esse, et vos porro quasi commendationis loco mihi et meo ministerio fore.” This, however, seems harsh. The connexion is (I think) better traced by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) as follows: “After he had thus set forth the superiority of the new over the old covenant, it might be inferred, as a consequence, ‘So then we the Apostles and ministers of the New, are inferior to Moses the minister of the old.’ To soften, therefore, what might have seemed a boasting, he omits that conclusion, or only alludes to it by saying: “This is, however, nothing of our own, but our boastings is through Christ in God. For Christ is the author of that, and we are the humble instruments.” Perhaps the force of the expressions may be more fully represented in the following paraphrase. “We, however, (ἑ) have such a cause for boasting (as this superiority implies) in God alone, and through Christ.” Thus there is an ellipsis of πάνα. The words following are (in the deep humility of the Apostle) meant to further inculcate their dependence on God.

In the ἐστὶ there is the usual ellipsis of ὅλα ὑπερεργοῦν; q. d. “Mind, I mean not to say that we are sufficient of ourselves,” &c. By λογίσωμαι is not merely meant cogitare, as most modern Commentators explain (and so our English version to think anything); nor (as Dodd. renders) reckon, which the context will not permit. Preferable is the version.
of Whitby and Mackn., to reason, i.e. to bring men to conversion by any reasoning of our own. But this is scarcely suited to the accompanying formulas, ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν and ἐξ ἑαυτῶν. I would therefore adopt the interpretation of all the antient and some modern Commentators, as Grot., Rosenm., Wets., Wells, Schleus., and Jaspis, excogitare, of which sense Wets. adduces examples from Demetr. Phal. λογίζεσθαι ἐξ αὐτῶν. Ælian, V. H. 1, 6. εἰσὶ δὲ εἰς τοιούτων λογιστικά, ὡστε ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν ἐκλογίζεσθαι τᾶς ἡμέρας. Aristid. Sicul. p. 364. ἄνω γὰρ ἐστε σοφότατοι τῶν Ἐνθῆνας, αὐτὸς τὸ ὄφ’ ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν ἀριστεῖ λογισαμοθα τὰ δέοντα, καὶ ἑτέρον λέγουσιν κρίνων. The sense, then, seems to be this: "We are of ourselves unable even to devise, or conceive the mysteries and truths of the Gospel, much less to give them the effect by which the Holy Spirit writes and imprints them on the hearts of men; but our power and sufficiency is (alone) from God." "The Apostle (observes Rosenm.) says that he could not have discovered this mode of salvation, but that he had his doctrine by Divine revelation."* The αἰς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν is meant still further to enforce the ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν. It is plain that τι must be limited to the things in view, namely, anything relative to the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel and the method of salvation revealed in the new covenant. Perhaps the αἰς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν may be an elliptical form for "so as to promulgate it as from ourselves, (with such effect as we do.)." Oecumen. well paraphrases thus: ὅτι ἡμεῖς μὲν ὡς ἵκανον ἐμεῖν τοσαύτη διακονία ἐπιτρεπομαθοθασίλα, ὥστε ἂν ἴθι λαβεῖν τῷ πράγματος τὸ μέγεθος, ἢ οἴκισι τοιοοθα τι ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ’ ὅτι πεπόνησον ἡμᾶς ἰκανοὺς γενέσθαι τῷ τηλικοῦρ πράγματι. And Theophyl. autòς γὰρ (ὁ Θεός) ἴκανον ἡμᾶς, τουτεστιν,

* So Grot.: "Et quae tot seculis incognita per Evangelium Deus patetur, unde nascuntur vires tam exempla edendi opera, ejusmodi sunt ut nemini quavis ingeniosissimo in mentem venire potuerint. Ideo autem cum dixisset, ἂφ’ ἑαυτῶν, repetit, ὡς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν: quia potest homo ista capere, sed non ex se reperire."
6. ὁς καὶ ἐκανονεῖν ἡμᾶς, &c. The force of ὁς may be better understood by rendering: "And he it is that hath enabled us, and made us fit to be ministers of the new covenant," i.e. to preach the Gospel. Here εἶναι is to be understood. On the force of the term καὶνὴ διαθήκη see the note on Matt. init. Theodore well paraphrases thus: Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεοῦ ἀρχῆγος ἐγερθησεν ἐκανονεῖν δύναμιν, ὥστε διακονῆσαι τῇ τῶν πνευμάτων χάριτι. Grot. observes that διακόνως is here used generally; as in 1 Cor. 3, 5., and διακονία at Acts 1, 17. and elsewhere.

In the words following the Apostle again (as it should seem, for the sake of the Judaizing Christians) takes occasion to set forth the difference between the Law and the Gospel. Τῆς καὶνῆς διαθήκης, "a new Covenant, or γράμματος (he adds) ἀλλὰ πνευμάτως, "not of letter, but of spirit," i.e. not a religion literal, or comprehended in writing, like the Decalogue, and the Law of Moses, but spiritual. This may be understood in a two-fold way; first in the physical sense, since Christianity was at first promulgated without any Divine Scripture,* and solely by the Holy Spirit, which also by its miraculous χαρίσματα extended at least up to the period when it became literal as well as spiritual, and by its ordinary and sanctifying influences hath ever since enabled true Christians to perform the duties which the Gospel enjoins: and secondly, in a moral sense, as being raised above the dry forms and empty shadows of the law, and aiming at true and substantial excellence. "Now Moses (observes Grot.) brought the

* The Apostle speaks of his own times. For after the Apostolical age it was highly necessary that the doctrine of Christ should be committed to writing. (Rosenm.)
writing in two stone tables to the people. The Apostle’s word was accompanied with more illustrious signs than Moses had given, even with tongues, miraculous healings, raising the dead, nay, and with the power of conferring such gifts on others; which had been utterly without example.” Thus it is remarked by Æcumen., that the law promulgated the writings of Moses; but the preaching of Christ ministered the gifts of the Spirit. And Theophyl. observes, that the law was, in a certain sense, spiritual, as given by the Spirit, but did not confer the Spirit, as did the New Covenant: for not only did the Apostles teach spiritual and divine doctrines, but by the laying on of hands gave the Spirit.” It may also, as Whitby observes, be called the covenant of the Spirit in allusion to Jerem. 3, 33., where God promises, under the new covenant, to put his laws in the inward parts, and to write them in the hearts of his people. And to this view Jaspis confines it, observing: Πνεῦμα appellatur nostrā religio; nam interna spectat cum effectis et commodis suis, Mosaicā maximam partem ad externa pertinente.” He then, with great taste, as well as truth, observes: “Paulus autem, quo magis commovetur animo, eo elegantiori et magis figuratū utitur oratione, i. q. indicium est, quām naturalis sit illa Pauli elegantia.

6. τὸ γὰρ γράμμα—ζωονοεῖ. There are several ways in which this will hold good. Hence Commentators differ according to the views they take. Without noticing refinements to which the Apostle would not descend to advert (and which may be seen in the Crit. Sacr., Pole’s Syn., Wolf’s Curæ, and other works), some here recognize a Jewish proverb, expressing the superiority of the spiritual, i. e. mystical, interpretation of the law over the literal. But, as Doddr. observes, this is a very arbitrary and unwarrantable exposition. By γράμμα, all judicious Commentators are agreed, is meant the Law of Moses, and by τὸ πνεῦμα the Gospel, the former of which might be said to kill, in a metaphorical sense
(in which Grot. here understands the expression), as being merely minacious and dammatory, threatening death and leaving to it those who disobeyed; containing no promises of a future state even to those who obeyed it, Joh. 6, 49. Gal 3, 21., and for those who disobeyed it (as all, from the frailty of human nature, must do) there could be no hope. Nay, it not only denounced punishment and death, but often indirectly occasioned it by the multiplicity, the minuteness, and the difficulty of its ceremonial rites; thus, as the Apostle says, "taking occasion from our concupiscence, it increased sin," and did not confer any strength to perform its injunctions, being destitute of all the assistances of grace. Such is the mode in which the most eminent modern Commentators explain.

On the contrary, the Spirit, namely that new and spiritual system, the Gospel, giveth life, since it not only brings life and immortality to light, but, by the manifestations of the Spirit, enables believers to perform its injunctions. More may be seen on this subject by consulting the Crit. Sacr. and Pole's Syn. I would add, that ζωοτοικώσατε, is so used in Gal. 3, 21. εἴ τις ἐθανάτωσα τὸν πνεῦμα ζωοτοικώσατε, which, I think, show that the recent foreign Commentators err in interpreting the word solely of offering felicity; for there is plainly, in both passages, a reference to that expiatory sacrifice by which the vivification is effected. Perhaps, too, the Apostle meant especially to contrast the two dispensations, by considering the tendency and disposition of each. The chief end and purpose of the Law was punishment, not reward. It was extreme in remarking, and severe in punishing the least faults: whereas, the chief end of the Gospel is, in every sense, life and happiness. It deals in forgiveness, and never spurns the penitent and reformed sinner, but washes away his sins. And it may be said ζωοτοικώσατε, as "quickening those who were dead in trespasses and sins," and imparting new life by the sanctifying graces of the Holy Spirit. See a
dred passage of Ephes. 2, 1.; which it is strange the Commentators here should not have referred to.

7. *ei δὲ ἡ διακονία—δῶρον.* Having already shown the superiority of the New Covenant, as compared to the Old, that written with the Spirit to that written with ink, that written in the heart to that written in stones, and having said that the one killeth, but the other giveth life, he now proceeds to show that the glory also of the Gospel is greater; insomuch as the law had only corporeal and perceptible glory, namely, that in the face of Moses; but the New one an intellectual and spiritual one, which no one perceiveth with his senses. (Theophyl.)

Such is evidently the connexion, and the sense intended to be expressed is pretty obvious; but to show how it arises from the words "Hic labor, hoc opus est," for the construction is somewhat irregular, nay, as Rosenm. thinks, ungrammatical. Perhaps it may be sufficient to say that the sentence is expressed popularly, and colloquially; and, as the very essence of that style is ellipsis, and the using of one word to express two, the sense may be best expressed by a paraphrase.

That διακονία must denote ministry, office, (as often elsewhere,) is plain from ver. 8 & 9. Yet is here objected by Rosenm., that this διακονία cannot be said to have been engraved on stones. He would therefore take διακονία for διαβήκη. But this is too harsh. It is remarked by Grot.: "Dicit ministerium Mosis inscriptum, quasi saxis tabulis, quia illae tabulae ostendebant ipsum cui Deus eas tradiderat esse μεσίτην illius foederis. Est ergo Metonymia causa pro effectu." Perhaps it may be better simply to take διακονία for διακονία διαβηκής, and then the ἐνετευρ., though made to agree with διακονία expressed, yet properly belongs to διαβηκή omitted. The sense, then, seems to be this: "If the ministry or office of promulgating a covenant engraved with letters on stone was glorious, (for ἐν δῶρον is a phrase standing for the cognate adjective ἐνδόξος, of which examples
are adduced by Wets.) and so glorious, that the Children of Israel were not able to look at the face of Moses, because of the (exceeding) glory of his countenance," &c. Thus, upon the whole, there is no great irregularity, nor difficulty. Two or three things in the phraseology may, however, merit attention. Grot. notices that ἐννυστοὺς is equivalent to the Hebr. חָרֹם and κολάστειν in Exod. 32, 15. where it is used of these same tables. The word signifies properly to impress a figure on any thing by a stamp, or, in a general way, to engrave. Examples from the Classical writers are adduced by Wets. and Schleus., the former of whom has an interesting passage, as regards the thing, from Liv. 39, 27. quà jurejurando, quœ monumentis litterarum in lapide insculptis in æternam memoriam sancta atque sacra sunt. Ἀτένισθαι signifies, to stedfastly survey, keep the eyes fixed upon; as Luke 4, 20, 22, 56. Acts 1, 10, 3, 4, 6, 15, 7, 55.

7. διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου. Of this glory, called in the Hebr. גְּלֻ, we are told in Exod. 34, 29 & 30. that it was too dazzling to be looked at. The words in Exod. 34, 29. are: διδόξασται ἡ ὅψις τοῦ χρωμάτος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. But this version does not correctly represent the sense of the Hebrew words, which suggest the idea, not indeed of horns such as ignorant painters and sculptors have adorned the countenance of Moses, but of some exceeding great irradiation, forming what is called a glory, such as is represented as surrounding the countenance of Jesus and the Apostles.*

* On the γλ Wolf refers to Fabr. Cod. Pseud. Vet. Test. 666. sq., Zorn. Bibl. Aniq. 117., and Carpzov in a Diss. on this subject, who, and the preceding writers, have shown, that by the δόξα rays are indicated as proceeding from the countenance. This, too, is confirmed by the Rabbinical writers, who (as Elsner observes) say that the face of Moses shone like the sun. He also proceeds to show, that the Mahometans ascribed to their prophet, and the Gentiles to their heroes and philosophers, coruscant countenances. To this purpose he cites Pausan. Cor. 36. who relates, that from the countenance of Αεκλαπίος, when a child and exposed, proceeded an ἄστραφυ,
Hardt and others endeavour to account for this *glory* on natural principles, and consequently run into great absurdities; so that (as usual) this new hypothesis draws more largely on our belief than the antient and common opinion.

This δὲξα was, as Mackn. observes, an emblem of the knowledge which the Israelites derived from the Law.

7. τὴν καταργουμένην, "which glory was to be done away, and to cease." On the meaning of this, Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Menoch., Est., and Doddr., interpret "done away by death." But that would, I think, have been scarcely of importance enough for the Apostle to have noticed. Others interpret it "which was but transitory, and ceasing with youth." But this is a lowering of the sense not to be tolerated, and which is plainly adapted to serve a purpose. The best founded opinion seems to be that of the Greek Commentators, Beza, and others, that this was a type of the abrogation of the glory, namely, all the Levitical Law. At least the Apostle seems to have meant to hint, that as that glory was temporary, and would cease at death, so was the Dispensation, of whose Divine origin this was the sign, meant also to be temporary. The glory of Moses, or that of the Shechinah, was a fading glory, but that of the Gospel would continually increase to all eternity.

8. πῶς ὦ γλυκὴ μαλακόν—δὲξηγι; Here is an *argumentum a minori ad majus.* "How then shall not the ministry, &c. It is observed by Theophyl., that as in

whence the shepherd who found him thought it ὑεῖον τῷ, and Virg. L. 2, 682, where something similar is related of Ascanius; and so of Serv. Tullius by Pliny, Plutarch, and Dionys. To other divine persons (he adds) other writers have ascribed ἀκτινα ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ. And he also adduces examples from Philostr. and Porphy. But their words can (I think) only be considered as strongly figurative. As to the preceding, and such like stories of the same kind which may be found in the Classical writers, I would consider them as *fictions founded upon truth,* namely, the antient tradition of the coruscant countenance of Moses.
the preceding member of the comparison we had διακονία βασιλέως, so here we might have expected διακονία ζωῆς, instead of which we have τὸ πνεῦμα, which imports more; namely, that the New Covenant has the faculty of supplying not life only, but the Spirit which imparts life:—how then must it exceed in glory.” Some recent Commentators take πνεῦμα to signify religio præstantior. But this is manifestly too confined a sense. After πνεῦμα, Grot. supplies “qui arrhabo vitæ æternae.” It must be observed, that ἡ διακονία is for ἡ διακονία τῆς διαθήκης; as before. And by the spirit must be meant the Holy Spirit, not only as evinced at the first promulgation of the Gospel in signs and wonders and mighty deeds, but in every succeeding age, through its ordinary influences in sanctification, given to every man to profit withal. Of this it is truly said by the Greek Commentators, that it supplies life.

The words ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ are very wrongly rendered by Mackn. “should be performed with glory.” All the best Commentators are agreed, that ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ is for ἐνδοξος ἔσται. Mackn. would represent the parallelism as drawn between Moses’s glory and that of the Apostles’, when the Holy Spirit descended in flames in fire. And so Whitby. But this seems founded in error, and has been refuted by Doddr. Mackn., however, very ably develops the sense of τὸ πνεῦμα, understanding it of the Holy Spirit and the miraculous powers communicated by it.

9. εἰ γὰρ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως, &c. It is briefly, but pithily, remarked by Theophyl.: πᾶλιν τὸ αὐτὸ νόμιμα περιστρέφει. For this is not (as Rosenm. calls it) a mere repetition of what is contained in ver. 7 & 8. Theophyl. thinks, too, that it is meant by the Apostle to explain in what sense he had said “the letter killeth.” “The Apostle (continues he) represents the Law as a ministry of condemnation, and dealing in punishment; the Gospel, as a ministry of righteousness. For it not only absolves from sin, but justifies sinners. Therefore it must exceed in glory.”
It is a question whether δικαιοσύνη should be here rendered *justitia*, as in some Latin Versions, and *righteousness*, as in our English ones, or *justification*. The former interpretation may be defended, and is maintained by Grot., who understands that internal righteousness which is so well pleasing to God, that He hath promised salvation to it; and on which see the Epistle to the Romans. But the latter seems preferable, which is supported by the Greek Commentators, and also by Vatab. and Vorst., who observe, that the sense *justification* is absolutely required by the antithetical term *condemnation*. And such (I find) is the mode of interpretation adopted by Jaspis, who explains: “quod modum docet quo justi et insontes a Deo habeamur,” referring to Rom. 2, 5. and 5, 1 & 9.

10. καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ δεδοξασται—δόξης. Mackn. very incorrectly renders καὶ γὰρ “and therefore.” Far preferable is our common translation “for even.” Rosenm. renders it quid quod. None of our modern Commentators, however, perceive that the full sense can only be attained by supplying a clause omitted to which γὰρ refers, and which Theophyl. well expresses thus: καὶ τι συγκρίνω τὴν παλαιὰν καὶ τὴν νέαν; τοσαύτη γὰρ τῆς νέας ἡ ύπεροχή, ὡστε, &c. He then offers the following very able paraphrase and illustration of the passage: ὡστε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει, τούτῳ, ἐν τῷ συγκρίνεσθαι, οὐδὲ δόξαν ἔχειν νομισθήσεται τὸ δεδοξασμένον, τούτῳ, ἡ παλαιὰ, διὰ τὴν ύπερβάλλουσαν δόξαν τῆς νέας· καίτοι γὰρ δεδοξασμένος ὁ νόμος αὐτὸς καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ὁμοιος διὰ τὸ ύπερβάλλον τῆς δόξης τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀδόξος φαίνεται.

At δεδοξασμένον must be understood πράγμα. There is a similar use of the word 1 Pet. 1, 8. Most modern Commentators understand the munus Mosis; which comes to the same thing; and on account of the διακονία before occurring may very well be admitted. Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει the modern Commentators explain hoc nomine, hac de causd, hoc respectu, in regard of this. But the force of the expression was
better discerned by Theophyl. It plainly refers to the clause omitted, and is therefore to be rendered “in respect of any comparison;” a mode of interpretation which has been adopted by Est., Erasm., Vatab., Casaub., and Rosenm.

10. οὐδὲ δεδόξασται. There is here an idiom, chiefly consisting in hyperbole, for “was in a manner, or comparatively, inglorious.” This is the simplest, and (I think), closest translation. And so Theophyl.: οὐδὲ δόξαν ἔχειν νομισθῆται. The Commentators, however, almost invariably explain it “cannot be named as excellent;” which is wandering too far. Grot. commends the Syriac version “œquum non fuit honorari.” But this seems to be farthest from the truth.

10. ἐνεκέν τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης. This is rendered by Beza and Schleus. “quod attinet ad.” But that proceeds on a wrong view of ἐν τῷ μέρει. Others, as Grot., render it “in comparison of.” But I most approve of the exposition of Theophyl. διὰ, propter. Theodoret has the following elegant simile: Ἔν νυκτὶ μὲν γὰρ τὸ λυχνιαῖον φῶς Φανώτατον εἶνα δικεί; ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ δὲ μέση κρύπτεται, καὶ οὐδὲ φῶς εἶναι νομισθῆται.

11. εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργοῦμεν—δόξη. The καταργυ is very ill rendered by Pisc., Erasm., and others aboletur, and by our English Translators and Mackn. “is abolished.” It must be taken like the καταργοῦμεν at ver. 7. as a participle, not present (as the Commentators suppose), but imperfect, and that in a peculiar sense, namely, “was (to be) done away,” which is equivalent to the future “should be done away.” The sense was seen by Theophyl., who explains: ὁ μέλλων καταργεῖθαι καλ πάλευται. And so Pareus, Vatab., Grot., Rosenm., and Doddr. At καταργοῦμεν, as at δεδοξ. just before, there is an ellipsis of πράγμα, with a reference to διακονία. The construction is, as Grot. says, ad rem, (like triste lupus stabulis,) and διακονία is referred to; though that may be interpreted the covenant or dispensation itself.
11. διὰ δόξης. This is taken by some modern Commentators, as De Dieu, for ἐνδοξών. And Grot. considers the διὰ as put for μετὰ. But this seems too limited a mode of interpretation. Something more is intended. Theophyl. better considers it as an elliptical expression for διὰ δόξης εὐδόκησε, i.e. "introduced and attended with glory." And so Doddr. The sense may be accounted for thus. The real ellipsis is ἦν, which may be interpreted "was given, or promulgated." The τὸ μένον ought to be rendered not "that which remains," but "that which is to remain;" according to the idiom above occurring. So Theoph.: ἐν δόξῃ ἐσται ἡ μόνιμος. When, however, it is said to be μένον, we are only, with Theophyl., to understand μόνιμον, namely, lasting as long as the Providence of God shall see fit; for cease it must at the end of the world. So 1 Cor. 15, 24. " Then cometh the end." It is also termed μένον, since no other dispensation is to succeed it. When, therefore, some Commentators, antient and modern, speak of the Gospel's remaining for ever, they can only mean "remaining in its effects." So Theophyl.: μένον δὲ τὸ τῆς χαρίτος δώρον, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τῆς ἐν τέλος.

12. ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα—χράιμεθα. On the sense to be assigned to τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα the Commentators are not agreed. Mr. Locke takes great pains to prove that the Apostle must mean by ἐλπίς the honourable employment of an Apostle, or the glory belonging to his ministry. And so Menoch. and Tiren. But this seems too limited an interpretation. Others, as Rosenm., understand "hope of the perpetual duration of the Gospel Dispensation." But this also seems to be too limited a sense. It should rather seem to refer to all that had been said in the preceding verses on the superiority of Gospel to the Law, and which was, no doubt, said for the sake of the Judaizers; q. d. "Having such an assured hope as this of the advantages the Gospel gives over the Law, superior as it is in all respects, both in nature and tendency, in the man-
ner of its introduction, the authority, privileges, and gifts of its ministers, and finally its duration." See Chrysost. and also Mackn., who has discerned and expressed the sense better than any other Commentator, antient or modern. O si sic omnia!

Examples of the above sense of ἑλεύς are to be found in 2 Cor. 1, 7. Phil. 1, 20. Tit. 1, 2.

12. πολλὴ παρφήσια χρηματεα. The sense of these words is somewhat uncertain. Rosenm. paraphrases them thus: "Apertè et agimus, et loquimur, sine omni timore, licet Judæi maximè offenduntur, sicut eos Christi nova doctrina offendit." But this sense is not agreeable to the words following. Besides, had this been his meaning, the Apostle would have written ταύτη τῇ παρφήσια. The words καὶ καβάσερ plainly point to another sense of παρφήσια, equally well founded, namely (as Schleus. in his Lex. renders) "apertè, perspicè et sine verborum involucris et ambagibus loquor." So Mark 8, 32. καὶ παρφήσια τῶν λόγων ἔλαβει, in which passage, Schleus. observes, παρφήσια is opposed to parabolical and enigmatical language, which Christ occasionally used when advertising to his death. And he cites, as further examples, Joh. 10, 24. 11, 14, 16, 25 & 29. and refers to Wets. N. T. 1, 885. Such, too, is the sense assigned by Theoph., who explains: πολλὴ παρφήσια χρηματεα πρὸς τῶν μαθητευμένων, οὐδὲν ἀποκρυπτόμενον, οὐδὲν ὑποτελλόμενον. And so Jaspis: "Hæc intelligatur de doctrinâ apertâ, in qua tradendâ nil involucris condatur."

18. καὶ οὐ καβάσερ Μωυσῆς ἔτιβει—καταργουμένων. After οὐ it is plain some verb is to be understood. Beza, Doddr., and others* supply ἔσμεν. But this is very inartificial. Others, as Whitby, more rightly, supply ποιώμεν. This, however, would require an ὅ before ἔτιβει. I most approve of the subaudition of Rosenm. παρακαλὐπτομεν. In strictness, the regular

* And so Grot., who explains: "Non ita se res nostre habent, ut cum Moses facici sua velum imposuit."
ellipsis can only be καλύμμα ἐτθεμέν, from the context, which must be interpreted metaphorically, i. e. we do not use a veiled, obscure, mysterious form of speaking. So Theophyl.: οὗ χρεία καλύπτεσθαι ἤμας καλάτερ τὸν Μωσήν, * τούτεστι, οὗ δεόμεθα ἀποκρύπτειν ταῦτα ὄμων, ὀσκερ τῷ καλύμματι, τῇ ἀσαφείᾳ. The words following show the end for which Moses used the veil. But on the exact sense neither antient nor modern Commentators are agreed; for it is far easier to devise a plausible interpretation, than to remove the objections which may be urged against almost every exposition that has been brought forward. Here, as in many other passages, the Apostle may be called by the name especially applied to Lycophron (though from different causes,) σχοτεινὸς. Schleus. renders: “ut Israelitae usque ad obitum Mosis non aspicere possint.” But this interpretation is plainly inadmissible. Jaspis understands the whole passage thus: “Palam et apertē doces; Moses, contrā, omnia typis involvit, ne Judaei futuram legis Mosaice auctoritatis cessature finem animadvertērent;” comparing Rom. 10, 44. And he thinks that this interpretation is favoured by ver. 11. In nearly the same way the passage is taken by Theophyl., except that he seems to think τοῦς denotes effect rather than purpose. Not materially different is the view taken by Locke and Wets., who think it is meant that Moses spoke obscurely, lest the mysteries hidden under the law should be discovered. But to this Le Clerc and Wolf have started not ill founded objections, observing that the institutes of the Mosaic Law were sufficiently clear, though so constituted as being only a shadow of great things to come, and to be abrogated when the light should appear. This is,

* And so Whitby: “Here is another excellency of the Gospel, that it was not veiled under types and shadows, so that its nature and end were likely to be obscured by the people drawing a veil over their understanding and judgment, but was delivered with perspicuity and plainness of speech.”
to a certain degree, true; and yet many things in the old covenant were dark and obscure, at least in their purport and intent; though the things themselves might be plain. It is truly remarked by Dodd., that Moses was in this a type of his own Dispensation. For this thought Dod. was indebted to Grot., who observes that St. Paul begins here ἡ Ἱ, to give the mystical explanation of the glory or light of Moses, and the veil which he put over his countenance. And so Est.: “Paulus hic eleganter et appositè rem gestam in Exodo ad allegoriam convertit, et latens sub historiâ mysterium aperit.” This (if I am not mistaken) will supply an important clue to the right interpretation, which (omitting those of Rosenm., Mackn., and many others equally devoid of probability,) seems to me to be that of many antient Commentators, who by the end understand Christ, as is proved by the following verse. Thus Theodoret: ἐκείθει τὸ προσώπο τὸ καλύμμα, διδάσκων εἰς τοῦ νόμου τὸ τέλος ἰδεῖν εἰ δυνάσται τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνη παντὶ τῷ πνεύματι.* And further on: καταργοῦμεν γὰρ ἐφ᾽ οὗ τὸν νόμον, τινὲς τινὰς καταργοῦμεν τέλος δὲ τοῦ καταργοῦμεν, τὸν ὕπο τοῦ νόμου καταργοῦμεν, τουτέστι τῷ Χριστῷ. So also Wolf and Schoettg., the latter of whom thus states the sense: “Moses de Christo Legem abolituro paullo obscurius pronuciavit: ego vero apertè, quod res est, profero.” The words, then, may be thus paraphrased: “so that they did not see what was adumbrated under the Law that was to be done away, even the substance, the Gospel of Christ, which was to be the complementum of the Law.” It should seem that the glory was meant to prefigure and signify the divine knowledge revealed to Moses, and perhaps to typify the Messiah. It was also (I suspect) a symbolical action, meant to teach that the divine knowledge he was to reveal would be, in some things, veiled and dark.

* These are the words of Rom. 10, 4. which are very applicable; since καταργοῦμεν must be understood as the τὸ καταργοῦμεν. at ver. 11., and denote the Old Covenant or Mosaic Dispensation.
Such is (I conceive), upon the whole, the true interpretation; though the brevity of an annotation will not permit me to enlarge further upon some of the details of proof and illustration.

14. ἀλλ' ἐπαφεῖσθη τὰ νομάτα αὐτῶν. The ἀλλὰ has here (I think) not its ordinary sense, but seems to refer to a clause omitted; q. d. "Nor has this only been so in old time, but ever since their understanding and perceptions have been and are stupefied." This sense of πορόω and ποροσίς, by which they denote mental stupidity, is frequent in Scripture. Compare Mark 3, 5. Eph. 4, 18. Nay, the verb is used of the Jews themselves in Mark 6, 52. 8, 17. Joh. 12, 40. And this sense is inculcated by the Greek Commentators. See Chrysost. and Theophyl., and especially Theodoret.

14. ἂξις γὰρ—μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον. "For to this very day the same veil in the reading of the Old Testament remains unremoved." There is supposed to be an allusion to the veil with which the Jews even now veil themselves on the further reading of the Scriptures. But I do not see how that will here apply. Whatever be the allusion, it is plain that the Apostle here uses κάλυμμα in a figurative sense, and (as Rosenm. observes) compares the moral state of the Jews of his time with the physical state of the Jews of old.

14. τι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται. Almost all the Commentators take κάλυμμα as the noun referred to in καταργεῖται. And they render: "because the veil is removed by Christ;" or "which veil is," &c. But καταργ. cannot, without great harshness, be taken in such a sense; not to say that thus the clause would be very tame and frigid, and require a μόνας. Mr. Slade has rightly remarked, that the clause is explanatory of the nature of the veil (i. e. is meant to illustrate the figurative use of κάλυμμα in the last passage.) That (he says) consisted in an ignorance of what was to be done away by Christ, of the real scope and meaning of the law. And he translates
thus: "The same veil remains, viz. that being undiscovered, (literally not unveiled,) which is abolished by Christ." But this is scarcely sense at all, much less the sense of the Apostle. Preferable is the version of Mackn.: "it not being revealed, that it is abolished by Christ." Yet it is very harsh to discover μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον from μένει: neither could ἀνακαλ. be well taken in such a sense as Mackn. assigns to it. Finally, it would be requisite to add an ὅν after ἀνακ. Mackn., however, is right in referring καταγγ., not to κάλυμμα, but to ἡ παλαιά διαθήκη just before. And so Schleus. It should seem that after μὴ ἀνακ. is to be supplied from the preceding, by a sort of dilogia, "it remains (I say) unrevealed, that in Christ this old covenant is abrogated."

15. ἀλλ' ἔσος—κεῖται. These words are a repetition, with further explanation, of the words ἀλλ' ἐπωφαράθη—ἀνακαλυπτόμενον.

It is plain that by Moses is meant the Books of Moses, or rather, in a general way, those of the old covenant. Keῖται, lies. This word is often, as here, used of a garment. Thus we say a coat sits well.

16. ἡνίκα δ' ἂν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς Κύριον, π. ῥ. κ. These words (as Chrys. observes) suggest the only remedy for this blindness and stupidity, and the only mode of restoration. They may be thus rendered: "But when they shall turn to the Lord, (and then only) the veil will be removed." At ἐπιστρέψῃ some supply ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, others τις, or ἐκαστὸς αὐτῶν. But the only legitimate subaudition is that of ὁ Ἰσραὴλ, from ver. 15., and which is referred to at ver. 14. By Κύριον is plainly meant the Lord Jesus, the true Messiah.

Περιαπεῖται, "is removed, is to be removed, will be removed." The remaining sense in both these verses is so clear as not to need dwelling upon. The Paraphrasts and Commentators (especially Pole) may be consulted.

17. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστίν. It is not easy to
ascertain the sense of these words, which are interpreted variously by Commentators antient and modern. Almost all those modes of interpretation yield a tolerable sense; but seem too strained, and require much arbitrary subaudition. The Greek Commentators unite the words with the preceding, and would prove from hence the deity of the Son and the Holy Spirit. But one can hardly suppose the Apostle would introduce such an important doctrine here. Theoph. paraphrases thus: τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ μελλόντος τύπος ἂν, ὅτι ἔτοιμον ἐπιτραπέζη τις πρὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα (τούτο γὰρ ὁ Κύριος) τὸτε γιμνὸν ὅμεται τὸ πρώτα τοῦ νομοθετοῦ ὑμῶν δὲ αὐτὸς ἐσται ἐν τάξει Μωσέως, καὶ τῆς δόξης ἀπολαυσθεῖ τής ὑπερβαλλούσης τῆς τοῦ νόμου δόξαν, ὅσων εἰρηται πάλιν γὰρ χαρίστεται τὸ Πνεῦμα, αἰς Κύριος καὶ παντοδυνάμις.

Rosenm. takes πνεῦμα to denote the author of a more perfect religion, namely, the Christian. And in nearly the same manner Morus understands it, who thus paraphrases: "Quum dominum dico, intelligo illam divinitus datam religionis scientiam." As examples of this signification he adduces Gal. 3, 2, and 3., where it denotes the knowledge of a religion which reaches to the heart (with its effects and benefits), and is therefore superior to the Jewish, which had regard to the outward conduct only. And it would be some confirmation of this mode of interpretation if (as Dr. Paley was of opinion) this clause were a resumption of the subject treated on at ver. 13., and all from καὶ ὃς to κάλυμμα might be considered as parenthetical. But knowing the uncertainty and arbitrariness of such arragements, I feel no little distrust of any interpretation founded thereon. Dr. Doddr. details the sense very ingeniously, but not satisfactorily. I find no interpretation which seems so well founded as that of Dr. Mackn. (and, in some measure, Wets.), which is as follows: "Now the Lord signifies the covenant of the spirit of which we are the ministers. And where the spirit, the inspiration of the Lord is, as it is with us,
there," &c. Or more plainly thus: "By the Lord I mean the covenant of the spirit," i.e. accompanied with the inspiration of the holy spirit.* And where the spirit thus obtained by the Lord is, there," &c.

If this be the true interpretation, the words do not refer to these at ver. 13., but to those which immediately preceded.

17. ἐκεῖ ἐλευθερία, "there there is freedom." Mackn. very wrongly renders this "freedom in speaking." It undoubtedly means freedom from the yoke and bondage of the law, and servile slavery to the letter, and an admission to the privileges of the spirit. There may be also an allusion to the use of the veil; q. d. "we are there permitted to see unrestrainedly the glory of God. So Theophyl. See more in the Commentators ap. Pole. Thus in James 1, 27. Christianity is called ὁ νόμος τέλειος τῆς ἐλευθερίας. and James 2, 12. διὰ νόμον ἐλευθερίας. See also 1 Pet. 2, 16.

18. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακαλυμμένοι προσάπτω—ἀπὸ Κυ-ρίου πνεύματος. This is a passage of no ordinary beauty, but, at the same time, of no little difficulty. Whom does the Apostle mean by "we all." Est., Beza, and nearly all the recent Commentators say, the Apostles; or perhaps also ministers. And this seems to be somewhat confirmed by the context. Most Commentators, however, (including the Greek ones,) Grot., Calvin, and Jaspis, explain it of all true Christians. And I cannot but consider this as the right interpretation; though the words may be meant more especially of the Apostles and ministers. So Theodoret: Μαυσίγης μόνος ἀπῆλαισε τῆς δόξης ἐνταῦθα δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἀπαντεῖ. And Theophyl. : Τοσούτω ἀπολαύσωμεν ἐλευθερίας καὶ εὐγενείας, φησίν, ἀντε πάντες ἡμεῖς οἱ πιστοὶ, οὐ χαίτερ ἐκεῖ εἰς ὁ Μαυσίς, ἀνακαλυμμένος προσάπτω (οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῖς πιστεύοντι καλύμμα), &c.

* So Theodoret: πνεῦμα Κυρίου αὐτῷ προσηγόρευσεν, ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡ τούτου κεχορήγηται χάρις.
18. κατοπτριζόμενοι. Many modern Commentators, as Est. and Mackn. render this: “reflecting as mirrors;” which sense, if the πάντες were meant of the Apostles only, would be more suitable. But that is not the case; and the common interpretation beholding, (which is supported by the most eminent Philologists, as Bos, Elsner, Wets., and Schles.,) seems by far the best founded; nor does it exclude the idea supposed to be intended on the other interpretation. Doddr. renders: “ beholding as by a glass.” But this undoubtedly proceeds on a misconception. It is rightly rendered, in the common translation, “ beholding as in a glass.” It must be remembered that the κατοπτρον of the antients was not what we call glass, but a piece of very highly burnished metal. So Xen. Cyrop. 7, 1, 2. τα δὲ Κύρου ὄπλα ὁσπερ κάτοπτρον ἐξελαμμεν. Eurip. Troad. 1107. edit. Bekk. Χρυσεα δ’ ἐνσπτα, παρθένων Χάριτας, ἐκευσα τυγχάνει Διὸς κόρα. Eurip. Hec. 919. χρυσεών ἐνσπταν Δευτσουτ’ ἀτεμιάνας εἰς αὐγάς. Αἰσχ. cited by Abresch. on Αἰσχ. Agam. 812. Bloms. κατοπτρον εἴδους χαλκός ἐστ’, οἷος δὲ νοῦ. Now a substance of this sort reflected images with great distinctness and brilliancy. So Plut. cited by Schl. Lex. ὁσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ καθαρὸς. To which I add Philostrat. Vit. Ap. 8. p. 340. οὐκ εὶ δὴ ὄλεον περὶ αὐτὰς οὐδὲν εἶναι διόρων ὁσπερ ἐν κατοπτρῳ αὐγῆ, τάντα γιγνόμενα τε καὶ ἐσωμένα. Ibid. 2, 30. ὁσπερ ἐν κατοπτρῷ εἰδώλα διαβεβούνται. Procop. 129, 26. ταῦτα Νεάστολι ὁσπερ ἐν κατοπτρῷ — ὕφαι πάσχουσαν. Eurip. Hippol. 430—3. Καικοὺς δὲ κυτῃν ἐξεβύνει, ὅταν τῷ χώρα, Προφθεῖς κατοπτρον, ὡστε παρθένῳ νέα, χρόνος where the Commentators compare Ter. Ad. 8, 3, 60. “denique Inspicere tanquam in speculum in vitas omnium Jubeo.”

Thus the sense is undoubtedly that of clear and distinct knowledge; as indeed is also suggested by the words subjoined, ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ, which (as Rosenm. observes) show the mode in which they had seen the splendour, and cannot refer (as would appear) to the face of Christ. The words τὴν δέ εἰσαν
Koivos metastratgevous might signify: "beholding the clear and brilliant image of his doctrine, and recognising its glory in its saving efficacy on the hearts of men;" and thus having our minds enlightened by it: for (as Parkhurst ap. D'Oyley observes) as the antient mirrors were made of metal highly polished, it must necessarily happen that the person who looked on his image in them would have his face strongly illuminated by the reflected rays.

By so doing, the Apostle continues, την αυτήν εικόνα μεταφρασσομεθα απε δόξης εις δόξαν. Here there is an allusion to the changing of the face of Moses on beholding the Schechinah. It is rightly remarked by the modern Commentators, as Beza and Wets, that there is an ellipsis of κατὰ, not εἰς. And for this reason, since the latter would denote an absolute change into the very form; while κατὰ merely implies a change in some measure conformed to it; and is therefore here very suitable. Thus in Col. 3, 10. St. Paul speaks of the regenerate Christians as των ἀνακαινισμένων κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ Κτίσαντος αὐτῶν.

The annotation of Doddr. on this passage has great beauty of thought and expression; and as it is extracted by Slade and Valpy, I shall not introduce it, but only point out the source from which Doddr. derived it, namely Chrys. or Theophyl., who explains την αυτήν δόξαν μεταλαμβάνομεν by την αυτήν δόξαν μεταλαμβάνωμεν, οὐν κάτωτρον ὅτες καὶ δεχόμεθι την λαμπρότητα, καὶ αὐτῷ ἀντανακλάσθεν. Καὶ ὀσπερ ἀργυρος ἀντικυρ ἥλιον κείμενος, ἀντιστέμει τινας ἀκτίνας καὶ αὐτὸς τῇ προσβολῇ τοῦ ἥλιου. It does not appear that either he or Chrys. had any other idea of the words than that expressed above from Parkhurst.

The words απε δόξης εις δόξαν imply that the more we behold this brilliant and glorious light, the more

* So Wets., who paraphrases: "juxta eandem imaginem, ad similitudinem ejusdem imaginis, quam quasi in speculo contemplati sumum, et ipsi transformamur."
do we reflect back its rays, i.e. (casting aside the
figure) the more we contemplate the great truths of
the Christian religion, the more do our minds be-
come imbued with its spirit. "We go on (to use the
words of the Psalmist, 847., a passage entirely pa-
allel to the present) from strength to strength," or
(as Mr. Merrick translates) "from stage to stage ad-
vancing still," or (as it is well explained, in its true
spiritual import, by Bp. Horne) we are enabled to
proceed from one degree of holiness to another,
until we come to the glorified vision of God in hea-
ven itself.

Hardy (from the earlier modern Commentators)
well annotates thus: "Subinde majori glorid et cla-
ritate, nempe a sanctificatione, quae est initium glo-
nificationis; per eam enim reparatur Dei in nobis
imago, quae nostra gloria est." Finally, Theodoret
has the following most beautiful illustration: "Ελλα-
μεν· ἔκειθεν αὐτῷ μικρὰν δόξης μαρτυρίαν τοῦτο δὲ ἂν
τῶν καθαρῶν κεκτημένων καρδίαν· ὡστερ γὰρ τὸ διαφανές
θὸς ἐκφάττεται τῶν εἰσορθίων τὰς δόξας, καὶ αὐτόν τὸν
τῆς τῶν κύκλων, καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόν τὰ κύτη· οὕτως ἡ καθαρά
καρδία τῆς θείας δόξης ὅπου τὰ ἐκμακρύειν καὶ κάτοπτρον
γίνεται.

18. καθάπερ ἀπὸ Κυρίου πνεύματος. Whitby and
Mackn. render: "as from the Lord of the Spirit." But
this construction is very harsh and unusual: Beza,
Locke, Wolf, Rosenm., Doddr., and Jaspis,
render: "as from the Lord, the Spirit." And this
interpretation seems preferable; but, as Bp. Mid-
dleton observes, the article would then have been
added. I see no reason to deviate from our common
version, "as from the Spirit of the Lord." This in-
terpretation (which supposes a trajectio very fre-
cquent in the Apostle) is supported by the Vulg. and
almost all the early translations, and also by Grot.,
Hamm., and others. The sense is: "the Holy
Spirit procured or imparted by the Lord."
VERSE 1. διὰ τοῦτο ἔχοντες τὴν διακοιλιόν ταύτην. Vater observes that the Apostle here again describes his παρθενία. It is well remarked by Theophyl., that in order to soften what might have seemed arrogant; St. Paul ascribes the whole to God; q. d. “Our ministry is not our own, but proceeds from God and his grace and mercy.” for ἐλειώθα; is often (in the deep humility of the Apostle) used of the grace of God, as shown in bringing men to salvation, and benefiting and blessing them; as Rom. 9, 15, 16 & 18, 11, 30 & 32. 12, 8. 1 Cor. 7, 25. ὡς ἐλεημένος ὑπὸ Κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι. And so 1 Pet. 2, 10. οἱ οὐκ ἔλεημένοι, ἃν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες. The passage is well paraphrased by Theophyl. thus: διότι τοιοῦταν ἡξιώθησαν, οὐκ ἀπαγορεύομεν πρὸς τὸν κυνόνος, πρὸς τὰς θλίψεις ἐπείδη ἀπαξ ἐλεηθέντες ἐτάχθησαν διακοιλιόν. Rösenm. paraphrases the οὐκ ἐκκακάωμεν thus: “diligentissimè facio, quod meum est, licet eximii difficillatibus, molestis, et malignis aliorum artibus fere obuar.”

2. ἀλλ' ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχρῆς. The ἀπειπάμεθα is strangely rendered by Mackn.: “we have commanded away.” The common translation, he says, implies that the Apostle had formerly used these hidden, shameful things, for the purpose of spreading the Gospel. But Doddr., with far greater judgment and taste, says that it does not imply that they had ever any thing to do with them; and he would render: “set them at defiance.” The common translation, however, sufficiently well represents the sense: and this force of the word is learnedly illustrated by Dresig. de verbis mediis N. T. p. 187., and by Schleus. in his Lex., who expounds it, mihi ipsi aliquid interdico, me abdico aliquid re, renuntio, recuso, depono, abjicio, vito, caveo. And he renders the present passage thus: “sed renuntiavimus occultis sceleribus seu consiliis improbis, sensibus turpibus et perversis.” The sense, then, is this: “we
have (all along) renounced, and do renounce; we have nothing to do with and keep ourselves from, &c."

2. τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς αἰσχρίνης. This is usually explained "every hidden baseness; all such base practices as men, from shame, conceal." In which view I would compare Herodot. 2, 35. τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὰ, ἀναγκαῖα δὲ ἐν ἀποκρύφῳ τοιεῦχ ἄρειν. It may, however, denote all underhand and dirty dealings, and especially hypocrisy, such as the false teachers, whom the Apostle is supposed by all to allude to, were chargeable with. This, too, would appear to be a sort of generic term, which the Apostle then follows up with a more particular allusion to the evil practices of the persons in question.

2. μὴ περιπατεῖτε ἐν πανουργίᾳ, not pursuing a crafty conduct; not aiming at what is called at 1, 12. the σεφία ταρκήν.

The διαλογίτες τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ is synonymous with the κατηλεύειν τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ in the last Chapter, and denotes corrupting the word by impure admixtures of Gentile philosophy, or Jewish tradition; or by intermixing any opinions inconsistent with its purity, and introduced for the sake of private interest, or to flatter the passions and prejudices of men. Now this was a frequent sense of διάλογος. Thus Schleus. in his Lex. cites Pollux 7, 169. διάλογον τὰ ἄριστα. Aelian. H. A. 16, 1. βάφη γνησίως, ἀλλ' οὐ διαλογίζεται, and elsewhere. Thus we say "to play tricks with an article." This sense, too, is confirmed by Theophylact.* Our common translation renders: "handling deceitfully." And so several Interpreters. This signification is frequent both in the Old Testament and the Classical writers, and is applicable enough here: but it is not so significant as the other; not to say that it would be the same with the imme-

* His words are these: Οὐ μόνον, φησίν, ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ἄλλως ἔστι καὶ καθαρὸς, καὶ ἀτόνητος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ δόγμα καὶ λόγον ἄδολος. Οὐ γὰρ παραμιγγένουμεν τι τῆς ἐλεω σοφίας αὐτῆς, ἢ κοινακεντικὸν τι, ἢ κρήματα συλλέγομεν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου, ἢ νῦν μὲν τούτο, νῦν δὲ ἐκεῖνο οἱ διάλογοι πρὸς τοὺς καίρους καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα, ὥς οἱ ψευδαπόστολοι.
diately preceding. Both senses, however, may be admitted, since the false teachers might be said to corrupt the Gospel as well by the suppression of truth as by the introduction of falsehood: and this last seems hinted at in the following words.

By _ζυγώτες_ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. ... is meant “acting so as to recommend ourselves to the good opinion and unbiased judgment and feelings of men;” a sense of _σωφρόν_ which occurs in 1 Cor. 10, 29., and of which examples may be seen in Schl. Lex. So Theophyl.: _κατὰ τὸν πάρακλητόν μαρτυρεῖ_ χριστον. The next words ἔκάινον τῷ Θεῷ are, by Commentators, supposed so be a formula of asseveration; or to have the sense “consentiente et probante Deo.” The former opinion seems the best founded, and is confirmed by the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl. renders: ἐάν εἰς ψευδαξιότατον μαρτυρεῖ ἐχειν ἐκ ἐν ἐξαιρέτοις.

3. ἐκ ἐν καὶ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένοι. In _κεκαλ._ we may recognize a continuation of the same allusion as that in the foregoing verses to the veil which covered the face of Moses. The _καὶ_ is not (as some treat it) pleonastic, but may be rendered _even_. Most modern Commentators (see Hardy and Rosenm.) explain _κεκαλ._ un-acknowledged. But there seems no necessity to resort to any such straining of the literal sense, which is this: “If our doctrine, and the excellency of it, remain unperceived by some, and consequently not embraced by them,” &c. This might very well be; for, as Grot. observes, however conspicuous of itself, yet, like the sun, it would not be visible to the blind. For this simile he was indebted to Theophyl.

The words following may be rendered: “it is hidden or obscure to them (only) that are reprobate.” Such, I conceive, is the true sense of _ἀλλα_, which Grot. renders: “those who deserve to perish; who foster their vices, and will not see the truth, which condemns those vices.” And this comes to the same thing. The early modern paraphrasts include the
inference which necessarily results from hence; namely: "it is not our's nor the Gospel's fault if they perish; and it is no proof of obscurity or want of evidence that they cannot perceive it." Theodoret here compares the expression in the foregoing Chapter, that the Gospel is to some an odour of death unto death. See the note on that passage.

4. ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων, &c. These words are exegetical, and show the sort of persons meant by the ἀγορά, namely, those unbelievers whose perceptions have been blinded by the God of this world. Such (I conceive) is the true sense: though the construction is somewhat irregular, it being what may be called popular. It is for ἐν ἀκίνητων ὁ Θεὸς—αὐτῶν. For want of discerning this, some (as Mack.) have strangely misconceived the sense of the passage, nay even the error of the Manicheans and others, noticed by Theophyl., may be ascribed to a grammatical blunder, into which, however, they would not have fallen, had they not sat down predetermined to find or introduce their opinions wherever there might be any colourable pretence.

By this world is meant the wicked part of it, the mere worldlings. And the Prince of it is obviously Satan, the evil Spirit, to whom, as the original author and continual promoter of sin, sinners are, as it were, bound to yield obedience.* Joh. 12, 31, 14, 30, &c. He is said to blind the understandings of the unbelieving, which many recent Commentators render: "permit their understandings to be blind," &c. But this is a very precarious gloss. It is, indeed, found in the Greek Commentators; but they, most unaccountably, take ὁ Θεὸς τῶν αἰώνων to denote

* So Beza, Sclat., and Grot.: "cui se maneiparunt homines hujus seculi, qui terrena bona æternis anteponunt, quae plurimi sunt. Porphyrius de malis Demonibus agens, ὑπερτῶν αἰῶν ἰδρυμεν δοεί Θεός ελαυ μεγαστος. Ita, tantum si Deus esset, hominibus imperat; et idolorum cultus ad ipsius usum reedit. Plutarchus de Iside, Πίσσα φῶς ἄλογος καὶ ἐνορίως τῆς τοῦ κακοῦ δια- μονος γέγονε μόλας. Diabolus sic Deo quomodo Fester Phil. 3, 19. quia Dei vice colitur."
the great God of the universe; which cannot be accounted; some of this sense of the expression there is no example in the New Testament; whereas, as denoting Satan, it occurs in Job. 12. 5. 14. 30. and elsewhere. We must, then, reject the common interpretation, and understand the blindness of such an influence from the author of evil, as may be consistent with the free agency of man: a question which it would be out of place here to discuss.

This sense of Arch. Wets. Illustrates from Joseph. Bell. 5. 5. 8. 2. ἐκ χείρος τῆς σκότους τῶν γαρπάγων καὶ τῶν παραπομπῶν ἐκείνων, and several other passages. I add Joseph. 337. 20. παντός τοῦ κόσμου τέκτων.

4. εἰς τῷ πατρὶς σώματος τοῦ ἁ. τ. ἐ. τ. ἁ. τ. Χ., “so that the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ (who is the image of God) might not shine unto them.” Here, as in many other places, Mackn. deserts the common translation very unnecessarily, and even erroneously. Εἰς τῷ πατρίς σώματος must be taken metaphorically for, “that it might not show its true purport and its excellencies to them, so that they should neither understand the one, nor appreciate the other.” Porripio, illumination, and here, metaphorically, excellence. It is said (Grot. observes) with a reference to the preaching of Christ’s miracles, resurrection, and ascension to Heaven; and also of a celestial kingdom and the sending of the Holy Spirit procured by him. Τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης is, by an usual Hebraism, for “the glorious doctrine.”

4. ὅστις εἰσὶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. (as the early modern Commentators ap. Pole explain) either, 1st, in respect of his Divine nature, by which he proceeds from the Father, as an image bearing an exact and perfect resemblance to him; or, 2dly, in respect of his office of mediator, of which the principal part is, that he should hold forth the Father to our view. (See Mackn.) Slade (partly from Mackn. and Rosenm.) subjoins: “Dispensing light to the world; like God, who is the fountain of all light, natural as well as spiritual.” Grot., taking another view of the
scope, says Christ is so called as shewing us the perfect attributes of the Deity, his power, wisdom, holiness, goodness, &c. Heb. 1, 3. Joh. 1, 18. Col. 1, 5. 1 Tim. 3, 16. Wets. has numerous Classical citations illustrative of that sense of ἐκάω which is used metaphorically of the son of any one. But this does not seem applicable here.

5. οὐ γὰρ ἐαυτὸς κηρύσσομεν—Κυρίον. The connexion, which is not very clear, and has not been indicated by our modern Commentators, is thus ably traced by Theophyl.: "The Apostle had before said οὐ περιπατῶμεν ἐν πανουργία, after which he inserted something concerning unbelievers, how they are κεκαλωμένοι. Now then he says: "We do not act in a tricky manner, or practise base arts, because we do not preach ourselves, as do the false teachers." For they persuaded their disciples to name themselves after them. Mackn. introduces the passage thus: "Now, though we Apostles are the images of Christ, we preach not," &c. But this is a very licentious and unwarrantable mode of paraphrasing (if so it may be called), into which that Commentator too often falls.

The words ἐαυτὸς κηρύσσομεν are variously and somewhat vaguely explained. Rosenm. paraphrases them thus: "We have not in view our own glory and private interest, in preaching the doctrine of the Gospel." And so Calvin and Est.: "non nostro vel quæstui vel utilitati servimus." But this sense cannot, I think, be established. I conceive that the principal view in which the expression is to be understood is this. Κηρύσσω may signify to act not merely as a herald, but also as an ambassador. And so κηρὺς is used in 1 Tim. 2, 7. ἔγω κηρὺς καὶ ἀπόστολος and 2 Tim. 1, 11. 2 Pet. 2, 5. The sense, therefore, seems to me to be this: "We do not act in this business as principals, nor dispatch as if it were a business of our own: we merely act as ambassadors and procurators on the part of another, namely Jesus Christ." This interpretation has (I find) been pre-
occupied by Grot. The interpretation first mentioned may, indeed, have place, but only as secondary to this; since the inference (which is popular) might very well be: "and therefore we can have no interests of our own to serve, and it cannot be our fault if men will not hearken to our representations." Dodd, paraphrases: "we do not make ourselves the end of our preaching." But that does not seem to be the sense directly had in view; though it may be included.

Wets. illustrates the expression ἔσωτος κηρύσσωμεν from Dio Chrys. 13. p. 222 A. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν καλομένων φιλοσόφων αὐτῶς ἐκκρήγησαν, ἀπότελεὶ Ἡλευριακαὶ κύρικες and Syn. τὸ κηρύττειν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑπὲρ ἐπιδείξεως, εἰ σεφίας, ἄλλα σοφιστεῖς ἀπείρα.

In the interpretation of the latter clause of the antithesis, it must be observed (what it is strange should have escaped the Commentators) that there is a Dilogia in κηρύσσωμεν, which must here be taken with a modification of sense, and merely import: "we hold forth, or represent ourselves." The ἐς has a strongly adversative force, and requires to be illustrated by a clause which is omitted; q. d. "So far from acting as principals in this business with you, we are rather servants to you therein." Theodoret aptly compares 1 Cor. 4, 1. ὅταν ζημίας λογιζομεθα ἄνθρωπος, οὐ ἐπιθέτας Χριστοῦ, καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους μουστῷ Ὑστοῖ. Here, we may observe, there is still greater humility evinced.

Διὰ Ἡρωῶν is explained by Theophyl. ἄντι ἕκανσαν ὅτας ἦμοις ἡγάσατε, καὶ πάντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπικαλέσθε. But the sense should rather seem to be: "for Jesus Christ's sake; out of love to him, and gratitude for all that he hath done for us."

6. ἦτε Ἡλευριακαὶ κύρικες. This is a sentence of some difficulty, occasioned partly by the construction, which is irregular, and partly by a slight deviation in the terms from the norma loquendi. The recent Commentators explain ἦτε Ἡ-
Oeis by "idem vero ille Deus." The question is, what is the connexion. Rosenmüller traces it thus: "The Apostle shows the origin of this his doctrine; declaring that he had not learnt it from men, from the Jews or Jewish teachers, but from that God who, Gen. 1,3., formerly bade the light arise upon the earth from darkness. Theophyl., however, takes ἐπὶ for ἑως because (and so all the early Latin Versions, which have quoniam), as assigning a reason why they preach not themselves. But this seems somewhat strained; and the former method is preferable.

With respect to the construction, we must either supply an ἐπὶ after ὥδε, or else take ὥδε for ἑως; as in Rom. 10, 27.; which Rosenmüller prefers, and (I think) with reason. Only it must be remembered, that wherever ὥδε is used for ἑως, there is an ellipsis. The passage, then, may be so translated as to represent the ellipsis thus: "For the God who bade the light to shine from darkness (he it is) who hath shone in our hearts." The use of the participle and relative for the verb and relative, is common both to the Hebrew and the Greek.

The use of ἐπειδή in the sense of bid, order, though said to be Hebrew, is found in the Greek writers; as Thucyd. ἐπειδή is employed in the Hiphil sense, as ἐπειδή in the last Chapter. It must therefore be rendered: "hath caused it to shine in our hearts." The Apostle has reference to the state of ignorance and prejudice to which he had formerly been so wedded, when, in a twofold sense, the light from heaven broke upon him.

The next words πρὸς φωτισμὸν, &c. are meant to indicate the purpose for which it might be supposed this light was vouchsafed to him; namely, in order that he might communicate to others a knowledge of the Divine majesty, which is so conspicuous in Christ Jesus. For so (with Schleusner) the general sense of the words may be expressed.

Φωτισμὸς usually signifies light, or illumination. Here it denotes the illumination of instruction. The
syntax in \( \varphi α\ι\sigma\iota\sigma\mu. \) is somewhat irregular; and the Commentators perplex themselves to little purpose. The simplest method (though it seems to have occurred to none of them) is that of understanding \( \pi\epsilon\rho\lambda, \) or the like, which may be rendered: “for enlightening and instructing them concerning the knowledge of the glory of God.”

In the words \( \epsilon\iota \tau\rho\sigma\omega\alpha\tau\omega \) there seems to be again an allusion to the \( \delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha \) shining in the face of Moses. The sense is: “in the face or person of Christ the glory of God shone clearly, and the Divinity appeared without a veil.” And so Hardy, from the early modern Interpreters. See Noesselt ap. Rosenm., from whom Mr. Valpy very well paraphrases thus: “The face of Moses gave a feeble and transient reflection of the glory of God, which was covered with a veil: but the face of Christ, the image of God, displays it fully and permanently to those who are illuminated by his Holy Spirit.” Theoph. takes it simply for \( \delta\iota\alpha \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \) \( \chi\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\tau\omega\omicron\）。 But this seems too limited a view, and neglects the manifest allusion.

7. \( \varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu \theta\nu\sigma\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \epsilon\omicron \sigma\omicron\tau\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\omicron\iota\nu\iota\iota \omicron\sigma. \) The connexion is thus traced by Theophyl.: “After having said much concerning the ineffable glory, some one might say: ‘And how do we remain in a mortal body who receive such things as you speak of?’ To which the answer is, that \( \textit{this} \) also is from the power of God, that an earthen vessel holds such treasures.” And Theodoret well adds: \( \theta\nu\sigma\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu \mu\epsilon\nu \alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha\'\iota\omicron\iota \tau\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\nu\nu \tau\omicron\nu \pi\nu\epsilon\omicron\mu\iota\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron \chi\alpha\iota\nu\nu \alpha\omicron\tau\alpha\kappa\iota\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu \phi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \tau\omicron\nu \sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\omicron. \) It is observed, too, by Schlicting, that this is said lest any one should think that these continual tribulations and miseries were not consistent with Apostolical dignity, such as he represented it.

"\( \varepsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\nu \theta\nu\sigma\sigma\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu, \) is well explained by Theophyl. \( \chi\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron, \) \( \textit{we hold or possess.} \) By \( \theta\nu\sigma\omicron\iota\) is meant the rich treasures of the Gospel, so highly precious and beneficial; and, as Theophyl. adds, this was
meant to show the power of God. The same comparison occurs in Matt. 13, 44.

'Εν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν, "in earthen vessels," i.e. in bodies very mean in substance, fragile, and liable to various accidents from the common occurrences of life. No expression could more aptly designate the human body. Now σκεύος properly signifies a vessel, or an utensil. In both these views it is here considered: the former, inasmuch as it is the depository of the soul; the latter, as being the organ, or utensil, or tool by which the human mind acts. Compare Thess. 4, 4.* So ὡς in 1 Sam. 21, 6., and σκεύος frequently in the Greek Philosophers (from whom examples are cited by Gatak. M. A. 3, 4.) and from them the Latins so used vas; as Lucret. 3, 4. Cic. Q. 1, 5. See Suic. Thes. 2, 970.

'Οστρακ. properly signifies testaceous; as being from ὀστρακόν, a shell: but it also (from the similarity) was employed to denote a piece of baked earth. Now as that is a proverbially brittle substance, so it came to signify whatever is fragile, mortal, subject to evils and calamities.† This use of ὀστράκινον (for it was confined to the neuter,) in the place of κεραμεόν, is said by the Greek Grammarians to have been of the common dialect. It is, however, found in the later Greek writers, from whom examples have been adduced by Wets.; as Anthol. τῆς γανοῦ ὀστρακ. Lucian Lexiph. 6. ὅσα ὀστράκινα τὸ δέρμα.

* Sometimes it denotes the man himself; as Acts 9, 15. (See Schl. Lex.) For (as Grot. observes) the Platonists made two bodies of a man, one the ὀχύρα ψυχής, or vehicle of the soul; the other the palpable, or the grosser carnal part, which we touch; and that they called the ὀστρακοῦν, from its standing in the same relation to us as the shell to the fish. See Jer. 32, 14. Thren. 4, 2.

† As is plain from the following passages of Artemid. cited by Wets. 1, 52.: τόιλων δὲ καὶ ὀστράκινον γεγονέναι καὶ βάναυν σημαίνει. 6, 35. θάνατον μὲν γὰρ εἰκότως τοιχισμεν τῇ γυναικὶ, τὸ εἶναι ἐν ὀστρακίνῳ σκεῦει. Wets. also cites the following witty saying from Arrian Epict. 3, 9. ταῦτα ἐξω ἀντὶ τῶν ἄργυρομάτων, ἀντὶ τῶν χρυσωμάτων αὐτὶ χρυσά σκεύη, ὀστράκινον δὲ λύγον.
There is a similar metaphor in 2 Tim. 2, 20. St. Paul, I conceive, had reference to a dict of the Philosophers, who called man an earthen vessel. So in the answer of the Delphic Oracle from Arcesilaus (recorded by Herodot. 4, 163.) ἦν δὲ κάμινον εὔρης πλέων ἀμφόρεαν μὴ ἐξοπτήσης κ. τ. λ. Herodot. relates that the Oracle was thus verified: οὐκ ἔσται τῆς κυκναλαν ἐς πύργον μέγαν καταφυγόντας ὀλὴν περινήσας ἐνεπηγε. This clearly proves the existence of the dict, that "men are but earthen vessels."

7. ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ—ἡμᾶς. The ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως, is elegantly put for "exceeding great power," summa vis. See Krebs, who has adduced several examples of this use from Joseph. Ὡς is put (populariter) for φανερῶς, "might evidently appear to be." By the δυναμ. Rosem. (partly from Sclater) understands that power of God by which he delivered Paul and the other Apostles from dangers and troubles. But this seems erroneous. The ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυναμ. is rather considered in its effects, i. e. the mightiness of the things effected, whether miracles (signs, wonders, and mighty deeds), or the amazing work of conversion effected by a few poor, illiterate, and insignificant handicraftsmen. This clearly evinced the power of God to be with them; since, had the Gospel been committed to the wise, the learned, and the powerful, its success might, and probably would, have been ascribed to their influence. So Theophyl.: ἵνα μὴ νομίζομενα κατερθοῦν εὗ ἔκαστῶν τι, ἄλλὰ πάντες οἱ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγουσιν εἶναι τὸ πάνι. He might have applied the words of the Psalmist (64, 9.) "And all men that see it shall say: This hath God done: for they shall perceive it is his work."

8. ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἀ. ο. σ. "So great (the Apostle means to say) is God's power, that although we be earthen, and encompassed and beaten about

* So Theophyl.: ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς φαινομένης ἐν ἡμῖν δύναμεως.
by so many trials and tribulations, we are not broken down, or destroyed." Theophyl. Doddr. thinks that the true key to this passage (which may seem a digression, though very pertinent to the Apostle's purpose) is this, that he aims at recovering the affections of these Corinthians, which were much alienated from him; for this purpose he freely opens his heart towards them, and tenderly represents the many and grievous pressures and hardships to which love to souls, and to theirs among the rest, exposed him.

Rosenm. supplies ἐκμεν. But I should prefer ἑσσε, with Theophyl: or rather these participles are dependent on the preceding verb ἐχωμεν. At ταυτ Rosenm. subands τόπο. This, however, is too limited. The ellipsis is better supplied by Theophyl. as follows: Ἡλισμενα γαρ ἐν ταυτι καιρῳ, και τόπῳ, και πεγαματι, ἐν φιλοι, ἐν ἐκδοσι.

In this energetic and noble passage the terms are of a very peculiar cast; hence on their exact import modern Commentators are not agreed. Some, as Hamm., Le Clerc, Krebs, and Schoettg. (and indeed, to a certain degree, the ancient Commentators) regard the whole passage as a series of agostical metaphors. To their very learned and ingenious expositions I can only refer my readers. Others, as Ros. and Schleus., recognise no such allusion. The truth is, that the first mentioned Commentators carry the matter too far. To me it appears that they may rather be regarded as military allusions, taken from an army so harassed as scarcely to know how to turn itself. So ἀλβ. and στεν. may be understood, of which the following words ἀπορ. and ἐκεῖν, are exegetical. Certain it is that ἀλβ. is quite applicable to soldiers closely besieged. It is indeed not very unfrequently so used in the Classical writers; though almost always of a place rather than a person. Thus, in Arrian Diss. Ep. 1, 25. ἀλβειν and στενοχαρεῖν, are terms conjoined. This passage is adduced by Schleus. in his Lex. under the same
head with the τελευταίος ἔος, at Matt. 7, 14. which I would also refer thither. As, however, no other example of this signification has been adduced by Philologists, the following may be acceptable. Theocr. Id. 21, 18. Θεαματον καλύβα τρυφερόν τρισένχε βαλαστα, where Toup alone saw the true sense, who renders Θεαμά, angustam, and compares Pollux 9, 28. τῶν θεομήν καὶ Αρριαν, E. A. 6, 23. καὶ καλύβας ἡγίσκασι. But the last passage is not quite apposite; as the learned critic himself would have seen, had he been aware that the origin of the expression is καλ. τυγ. is no other than Thucyd. 2, 52, a passage which has given rise to numerous imitations; which I shall point out in my forthcoming edition of that writer.

The expression is well explained by Theophyl. οὐκ ἐπεξεργάσαι τὸν Θεὸν πλατύνως τὰς καρδίας ἡμᾶς.

In εἰσαρχομένου the preposition is highly intensive, and signifies utterly, quite; as in εἰσερχόμενος. The word also occurs in 1, 8. ὡςε εἰσαριθμησία ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῶν. And in Ps. 88, 18. it stands for ἐπεί, “to be altogether perplexed, or aghast.” It is sometimes found in the later Greek Classical writers; as Plut. Alcib. 5. (cited by St. Thes.) ταύτ' ἀκώσαστες οἱ τελευταίοι εἰσαρίθμησαν. Schafer also refers to Diod. Sic. 2, 507. D. Hal. 8, 1354. and εἰσαριθμήσας in Orig. 2, 491. In this, as well as in other compounds of ἄροτρον, and also in the simple itself, the passive is used in an active sense, i.e. becomes a deponent. The expression is well paraphrased by Theophyl. : εἰς ἄροτρον καὶ μηχανίας εὑρίσκετε, κλη ἄλλ' ἄροτρα ἰστάμεθαι καὶ οὐκ ἀργονικάκουτες καὶ ἱπταμένου, ἀλλ' πέφυτος ἐν Θεῷ εὑρίσκοντες καὶ νικώντες. It must not be supposed, because Theophyl. has ἰστάμεθαι—ἱπταμένος, that he recognised an agonistical allusion. For in ἱστ. there is an allusion to soldiers standing to the enemy, and not sinking under their blows, &c. There is a parallel passage in Eph. 6, 13. (where is a whole knot of military allusions) ἵνα δυνηθῇ τε ἀντιγ-
And so Thucyd. 5, 102. καὶ ἦμιν τὸ μὲν εἴδος εὐθὺς ἀνέλπιστον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ δραμένου ἐτὶ καὶ στήναι ἐλπὶς ὀρθῶς.

9. διακόμενω, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπουνει καταβαλ-λόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι. In the former part of this clause all modern Commentators since the time of Hamm., recognise an agonistical metaphor. And so Schleus., who renders οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπτω "in cursu superiores." But there seems something incongruous in this idea; since, as Mackn. observes, "the Apostle's enemies could not be said to contend with him in the Christian race," nor (I would add) in any race. There seems no reason, then, to reject the interpretation of the antient and early modern Commentators, "we are not deserted," namely, by God. So Theophyl.: διακόμων ημᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει. And he adds: πρὸς γυμνασίαν γὰρ ημῶν, οὐ πρὸς ἁπάντα, σύγχρονην ταῦτα. It is a very beautiful remark of Theodoret: εὐποίησε δὲ οὐς σώκαμεν φυτοῖς εἰς πυην τεθηλός, κηρύττομεν δὲ οὐ πάσχοντες αὐτήμαντοι φολαιτομεθα, τοῦ προαπιμένοις Θεοῦ τὴν ἱσχύν.

In the next words καταβαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι: almost all recent Commentators recognize an agonistical allusion. But this, I repeat, would here again involve incongruity, as in the preceding sentence; with this additional harshness, that ἀπολλυ. is not applicable to an agonistes defeated in the contest; since such were not destroyed. And as kata-βαλλ. is quite as applicable (or even more so) to the

* Perhaps the Apostle had in view Ps. 20, 8. (Hebr.) "Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses: but we will remember the name of the Lord our God. They are brought down, and fallen: but we are risen, and stand upright." Where the Sept. has ἁνεστημαι καὶ ἀνορθώθημεν. But the true sense of ὑπίστως is, I think, that expressed by Pisc. and Gigerus, sititimus, or stamus, immoti et victores. See Josh. 7, 19. Dan. 7, 4. The next word ἱσχύς is exegetical of the preceding, and it is well rendered by Tirin. consistimus. It would have been better rendered, in the Greek, by ἁρδω λατόμεθα.
soldier,* indeed ἀπολλαμένοι. must determine it to that alone. Theophyl. paraphrases thus: ἀπολλαμένοι; τῇ προθύμίᾳ, καὶ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐνεστάσει, καὶ κατ’ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ Θεοῦ συντηροῦμενοί.

10. πάντως τῇ νεκρασίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἱ. ἐν τῷ σῶματι περιφέροντες. This is an energetic mode of expressing the mortal perils to which he was perpetually exposed; it is altogether parallel to that in 1 Cor. 15, 49. καθ’ ἡμέραν γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκαν. In interpreting the words of the present passage it will not be proper to press too much on the terms. There is only a general comparison intended to be drawn between the case of Jesus and his own, which, as St. Paul had not then suffered death for the Gospel, was not complete, as it afterwards was. Yet his perils were unto death, and he was, in that sense (as he says of himself) in deaths oft. So that περιφέροντες τῇ νεκρασίᾳ τ. κ. Ἱ. must mean “bearing about every where (i. e. ‘constantly sustaining and enduring;’ (for that is all that is meant by περιφ.) mortal perils to the body, as well as excessive perturbations of mind;” all which Jesus suffered even unto death itself.

Νεκρασίας answers to the Heb. רמות in Ps. 79, 11. 102, 21. 1 Sam. 21, 4. The genitive τοῦ Ἰησοῦ has the sense “after the likeness of.” So Grot., who adds: “Solent enim similia simillum nominibus nuncupari, ut in sequenti opposito.” And so Theophyl.: ἔματος καθημερινῶς υφιστάμενοι, καὶ μιράμενοι τὸν δάκτυλον τοῦ Κυρίου ἰδί, &c. Rosenm. and Nosselt would take ηεκρ. for the signa periculorum, i. e. wounds, the στίγματα τοῦ Ἱ. mentioned at Gal. 6, 17. But that yields a very frigid sense; and the allusion there is somewhat different. (See the note.)

In the interpretation of the words following, ἵνα καὶ ἐὰν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—φανεροθη, the recent Commentators causelessly stumble, and run into strange diversities of exposition. The words seem to be in-

* As is plain from Schleusner’s examples; though he adopts the agonistical metaphor. Indeed of the military sense the Greek writers are full of examples.
roduced to suggest the cause, or one principal cause, why the Apostle was permitted to suffer all this, namely, in order to establish their faith in the resurrection of Jesus. So Theophyl.: ei γὰρ τίς ἀκινεῖ ὁ Ἐυαγγελιστὴς, ἡμᾶς ὑμᾶς καθότι ἡμέραν μὲν ἀποκάλυπτος, καὶ ἡμέραν δὲ ἑωμένη, οὐκ ἂν ἔτι εὐλόγας ἀπεστήσῃ. And so Whitby, who paraphrases: "It being a certain demonstration that Christ is risen, and still lives; that we, who persuade others to believe this, are enabled to do such mighty wonders in his name, and patiently and constantly to suffer such fiery tricks by his grace." The reasoning, it must be observed, is popular.

The above seems by far the most simple and natural interpretation. Theophyl. proposes the following: ὅτι ὁ ἑτερ ἡμεῖς τὸν βάπτισαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπομένειν, καὶ ἕωμεν αἱρούμεθα δί' αὐτῶν βαπτίζων, οὖτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἀξιώμαται ἀποκαλυπτόντας ἑωμένην τὴν τέτει ὁ στερησεν καὶ ἔλαχιστον φησιν. Εἰ γὰρ συναπεδάγαμεν, καὶ συγκρίναμεν.* But I do not see how any such sense can be elicited from the words.

11. This verse is entirely explanatory of the preceding. It is observed by Theophyl.: εἶπεν γὰρ ἐὰν τῇ ἁγίᾳ σαφεινέως. A remark which it will be proper for students to treasure up in their minds.

Nothing in the phraseology seems to require much explanation. Theodoret well paraphrases the passage thus: Τοῦτον δὲ χάριν ἀστασιάς δεχόμεθα τοὺς ἐπιστρέφοντες ὑπὲρ τοῦ δεσποτοῦ κυνήγους, ἵνα καὶ τὴς ζωῆς αὐτῶν μετάσχουμεν, καὶ τὴν πρόσκαιρον διδώτως ἱκνῆται. τὴσ σαρκὸς τὴν ἁφαρσιὰν ἀντιλάβωμεν.

12. ὅστε ὁ μὲν βάπτισαν — ἡμῖν. Here we have an inference, intended to draw a contrast between his own Christian condition and that of his converts.

From the hyperbolical phraseology of the preceding verse it is plain that βάπτισαν is to be taken in the sense of "peril of death." Here, however,

* Taken from Rom. 8, 17., which passage it is evident Theophyl. cited from memory: for there we have not συναπεδάγαμεν but συναπεδέχομεν.
though the terms employed are familiar, the sense is not proportionably clear. Most modern Commentators interpret as follows: "The preaching of the Gospel exposes us to death; but unto you it brings eternal life." And this is considered by Rosenm. and Valpy as the simplest interpretation. In St. Paul, however, the obvious is not always the true sense. Something more profound seems intended by the words. Chrysost. offers the following exposition: ὑμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐν καθότως καὶ ἐν πεπαλαιωτῷ, φθείρῃ ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν αὐτῶ, τὴν ἐκ τῶν τῶν καθότως κατομφαλον βαρὺν καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐν καθότως ὑμεῖς υπομένετε, τὸν δὲ χριστίαν ὑμεῖς ἀπολαύετε. Theodoret interprets as follows: τὰς γὰρ ύμετέρας ἑνεκα συσταθήσας ὑπομένεις τοὺς καθότους μετὰ καθότως γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν διδασκαλίαν προσφέρομεν ὑμῶν δὲ καθομφαλον, ὑμεῖς ἀπολαύετε τὰς ἁμώς. Rosenm. and Jaspis steer a sort of middle course, the former explaining thus: "Quare mortis quidem (nostre) fructus in nobis, sed vitae (nostre) in vobis cernitur, vel: qua re fit, ut quum mortis periculis jactamur, id nobis magis obsit; sed quum liberamur istis, id vobis magis prosit." And the latter thus; "Vobis solatis ista vitae mere discrimina inserviunt, ut meo exemplo discatis, Deum opitulari miseris, et ut ego hisce periculis ereptus vobis adhuc prodesse et docere vos possim. Vestram ergo in Deo fiduciam alunt." To me it appears that the true sense is that assigned by Chrys., namely: "that in us the Gospel takes effect by producing trials and tribulations; but in you (thereby) it takes its effect by life, i. e. a comparative freedom from those perils and tribulations which fall to our lot." Such an ellipsis as that of thereby, which is implied by the turn of the context, is frequent in St. Paul.

13. ἔχοντες δὲ τὰ καύτα παρὰ. Here ἔχοντες is plainly put for ἔχοντες; a common idiom in the popular style, which (as Beza observes) contains in it the sense of cause. The δὲ will be merely a connective, equivalent to: "Since, then, we have the same spirit of faith." The connexion here is elabo-
rately discussed by Theoph., and by Theodoret more simply, and perhaps more truly thus: “He had made mention of eternal life: but that is in hope, and what is hope is not seen. He therefore adverts to the voice of prophecy, shewing, also, that the saints of old times were illustrious examples of this faith.”

Between πίστεως and κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον there is a kind of ellipsis, such as rarely occurs in the Classical writers, though frequently in the New Testament; especially, when a quotation from the Old Testament is made. Here we may supply: “which he had who, according to what is written, said,” &c. Or more simply: “agreeably to what is written, or what he had who wrote.” So Theophyl., who paraphrases: “As David, when in trials, and delivered from them by God, said: “I have believed, therefore have I spoken:” so we, also, having the same spirit of faith which he had, believe and confidently trust, and for this reason have spoken, that as Jesus rose from the dead, so we, &c.

Πνεύμα πίστεως is not merely (as some consider it) for πίστων, but rather, according to the opinion of most modern Commentators, πνεύμα signifies indoles, animi, sensus, feeling, &c.; and the sense may be thus expressed: “We have a mind and disposition animated with the same faith,” &c., the word πνεύμα is so used in 1 Cor. 7, 19. See other examples in Schleus. and Wahl, the latter of whom also refers to Soph. OEd. Col. 612.

The quotation is from Ps. 116, 3., of which the sense is: “I have trusted in God and his protection; I have looked to him for deliverance; and therefore have I spoken this.” After λαλ. must be supplied τώρα or the like. So Rosenm.: “liberē profitemur ea quae credimus et speramus.” The scope of the Psalmist is very well traced by Doddr. thus: “Though I have been in very great affliction, and sometimes almost depressed, yet faith in God hath supported me, and put this song of praise into my mouth.” The Commentators in loc. may be con-
sulted, also Slade. It is truly observed by Theophyl., that this was said on account of those who calumniated the Law. Here Balkley compares Plato Symp. Op. p. 190. τέτειμαι ὁ ἐγώ, τετείμην δὲ πεπώμαι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πειθέων.

14. εἰδότες — διὰ Ἴησοῦ ἐγερθή, “Being fully confident that he who raised up the Lord Jesus, will also raise us up, and will present us together with you.” Some recent Commentators recognize no more in these words than a profession of expectation that God would deliver him from the perils to which his life was exposed. But this is not only little agreeable to the context, but requires much violence to be done to the words. Indeed there must thus be supposed a dílogia in ἐγερθή, which would here be very harsh. Equally inadmissible is the method of taking παραστίσει of preservation, or understanding διὰ τοῦ Ἴησοῦ in the sense of propter Jesum. The ancient and the most judicious modern Commentators are agreed that the words must be understood solely of the resurrection. (See Chrysost.) Theodoret very well paraphrases thus: τὰνταν ἔνεκα τοῦ δανᾶτον ὁ Δαναῖς κατεδέχατο, ἵνα πάντες αὐτῷ τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ πανίσχυμεν πιστεύομεν τοῖς γεγονόις, οίς καὶ ἡμᾶς δι’ αὐτῶν κρείττους ἀποφανε τοῦ δανᾶτον, καὶ οὐ νόμος τῷ φοβερῷ ἡματι παραστήσει. The παραστίσει is well paraphrased by Doddr. thus: “will present us, with you, before the presence of his glory with exceeding great joy, in each other and in him; and will introduce us to that heavenly kingdom, to the prospects of which he hath called us by that Gospel which we have preached, and which you have believed.”

15. τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι’ ὑμᾶς — Θεοῦ. Here again the terms are plain, but the sense is somewhat obscure and indeterminate. The question is, what is meant by τὰ πάντα? Chrysost., and the other ancient Commentators, referring it to what precedes, say, “the death and resurrection of Christ, and the other benefits of the Christian revelation;” q. d. “All these are given δι’ ὑμᾶς, and not for, or on account of,
others,” namely, the false Apostles, who represented themselves as mediators between God and them. And so Grot., Beza, Est., Sclater, our English Translators, Dodd., Storr, and others. Thus there will be an ellipsis of eis in the sense fiunt. And this interpretation is supported by the words following. Most modern Commentators, however, from Tirin., subaud ἅπασαν ἤκακαις ἡμᾶς. And thus there will be a reference to the διάνεις at ver. 12. (See Rosenm., Mackn., and Valpy.) But this is too arbitrary an ellipsis to be admitted.

The next words ἣν ἡ χάρις—τοῦ Θεοῦ must be interpreted according to the view taken of the preceding. On the latter interpretation, the ἣ χάρις will denote the preservation of Paul alive, and πλέον will refer to his frequent exposures to death. But this is harsh, and the interpretation on which it proceeds is (I think) inadmissible. The words are well paraphrased by Theophyl. thus: τῶν δὲ ποιεῖ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ χαριζέται πολλοῖς, ὅστε πλεονάζοντας τίς χάριτος πλεονάζω καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν διὰ πολλῶν περιστάτων προσανατολήν εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. See also Dod. It appears that περισσ. eis here signifies to redound to. The terms πλεονάζειν and περισσεῦειν are also conjoined at 1 Thess. 3, 12. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς πλεονάζασκαι περισσεῦσαι. The construction is: ἦν ἡ χάρις πλεονάζασα εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῶν πλεονάσων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν which Schleus. renders: “ut redundet in honorem Dei, multis nempe Deo pro hoc beneficio gratias agentibus.” This sense of περισσ. with eis (redound unto) occurs infra 8, 2. & 9, 12. Some, as Erasm. (and recently Mr. Valpy); refer διὰ τῶν πλεονάσων to πλεονάζειν, and take the verb περισσ. in an active sense. But this seems to be doing great violence to the construction.

16. διὸ οὐκ ἐκκακάσθη, “Wherefore (I repeat) we do not faint or flag.” The Apostle here repeats what he had said at ver. 1., to which the particle διὸ is very suitable: for it has sometimes a transitive or resumptive force; as Rom. 2, 1. Jam. 1, 21. The
δὲ seems to carry with it much meaning left to be supplied, and which refers to the preceding: and this may be expressed in some such way as the following: “Wherefore (although we suffer calamities, and encounter perils of various kinds, yet, knowing the power of God, and feeling assured that as he hath delivered us now, he will continue to deliver us, and finally raise us up at the last day) we faint not nor despair under our sufferings.” This paraphrase is chiefly founded on the antient Commentators.

The sense of the next words is sufficiently clear. On the import of ὁ ἔξω and ὁ ἐσω ἄνθρωπος see Rom. 7, 22. and the note there. Wets. here compares Sext. Emp. a. Phys. 353. τὸν τράχηλον, ἢ τὴν κεφαλὴν, μὴ τοῦ ἐκτὸς ἄνθρωπον συμπληρωτικα εἶναι μέρη.

16. διὰφθείρεται. Grot. compares a similar use of the Latin perire in the Roman law, as used of things which are not destroyed, but only injured. It were more to the purpose to compare Luke 12, 23. σὺς διὰφθείρει. The truth is, that διαφθείρω is there put for φθείρει, which the Classical writers employ in this sense. For though they sometimes use φθείρω for διαφθείρω, yet never the contrary. Theodoret, Theophyl., and some MSS., indeed, read φθείρεται; but that is evidently a correction. The term here relates to the effects of persecution, harassing, &c. on the body.

16. ἀνακαινοῦται, is renovated, invigorated, recreated, acquires new strength. There is a similar use of renovare in Latin; as Liv. 21, 21. (cited by Schl.) milites renovati quiete. Also Liv. 28, 35. (cited by Wets.) Ἀτας in medio virium robore, quod plenius nitidiusque ex morbo velut renovatus flos juvenae faciebat. It seems to savour of Latinism. I am not aware that the word occurs any where but in St. Paul.

This ἀνακαινωσις has nothing to do with the renovation implied by regeneration; as T. Aquinas and Est. suppose. It is rightly explained by Chrysost. as effected τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἐλπίδι, τῇ προθυμίᾳ, namely, by a
holly confidence resulting from former deliverances, and an implicit faith united with an anticipation of the glory that shall be revealed. And here it is well remarked by Theodoret: Ἰς ἔριστον γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ καμίβεται κόρδων ἄνδρεσιν χρωμένη: εἰτὰ τοῖς προσδεκμένοις ἀγαθοῖς παραβρέθηκε τοῦ παρώντος βίου τὰ λυπηρά.*

16. ημέρα καὶ ημέρα is said by Rosenm. to be a Hebraism, formed from עָמָה עָמָה. But that means "day by day." Grot. more aptly compares עָמָה עָמָה in Esth. 3, 4. Job 1, 4. Ps. 64, 19., which is rendered by the Sept. καθ' ἑκάστην ημέραν.

17. τὸ γὰρ παρατίθεν ἐλαφρὸν—ἡμῖν. This verse and the next contain a passage which in energy and beauty of expression is little inferior to any one of Demosthenes himself, to whom indeed and to Thucyd, in his Orations (I would observe) the style of the Apostle, when it rises, as here, to the oratorical bears no slight resemblance. Thus, for instance, both these writers frequently use the neuter adjective with the article for a substantive; and both (especially the latter) frequently use the word παρατίθεντα.

Rosenm. observes, that παρατίθεν, like ᾠδήκα, not only signifies immediately and suddenly, but also in presenti; and that the adverb is put for the adjective. But although that use of the particle is often found in Thucyd., Demost., and other writers who formed their style on the Attic model, (as fully appears from Wetstein’s numerous examples), yet whether παρατίθεν is here to be taken for an adjective, may seem doubtful. Instances of this adjectival use of παρατίθεν, when applied to a neuter adjective with τὸ standing in the place of a substantive, are

* Here Bulkley compares Plato de Repub. l. 9. T. 2. p. 274. who speaks of man’s inward man, and says that it is rendered more strong and powerful by him who inculcates the saying and doing of things that are just. Also Max. Tyr. Diss. 41, p. 493. who says, that though the body be diseased, disturbed, and corrupted, yet if it have but a robust and vigorous soul, all this will be slighted, and made light of. Νοεῖν σώμα, καὶ παράτηται, καὶ φθείρεται, ἄλλ' ἀν ἐκπορεύεται, &c. which passage is chiefly applicable as illustrating the διαφθείρεται.
very rare.* It is plain that παραυτίκα must here be taken for an adverb qualifying ἐλαφρῶς; literally, "for the at present lightness of our affliction," or "for our at present light affliction." In this compound particle παρ signifies at, and αυτίκα signifies present. Here it is well opposed to αἰώνων: for in the best authors it is found in similar antitheses, with τὸ μέλλον, αὔσις, ἐπειτα, or similar words expressive of future time.

But, to turn to the consideration of the sentiment, Theophyl. has truly observed, that it is meant to be explanatory of the preceding, i. e. "to show how the inner man is renovated, namely, on reflecting that this affliction is but temporary, and is comparatively light, because it is temporary and procures a weight and magnitude of glory and reward exceeding all comparison." This view of the sense of παραυτίκα and ἐλαφρῶν is highly ingenious; yet it cannot be regularly elicited from the words; though it may be true that their being temporary tends to make them even now seem light. I therefore assent to the opinion of some recent Commentators, as Rosenm. and Schleus., who take παραυτ. (as did the Syriac and Vulgate Translators) in the sense present (which sense almost all Wetstein's examples tend to confirm); q. d. "for our present afflictions, which are (comparatively) light, &c. And Schleus. rightly thinks this is confirmed by the αἰών in the antithetical clause. The common interpretation assuredly would require τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα, καὶ τὸ ἐλαφρῶν π. θ. η. Besides, the authorities for παραυτ. in the sense momentary are very slight. As to those adduced by Beza, they rather prove the other sense, namely, at present; as will be manifest to any one who shall examine the passages (which are Demosth. p. 72, 16. Edit. Reiske, and Thucyd. L. 1, 124.) The error arose

* Yet, I acknowledge, they do occur. Wetstein's examples supply one from Thucyd. 3, 46. (or rather 56.) εἰ γὰρ τῷ αὐτίκα χρεσίμω ἢμῶν. To which I add 4, 56. καὶ τὸ παραυτίκα πνον ἢμῶν ὑφέλιμον καθιστήμα. For such is required by the true construction of the passage.
from this, that παραωτικά, especially if there be an
elipsis of μόνω, naturally suggests the idea of what
is temporary.

The ἔλαβον must be understood in the sense comparatively light; as indeed is evident from the
words following.

17. καθ’ ἐπεξελεύσθη εἰς ἐπεξελεύσθη is admirably ex-
plained by Theophl. ἐπεξελεύσθης ἐπεξελεύσθης. For
εἰς ἐπεξελεύσθη is a phrase standing in the place of an
adjective, and καθ’ ἐπεξελεύσθη is an adverbial phrase
qualifying it. Rosenm. compares the Hebr. יַעֲנָי נַעֲנָי. Mr. Slade renders it “infinitely exceeding.”

17. βάρος δέχεσται is rightly said by Grot. to be for
δέχεσται βαρέσται, so called because it is solid. He seems
to think it a metaphor taken from gold or silver
articles, as compared to plated ones; which may ac-
count for the βάρος.* Wets. too adduces an ex-
ample of a similar use of pondus in the Latin.

17. κατεργάζεται, works out, produces, acquires,
obtains; as in Joh. 6, 27. and elsewhere. And so
also in the Classical writers. Thus Rosenm. adduces
an example from Dionys. Hal. Ant. L. 5, τούτο τὸ
ἔργον ἀδάνατον αὐτῷ δέχεται εἰργάσεται.

18. μὴ σκοτοῦντων ὑμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα—αισθεία. This
is explanatory of the preceding, and (as Chrysos. sug-
gests) is meant to show how they become light, or
come to seem light: which will appear (he means to
say) if we look not at the things, &c. For (as ΟΕcu-
men. remarks) if we weigh the things of the present
state with those that are in the unseen state, light
indeed will seem the former; and the reason is, be-
cause they are temporary only, the others, eternal.”

18. σκοτοῦνται is explained by Cap. Est., and Hardy
“nobis instar scopi proponimus.” But this is being

* Theophyl. indeed explains it as simply put for μέγεθος. And so
Hamm., who observes that βάρος signifies riches and plenty, as well
as weight; hence the word in the Sept. often denotes multitude, or
greatness; as 1 Kings 10, 11. 2 Kings 6, 4. 18, 17. 2 Chron. 11, 1.
1 Macc. 1, 17. 3 Macc. 6, 33. He therefore renders βάρος δόξας
“riches, plenty, and abundance of glory.”
slavishly literal. The word is admitted by all the
most judicious Commentators to have here a meta-
phorical sense yet further removed, namely, keep an
eye upon, mind, care for, be intent upon, &c.; as in
Phil. 2, 4, 3, 17. and sometimes in the Old Testa-
ment, and often in the Classical writers, from whom
examples may be seen in Schleus. Lex.

At προσκαίρεια must be understood μόνον. And in
the βλέπωμεν must (as Theodoret suggests) be com-
prehended not the calamities only, but the conven-
iences and comforts of this present state, to neither
of which (he adds), as being ἐπικαίρια, we ought
προσκαίρεια to be devoted. These are elsewhere
called τὰ επιγεία and τὰ ἐν κοσμῷ, as being those
things on which the people of this world set their
hearts.

By the τὰ μὴ βλέπωμεν are meant the things not
yet corporeally seen, as being of an another world.
See the impressive and beautiful ἡθικών (moral, or ap-
lication,) with which Chrysost. concludes his Ho-
mily on this portion of Scripture. From this I shall
extract the following fine passage, tom. 5, p. 35, 30—
36. βούλεις μωδεῖν τῶν αὐτῆς μὲν ἡ βασιλεία παρασταθῆναι ἐν ἀδύνατος, ήπιστράτηγος, ἐκεῖνη δὲ τὸ μακροῦ οὐκ ἔχειν, ἐφανέρωσα τῆς παρούσης ἑστι καὶ δεητερά καὶ μάνιμος, ἐξατάσαμαι, εἰ δικαίος, τὰ λαμπρὰ τῆς πα-
ρούσης βασιλείας, τῶν πλούσιων, τῶν δόξαιν, τῶν δυνατεῖν, τῶν
τίμαισα τὰς παρὰ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ οὐκεὶ τούτων οὐδεὶς ἐξοτιμή-
τοι, τι γὰρ ἀποστήτειν πλοῦτος τὸν μηδὲ μεχρὶ τῆς ἐστή-
πασ πολλάκις ἡμῖν παραμένουσι; καθὸ τε γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἁγιασ-
μὸς ἐπὶ τούτῳ εἰς ἑκείνου συνεχείς μεδίσταται, καὶ
πάλιν ἐπὶ τούτῳ πρὸς ἄλλου τοιούτων τι καὶ ἡ δόξα
ἐστιν.

J. Capell, here compares a beautiful passage of
Senec. Epist. 59. Omnia ista quaes sensibus serviant,
quæ nos accendunt et irritant, negat Plato ex iis esse
qua verè sunt. Igitur ista imaginaria sunt, &c. Mit-
tamus animum ad illa quaæ æsterna sunt. Contemna-
mus omnia quaæ adeo pretiosæ non sunt, ut an sint
omnino dubium sit. Bulkley too compares Proclus
in Plat. Theol. 24, 284. Τὰς μὲν ψυχὰς ἀνέγοντος (τοῦ ἄνευ ἀρίθμου, scil.) ἀπὸ τῶν φαινόμενων ἐν τῇ ἀφανῇ. In this passage there seems a remarkable coincidence in words, which may be accounted for from the effect which the Scriptures had, when universally dispersed, on the writings of the Philosophers.

CHAP. V.

The commencement of this chapter is most closely connected with the conclusion of the last; and therefore the division was made at an improper place. This is apparent from the γὰρ: and the connexion is not ill traced by Schilting as follows: "Rationem adsert, per prolepsin, cur ea quae sunt æterna spectet: quasi dicat, nam si quis mihi objicat, corpore nostro mortali dissoluto nullam nobis amplius spem superesse." It is otherwise traced by Theophr., who concludes by saying, that "the Apostle here again discourses of the resurrection, but not so distinctly or particularly as in the former Epistle, lest he should seem to think them as yet uninformed." The truth is, it is here introduced incidentally. The Apostle enlarges on the supports he enjoyed in present trials by hopes beyond the grave, and this evidently with the view of exciting others to animate themselves with the same hope, that they may afterwards partake of the same fruition.

VERSE 1. οἴδαμεν γὰρ, δι', εὰν η ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οὐδα τῶν σκίνων καταλυθῇ, &c. By oίδαμιν is expressed assured knowledge and faith. 'Εαν almost all Commentators explain although. But it was long since my opinion, that it ought rather to be rendered post-quam or quando; as in a similar passage of Joh. 12, 52. εὰν υπ' θαλά κε τῆς γῆς. And this is confirmed by Est., Schott., and Jaspis. The common interpretation, however, may be retained, if the signification of καταλυθῇ be modified, thus: "For though our earthly house of this tabernacle be to be dissolved;
though it must be dissolved." And certainly there is something more natural and vigorous in this sense than in the former, which would moreover lead to a difficulty, as if this celestial body were to be given immediately on the dissolution of the other: which would be at variance with what is said in the last chapter.

1. ἐκτεινόμενος, earthly, as opposed to the οἰκία ἐν οὐρανοῖς just after, i.e. οὐρανοῖς. With respect to the expression οἰκία τοῦ σκῆνος, some Commentators, as Rosenm., regard the οἰκία as redundant, since σκῆνος of itself denotes the human body; as indeed is fully proved by Wetstein's numerous examples from the Classical writers.* Yet I see not how οἰκία can be thought redundant; neither can I approve of Rosenmuller's version: "Etiam corpus nostrum fragile dissipatur," which by no means expresses the full sense. Many eminent modern Commentators, as Michaelis, Schleus., and Middleton, following the Syriac version, take τοῦ σκῆνος simply to denote the body; and for an example of that sense they appeal to ver. 4. But that will afford no support; since it comes after (and immediately after), not before, or in any distant part. The word is added κατ' ἐξήγησιν: but if by τοῦ σκῆνος the Apostle meant no more than the human body, an explanation was scarcely necessary; and the fact that he has no where else in

* From these it appears to have been used very frequently by the Philosophers, especially the Pythagoreans. Thus it occurs several times in Stoicus, and is also found in Plato 1093 D. 1094 D. 1096 A., and occasionally in the medical writers (who often borrow expressions from the Philosophers), as Hippocr. Aphor. ἀπολιποῦσα ἡ ἀγχή τοῦ σώματος σκῆνος, Nicander, Arctæus sape, Longin. 32. καὶ παρὰ Ἑραλδόντι τὴν ἀνθρωποείν σκῆνος ἀναγολη πομπικῶς, καὶ ἔτι φάλλων ἀναξιωματίζει θεῖος παρὰ Πλάτωνι. Aelian A. N. 9; 33, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀμάχω τινι καὶ θεία δυνάμει ἀνέσκεψε τῷ σκῆνει τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ τὴν ἐνενθ' ἀνέστησε' though the expression is there used improper of the body of an animal. Sometimes the allusion is made to a house: as Lucian Somn. § 23. p. 71. (cited by Bulkley) ἕγοι τῶν ἱππῶν—ἄριε—ὁ Μνημάρχος ἐξεραυήσατο μοι τῶν οἰκῶν. To which I add Lycoph. 783. ἐκεύειν συμβίγγα προσμᾶςων δεμή, voluntariam vi bicem opponens corpori suo.
his Epistles used the word in this sense seems to 
discountenance this notion. I cannot but think, then, 
that the Apostle had something more in view, and 
meant to advert to the body as a mere tent, booth, 
but, or shed, set up for a temporary purpose, and 
liable to ruin: and thus it contrasts well with the 
εἰκάν αὐχενοσποίητον, αἰώνιον, here placed in opposition 
to it by the Apostle. Besides, this is required by the 
προσκαίρα in the preceding sentence. The common 
interpretation, too, is supported by all the antient 
Commentators.* And so also Wets.: “Est domus, 
quam ad tempus habitamus; i. e. diversorium sive 
hospitium, in quo commorarumur. comm. 4.” 
The words τοῦ σκήνου, however, are not in apposition 
with the preceding; as Est. and Mackn. suppose; 
but (as Grot. has rightly noticed) are genitives 
of explication: as Fons Timavi, Arbor feci, &c. Possibly 
the Apostle had in view Sap. 9, 15. τὸ γεωδῆς 
σκήνος, similarly to which Plato has called the body 
γῆιν ου σκήνος. The author of Sapient. probably had 
Plato in view. 
The antient Commentators plainly pay no attention 
to the article, which is improperly taken by some for 
the demonstrative. 
Καταλωθῇ is used with great propriety, since the 
term was employed of the destruction, usually 
gresimal, of substances of every kind, as buildings, including 
1, 9. (cited by Schleus.) μὴ καταλωθῇ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ 
γῆρως. And so Joh. 2, 19. λύσατε τὴν νάον τοῦτον, 
namely, the temple of his body. In Matt. 26, 61. his 
accusers attribute to him the term καταλωθῇ. 
1. οἴκωδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐχαμεν, i. e. (as Wets. explains) 
“we have laid up for us ἀποκειμένην. Ἐκ Θεοῦ, i. e. 
made by God, and therefore divine. Now this is 

* Thus Theophyl. (from Chrysost.): ἐπίγειον δὲ οἰκίαν σκήνος, 
τὸ σῶμα ἐκδέλεειν’ διὰ δὲ τοῦ σκήνου αὐτὸ καλέσει, τὸ πρόσκαιρον 
ἐβδόμον τοῦτον γὰρ ἡ σκηνή. And a little after: “Ορα δὲ τὸν 
πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγειον ἀντέθεικε τὴν οἰωνίον πρὸς τὸ σκήνος, τὴν αἰώ-
nον.” And so Theodoret and Cæcumen.
called an οἰκία, as opposed to the σκέφης, and is termed ἀχειροτέκτων, &c. which may be paraphrased: "a house not (like our present fleshly tenement) made with hands, (and therefore mortal), but immortal and eternal in the heavens." On the ἀχειροτέκτων the Commentators, antient and modern, have raised needless difficulties. Of the former some would take it to mean no more than supported by hands, i. e. the work of hands which procure food and drink. But this is quite anile. Schleus. treats it as no more than explanatory of the former ἐκ Θεοῦ. And Theophyl. seems to have been of the same opinion. But he gives no better reason than that the human body is not χειροτέκτων, which indeed is, in strictness, true; but, in a certain sense, the term may be admitted, inasmuch as being begotten or formed by human beings, it may be said to be so. In proof and illustration of this I need only refer to the kindred term παιδοτέκτως, begotten. So παιδοτέκτως, παιδοτεκτός, παιδοτεκτός, and other compounds perpetually occurring in the best writers. Such is (I conceive) the sense of ἀχειροτ., which no Commentator seems to have perceived, except perhaps Theodoret, who says the Apostle opposes τῇ ὑπ’ ἀνθρώπων κατασκευωμένῃ τὴν ἀχειροτέκτων. The Apostle, then, means that the future and glorified body will be as much superior to human begotten and formed body, as the habitations of the blessed exceed in glory earthly and human made habitations.

It is strange that some recent Commentators, as Morus, Rosenm., and even Mackn., should so explain away the solid sense of the terms οἰκοδομή and οἰκία, as they do. Mackn. thinks it nothing less than absurd to refer these expressions, of the earthly and heavenly house, to the earthly and heavenly bodies of the saints, since it occasions a confusion of the metaphors. And he (in common with the above Critics) understands them of an earthly and heavenly dwelling; translating ἐπενδυόμεναι, "to go permanently into," and γυμνός, "destitute of a habitation."
But no sound Critic, or judicious Philologist, will ever admit such a violent and arbitrary exposition; and the common interpretation is supported by the best scholars, as I have shown in my note in loc. Mr. Slade, very properly, resists this perversion, and makes the well founded objection, that ἐπενδυόμενος, in the same passage, with γυμνό, must refer, either literally or figuratively, to putting on a garment; not to say that we have no instance of the compound ἐπενδυόμεναι being used in any other sense; ἐσθήτας ἐπενδυόμενοι γυμνακέας τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς. (Plut. ap. Steph.), and there is no greater confusion in the metaphor here, than what is often observable in St. Paul and other good writers.” 1 Tim. 6. 17. 1 Cor. 16, 9. Eph. 2, 19 and 20. 6, 16.

2. καὶ γὰρ εν τοιτε ἐπενδυόμεν—ἐπιτολοῦντες. “For (while we are) in this (tent, or hut,) we groan.” Here there is an ellipsis of ὑστερος, and σκέπαι (not μέρει or πράξαι, as Phot. Zeger, Grot., Est., Vorst., Rosenm. and Jaspis supply); as appears from ver. 4. where there is an epanalepsis, and this clause is given complete. The words may be rendered: “For we (I repeat), as being, or while being,” &c. Ἐπενδυόμεν, “we groan,” i. e. under the various distresses and calamities to which the frailty of that tabernacle subjects us; and (as Doddr. suggests) with longings after immortality. I would compare a parallel passage of Rom. 8, 23. καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ εἰν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπενδυόμεν. The participle here stands for a verb and copula; q. d. “and, (or since,) we earnestly desire.” The εἰσι is (as often) intensive. This verb is very often used by the ardent and warm-hearted Apostle.

2. τὸ ὕπερτρις ἡμῶν το εἰς εἰμαντὸ ἐπενδυόμασθαι. Some would interpret the ὕπερτρις merely of that heavenly domicilium, or habitation, mentioned at ver. 1. But it may be questioned whether domicilium be there meant; and here ἐπένδυς cannot admit of the sense “go into, enter upon.” All the best Commentators antient and modern are agreed that it can only sig-
nify, "to put on (as it were) one dress over (ἐν) another." So Plut. Pelop. p. 283. &εἴητας ἐκεῖνων γυναικεῖα τοῖς θαράξι. We have only to suppose that the Apostle here changes the former metaphor, by which the body was compared to a habitation, into another by which the body is compared to a garment.* The only harshness is, that it is

* On this change of metaphor it may be observed that as the Pythagoreans compared the body to a tent, (or hut,) for the soul, so did the Platonists liken it to a vestment. Thus (of the passages cited by Wets.) Plato, 356. ἐκεῖνων ψυχαῖς ἔχοτες ἡμιαμπεῖον εἶσαι σώματά τε κατά. To which I add Synes., 288. c. μηδὲν ἦγεῖσθαι δείνον, ἀναγκάσσαι τοῦ φυλακῶν τῶν κρείττων. Max. Tyr. 13, 4, 1. 239. ημὸς ψυχῆς—καραδοκούσης ἡμᾶς ἀπαλαγέν τοῦ δυσχρήσου τούτου περιβλήματος. Apoll. Tycon. Ep. 58. p. 403. δὲν (scil. ψυχη) ἐν μὴ μεταμφίεσθαι.

This, and what follows, Schoettg. illustrates from the writings of the Jews: and though I cannot accede to the interpretation adopted by the learned Commentator, yet, as his remarks contain much curious information, I shall insert them, with the omission of the illustrative examples.

I. It must be observed, that the Hebrew word ἡμὸς signifies circumdari aliquid re, or instructum esse. II. The Jews ascribe to the soul a vestment both in this life and the next. III. They maintain the pre-existence of both, i.e. affirm that the soul has already a covering, while as yet hidden under the throne of God, and as yet not clothed with a body. IV. This vestment is no other than what we call the image of God, which was lost by the fall, and is to be restored in the next life. V. After the fall, Adam and all men are stripped of this, as long as they remain in sin, and then they are said to be naked. VI. The good are clothed therewith, as soon as the Schechina begins to dwell in them. VII. When they are clothed therewith, then they are enabled to perform good works, may, even sometimes to work miracles. VIII. Hence it is the duty of every one to preserve this vestment pure, and, as far as lies in him, without spot. IX. In life eternal this will be a vestment for the soul, or rather an ornament assigned to it for the virtues practised in this world. X. This celestial vestment they describe as lucid, and radiant, such as on this earth no one can attain. XI. It is necessary for the soul to be clothed with this vestment, for, till it is clothed therewith, it cannot behold the majesty of God. And so the Apostle himself, 1 Cor. 15, 53. says it is necessary for this mortal to put on immortality."

Schoettg. then subjoins the following application: "Since, therefore, the Apostle speaks both of an habitation, and a vestment, with which he is to be clothed, it is obvious that he means, not a corporeal, but a spiritual vestment, clothed with which he desires to enter the heavenly kingdom."
introduced in the same sentence with the preceding, and therefore causes somewhat of incongruity. Such things, however, are frequent in the popular style, nay, not without example in the best writers of antiquity, especially Pindar.

It is plain from these words (especially when compared with a parallel passage at 15, 51., that the Apostle here professes a wish to put on, as a vestment, this glorified body, i. e. enter upon a blissful immortality without passing through death, which, as we learn from 1 Cor. 15, 51—53. and 1 Thess. 4, 15—17., will not be the lot of the righteous who are alive at the day of judgment. See more in Hamm. and Slade.

2. τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, is by almost all Commentators taken as a circumlocution for οὐρανοῦ. But this seems paring down the sense. I should prefer supplying ἀνθρώπου, and would take οὐρανοῦ for Θεοῦ, which is often so used; as Matt. 21, 25. "the baptism of John whence was it? ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπου:" Mark 11, 30. Luke 15, 18 and 21. 20, 4 and 5. John 3, 18. Hebr. 12, 25. τὸν ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ (i. e. Christ). The complete phrase occurs in Joh. 3, 27. ἔναν μητέρων αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. And this is confirmed by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. says it is so called, not that it descends from heaven, but that we have, (as it were, sent from thence) the τὴν τῆς αἰθαρείας χάριν. And so Theodoret and Ὀεκομιγμ. all from Chrys. They, however, did not hit on the true sense of οὐρανοῦ.

It is rightly remarked by the antient Commentators, that the Apostle makes use of the term οἰκετεύρην and not σκύνος, as being one which has a stronger notion of continuance.

3. τῷ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι, ou γιμνοὶ εὐφθαρσομέθα.

On the construction and sense of these words neither the antient nor modern Commentators agree. The antient Commentators all read ἐνδυσάμενοι, as in our present text; at ἐνδυσάμενοι they supplied τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, i.e. σῶμα ἀφθαρτον, and at γιμνοὶ, δέχεται;
q. d. "If indeed it may so be that, after assuming this corruptible body we shall be not found deprived of glory and acceptance."

"For all men (say they) will put on the clothing of incorruption, but all will not partake of the divine glory." This construction, indeed, seems to be accurate; but the ellipsis is too arbitrary to be admitted; and Dr. Doddridge's interpretation, as being also founded on the same ellipsis, (though with a harsher application), must equally be rejected. Other modern Commentators who retain the common reading, propose various interpretations. Hamm. endeavours to remove the difficulty by altering the punctuation, thus: εἰ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι, αὐτοί γυμνοὶ, εὐρησάμεθα, with the following sense: "If, indeed, we shall, happily, be among the number of those faithful Christians, who will be found clothed upon, not naked." But this destroys the construction, and would require ἐνδεικτός. Rosen. assigns the following sense: "Nam in altera vita non penitus destituti corpore erimus, sed habebimus omnino corpus." But this sense cannot well be elicited from the words, and would not be agreeable to the context. Wets. gives the following explanation: "Opponit vestitos, die judiciei superstites nudis, i.e. ante illum diem mortuis." But this would require the same construction as the one laid down by Hamm., which is evidently inadmissible. Besides, the sense, which is literally this: "hoping that we may be found alive, and not dead," is feeble and frigid. The interpretation of Hardy, (adopted by Mr. Slade) yields the very same sense, and indeed seems to have been founded on Wets. They endeavour indeed to support their opinion from a remark of Bos, that the Apostle uses the Platonic sense of γυμνός to denote the dead, and ἐνδυσάμενοι to denote the living; as Plato 277 c. δι' ἡ καθ' ἡγεμονίᾳ τοῦ ποιματος παρ' ἐκείνου ἄπεργατος and Lelian, A. N. 11, 39. τοῦ δὲ βίου ἀπελθόντα—καὶ ἀποδυσάμενον τό σῶμα, καὶ γυμνόν γεγεινημένον γυμνόν [ἐπάρσα]. But this is not quite a satisfactory proof that γυμνός was so used absolutely; and that the Platonists employed ἐνδυσάμενοι in the sense here required, there is not the shadow of a proof. Nor is it probable that the Apostle knew anything about the Platonic philosophy. Besides, the sense (I repeat) is frigid, and the phraseology tautological. It would make the Apostle thrice express the same wish, namely, that he might be allowed to put on his incorruptible body, without having to put off his corruptible one by death. Now it is not likely that the Apostle should have been so anxious about so very unimportant a point; not to say that this would be inconsistent with the courageous spirit everywhere shown by the Apostle.

Under these circumstances, I cannot but think that the common construction is to be retained; though not the common reading. I would certainly adopt ἐνδυσάμενοι, with some of the most ancient MSS., the Arabic Version, several Latin Fathers, and (whose authority weighs with me more than that of all the Latin Fathers) Chrysost., who evidently himself adopted this reading, though he also notices and explains ἐνδυσάμενοι. It is strange that Griesbach should have omitted so important an authority. The reading has also been adopted by some moderns, as Beza, Mill, Pyle, Wells, Schleus. and
others. And if the MS. authority be thought weak, I would observe that εἰ and εἴποτε are continually confounded.

It is proper to observe, (though it has been unnoticed by the Commentators) that these words εἰ ἔγε—εἰ πρὸς τὸ επάνω are parenthetical. For (as I observed on ver. 2.) the words καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὀφροὶ, &c. at ver. 4. are, by epanalepsis, a repetition of what was said before the parenthetical clause was introduced.

The clause, it may be observed, is expressed with that profound and heartfelt humility which every where distinguishes the Apostle; yet I assent to the antients, that it was meant to inculcate a lesson of humility on the Corinthians, and, in this view, may very well be compared with that in 1 Cor. 9, 27. "lest that when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast away." Where, see the note. It is, however, of importance to ascertain the sense of γυμνὸς. Some Commentators, both antient and modern, have inferred from this term, (and not without countenance from the context) that the wicked will be left not only γυμνὸς, as regards the incorruptible body, but even as regards any body at all, i. e. will not be clothed with their former mortal body, and that on the soul, (which alone then remains,) will be inflicted such punishments as God shall, in his justice, award. And I myself formerly adopted this interpretation, rendering the passage as follows: "(Hoping) if so be that after having put off (our mortal and corruptible body), we may not be found (by the Lord at the day of judgment) naked, and without a body, (as the wicked)." But this mode of interpretation seems to be too arbitrary. I now rather assent to the generality of antient and modern Commentators (see Slade), who think that the term does not necessarily imply, that the unfaithful and rejected will have no bodies at all; only that they will be naked as far as regards a heavenly body, that they will not be clothed upon in the sense intended by the Apostle. And this is strongly countenanced by the preceding words; for by γυμνὸς the Apostle seems to mean unfrurnished with the ἐκπόρισμα just before mentioned. If this interpretation be admitted, (as I think it ought), it will surely follow that nothing can be, with certainty, pronounced on the nature of the resurrection of the wicked; at least, that nothing here said has any reference to them. And this, indeed, seems most probable, especially as in the more copious discussion on this interesting subject in the former Epistle (which it is clear the Apostle has here in mind); it is acknowledged by the most judicious Commentators that the Apostle has reference in all that he says to the resurrection of the righteous only. Therefore the question as to the state of the wicked will have to be decided by other passages of Scripture, or by inferences from what is there found. With such passages we have here nothing to do; yet we may be permitted to observe, that there is no occasion to suppose that their bodies will not be raised, as well as those of the righteous; the reasons for which would be here out of place.

So that, upon the whole, the true sense of the Apostle is attained by Theod. (from Chrys.) who writes as follows: Πάντας μὲν γὰρ
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4. For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, love, and a sound mind.

This (as I before observed) is a repetition, per epanalpsin, of what was written in ver. 2., in which the Apostle expresses his meaning somewhat more clearly, as in the case of στενάξομεν βασιλεύειν, i.e. weighed down by calamities, trials, and infirmities. 'So' I, inaccurat as. This shows the nature and extent of the wish.

In the interpretation of this verse, as in the preceding, many modern Commentators, from Grot. to the present day, attribute to the Apostle the sentiment, expressed from them by Hardy, as follows: "Nollemus mori, sed per mutationem superindui corpore celesti, et immortali; nam corporis, et animae grave est divortium." And so Mr. Locke, who paraphrases the whole passage thus: "For we that are in the body groan under the pressures and inconveniences that attend us in it; which yet we are not therefore willing to put off, but had rather, without dying, have it changed into a celestial immortal body; that so this mortal state may be put an end to by an immediate entrance into an immortal life." Now as I have shown that the sentiment was, without reason, ascribed to the Apostle in the former verse, so there is as little reason for supposing it here. Such a thought never (as far as I can find) entered into the mind of the ancient Commentators. The sense of the words is briefly, but ably, expressed by Chrys. 603, 38: "οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο στενάξομεν, φησιν, ἵνα τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλάξωμεν (τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲ ἀλλούσασθαι βουλόμεθα) ἀλλὰ τῇ φθορᾷ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ στενάξου ἐλευθηρίαν. So also Theodoret: στενάξομεν, δὲ, οὐκ ἀπαλλάξουσιν τὼν σώματος φιλέμενοι, ἀλλὰ τῶν τούτων παθῶν ἔλευθεροι γιγανεσθάι συνεντευξεῖς. The sense, then (I think) is plainly this: "For (I repeat) while we are in this hus, or shed, though groaning under the weight of many afflictions, yet our wish is not so much to put off this body, and thereby be rid of these evils, but rather our anxiety is to put on an heavenly garment, even our incorruptible body." Much difficulty has been occasioned by the extreme brevity of the Apostle, especially in the words ἐκδυσάμενοι and ἐκδυσάμενοι, which are very clumsily and darkly rendered by our English Translators, and Ruckell, to be unclothed, and clothed upon. The force of the middle voice will not permit such a sense, and it is neglecting the σύνεια, which I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen. Ἡμι at ἐκδυσ. must be supplied, from ver. 1., ἡμὶ οἰκτικῶν τοῦ αἰματος, and ἐκδυσ. must also be supplied from ver. 2. ἡμὶ οἰκτικῆς ἡμῶν τὸ ἄθροισθαι. Now although we have there a confusion of time and person, yet it is plain that the Apostle especially rests on..."
that derived from a garment. The question, however, is, what sense we are to assign to ἐνδύσασθαι here and at ver. 2. According to the literal signification of the term, and the force of the ἔτ, it must mean "assuming another over the former," i.e. the incorruptible over the corruptible. Now that the wicked are to be clothed upon with their former mortal body, was the opinion of most of the Fathers, and of some moderns, and (as I have before shown) seems well founded. But whether the righteous are to have another and glorified body, besides their mortal and raised body, is the question here. Some of the ancient and modern Commentators have thought that they will have. See Whitby, and the authorities by him cited. And so Schleus. They suppose that the raised bodies of the just will be covered and surrounded with another body, which shall be bright, aerial, and resplendent, and shall, somehow, communicate a principle of immortality to the raised mortal body. But this lies open to many objections. How could it be called an ἐκστήρυσιν? Besides, for this notion there is no support in Scripture. For, as Mr. Locke observes, it is accompanied with this difficulty, that "then it would follow that the wicked should not have immortal bodies at the resurrection: for whatever it be that St. Paul here means by being clothed upon, it is something that is peculiar to the saints, who have the spirit of God, and shall be with the Lord in contradistinction to others, as appears from the following verses, and the whole tenor of this place." Mr. Locke, indeed, acknowledges that it is somewhat countenanced by 1 Cor. 15, 53 & 54, δει γὰρ τὸ φθαρὼν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, καὶ τὸ θερμόν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι άθανασίαν. But there we have, not ἐνδύβω, but ἐνδύομαι, which means no more than "acquire a principle of incorruption and immortality," (See the note.) Now these two passages are geminis gemelli; and, according to the well known Critical canon, the more obscure (which is the present one) must be explained from the more familiar; and then it will be plain that ἐνδύβω is put for the simple, or, at least, that ἐνδύς has only a slightly intensive force. It were highly injudicious, indeed, to erect a notion so wild and objectionable on so slight a foundation as the sense of a Greek preposition in composition. As to such of the Latin Fathers as have supported the interpretation, it may very well be accounted for by remarking that some of them had been Platonists, and most of them were inclined to those popular philosophical doctrines, which they are supposed to have sometimes introduced. Not will there be any discrepancy between this and the passage of 1 Corinth., if we interpret the ἐνδύς and the ἔτ of the acquisition of some principle of incorruption and immortality superadded to (which is the force of ἔτ) what is corruptible and mortal. Now this sense of ἐνδύσασθαι is very frequent. Thus Schleus. in voc. § 2. gives the following definition: instruo me, ornor, officior et praebitus sum aliquum re, utor. And so the Latin indo, which was derived from this source. The above sense of ἐνδύβω (I must observe) is countenanced by Chrys., Theophyl., and others. Thus Theophyl.:—θέλοντες ἐπενδύσασθαι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν"
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ὁ δὲ τοῦτο γε οὐδὲ ἐκδύσασθαι βουλόμεθα, ἡλλὰ τῆς φθορᾶς ἀπαλλαγῆς, ἵνα ἀναλώσῃ καὶ δεσιμωθῇ καὶ φθορά ἑπὶ τῆς ζωῆς, οὐ τὸ σώμα. And so it was evidently taken by Clem. Alex. p. 309. Ἐξερύσσεσθαι τοὺς λόγους τὰ ἔρθαι τῆς τοῦ καθεστώτος, γρηγορότως καὶ ἐκδύσασθαι τῆς φθορᾶς.

Hence it will be obvious that the obscure, because highly figurative words, ἵνα κατεργασθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ἐκ τῆς ζωῆς, which (as Chrys. observes) are explanatory of the preceding, must signify, "that thus the mortal principle may be absorbed, overcome, and annihilated by the vivifying and immortal one." Almost all Commentators have failed to see the sense, by supplying after τὸ θνητὸν the word σῶμα,† whereas θνης appears from ζωῆς to be a neuter adjective for a noun, in the sense I have laid down. I would, moreover, observe that this passage affords an explanation of a parallel one in 1 Cor. 15, 54. κατεργασθῇ τὸ θνατὸς εἰς νῖκος, where, had the Apostle written ὑπὸ ζωῆς, all would have been clear.

Thus, I think, no further difficulty remains; and the whole is as clear as we can expect a passage of this nature to be: and, above all, it is plain that there is no reason to impute to the Apostle the sentiment of wishing to avoid death, by having his mortal body converted into an incorruptible one, by being alive at the resurrection. I have been the more anxious to show the fallacy of this opinion, (which chiefly rested on a misinterpretation of the common idiom οὐκ—ἀλλὰ), because it involves the notion that the Apostle thought the world was soon to come to an end, a sentiment which has been imputed to him in some texts, but perhaps always without reason.

Mr. Locke appeals to 1 Thess. 4, 15. & ver. 6. 1 Cor. 1, 7, 7, 29 & 31. 10, 11. Rom. 13, 11 & 12. Heb. 10, 37. But see the notes on those passages. I must venture to say that I think it doubtful whether the Apostle any where clearly expresses that opinion; assuredly he no where authoritatively asserts it.

5. ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος ἥμας εἰς τοῦτο, Θεὸς. There is something awkward in these words. For, though it is manifest that ἐστι is to be understood, yet it is not clear what sense is to be ascribed to κατεργασάμενος. Some Commentators, as Camer. (understanding an elliptical antithesis), render it: "hath created us to this." But that mode of interpretation seems harsh. Still more so is that of Dodd. and Mackn., "hath wrought us to this," i. e. this desire; which, it is obvious, is very far from being the sense. Preferable to this is the interpretation of Grot. "who hath pre-

---

* Thus, to use the fine simile of Theodoret, ὅσπερ ἄνευς οὐκ ἐφιάλον τὸ φῶς φροῦδον τοῦ σκότους ποιεῖ, οὔτως ἡ ἀνάλογης ζωή τῆς φθορᾶς ἀμφιβολεῖ.

† So Rosenm., who renders: "ut corpus mortale assumatur ab immortali."
pared us for this, namely, by the preaching of the Gospel.” But this sense of κατέργασε is quite unauthorized. Upon the whole, I think the true sense was seized by the ancient Commentators, as Chrys., Theophyl., ΟΕcumen., and Theodoret, who understand it as said per prolepšin, i.e. “created us originally with this view.” Thus Theophyl. paraphrases: Ἡσ宝贵的 δὲ ἐστὶν ὅ εἰς αὐτῷ τοῦτο ἐξ ἁρχῆς καταργασάμενος ἕμας· καὶ γὰρ εἰσίν ἂν ἐνα πλεῖον ἑφθασεν καὶ οὐ νῦν τοῦτο ἐξελεύν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἁρχῆς. ΟΕcumen. rightly regards it as an answer, by anticipation, of the question, “Who is there who will work this change?” So Schliting paraphrases: “Let no one doubt the certainty of this, for,” &c. The sense is well expressed by Theodoret thus: “Ἀναθέν δὲ τὰ καθ’ ἕμας οὕτως ὁ ποιητὴς ὁκονόμασεν· καὶ προερχόμεν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τὴν παραβασίαν, προκατεσκευάζει τὰ τραύματι κατάληλος φάρμακον. So that it appears the meaning of κατέργασε. ε. τ. is “destined to, or for.” And so Schleus. Lex. and Grot. By τοῦτο is unquestionably meant this change from corruption to incorruption, and from mortality to immortality. Indeed it might equally well be said that God destined us to it, or destined it for us: but the former mode of interpretation is preferred, as being more suitable to κατέργασε, which carries also with it the notion of creation. We may compare this with a similar expression in Eph. 2, 10., where Christians are said to be created unto good works. On the contrary, in Rom. 9, 23., we have σκεύη ὁργῆς κατεργάσεις εἰς ἀπωλείαν and a little further on we read σκεύη ἔλεος, αὐτοτιμάσεις εἰς δόξαν. We may therefore render: “Now he who hath created and destined us unto this very thing, or purpose, is God.”

The words following are extremely brief: but they are meant to show the certainty of the thing, since God hath evinced this by previously giving us the pledge or earnest of the Spirit. On the force of ἀφρασθείον see the note supra 1, 22. The sense of τοῦ πνεύματος is, I. conceive, quite perverted by the re-
cent foreign Commentators, who take it to mean no more than "sensus verè Christianus." So Rosenm. and Jaspis: "Qui autem media dedit ad futuram felicitatem consequendum ejusque spem certissimam instillavit, ipsam quoque profectò dabit." But how could this be considered as a pledge, or evidence of their immortality? Mr. Locke has well observed that the spirit is mentioned in more places than one, as the pledge and earnest of immortality; more particularly Eph. 1, 13 & 14., which, compared with Rom. 8, 23., shews that the inheritance whereof the Spirit is the earnest, is the same which the Apostle speaks of here, viz. the possession of immortal bodies. But this requires us to suppose the Holy Spirit, and the extraordinary and miraculous gifts (χαρίσματα) which Paul himself, and indeed several of the Corinthians whom he was addressing, enjoyed. In fact, this may be applied, mutatis mutandis, to the case of Christians of every age, who only enjoy the ordinary graces of the Holy Spirit unto sanctification, since they may be regarded as a satisfactory evidence and pledge (at least to themselves) that they shall receive the other blessing destined for them, namely, a happy immortality.

The ancient Commentators clearly saw and have carefully illustrated this higher sense of τοῦ πνεύματος. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) paraphrases: "Would you have a demonstration? I will give you another also." Yet he, with most other ancient Interpreters, confines himself too much to the secondary view above adverted to. Theodoret, however, is an exception, who in the following few words has better pointed out the primary sense than any other Commentator: τοῦτο δὲ τέθεικεν, ἀπὸ τῶν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐνεργομένων διαμάταν τὰς περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐπαγγελίας δεινῶς ἀληθείς.

6. θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε—Κυρίον. This and the two next verses have not been well interpreted by ancient and modern Commentators, few of whom sufficiently discern the scope of the passage, whose
sense can only be elicited by a strict attention to the context, and cannot well be expressed but in a paraphrase. It must be observed that the construction is suspended at the participle ἐναπο, not concluded. It is then resumed after the parenthetical words ὅτι —ἐλήφε. The Commentators supply ἐπει. It is, however, of more importance to enquire what is the meaning of καὶ ἐλήφες: for upon this the sense of the whole passage hinges. Some modern Commentators, as Rosenm., render it: "although we know." And indeed this is a sense sometimes found attached to participles: but it is here at variance with the context, and the scope of the passage, which is intended (I think) to point out the grounds of that holy confidence amidst dangers, of deliverance by God, which the Apostle always felt. The ὅτι has, I think, much meaning, and may be thus expressed: "in reliance, therefore, on these gracious aids, which are the pledge of resurrection and glorification, we are of good courage in encountering danger, nay even death." Then the words καὶ ἐλήφες are meant to show the nature of that courage, as it respected death, and may be rendered: "especially since we know this," ὅτι ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι.—Κυρίον. Now ἐπεὶ is very ill rendered by our English Translators and Mackn. "at home," which suggests an idea the very opposite to that which the Apostle always affixes to human life. See Heb. 11, 13. and Philipp. 1, 29. Dr. S. Clarke, Doddtr., and others, on the contrary, render it sojourning. But this is a signification completely at variance with the usage of the Classical writers, who never employ the word in that sense. Indeed, it is not necessary to adopt either of the two objectionable significations. From what follows at ver. 9. (where our English Translators did see the sense) it is plain that the term has the frequent signification versari in aliquo loco, simply to be in.

ἔξωθεν, especially when followed by ἐν τῷ, implies separation from; and it was almost always used of
being absent from home; as εἰσ. and εἰσ. are here opposed. Thus Thucyd. 1, 70., contrasting the Athenians and the Lacedemonians, says they are ἀκομματαὶ πρὸς ἐνυματάτους which passage has been imitated by Philo Jud. 359 β. ἀκομαμματαί πρὸς ἐκ- ὂνοματικοῖς and Aristid. 2, 174. who notices among traits of the Athenians, ἐξύπηκτα καὶ τὴν ἐπι- τῶς παρουσίας ἀδεῖας.

The ἀνὰ may be considered as pleonastic; at least it was not used in such a case by the Classical writers. Thus Eurip. Hippol. 655. ἐστ᾿ ἄνὴρ Ἰκήμος ἐδοθώ.

This was meant to fortify them under persecutions, and prepare them to suffer even death itself for the Gospel’s sake. And it is judiciously observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle has concealed the name death under an euphemism.

7. διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιταταγμένων οὐ διὰ εἰδών. The scope of the Apostle in these words (which few Commentators have seen) seems to be, to show how, and in what sense, it is true that we, in this world, ἐκδημ. ἄνα τῶν Κυρίων. (See Theodoret.) Now the chief point to be attended to is the ellipsis of μόνον, which the ancient Commentators, and, of the moderns, Whitby and Rosenm., have best discerned. The sense is: “in this state περιταταγμένος, i.e. (by a common Hebraism) ἔτι, we live, conversamur.” Grot. renders: “vitam nostram componimus.” Διὰ πίστεως and διὰ εἰδών are for ἐν πίστει and ἐν εἰδεί. So Camer. and Beza explain αὐτοῖς. The other, however, is more significant, and signifies, “in the exercise of.” By living is here meant living in a spiritual sense, subsisting on the blessings of Christ and his religion. “Here (Theophyl. observes) we know him, but only μετέπλως, not face to face; which is alluded to in the δι’ εἰδών.” “Now (remarks Theod.) we see the expected blessings by faith only, and that is the reason why we desire to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.” By εἰδώ, Cesaub. thinks, the Apostle means τὸ εἰδόμενον καὶ
"παρέν, as the Latin Jurisconsults give the name *species* to the *thing itself* which happens. See his note on the Crit. Sacr., or Pole's Syn. Many Commentators aptly cite from the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews: "Faith is the evidence of things not seen." Wolf observes, that according to the Biblical use, the expression διὰ πίστεως περιπατεῖν implies conjunction with God, and enjoyment of celestial benefits, as opposed to the beholding the Deity, united with perfect beatitude.

Here I would compare a fine passage of Plato, Phæd. 30. where he describes the state of a person utterly subdued by the blandishments of the body, and intent only on what the senses can offer: Ἐὰν δὲ γε, οἴμαι, μεμιασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλάττηται, ὅτε τὸ σώματι καὶ ἓσωστα, καὶ τῶτο περιπατεῖν καὶ ἐρῶστα, καὶ γεγοντευμένη ὡς αὐτόν, ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ ὑδατῶν, ὅστε μηδὲν ἄλλο δοκεῖν εἶναι ἀληθὲς, ἄλλ᾽ ἢ τὸ σωματοειδὲς, οὕτως ἄλλωστε, καὶ ἰδοί, καὶ πίοι, καὶ φάγοι, καὶ πρὸς τὰ Ἀφροδίσια χρήσατο.

8. θαράσσωμεν δὲ—Κύριοι. This is an *epanalepsis*, and a continuation of what was said before the parenthesis. “Now we (I repeat) are of good courage.” The δὲ is paraphrased by Theophyl.: “since these things are so.” Εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἕκοψίμεθα. It is thus explained by Theophyl.: σφόδρα ἐπιθυμοῦμεν τοῦ ἐκδύσασθαι τὸ σώμα τοῦτο. But this is overlooking the μᾶλλον. The word signifies literally, “to think good, or well,” and with μᾶλλον, “to prefer.” The sense of the passage, however, seems to require, not *malimus*, but (as Rosenm. renders) *mallemus*. And he adds, by paraphrase, “si nostram tantum conditionem respicimus.” But it may also refer to the *will of the Lord*.

The ἔκθημ. and ἔνθημ. I have before explained. Ἰπρός τῶν Κύριων, ἀπὸν Dominum, with. This sense of πρὸς occurs both in the Gospels, Acts, and Epistle; and examples may be seen in Schleus. in v. § 8, who compares a similar use of the Hebr. בּ in Gen. 24, 11. and elsewhere. He has also some Classical
examples, which, however, are not of the same nature. Theophyl. with great taste, observes, that the Apostle does not say "partake of incorruption," but, what is more, "be with the Lord."

9. οὐ εἰσὶν εἰρημένα ἡτται, εἰσὶν ἐνέργειαι, εἰσὶν ἐνέργειαι, εἰσί ἐνεργεῖαι, εἰσί ἐνεργεῖαι. The ἐνεργεῖαι, which is very significant, denotes effect, and may be rendered "wherefore, since we have such hopes of resurrection and glorification, having the earnest of the Spirit, &c. Φίλιπποις, "we strive eagerly," προσαμφιβασάτε; as Rom. 15, 20. ἔργα παρά τινις εἰς ἐνεργείας εἰσκοιμίζεται τοῦ Θεοῦ, and ver. 5. and 11, 16. The present expression is however found in Eph. 5, 10. Phil. 4, 18. Sap. 4, 10. and elsewhere. Our Translators render it "to be accepted, or acceptable," or "to be pleasing." It signifies "to be well pleasing," and (from the adjunct) "accepted in his sight," or rather "to act so as to approve ourselves in his sight." For it carries with it a notion of works and action, as will appear by consulting the passage adduced by Schleus. in his Lex. So Theophyl. well explains it: τὰ εἰσερέτας αὐτῷ ἡμᾶς. And he adds, that it reads the lesson ὅτι συνήθως εὐθείας ἐστίν, διὰ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα εἰσαρέτας αὐτῷ βιώσαι. And Theodoret remarks, that this shows that faith is not sufficient for salvation without obedience to the commands of our Benefactor.

I must observe, that throughout this and the preceding chapter Mr. Locke (and after him Dr. Mackn.) invariably expresses the plural pronouns by singular ones; which may sometimes be very proper; yet there are others when the Apostle uses the expressions he does, rather to suggest to them their duty;
as in the present verse: which may account for much of what would otherwise seem to savour of personality and vanity; and to this the use of the plural is to be ascribed. But as the ἕνεις in the next verse is evidently meant to be applied generally, (thus, to make that certain, the Apostle has added τῶς πάντας,) so by the use of γὰρ, which has reference to the preceding verse, it is evident that he meant that to be applied to their case as well as his own.

Here it is remarked by Wets.: “Tria tempora Paulus distinguuit: primo vestiti sumus corpore, et in hac terrâ habitamus; secundo nudi deposito corpore et exutâ veste dormimus, expectantes iudicium et resurrectionem; tertio resurgimus, et iudicio sistimur.”

10. τῶς γὰρ—Χριστοῦ. This (as Theodoret observes) places in another light the necessity of acquiring virtue.

The τῶς πάντας was (I imagine) added for the reason just suggested. The Commentators, however, think that the Apostle meant to refute the Jews, who held that the Gentiles alone would be brought to the judgment-seat of God; for as to the Jews, their being God’s people would secure them acceptance. And so Rosenm., who cites the saying of the Rabbins: “Universo Israele portio et pars competit in mundo futuro.” But this seems too limited a view.

10. φανερωθήσεται. On the import of this word Commentators are not quite agreed. The antients, pressing on the literal sense, remark that it imports more than παραστήσει; q. d. “we shall be made manifest.” So Theophyl.: μὴ γὰρ ὑπολάβης ὅτι ἐκεῖ τοῖς και παραπετάσματα, καὶ βαθύνησας καρδὶς ἀποκρύπτει ἢ τὰ ἐργά, ἢ τὰ βουλεύματα, ἀλλὰ πάντα φανερώθησιν. And so Beza: “Non modo siste praesentes, sed etiam illic in nos inquiri, ut palam fiat qui fuerimus.” So also Doddr. and Valpy. Yet Pisc., Grot., Rosenm., Schleus., and most recent Commentators render it comparere. And so our common version appears. And this seems more agreeable to the words
following. Yet I should wish for some example of this use of the word, which is not, I think, to be found in Scripture. In the mean time, I would not venture to say that the Apostle had not a reference to the manifestation of what was before the τὰ σώματα τῆς ψυχῆς.

10. οἷος εὐχήσταται ἔσται τὰ ἁμα τῶν σώματων. Supply τευχάμενα from the following ἔχειν. Here Bulkeley compares Lucian Nicom. p. 78. Αὕτα τινῶν, (scil. εὐχής) έστελεν ἀνθρώπων, καταγέννησε τε, καὶ καταβαρότερους, καὶ διελέγετο τὰ τευχάμενα ἡμῶν παρὰ τὴν εὐχήν. In εὐχήσταται the force of the middle verb is to be observed. In the active, the term signifies to bear, carry; in the middle, to carry off as our own, receive. Hence it is very applicable to the receiving of rewards, or punishments; as here, and in Eph. 6, 8. Col. 3, 25., in all which passages the action is put for the merces, or reward of the action, whether for good, or for evil. Αὕτα τῶν σώματων. Erasm., Tirin., Vatab., and others render thus: "per corpus." But that cannot be the sense, since under the τευχάμενα must also be comprehended criminal thoughts, and all evil mental habits. Beza, and most recent Commentators, rightly, take it for εἰ τῶν σώματων, "in the body," "in this life." The words following are added, to explain and strengthen the preceding. Πρὶς signifies according to, suitably to.

It is remarked by Theophyl. and Ecumen., that in the ἐστε ἁγαθῶν, ἐστε κακῶν, motives are suggested both of reward and punishment; and all the antient Commentators are agreed that hence it is plain the soul will be punished in conjunction with the body which it occupied in this life. See Acts 17, 31. 1 Cor. 4, 5. 2 Thess. 1, 7. 2 Tim. 4, 1.

11. εἴδοτες ὅτι τῶν φόβων τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀνθρώπων πείθομεν. The Apostle again uses the plural of himself only: "since therefore we know." Φόβον refers to the awful tribunal just mentioned. The sense, then, is: "well knowing how the Lord is to be feared," ἀνθρώπων πείθομεν. The antient Commentators, as
also Hamm. and others, assign to these words the sense: "we strive to sway men, by giving none occasion to stumble, providing things honest in the sight of all men." But, however that may be true of the Apostle, it does not appear to be the sense intended; neither is it necessarily required by the words following, on account of which the Commentators in question seem to have devised the interpretation. The plain and natural sense is that assigned by Grot. and most other modern Commentators, "we endeavour to persuade men, by means of these awful considerations, to embrace the Gospel, and obey what it enjoins, that they may avoid the evil, and attain the good."

The meaning of the next words is not very clear. Hence the variety of interpretations. The words come in very awkwardly after εἰδότες πείθομεν, whether δὲ be taken (with some) for a simple copula, or whether for an adversative. Of the attempts made in the way of critical conjecture take the following. Some insert an οὐκ, or make the sentence in effect negative, by placing a mark of interrogation. But this method produces a frigid sense; and the other is both unauthorized and harsh. Bishop Hoadley would render πείθομεν convince, and the δὲ "and thereby." But no reliance can be placed on any such violent and factitious interpretations. Various others may be seen in Rosenm., not one of which seems probable. To me it rather appears that there is an ellipsis, here harsh indeed, but such as is not unusual to the Apostle, namely, of οὕτω πείθομεν at τε, and to be supplied from the preceding. The sense will then be: "In thus urging you to embrace the Gospel, by motives both of fear and hope, we are made manifest to God, and your consciences." Yet this has some of the harshness found in all the other interpretations. I may then be permitted to suggest a new mode of removing the difficulty, by a change of punctuation, thus: place εἰδότες—πείθομεν in a parenthesis, or, at least, put a period after πείθομεν, and
take ἴσως in the sense "we are already manifest to God," namely, that such are our views. This use of ἴσως was doubtless suggested by the ἴσως just before.

'Ελπίζω δὲ—ἵσως ἴσως, "and I trust I am so (manifest) to your minds," i.e. I trust it is also manifest to your minds and judgments. This sense of ἴσως is found in many passages of the New Testament. See Schleus.* Lex. It is strange that almost all Commentators should render it consciences. The syntax δὲ, autem, is often found in Thucyd.

Here Wets. compares a very beautiful passage of Plato Gorg.: χαίρειν οὐν ἐόσθε τὰς τιμὰς τὰς τῶν πολιτῶν ἀνδρών, τὴν ἐπιθείαν σκοτίαν πειρόμαι τῷ ὑμνῷ ὅς ἐν δύναμι, βέλτιστος ὑπὸ καὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἐκείνου ἀποθεωτὶκὰ ἀπωθεωτικῶν. Παρακάλω δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ἀνθρώπους καθε ὅσον δύναμι.

12. οὐ γὰρ πάλιν—ὑμῶν. Here we have (as Schlit. observes) an anticipation (by prolepsis) of an objection, such as: "Why, then, if your views be so manifest to us, do you again commend yourself to us." To which the answer is: "I do it not for the sake of self-commendation, but I commend myself, in order to afford you matter and cause to glory of me, namely, that you have been converted by a true Apostle." Thus there is an ellipsis in οὐ γὰρ πάλιν ἐαυτοὺς συνισταμένη, or συμφιλ. is a vox praegnans. Theophyl. well paraphrases: εἰς τούτους τοὺς λόγους ξηδείμεν, οὐχ ἐαυτοὺς συνιστώντες, "we do not say this, as commending ourselves," i.e. for the purpose of commending ourselves. See also Theodoret. The above seems a far more probable mode of filling up the ellipsis than that adopted by Rosenm., who paraphrases thus: "Nec enim hanc in rem plura dicam, ne me denuo vobis commendare videar," Doddr. observes, that it is clear from hence, and ch. 8. that the Corinthians were ready to misrepresent the care St.

* Thus Jaspis paraphrases: "planè mihi est persuasum, vos quoque me bonum virum cognitum perspectumque habere."
Paul took to vindicate himself, as pride and vainglory. On the other hand, they would have interpreted his silence as the effect of guilt and confusion. He therefore plainly, and very properly, tells them, that he said this in his own necessary defence, and to furnish his friends with an answer to those whose consciences condemned them, while they endeavoured to asperse him."

Κάωχημα here denotes "matter for boasting," i.e. for feeling pride and satisfaction.

The words following more fully develope the sense of the preceding, and the expression τοὺς ἐν προσατηρ καωχαρένους, is a periphrasis descriptive of the false teachers. Ἰνα ἔχητε. Here there is some verb wanting. Theophr. supplies λέγειν καὶ καωχαρεθαι, which may be admitted, but the elliptical term, in regular construction, can only be καωχ.; as Rom. 4, 2. Πρὸς is rendered against. But in all this there is something harsh. I cannot but think that it were better simply to supply καωχημα, and render πρὸς "in comparison with," "that you might have a matter of boasting over us in comparison with," &c. That by the following words the false teachers are designated, there can be no doubt; but the exact sense of the terms it is not easy to ascertain. The antient Commentators regard them as descriptive of hypocrisy. Thus Theophr. (from Chrys.) interprets ἐν προσατηρ by ἐν τοῖς πρὸς ἐπιθελεσι καὶ κατὰ πρόσατηρ, namely, such (he adds) as had an appearance, or wore the mask of piety, but carried nothing good in their hearts. But the καωχαρένους will scarcely admit of this interpretation. I therefore prefer (with Drus., Pisc., Grot., Est., and most modern Commentators) to interpret the words as descriptive of those (namely, the false teachers) who were proud of their outward advantages, their learning, eloquence, wealth, rank, &c.,

* Thus Grot. compares πρόσατηρ with the Hebr. πωσε in 1 Sam. 16, 7. where the Sept. has ἔχον. He explains πρόσωπον of πολωθήματα that which is highly esteemed among worldly-wise men. And so.
as opposed to the virtues of the heart, that purity of heart, and that testimony of a good conscience of which Paul had reason to boast. See supra 1, 12. So Mackn., who observes that ἐν προσώπῳ here denotes those superficial outward qualities, which raise the admiration of the vulgar, and of which, it seems, the false teachers boasted; whilst he was deficient in the qualities of the heart, namely, sincerity, honesty, disinterestedness, benevolence, and concern for the glory of God.” And, considering the circumstances of the Apostle, and of the false teachers, there can be no doubt but this is the true interpretation.

13. εἴτε γὰρ ἐξεστημεν—ὑμῖν. On the scope and exact sense of these words neither the antient nor modern Commentators are quite agreed. Some of both classes (as Locke) think this is a tacit reply to a charge from some of the Corinthians (See ch. 11, 1, 12, 6 and 11.), that St. Paul was a fool or madman, for what he said in commendation of himself; and then the meaning is, “You say I am distracted for my present conduct; but this is between God and myself. I am sure you Corinthians ought not to say it; for all my sober thoughts and most painful labours are for you.” To this, however, Doddr. makes objections. He takes the ἐξεστ. to denote being transported beyond oneself and the due exercise of reason, through zeal for God’s glory.” But this comes to much the same thing.* I cannot, however, regard this in the light of a tacit answer


* Thwophyl. pursues, but more successfully, the same kind of interpretation, by softening down the ἐξεστ. thus: “Ἀν τε τι μέγα φθεγγόμεθα (ἐκπανοι ἁγ ὑμῶν κυλεῖ, ἐμπερ καὶ ἄλλακον ἁφροῦνη) διὰ τίνος θεοῦ τούτο ποιούμε, ἢν μὴ ὑμεῖς νομίζοντες ἡμᾶς, εἰσελθεῖς, αὐτηναφόντε, καὶ ἀπολύσεις. Ἀν τε τι μέτρων καὶ τακτικῶν ἔνωσε, ἢ μᾶς, ἢν μᾶθης τακτικοφονεῖν. Some antients, and also Chovt. would understand those exstacies which the Apostle had.
to any charge of madness or folly; though such is the opinion of some antient Commentators; since the γὰρ evidently confines it to what went just before: and therefore I most approve of the interpretation of Theodoret: Σωφροσύνην ἐνταύθα τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐκάλεσε, ἐκστασιν ἤ ἐκ τῶν κατοχθωμάτων διήγησιν. And so the Schol. ap. Matth. And this exposition is supported by Vorst., Beza, Menoch., Tirin., Rosenm., Jaspis, and most recent Commentators.* Schleus., in his Lex., also supports this interpretation; but he mistakes the true ratio metaphora, by aiming at being very literal. He says it means “to exceed due measure in my commendation of myself.” But this weakens the force of the term, in which there is much acrimony. Εἴεσταιαι or ἐξεστήκεναι τοῦ νυν, or τῶν φρενῶν, or the like, were phrases used to denote being mad, or a fool; on which I have treated at Mark 3, 21. But the phrase seems to have been sometimes used metaphorically in the sense to boast, since all vain boasting is mere folly, and the vain boaster is the greatest fool. Thus ἀφραυ and ἀφροσύνη, are used respectively of a fool, and folly, in 2 Cor. 11, 1 and 16 and 21. compared with 12, 6 and 7. I could, too, if it were

* Of all the moderns, the true interpretation was most distinctly seen and ably discussed by Krebs, Obs. p. 301.; in the following masterly note: “Non audiendi videntur, qui hoc verbum ad ecstases Pauli, de quibus infra, putant referendum; cum totius orationis consilii et seriei non conveniat: propius ad rem accedunt, qui έξεστηκεν de insanid, qualis scilicet nonnullis videbatur, interpretantur, adeo ut statuatur, Paulum, ob singularem zelum, quem in munere suo obeundo adhibebat, quibusdam visum fuisse insanire: quod ipsum quoque Jeremia prophete accidisse, testis est Josephus, a. 10, 7, 5. Οἱ ἡγεμόνες καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖς ὃς ἔξεστήκατα τῶν φρενῶν αὐτὸν οὖν ἔφαθαλικον. Sed, ut verum fatetur, nec hæc sententia mihi probatur, cum oppositioni τοῦ σωφρονείν nullo modo sit congruens. Nam σωφρονείν, totius orationis ratione exigeunte, hic est modo de se loqui: ergo, ex lege oppositionis, ἔκστάναι glorianti notionem obtinere debet. I would add, that the complete phrase occurs in Eurip. Bacch. 340. ἔξεστησι φρενῶν, and Eschin. p. 28, 18. ἔξεστησι δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ τὴν αἰραίν βάρεως ἤνεγκα, & 33, 21.
necessary, adduce many passages of the Classical writers where there is a similar allusion. Now the opposite to this was expressed by σωφρόνειν. Thus in Acts 26, 25., in answer to a charge of madness, St. Paul says: ἄληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποθέγγομαι.

It is manifest that the verbs must here be repeated: a breviloquentia found elsewhere in St. Paul, as Rom. 2, 28. With respect to the words Θεῷ and ὑμῖν, the general sense intended by them is well traced by Theodoret thus: ἀμφότερα δὲ ὁρθῶ ποιῶ λογισμῷ. Thus Θεῷ may denote "for the glory of God, to whom the praise of my virtues is due, and not my own glory." By ὑμῖν is meant, "for your advantage," namely, by setting you an example of modesty and humility." So the antient and the best modern Commentators explain.

14. ἣ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνέχει ἡμῖν. This seems to rise out of the former; and the construction is (I think) traced by Dr. Whitby better than any other of our English Paraphrists, as follows: "For the love of Christ constraineth us (thus to promote his glory and seek your good) because," &c. Or better thus: "For (your benefit, I say,) the love I bear to Christ compels, urges me to act as I do (and promote his glory, and zealously further your salvation, and that of all men)." Chrys. well explains συνέχει by οὐκ ἀφίνοιν ἡμᾶς ἐχαρᾶειν. ΟΕcumen., by συνάδει, which illustrates the ratio metaphorae.

Theodoret, however, thinks this sentence is properly connected with ver. 13. Διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμοῦμεθα—εἰάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι, and, consequently, that ver. 10—13. are parenthetical. A very ingenious criticism, and which is adopted by Noesselt, but (I think) not well founded; since at that rate we ought to supply after ἡμῖν the words εἰάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι: which would be hardly consistent with the words following. The question, however, is, what are we to understand by the ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ? Some take
it of the love which Christ bears to us, as ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ in Rom. 5, 8. 2 Cor. 13, 13., ἀγάπη Χριστοῦ in Eph. 3, 14. This interpretation was adopted by Theophyl. and Theodoret, and has been strenuously maintained by Rosenm. Most modern Commentators, however, as Beza, Grot., Calvin, and Schleus., take the ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ to denote the love borne towards him; as in John 15, 9 and 10. Rom. 35. And this (they say) is favoured by the course of the reasoning. But such a point, in so irregular and desultory a writer as St. Paul, is not always easy to be ascertained: and perhaps the former interpretation may deserve the preference. The sense (which can only be expressed in a paraphrase) seems to be this: "For a love similar to that which animated Christ to die for the salvation of men, impels us to attempt all means whatever, encounter all dangers, and incur all sorts of obloquy." Then the words following will show the motive for this conduct; and may be rendered: "Since we reason and think that," &c.

Εἰ, "if (as is the case)," i. e. since. So Theophyl.: ἐςδ, &c. In the same sense it occurs in Matt. 22, 45. Efs, "one (even Christ)," i. e. if Christ died, as one for all, in the place of all, as an expiation and atonement, for the sins of all." For I cannot approve of the version of Rosenm. and other recent Commentators "in commodum;" since though ὑπὲρ has sometimes that sense, yet when the subject is the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, it can have no other sense than that which I have assigned, and on which the antient and all the best modern Commentators are agreed. I cannot but consider it incumbent on me to caution students, and the younger part of my readers, against this gloss on ὑπὲρ, (too frequently countenanced by recent Commentators,) since its tendency is evidently very favourable to So- cinianism; it being quite consistent with that system which rejects the fundamental doctrine of atone- ment; for even on that hypothesis Christ's death
tended to the benefit of man, but in no other way than the death of Socrates.

The very next words, ἀκούσας ὑαμιν, are interpreted by the foreign Commentators in the same spirit with the preceding, in which folly and rashness (not to say irreverence) are equally prominent. None surely but those who wish to be deceived, can bring themselves to interpret this (as do Gabler, Noeiselt, and Rosenm.) of the obligation under which all lie to be dead unto sin. The context and the scope of the whole passage forbid ἀκούσας to have the metaphorical sense which they ascribe to it. This gloss, then, (cooked up from Est. and Schloeting) must be given to the winds. The language of the Apostle is popular, and must not be judged by the rules of strict philosophical accuracy. The sense, however, is so obvious, that the ancient Commentators have not one of them thought it necessary to explain what they thought no one could mistake. The early modern Commentators, on the contrary, chose, as usual, to dilate on what is plain. The most judicious moderns regard it as a figurative hyperbole, said logice, since all were as good as dead, in a state of condemnation, and thus might be considered as dead. But, in fact, the expression may be justified on the strictest principles of grammatical accuracy. There is an ellipsis of ἀκούσας. Now

* "For," to use the words of Whitby, "in these two verses the word ἀκούσας, dead, is four times used, once before, and thrice after these words, all were all dead, and both before and after it undeniable signifies death in the proper acceptation of the word. Who then can think that in the second time, in the same sentence, it should import only an obligation to die to sin, or to ourselves? Whenever in the Scripture it bears a metaphorical sense, some other word is joined to it which enforces the sense; as when we are said to die to sin, Rom. 6. 2. to die with Christ, Rom. 6. 8. Col. 2. 20. to die to the law, Gal. 2. 19. to die to the world, Gal. 6. 14. Col. 3. 3. Here, therefore, nothing being added to it to inforce the sense, it must be deemed alien from the text."

† So Dodd: paraphrases: "For had not all, even the very best of men, been in a state of condemnation and death, there would have been no need of his dying for them."
(as I have before said, and proved,) that particle very frequently carries with it the ellipsis of ἀλλὰς. Thus the sense is as follows: "Then all would otherwise (i.e. if he had not died) have suffered death."* This idiom, especially in the verb to be, is found in our own language: and when Theophyl. paraphrases πάντες ἤμεν ἀπολελυκότες, it is evident that he had it in view.

15. καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν—ἐγερθέντι. These words are meant to illustrate the purpose of Christ's death, namely, to redeem from spiritual and eternal death, not those who should rest content with bare thankfulness for the benefit, but such as should exert themselves to rise, as much as their human nature would permit, above that wretched state from which the mercy of Christ had delivered them; those who should aim at that spiritual life to which he had raised them, and the complete and eternal fruition of which he had purchased for them by his death.

By living to themselves is meant living subserviently to their own carnal inclinations, as opposed to Christ's plans for their spiritual regeneration. And this is further suggested by the words following: ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι.

The reasoning (which is popular) seems to be this: That it were most injurious to Christ to frustrate his holy and gracious purpose, which was not only our delivery from spiritual death and perdition, but our restoration to that spiritual life and happiness which we had lost in Adam. And this is what is meant by living to ourselves, and our carnal inclinations, without reference to those purposes of our Redeemer. Chrysost. (who has here risen above all the Commentators) had something of this in mind when he wrote the beautiful passage above cited. And

* On which Chrys. observes: ἐσχάτης γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀθλητής, καὶ γείτὼν αὐτῆς χαλεπώτερον, αὐτοῦ πράγμα τοσοῦτον ἐπιδειξιμένον, ἐφρεθήνα τινας μετὰ τὴν τοσαύτην αὐτοῦ πρόνοιαν ἐνδεικτέον. Καὶ γὰρ πολλῆς ἡ ἀγάπη ἡ ὑπερβολη, καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοσαύτης οἰκουμένης, καὶ οὕτω διακείμενης ἀποθανεῖν.
Theophyl. concludes his annotation with the following admirable reflection: τις γὰρ ὅλης, χρεά ἐκείνων ἀνέλθειν, εἰ μὴ ἐμέλλομεν καὶ ημεῖς τῶν ὁμοίων τυχεῖν; ὥστε καὶ διότι ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ημῶν, καὶ διότι ἐξακολούθησιν ἡμῖν, καὶ διότι τῶν ἀρραβώναις ημῖν τῆς αὐλαργίας ἔδωκεν, ὀφείλομεν κατὸς ζην, καὶ οὐχ τῶν ἐστίν τινα ἐπιρροήν.

Mr. Valpy here observes, that from ver. 13. to 6, 12. the Apostle gives another reason for his disinterestedness in preaching the Gospel; and that is his life to Christ, who, by his death, having given him life who was dead, he concludes, that in gratitude he ought not to live to himself any more. He therefore being as in a new creation, had now no longer any regard to the things or persons of this world; but being made by God a minister of the Gospel, he minded only the faithful discharge of his duty in that embassy, and accordingly took care that his behaviour should be as he describes it below, 6, 3—10.

The passage is thus paraphrased by Wets.: "Omnes mortui sumus. Prior vita, quam nobis vivebamus, finem habet: Incipit jam nova periodus novâ vitâ, quam Christo debemus."

16. ὅστε ἡμεῖς—γυναῖκες. The sense of this verse is not a little obscure, from brevity of expression, and the Hebraic and mystic nature of the phraseology. Hence the variety of opinions, all of which it is impossible for me to detail, much less review. And it is unfortunate, that from the extreme flexibility of the terms it is easier to devise a tolerable sense, than to ascertain and establish the true one. The ancient Commentators (I conceive) have here failed in discerning the Apostle’s sense, by explaining the words as meant to be affirmed of all Christians. The best modern Commentators have, more rightly, maintained that they are only to be understood of St. Paul, or at most his brother Apostles who had forsaken the errors of Judaism. Some modern Commentators (See Pole) increase the difficulty by grotesquely mixing together both these
senses. To me it appears that the words are naturally connected with the 12th verse, and that the 13th and 14th verses are parenthetical. The ὅτε is thus resumptive, (See Hoog. de Part.) and gives, as it were, an epilogus, or coda, to a former chain of reasoning. Grot. and other modern Commentators rightly notice that κατὰ σάρκα refers to those things on which men, nay, even teachers of religion, sometimes pride themselves, namely, external qualifications, as of form, appearance, learning, eloquence, wealth, rank, and all other carnal advantages.

Some eminent modern Commentators, as Rosenm., Est., Le Clerc, Locke, and Mackn., take the words to signify, "I have no particular regard for any one on the score of being circumcised, or a Jew." But that can only be included among the particulars of carnal privileges, and perhaps not occupy a prominent place among them. The αὐτό τοῦ ὁμί is interpreted by most modern Commentators "from the time of my conversion." It may also have reference to what immediately precedes, and denote "from the time of this sacrifice of Christ." Certainly the κατὰ σάρκα, relates to the οἱ ὁμίνες—εὐαριστη, in the preceding verse, according to the most approved interpretation of those words. The ὁμί may very well signify that time, since it is used of any time, especially present and past, but chiefly recently past time; as Acts 7, 52, and often in the Classical writers. Thus the Greek Lexicographers render it ἀρχαιος.

Ὅδοςαμὲν is used (by a Hebraism) in the sense, "we have respected no one," or "we respect no one." The words following εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐγγείκαμεν—γιγνόσκομεν, are not a little obscure, and admit of at least two senses. Some early modern Commentators, and Whitby, interpret them of Paul's knowledge of the nature of the Messiah before his conversion, which was doubtless carnal, yet such as even the Apostles themselves clung to till after the resurrection of Christ and the illumination of the holy spirit: q. d. "And though we formerly recognised in Christ a
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**second King, yet now we know him no longer in**

**that light, but as a mighty Spiritual deliverer, whose**

**advocate is not of this world.**” Others, as Grot. and

**almost all recent Commentators, take the indicative**

**for the subjunctive (more Hebr. and render:**

**”We may have known Christ in the flesh, had**

**conversed with him on earth, and enjoyed the**

**benefits of his personal instruction, yet we should now**

**not recognize him no longer as the Jesus we knew, but**

**as the glorified Saviour and judge of men, and the**

**heavenly King.” This Rosenm. thinks is levelled**

**against some sojourners at Corinth, who, proud of**

**having enjoyed the personal converse of Christ, and**

**perhaps affinity by relationship, affected to lord it**

**over others, as if they enjoyed a ground of just**

**superiority. See 1 Cor. 1, 12. For further particulars in**

**support of this interpretation, I must refer in the note of**

**Rosenm. The interpretation, however, seems precarious,**

**and the former (I think) deserves our preference.**

**Nestle, p. 17. Rosenm. offers the following exposi**

**tion: “Eumque aitius fuerimus Christiani sectantes**

**tum demum non porro tales oportet esse.” But this is too literal, and evidently fictitious.**

**This seems to be a resumption of what was treated on in**

**the previous and meant to further develop the sentiment and show that it was intended to**

**be another general: i.e. there is here substituted a**

**general mark in the place of a particular one.**

**On each of the clauses of this sentence ζητεί must**

**be supplied. As ζητεῖ διὰ is a formula signifying**

**to be admitted (by baptism) into the society of**

**Christ and his followers, to become a Christian.**

**In Greek usage ζητεῖ the ζητεῖ has what may be called**

**an operant sense, i.e. “he is a new creature, being**

**renewed from original sin; and he becomes rege-

**The Rev. Pell explains: “be ingrafted into Christ by the spirit**

**and received in his regeneration by baptism.”**
nerate, inasmuch as he has undertaken an obligation to abandon the lusts of the flesh," alluded to in the preceding verses. Schliting and Rosenmüller interpret the ἐστις debe, "for it is his duty so to be; it is his profession; and this is the especial force of Christ's religion, and without which in vain will any one say he is in Christ." Thus the Christian is like an edifice rebuilt, being created in Christ Jesus unto good works."

17. τὰ ἄρχαῖα παρῆλθεν—πάντα. Here we have a farther illustration of the preceding. In the interpretation of these words many Commentators, both antient and modern, take the ἄρχαῖα to relate to the abrogation of the Jewish economy. And of this exposition the recent Commentators furnish abundant illustrations. I cannot, however, embrace it, as being too limited and hypothetical: for it proceeds on the supposition that the Apostle has here alone, or chiefly, in view certain Judaizing Christians, or persons who prided themselves on the external advantages of connection, or society with Christ. But I have already shown how precarious is that interpretation. I must therefore assign to ἄρχαῖα the full sense, since I conceive the Apostle meant it to be applied generally; and it seems to have especial reference to adult baptism. I say generally, since, as it regarded the Jew, it would include an abandonment of all his former (for that is the import of ἄρχαῖα) prejudices, and narrow views, also a going through that change of principles which may best be conceived by contrasting together the dispensations of the law and the Gospel: as it regarded the Gentile, it would denote a still greater change, even the total change especially expressed by the term καυρὴ κτίσις, as implying a total abandonment of the errors and corruptions of Atheism, or Polytheism, and also those demoralizing principles which were generated and fostered by such opinions. Finally, as regarded both Jews and Gentiles, it import'd a solemn abandonment of sin and immorality, a renouncing
the works of the flesh and the Devil, a ceasing to
worship the devil and henceforth a living after the
flesh, a change which might well be called a kainê
"change.

The kainê should apply to infants: but when,
and when admitted into Christ's Church by bap-
tsism, it is a new consecration. take on themselves
and enter into for them by their own hands to perform the same, even to
be ruled in all because they undergo the
change. Theirs life is a kainê krisis in
which if they would have been had they
been strangers for the old man, which is
ruined and put off. See Rom. 6, 6.

To enlarge further on the
place, and I should not
and I not observed the expan-
sions of a general to be too vague
theological students
more ideas.

Inaccessible Rabbinical passages,
not permit me to introduce.

Theoply. rightly
these things are given us by God.

observed by Rosenm., that by all
be understood all the things now in
and God had planned and effected by
the salvation of men. The whole of the
means to say, is to be ascrib-
I. X.,
ent unto himself by Christ (as
us all
his gracious offers), whether
made to all by
the grace of Christ, which was efficacious
and who
hath given to us (namely himself and the other Apostles) the ministry of reconciliation, i.e. the office of announcing this gracious offer to men, and pressing it on their acceptance. All this is fully illustrated at ver. 20.

19. αἰς ὅτι Θεός ἐν Χριστῷ — καταλλαγής. This is meant to further develop the sentiment propounded in the last verse; and therefore the best Commentators have rightly rendered αἰς ὅτι by quippe quod, or nempe. Others, however, defend the common rendering sicut. (on which see Hoogev. or Valpy in loc.) The sense is: “Namely, it was God himself who, by Christ, reconciled the whole world to himself.* This seems to involve a point on which the ancient Commentators particularly dilate; namely, that God, in his mercy, sought out the world, and not the world him, for salvation. Some other such like reflections may be seen in the theological and practical Commentators.

It is obvious that by κόσμος is here meant the human race generally, without distinction of religion, nation, condition, all without exception.

19. μὴ λογισμένος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, “not reckoning, or imputing to them, and (by the adjunct) not visiting with punishment their former transgressions.” So Rom. 4, 8. ὅ ὅφει μὴ λογισμαί Κύριος ἀμαρτίαν. Compare also Rom. 4, 3 & 6. and 1 Cor. 18, 5., where see the notes, in which the ratio metaphoricæ is explained.

19. καὶ δέμενος ἐν ἧμιν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. Most Commentators, after Grot., regard δέμενος ἐν ἧμιν as a Hebraism (referring to Ex. 4, 15.); in the sense “giving any one orders.” It is, however, sometimes found in the Classical writers, and seems to be a metaphor derived from putting any thing in any

*Weits. takes ἐν καταλλάσσων in the sense reconciliavit, καθήλωσε.

On this subject there is the following remark in Theop. Sim. 82. τὸ σωτήριον υἱὸς (crucifixion of Christ) δι’ αὐτὸ τὸν κόσμον αἰνετούσας δὲ μονογενῆς παις τοῦ Θεοῦ.
one's hands, or, figuratively, committing to him any trust. So here the sense is simply: "hath committed to our charge this word of reconciliation," i.e. the delivery of this message of reconciliation; this being suggested in the very term Gospel. Rosenm. thinks the καταλλαγῆς is governed of περὶ understood. But he is mistaken. The genitive is put, after the manner of the Hebrew, for its cognate adjective; q.d. "the message which bears this mode of reconciliation."

20. ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὐν πρεσβεύουμεν — Θεῷ. The οὖν is here very significant, and may be thus expressed. "Thus, then, by virtue of this office of reconciliation committed to us, the Apostles of Christ, we are now discharging this ambassadorial office." "Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, "on the part of (for so the πρεσβ. requires) Christ, the sender." In this sense ὑπὲρ occurs in Plato. Menex. (cited by Wets.) καὶ αὐτὸς δεῖμαι ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνων, eorum nomine. The word πρεσβεύω, in the Classical writers, signifies to discharge the office of ambassador, or sometimes merely to convey a message for another, without being empowered to do more than deliver and explain it.* And this, from the nature of the case, must be the sense here.

The next words are explanatory of the ὑπὲρ, and show that, in delivering the message, they act on the part of God; and therefore God may be said to exhort and entreat them to be reconciled unto him; ambassadors and messengers delivering any one's message being supposed to represent their sender. The message and exhortation thus earnestly enjoined is καταλλάγης τῷ Θεῷ; on which Theoph. remarks that it is not καταλλαγέως τῷ Θεῷ, but ὡς καταλλάγης αὐτῶ. This, however, seems a needless refinement, the expression being used in the same manner as at Matt. 5, 24. διαλλάγης τῷ ἀδελφῷ. It therefore simply means: "embrace the means of

* So Thucyd. 7, 9. (speaking of the messengers sent by Nicias to the Athenians) εἰ πρὸς τοῦ Νικία, δοὺς τῷ ἄνω γλῶσσας εἰρέω αὐτῶι, εἰπὼν, καὶ εἰ τις τῷ ἄνω ἱδρύειτο, καὶ τῷ ἐπιστάλεις ἀκέ-δοντα.
reconciliation offered you, by embracing the Gospel and fulfilling the conditions of salvation.”

21. τὸν γὰρ μὴ γνῶνα—αὐτῶ. In γὰρ there is an ellipsis which may be thus expressed: “For (not to mention other proofs of his goodness and mercy).” The expression τὸν μὴ γνῶνα ἀμαρτιῶν is (as Vorst. observes) an emphatic periphrasis of Christ; and, indeed, it has infinite dignity and beauty. It is explained by Theophyl. τὸν αὐτοδικαίωσιν διὸν: by Erasm., Beza, and others: “did no sin.” But this is very inartificial. Others render: “knew no sin experimentally.” Grot., Glass, and others, account the expression a Hebraism, and explain it: “was not conscious of sin.” See Ps. 35, 11. and 25, 5. It should therefore seem to be a dignified and refined way of expressing the former sense, with which we may compare the “Hic murus ahenius esto, nil conscire sibi, nullà pallescere culpà.”

21. ἀμαρτιῶν ἐκοινῆσαι. These words are by some, as Hamm. and Whitby, considered as sacrificial terms. and to be explained by their use in the old law, when applied to legal sacrifices. Thus they take ἀμαρτία for sin-offering, like the Heb. מִנַּן in Lev. 7, 2; הַעַשָּׁה and הָעַשֶּׁה for הָעַשֶּׁה in Ps. 40, 7 Exod. 29, 14. (where the Sept. has περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν) and elsewhere. And so Οἰκumen., who explains it τὸ περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν τῶν. Others, however, as Vorst. and Schoettg., regard the expression as an abstract for concrete, i. e. αὐτὸ ἀμαρτανόντα ἐκοινῆσαι, “treated him as a sinner.” So the Ps. μετὰ ἀνόμου ἐλαχίστῃ. On either interpretation, indeed (as Mr. Slade observes) the doctrine of atonement is clearly deduced. And though the latter is represented by Whitby as wholly indefensible, yet it is adopted by no less a critic than Bp. Bull.*

* His words are as follows: “Certum est (quod notant plerique interpretes doctissimi) in utroque membro hujus ānuolēsēus abstrictum ponit pro concreto, more Hebræo, peccatum pro peccatore, justitīa pro justo.—Ut Christus propter nos peccatum, sive peccator, factus fuit, ita nos justitīa Dei, sive justi, coram Deo facti sumus propter Christum; hoc est, ut propter nostra peccata Chris-
The peculiar use here of ἀμαρτ. was introduced to strengthen the antithesis; and it is well observed by the ancient Commentators that ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν is a much stronger expression than ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐπαληθεύει.

21. ἵνα ἡμεῖς γνωμένα δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ. Here there is a Hebraism, abstract for concrete, namely δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ for δικαιο Θεοῦ, i.e. ἐνάστιον Θεοῦ, "be accounted justified, and accepted." So Theophyl.: Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη, ὅταν τις χάρις δικαιωθῇ, ὅταν μηδεμία κῆλες εὑρεθῇ. And it is well observed by Doddr., that "this is a very strong phrase to signify our being accepted of God, as perfectly righteous, when considered as by faith united to him who was perfectly so." There is (he adds) an evident and beautiful contrast between Christ being made sin, and our being made righteousness, that is, treated as perfectly righteous. Slade here refers to Dr. Magee, Illust. No. 27., and Vitringa on Is. 53. 10., as there quoted, and also Barrow's Serm. 32. vol. 1. fol.

21. ἐν αὐτῷ, "by him." So the Heb. 2.

The sense of the verse is thus neatly expressed by Theodoret: Ἀμαρτίας γὰρ ἐλεύθερος ἄν τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν ὑπέμεινε θάνατον, ἵνα τῶν ἀνθρώπων λύσῃ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, καὶ τοῦτο κληρεῖσ ὅπερ Ἰησοῦ ἡμεῖς, ἐκάλεσαν ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ ὑπὲρχεν αὐτῶν τὸν γὰρ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν ἔδαφος ἄτο πλαύτων.

CHAP. VI.

VERSE 1. συνεφεύγοντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν—ὑμᾶς.

Most Commentators, ancient and modern, are agreed

tus tanquam peccator tractatus fuit, cùm reverà peccati express fuerit; ita nos, propter ejus justitiam et satisfactionem, tanquam justi a Deo tractamin, cùm reverà perfectè justi non simul, acil. propter Christi sacrificium, remissis nobis possessitibus peccatis nostris, concessoque jure ad vitam æternam." Exam. Cens. sive Resp. ad Anima. 11.

The learned Prelate further shows, that these words of the Apostle afford no countenance to the notion of Christ's righteousness being imputed to believers.
that at ἰερευνόντες we are to understand τῷ Θεῷ. Rosenm., however, thinks this harsh; and remarks that the Apostles are only so called as being joint workers for the same end, the conversion of men. And so Jaspis. But the propriety of the common interpretation is defended by ver. 20. in the last chapter, where they are said to act as πρεσβεῖς, or procurators, on the part of Christ. And at 1 Cor. 3, 9. the Apostles and Christian teachers are called ἰερευνό Θεω. Theophyl., indeed, conjoins both the above senses, as also does Dodd. Theodoret understands it of the latter only, αὕτης τοις παρακαλομένοις διακατατησίων οἱ πρεσβεύοντες.

1. μὴ εἰς κενὸν—ὁμας, "we exhort you not to receive the grace of God in vain," i. e. not so to act as to seem to have received it in vain. By the χάρις is meant the gracious offer of salvation and opportunity thereof, the grace contained in the Gospel,* and reconciliation with God, offered through Christ, of which there is mention at 5, 18—91. Wets. compares a similar passage of Plut. p. 125 E. παρεσκευασμένος ἄφιγμαι τε χάριν εἰμενὸς διαλαττομένου.

1. εἰς κενὸν is for κενὸς, "without any fruit or benefit to you."† The Apostle does not here advert to the positive injury attendant thereon; though the neglect of offered grace manifestly increases condemnation. It is rightly remarked by Mr. Slade, that this may be regarded as a very plain intimation.

* Grace of every kind, both ordinary, as in the case of general Christians, and extraordinary, which was confined to the Apostolic age. See the able note of Whitby in loco, and the masterly Appendix, in which he has successfully shown that God, in every succeeding age, has vouchsafed to men not only the outward dispensations of his Word to be the ordinary means of their conversion and sanctification, but also some inward assistances and operations of the Holy Spirit. In this he shows that these assistances may be so explained as to be no more unintelligible than are all the influences of God on the soul, or the temptations of the Devil.

† Of eis κενὸν Wets. adduces an example from Diod. Sic. 19, 9. τὴν ἔχραν εἰς κενὸν οὐκ ἐτόλμων ἐνδείκνυσθαι.
of the possibility of finally departing from grace given.

2. λέγει γὰρ Καίρῳ δεκτῷ ἐπίκουσα σου—σοι. For he (i.e. God) saith (at Is. 49, 8., where he is represented as addressing himself to the Messiah): “In an accepted time I have heard thee, and in a day favourable to the saving of thee have I succoured thee.” Theodoret remarks on the propriety with which the testimony of prophecy is called to strengthen admonition.

Though Θεὸς may be supplied (as Rom. 15, 10.), yet Jaspis renders the λέγει γὰρ not amiss by: “scriptum enim exstat.” The words of the Prophet, it may be observed, are adduced in their spiritual and mystical sense, such as has always been assigned to them even by the Jewish Interpreters.

Καιρὸς δεκτός, παρ γυνή, time of acceptance, or the time when he will receive our prayers for help.† Thus it will answer to the antithetical phrase ἡμερὰ σωτηρίας, “time of, or suitable to, deliverance.” So the Psalmist: “Seek thee in a time when thou mayst be found.” Theophyl. explains it καιρὸς εὐπρόσ-δεκτος, “the time of grace, in which is remission of sins, and a bestowing of justification; the time in which God hearkens to and saves us.” The sense is: “Now is (καὶ ἐξοχήν) the accepted time and the day of salvation; since now it is offered by those whose Divine mission is confirmed by signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.” Though, in a certain sense, the present is the only accepted time, or day of salvation, because on the future we cannot calculate.

The terms ἐπίκουσα and ἐφοβήσα ευχριστά elegantly correspond to each other. The former has here a sense also found in 2 Paral. 18, 20. Gen. 16, 2., namely, “to hearken to, and grant any one’s prayers for

* This is not (as some suppose) a mere Hebraism: which will appear from Seneca Med. 3, 7. Meus dies est: tempore accepto utimur.
help." So Lucian (cited by Wets.) ἕπακοιμασ τῶν εὖχαν. This notion of listening to or granting the request, seems contained in the ἔστιν, which is expressed in our phrase "to lend an ear." Thus hearken (which has perplexed the Etymologists) come from hear and ken (to know or mind).

These verbs may be rendered as presents, nay, (more prophetico,) as futures; which, indeed, the mystical and spiritual sense requires. This the Apostle, in the next verse, skilfully applies to the case in hand.

The present verse is evidently parenthetical, and in the next and following ones the Apostle proceeds, in a style unusually ornate, and in expressions most pathetic, to remind them of his labours and perils for their spiritual benefit, as an additional reason why they should not receive the grace of God in vain.

3. μηδεμάν ἐν μηδενί διδόντες προσκοπήν. Erasm., Vatabl., and Mackn. render, "give no offence," as if it regarded the Corinthians, and the following were moral precepts. But this is very harsh, and the διδόντες will not admit of such a sense. Both the ancient and the best modern Commentators are agreed that the διδόντες belongs to παρακαλοῦμεν at ver. 1., ver. 2. being parenthetical. A Classical writer, indeed, would not have so written; and therefore some take the participle for a verb, or supply ἔστεν. But this would be too arbitrary, and the former method is preferable. The Apostle (I conceive) means to connect with the term παρακαλοῦμεν (which is a general designation of the office of a Christian Minister), as it were, by apposition, a more special exposition of the mode in which he discharged this office of earnest exhortation; q. d. "We are continually exhorting you, we (I say) who give no offence—who—who," &c.

This seems to be the true ratio of the construction. And it may be observed that the Apostle enters into these particulars, in order, thereby, to call upon them for greater attention to his exhorta-
tions, and also, that they may, in some particulars, follow his example. For as Theophyl. with great taste, observes, ἐν τάξει δὲ διηγήσεως συμβαλλεῖ, ἴνα καὶ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὑτὸν ἀφοράσῃ. Such is the scope of the passage, which merits attention, since otherwise this long and affecting paragraph might seem to savour of vain-glory.

The participle μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενί διδόντες seems to be put first, as being the most general of all, and invariably kept in view. Διδόντες προσκοπήν, "putting no stumbling-block (πρόσκομμα, Rom. 14, 13.) by which the course of any Christian may be interrupted, and he be made to trip, or fall," i.e. be shaken in his religious faith, or be altogether turned away from it. This must, of course, import, "endeavouring to throw no stumbling-block; not intentionally throwing any." Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: Οὕτω ἀπευθύνω τάν βίον μου, ὅστε οὐ λέγω ὅτι κατηγορίας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέμψεως ψυχῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ σκανδάλου χαρίζων οὐ διδομί τινι, ἵνα μὴ μαρμηθῇ η διακονία ημῶν. And Theodore: σπουδὴ γὰρ ημῶν μήδε τὴν τυχώσαν πρόφασιν σκανδάλου παρέχειν τινι.

By διακονία some ancient and modern Commentators understand the preaching of the Gospel, or the Gospel itself. But this sense is destitute of authority, nor is there any necessity to inculcate it here, since the frequent signification, office, and ministry, yields a sufficiently good one. Most recent Commentators render, "our ministry." But though the article sometimes bears this sense, yet here it must have its usual one; as appears by the next verse; and η διακονία will denote the ministry in general, i.e. all ministry. For the misconduct of one minister throws a sort of stigma upon the others, indisposes men to listen to their exhortations, and thus injures the religion itself. Indeed, this also the Apostle probably had in view; for it is well observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle here means to hint an admonition to them not so to act as to throw any stumbling-block in the way of unbelievers, and hin-
der their conversion, by giving them occasion to speak or think ill of the religion.

4. άλλα ἐν πάντι συμιστώντες ἐ. ὁ. Θ. δ., "But (what is yet more) approving, manifesting, ourselves as the ministers of God." Συμιστάνειν here denotes to show, manifest, demonstrate; as in Rom. 3, 5 & 8. Gal. 2, 18., and especially in a similar passage infra 7, 11. ἐν πάντι συμετάσατε ἑαυτοῖς ἁγνοῦς εἶναι ἐν τῷ πράγματι. So Theophyl. explains it ἁποδεικνύσεις. This signification arises out of the primitive one "to place together," and imports the juxta-position of two things, for the purpose of showing their comparative size. Ατ δέ Θεοῖ διάκονοι there was no occasion for the early modern Commentators here to stumble. The true ellipsis is ὅτες, nor is there any solecism. The ξυνίστ., &c. seems to have especial reference to unbelievers; q. d. "showing and proving ourselves to be (what they deny) persons to whom is committed a divine legation.

4. ἐν πάντι, "in every circumstance and business, both by words and deeds."

The ἐν ὑπομονῆι must be taken with the following, and seems to be a general term implying endurance of every kind, which is then followed up by several words exemplifying it in specie,* where (as Theoph. observes) the ἐν denotes mode. The observation of Theodoret, however, deserves attention. "The Apostle (says he) gives various instances of the things which invaded him from without, namely, external troubles. He first details his involuntary, and then his voluntary labours." The first remark seems well founded; but not the second. And I would add, that here, as in other similar lists, the Apostle does not throw the particulars together in a confused manner, but distributes them into groups. Thus after the general term ὑπομονῆι πολλή, denoting endurance of hardships and trials of every kind,

* Rosenm. wraps all up by treating the terms following as συνομονή, expressing various kinds of calamities.
comes the first group, ἐν θλίψεω, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις, which seems to denote such afflictions, necessities, and pinching adversity as he every where endured. There moreover appears to be a climax: for ἀνάγκ. is a stronger term than θλιψ.,* and στενοχ. stronger than either, denoting pinching necessity and dire calamity. Thus, in a similar group, infra 12, 10. εὐδοκ. ἐν ἀσθενείας, ἐν ὀβρεισί, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διαγγείλ., ἐν στενοχωρίαις, and Rom. 8, 35. and supra 5, 8. θλιψομεν, ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωροιμεν, where see the note. The strength of the term was not unobserved by Chrysost.

The next words ἐν πληγαίς, ἐν φυλακαῖς advert to those actual and direct persecutions which he sometimes encountered, by stripes and imprisonments. Theophyl. remarks on the accumulation of both, where one would be hard enough to bear. Ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις. This is usually rendered tumults, sedition; and in such, indeed, the Apostle had sometimes to encounter the assaults of the idolatrous rabble at various places. This sense is strenuously, but not (I think) successfully, supported by Grot. I prefer, with all the ancient Commentators, and, of the moderns, Casaub., Beza, Pisc., Sclater, Schmid, Rosenm., and Schleus., to understand it of the life of exile and banishment from place to place, which resulted from persecutions, insomuch that, like his Divine Master, he scarcely had where to lay his head; yet I would include (what some take to be the principal force of the term) that unsettled and wandering life which his very office of Apostle of the Gentiles necessarily brought upon him. And this is countenanced by what he says at 1 Cor. 4, 11., where, in a very similar passage, he says: πεινώμεν καὶ διψώμεν, καὶ γυμνοτείμεν, καὶ ἀστατείμεν. And so ἀκαταστάτας in Is. 54, 11.

5. ἐν κόσμῳ, ἐν ἀγρυπνίας, ἐν ἁστείας. Some an-

* So Theophyl.: τοῦτο ἐπίγας τῆς θλίψεως, ὡς ἄδιέξοδης ἡ γὰρ κακὰ ἄγχονα γὰν ἀνθρωπο.
cient Commentators understand these as the Apostle's voluntary sufferings. But this seems an unfounded notion. The interpretation was, I imagine, devised to afford a countenance to Monkish austerities. The words may very well refer to his corporeal labour at his trade; the ἀγρυπτ. to the abridgment of his nocturnal rest, occasioned by the necessity of making up at over-hours, and in the night time, for part of the day consumed in his Evangelical labours;* and the νηστείαι may very well refer to that scanty fare which a trade followed up with such divided attention would necessarily occasion. The above view (which is completely established by the parallel passage at 1 Cor. 4, 12 & 13. πεινάμεν, καὶ δυνάμεν, καὶ γυμνασμένοι, καὶ κολαφίζομεθα, καὶ ἀστατώμεν καὶ κοπίαμεν, ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσί) is partly supported by Chrys. and Theophyl. The latter Commentator, in conjunction with some modern Interpreters, thinks that by the νηστείαι, voluntary, irreligious fastings are meant. But though they may be included, I cannot think they were principally intended by the Apostle. Others (see Hardy) recognise in the ἀγρυπνίαι, ἐν νηστείαις an agonistical metaphor. But that notion seems utterly unfounded.

6. ἐν ἀγρυπνι. This seems to denote integrity, purity, and sanctity of life in general, like the "integerr vitae sclerisque purus" of the Poet. Many Commentators unjustifiably limit the sense of the term, by explaining it of one or other of the species of which this genus consists.

6. ἐν γνώσει. On the sense of this term Commentators are little agreed. Some early modern ones, as Sclater, would understand by it prudence or skill in right action. So Rosenm.: "ut quidquid faciam, suo loco et tempore faciam." And so Schleus, explains it, "cognitio religionis practica, quae se ipsis

* In which view I would compare Ἀσchin. 42, 33. προσέθηκε την ἑκμέλειαν την αὐτοῦ—καὶ φυλακὰς τινας καὶ ἀγρυπνίας. The term is often found united with words expressive of care, trouble, &c., as ταλαιπωρία, φρόνις. See Wetstein's examples.
factis et virtutis studio exserit." Others explain it, "a firm and stable knowledge and persuasion," as opposed to one that is wavering. Grot. interprets it of a knowledge of the law, literal and mystical. But both these last interpretations are hypothetical and precarious. The first may possibly be the true sense. I am, however, inclined to give the preference to that assigned by Chrysost., who takes it to mean, "the wisdom that is from above, the only true wisdom;" not (he adds) like the wisdom of those who seemed to be wise, and boasted of their Gentile knowledge, but were, in Divine wisdom, miserably deficient." Indeed this interpretation is (I conceive) placed beyond doubt by an altogether kindred passage of James 3, 17. γ' θε άνωθεν σοφία πράτον μεν άγαθη ἔστι, &c., where it would seem that the Apostle had this passage of St. Paul in mind. And the interpretation is also supported by Theophyl. Theodoret, indeed, takes it for διασκαλία, which (he adds) is itself laborious. But this signification is utterly unauthorized; nay, it is so harsh that authority itself could not justify it. That Commentator was (I suspect) led into this interpretation from fancying (as many moderns have done) that the Apostle is solely speaking of practical virtues; whereas this class, I imagine, though it consists chiefly of practical virtues, yet has some few ones intermixed in it which are not properly such (as, for example, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίω), since they were such as especially distinguished him from the false Apostles, with whom he seems here to intend a contrast. Besides St. Paul here enumerates qualities which were not his own, and which therefore could not be called practical, as they cost him nothing, namely, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίω, and ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ. Now as the γνώσει occurs before these, (and considering the peculiar sense given to λόγος γνώσεως in ver. 12—14. of the former Epistle,) I have sometimes thought that the Apostle might mean by the γνώσις the λόγος γνώσεως, in the sense in which it is there employed; and that the terms here are placed in order, by climax, namely, ἐν γνώσει,
ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. But these are difficulties attendant on the sense of πνεῦμα ἁγίου and δύναμις Ἐσώ, which (though it is supported by eminent Commentators) induce me to abandon it.

6. ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι. These terms (I conceive) form another group, since they are closely related to each other, and are conjoined at 1 Cor. 13, 4. Rom. 2, 4. and Gal. 5, 22. They are explained conjointly by Theophyl., who observes (from Chrys.) Ἀδαμάντινης. Ὑφίστ, τὸ πάντοθεν παροξυσμόνευ καὶ κεντόμενον, οὐ μόνον μακροθυμεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι. Yet I cannot but think that the χρηστ. is not meant to be represented as exercised towards the same kind of persons as the μακροθυμία. Theodoret has alone seen the sense, who observes, that the Apostle intended μακροθυμίαν as shown περὶ τῶν ἄλλωτρίων, τὴν χρηστότητα περὶ τῶν οἰκείων. I also assent to some modern Commentators, as Erasm. and Est., that in the latter term there is intended an opposition to superciliousness, and starded austerity of manners.

6. ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Some antient and modern Commentators (as Grot.) understand this of the χαρίσματα, or gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as we read of in the former Epistle, and such as the Apostle undoubtedly possessed. But it is difficult to conceive why they should be placed here. Bishop Middleton has remarked, that the absence of the article will not permit us to interpret it of the Holy Spirit, in the personal sense. Now this reason would also be fatal to the interpretation above detailed, which is also refuted by this, that ἐν δύναμις Ἐσώ includes it. Other interpretations may be seen in Pole, and a very ingenious and able note of Schoettg. may be consulted. The only interpretation that bears the stamp and impress of truth is that of Chrysost., who understands, "the sanctifying graces and aids of the Holy Spirit," to which the Apostle ever yielded. And so Theodoret, and, of the modern Commentators, Est., Menoch., Bishop Middleton, and Doddr., which last Commentator, of all the other moderns,
has best expressed the sense in his paraphrase: "And these amiable dispositions we cultivate, in humble dependence on the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, who dwells in our hearts, as a continued principle of that undissembled love which we exercise without limitation, not only to friends and benefactors, but enemies and persecutors." Here I see nothing to object to, except that I could wish the clause καὶ ἀγάπη ἀνασκόπησι had not been interwoven with this,* since it is (I conceive) naturally connected with the words following. Moreover, instead of the words "in dependence on," I should prefer "by the aid of:" for Chrysost. has truly observed: ἐν αὐτῷ γέρο πάντα ταῦτα κατερθείμεν.

I cannot but notice the disgraceful error into which Mackn. has fallen, who renders ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ "of a well regulated mind." The word πνεῦμα (as Bishop Middleton rightly remarks) is no where so used, when associated with ἀγίῳ. I am surprised Dr. Mackn. did not see that this is betraying a strong hold of orthodoxy, and playing into the hands of the Socinians. Most of the recent Foreign Commentators unwarrantably lower the sense by rendering "in mente Christianæ."

6. 7. ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνασκόπησι. Ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας. These, I think, go together. And they are conjoined by Theodoret, who explains the former "undissembled, pure, and genuine love," confirmed by deeds, such as becomes a spiritual father to his flock; not such as that of the false teachers, undissembled and self-interested. He loved them, not their's. The expression occurs in Rom. 12, 9. And Schleus. compares 2 Tim. 1, 5. James 3, 17. 1 Pet. 1, 22. Closely connected with this is the next quality, namely, an ab-

* He seems to have been led into this by Beza, who remarks: "Commemoratis aliquot speciebus, eas ad duo quasi genera revocat, semper Spiritum Sanctum, ut causam efficientem; et charitatem, ut finem universalern." This indeed sounds well, but (I think) wants solidity. I presume not, however, to determine positively in so uncertain a case.
staining from any dissimulation, or suppression of the truth; preaching the Gospel ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας. So Chrysost. and Theophyl.: οὐ δουλούντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, speaking the word of truth, not corrupting it, as did the false teachers, with impure mixtures of Gentile Philosophy, or Jewish tradition. And on this sense the best modern Commentators are agreed. The connection which I have indicated between these two clauses may (I think) be confirmed by Eph. 4, 15, “but that, speaking the truth in love, ye may grow up,” &c.

7. ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ. This clause has been strangely interpreted by certain modern Commentators. Some, as Sclater and Est., attending solely to the words immediately preceding, explain it of the Divine διώκσις, or eloquence which St. Paul employed, either for refutation or conversion. But this is utterly unfounded. Grot. (and after him Doddr.) connects it closely with what follows, rendering: “Dei virtute nobis arma subministrante, tam dextrâ quam sinistrâ, ad justitiam implendam.” But this, though supported by most recent Commentators, seems using too great a license. I see no reason to desert the common interpretation, as found in the antient Fathers, and Greek Commentators, who explain it of the power of working miracles.* So Chrysost. 615, 27. Ὅπερ ἂν τοιεῖ, οὐδὲν ἐαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ τὸ πῶς ἀναπτέθη, καὶ αὐτῷ λογιζόμενος τὰ αὐτοῦ κατορθόματα, τῶτο καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐφεδρικὴ εὐπορία ἡ γὰρ μεγάλα ἐφθέγξατο; καὶ ἔφησεν ἄλητον παρεσχήσαι βίον διὰ πάντων, καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἀκραῖα τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ταῦτα ἀναπτύσσειν. And Theophyl. οὐδὲν ἐμὴν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ταῦτα ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ ἐγένετο, ἢ καὶ ἐν συμμείωσι καὶ τέφρῃ. And Theod.: ἀπεκαθή ἐξηρτήσει τῆς θείας δυνάμεως. A strong proof, moreover, that the Apostle uses ἐν in the sense of per, is, that after so

* Of the few modern Commentators who have supported this interpretation is (mirabile dictu) Schliting, to whose acuteness and learning I bear a willing testimony.
using the ἐν, and intending to add another clause, where he meant to express the means whereby he had been supported, he changes the preposition ἐν to the more familiar one διὰ.

I would observe, that in almost all editions the punctuation is here incorrect, by a comma only being put after Θεῶ, when it ought to have been a colon; as was (first of the moderns) seen by Griesbach. Certain it is, that Chrysost. and the antients so pointed.

7. διὰ τῶν ἡπλαίων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν. In the interpretation of these words, many Commentators have been much perplexed, and even our venerable guides, the antients, here fail us. They lose their accustomed good sense and tact, and run into mysticisms about Christians being armed (like those soldiers who fought with arms in both hands) as well against the temptations of prosperity, as of adversity. All which (however ingeniously supported) is quite unfounded. The question is, what is the scope of the passage? Now the Apostle has just been adverting to the power of God, by whose aid he had done signs and wonders and mighty deeds, and been defended against his enemies. Here he (I think) intends to advert to the human means of defence, namely, simply the armour of righteousness.

As therefore the Apostle is speaking of defence, it were absurd to interpret (as do most Commentators) the ἅλα of swords and spears, or other offensive weapons. The Apostle can only mean defensive arms, as a shield, and armour; in which last sense (as Schleus. rightly observes) the words allude to the armour of a Grecian hoplite, who when completely encased, was said to be ἄμφιδεξιος. The sentiment, which is popular, and therefore not to be pressed upon, is as follows: That he employs no other arms of defence against the attacks of calumny and prejudice than those of righteousness; namely, refuting their slanders by good deeds. Now this interpreta-
tion has simplicity to recommend it, and bears the stamp of truth. As to authority, it has little or none in its favour. For the modern Commentators, in general, err egregiously by confounding together offensive and defensive armour. Rosenm. and Valpy think there is an allusion to a proverb by which ἐχειν ὑπλα δεξιὰ καὶ ἀριστερὰ imported "ad utrumque paratus." But they have not proved the existence of the proverb, and if they did, it would have little bearing on the present case.

8. διὰ δόξας καὶ ἀτιμίας. Here again many Commentators err, by mistaking the scope of the passage, and especially by closely connecting the words with the preceding; whereas there ought rather to be a colon placed at ἀριστερῶν, since there is a change of the idea; διὰ not signifying through as denoting the means, but the medium; for this is plainly what is had in view in the διὰ δόξας καὶ ἀτιμίας: διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας. The sense therefore seems to be as follows: "This is the only armour we use: these are the only defences we employ. This is the tenour of conduct pursued by us under all circumstances; and whatever be the consequences of such conduct, though ever so disastrous, through honour and dishonour," &c. On which it is well remarked by Theodoret: πάντα ἐκ διαμέτρου ἐναντία—καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων τὴν μίαν ἱκέσασαν ἄρετὴν: οὔτε γὰρ δόξα αὐτῶν ἐπήρημεν, οὔτε ἀτιμία κατηγορεῖν: οὐκ εὐφημία ἐφοίησεν, οὐ δυσφημία ἴνισεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἱδεῶν, ἀμετάβλητος ἔμεινε. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) finely observes, that δυσφημία is ill to be borne by the generous and virtuous mind, being worse than bodily tortures; these affecting the body only, but those pressing, with their whole weight, on the mind.

8. ὁς πλάνοι, καὶ ἀληθεῖς. Here again the construction is changed, and one adopted in which the Commentators think there is an ellipsis of habemur, and sumus. But this, though it may sufficiently well represent the sense, the construction will not bear, according to which, we can only supply after ὁς πλά-
vsi the participle ἰντες; which, by a usual change in these pliable terms, is very common; q. d. "being (forsooth), or thought to be." Thus καὶ is for καὶτοι, and yet. The πλάνοι doubtless refers to some appellation which had really been given to him, either by the opposite faction at Corinth (as Mr. Locke thinks), or rather (as I should imagine) by the Jewish Priests and Heathen Philosophers and Priests every where; those being times when impostors of every kind swarmed, to whom was commonly applied the terms πλάνοι and Planus. Thus in Matt. 27, 63. we find the name applied to Christ by the Jewish Priests: in the note on which passage I have explained the force of the term; and to the citations there adduced I add a most curious one from Athen. 20 a. where after giving a list of the names first of the most notorious jugglers, he then subjoins: ἕγενασι δὲ καὶ πλάνοι ἐνδοξοί; and, after giving their names, adds that of a γελαστοκοῦσι, or merry-andrews. I must not omit to notice an excellent remark of Chrysost. and Theophyl., namely, that these words were meant to exemplify the εὐφημ, and δυσφημ; as the αἰς ἁγνουόμενοι καὶ ἐπίγιναικόμενοι the δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας. I had myself imagined that the αῖς πλάνοι, &c. referred to the διὰ δόξης, &c., and the αῖς ἁγνουόμενοι, &c. to the δυσφ., &c. But the antients must be supposed, in criticism of that kind, better judges than we can pretend to be. Chrysost. well illustrates the force of the ἁγν. and ἑπιγ. thus: Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν γναήμιοι, καὶ περιποιοῦσατοι ὁ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰδέναι αὐτῶι ἦξιοιν. "With some we are in great estimation; others do not chuse to know us; affect to treat us as obscure nobodies. Grot. refers to his note on Matt. 19, 29.

Thus it appears, that after ἀληθεῖς there ought to be only a comma.

9. αῖς ἀποθνήσκοντες, καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν. The Apostle here uses a sort of Oxymoron. ἡς ἀποθνήσκοντες is explained by Chrysost. and Theophyl. αῖς ἐπιθεματικοί καὶ κατάδικοι, namely, "in the opinions of our enemies, and those that plot against us, condemned to
death, and, as it were, dying.” This Grot. parallels by Semper casuris similes, nunquamque cadentes. And one may compare 1 Cor. 15, 51. “I die daily.” Καὶ ἰδοὺ, “and yet strange to say, we live.” For that is the sense of ἰδοὺ. The Commentators add: “and this by the aid of God, and until God shall chuse to honour us with a glorious death. The ἀποθνῄσκοντες, it may be observed, refers to death by persecution.

9. ὡς παιδευόμενοι, καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι. Most modern Commentators (as Est., Menoch., Vatab., Cajetan, Schlit. and Rosenm.,) explain this of punishment from the magistrates, whether Hebrew or Gentile, to hinder them from preaching; q. d. “when we are scourged as malefactors, men regard us as chastized for our crimes. Yet we are not put to death.” But this is very harsh; and the words καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι are thus incongruous. The true interpretation seems to be that of Chrysost. and the other Greek Commentators, and, of the moderns, Erasm., Pisc., Calvin, Doddr., and Schleus.: “we are chastened by God, but not given up to death.” Thus the καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι will be very apt. And the words are meant to farther develope the idea contained in the preceding. This interpretation, moreover, is required by the words of the Psalmist, 117, 18. (Παιδεύων ἐπαιδευσέ με ὁ Κύριος, τῷ δὲ θανάτῳ οὐ παρέδωκε με.) to which there is here (as the antient Commentators remark) an evident allusion; q. d. “God permits these things as chastenings intended for our good in the end, and to work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.” So Hebr. 12, 6. “whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth” (from Prov. 8, 12.) Compare Apoc. 3, 19. Sap. 8, 5. Sir. 10, 28. 2 Macc. 6, 15. And so especially 2 Cor. 11, 32. κρίνομένοι δὲ ὑπὸ Κυρίου παιδευμένοι. This, it may be added, is the filial correction.

10. ὡς λαπτομένοι, ἀεὶ δὲ χαίροντες. These words arise naturally out of the preceding; q. d. “Under these corrections and difficulties we seem (to the
heathens) to be suffering grief, and to be always in <maerore>, but (in fact) always rejoicing, namely, in the testimony of a good conscience; exulting that we are accounted worthy to suffer in God's cause, and comforted with the strong consolations of the Gospel, in the hopes of a glorious reward." The Commentators remark on the magnanimity evinced in these words; and it is finely observed by Chrysos.

116, 42. τί τοίνυν ταύτης ἵστατ' ἀν τῆς ζωῆς, ἐν ἐκκοίτον ἐκποίητον δεινῶν, μείζον ἡ χάρις γίνεται.

10. ὁς πτωχός, πολλοὶ δὲ πλουτιζοῦντες. The πλούτ. is by some explained in a physical sense, with allusion to the sums of money which Paul was continually collecting and distributing to the poor Christians. And this mode of interpretation is preferred by Chrysost., Est., and others, on account of the words following. Yet it seems unfounded; as will appear by the note infra. Others understand it of spiritual and eternal riches. See Matt. 6, 10. So Hamm. explains: "by conferring on multitudes that which is the true, the most valuable riches." And this interpretation is adopted by Grot., Menoch., Tiren., Rosenm., and Schleus. I see no reason why both significations may not have been intended. And such is the view taken by Theophyl., who, very properly (I think) places the spiritual first. His words are these: καὶ κατὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν πλούτων πολλῶν ἐκποίητες, καὶ κατὰ τῶν αἰσθητῶν δὲ. It is judiciously remarked by Theodoret, that having said ὁς πτωχός, the Apostle does not subjoin τῶν δὲ ἀναγκαίων εἰσπορεῦτες, but πολλῶν δὲ πλουτιζοῦντες.

10. ὁς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες. I am surprised that the Commentators should not have seen that here again the Apostle intends what he says to be taken in a two-fold sense; 1st. physical, namely, the possessing nothing, and yet, in a manner, possessing all things; q. d. "all that my converts possess being at my disposal," namely, for the benefit of others: for the Apostle does not appear in these words (which evidently correspond to the preceding
to have had in view any use of his own of that wealth; though most Commentators here explain, "having all things necessary for me," which spoils the sense;* 2d. spiritual, namely, "though we literally have no property or possessions in this life, we in fact have, in the glorious promises of another and a better, what infinitely outweighs all that earth can give." Whitby explains: "possessing all things, in contentedness of mind," Phil. 4, 18; in the favour of that God who giveth all things richly to enjoy, 1 Tim. 6, 17; in Christ Jesus, who is all in all, Col. 3, 11; and in whom we are blessed with all spiritual blessings, Eph. 1, 3; and in the promise to inherit all things," Rev. 21, 7.

"This (observes Doddr.) is one of the sublimest passages ever written." In which I entirely coincide; and I would remark on the long sustained point and antithesis, in which I know no one comparable with it except that inimitably fine passage of Thucyd. 1, 70. where he contrasts the character of the Lacedemonians and the Athenians.

11. τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέφυγε πρὸς ὑμᾶς—πεπλάτυνται. The expressions ἀνέφυγε and πεπλάτυνται, it may be observed, have great propriety, considered in reference to that impassioned strain of fervid oratory in the preceding verses, poured forth as from the mouth of a cataract.

* And therefore, in this view, the Classical citations of Wets. are not quite to the purpose, though curious, as exemplifying the oxymoron. Thus Athen. 134 A. ἀλεξίων ὠδέων, εὐπορούμεν τοῖς πέλαις. Terent. Eunuch. 2, 2. Omnia habeo, neque quicquam habeo: nil cibi est, nil desit tamen. Curt. 4, 1, 25. nihil habenti nihil defuit. Philostr. 105. ἀλεξίων, φονικός, Ἰχθοὺς Βραχύμηνα οἰκονομικαὶ ἐκτὸς γῆς καὶ ὧν ἐπὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἀστείωσε τετευχισμένους καὶ ὠδέων κεκτημένους, καὶ τὰ πάντα. Tauri ἐκ κείμενοι μὲν σοφότερον ἔγγραψε. To which I add Liban. Orat. 380 c. εὐλογημένοι, ὠδέων κεκτημένοι. Quintill. 4, 5. quam tacent, clamant, nihil habentes, omnia possident. In the above cited passage of Philostr. I am surprised Wets. did not notice the manifest imitation of the present one of our Apostle. Many such have been pointed out in the course of this Work.

- VOL. VII.
The force of the ἀνεψωγε will be best understood by considering that the mouth may be said to be opened, when the oratorical faculty is exerted; and there is an even philosophical exactness in the words following, since, as Schilting observes, ex cordis dilatatione etiam oris hæc assertio consecuta est, or fervent oratory proceeding from the heart, which, as it were, being warmed, pours forth its affections in correspondent words. So Matt. 12, 34. “Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.” (where see the note.) Wets. here refers to Deut. 11, 6. Ps. 34, 21. 80, 10. 118, 32. Essaj. 5, 14. 60, 5. Prov. 24, 28. 1 Kings 2, 1. 1 Joh. 3, 17. Phil. 2, 1. Luke 1, 78. Acts 16, 14. He also cites from a Rabbinical writer: “an latum est mihi cor tuum.” The sense therefore is: “I pour forth my whole soul:” for (as the Poet says), “thoughts that breathe” easily find vent in “words that burn.” Moreover, as πλατύνεσθαι is applied to the heart in such cases, it may be observed that in joy, and all the impasioned feelings of the mind, the heart really feels as if loosened and enlarged; whereas in the contrary affections, as sorrow, fear, alarm, &c. the heart seems tightened.

This, too, seems the most natural account of the phraseology. The Commentators, however, in general (too formally) interpret it solely of παρφησια; q. d. “I venture to speak freely to you.” And they compare 1 Sam. 2, 1. רדש חיה על מלוכי: and Grot. observes, that ἀνεψωγε has an Hithpael sense; as 1 Cor. 16, 9. But the Apostle does not merely, as it were, apologize for his freedom of speech, but means to say, that what he utters comes from the heart, and proceeds from his great affection for them. So Theophyl. ἢ γὰρ θέρμη τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τὸ στῶμα μου ἀνεψωμεν, καὶ τὴν καρδίαν μου ἐπιλάτωμεν. The Apostle, it must be observed, intended to make use of this profession of affection, the better to introduce a subject on which they required admonition, the want of mutual ἀγάπη; a remark for which I
am indebted to Chrys. and Theophyl., the former of whom has, in a very masterly manner, traced the connexion; and the latter has well abridged this matter thus: Τὸς ὁμοίως ἀγαθοὺς καταλέγεις, καὶ δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς, οἷς ἐν τάξει δημηγόρεως, ὅταν χρή αὐτὸν μιμησθαι, μέλεια λατινόν καθάπετασθαι αὐτῶν, αἷς οὐ σφόδρα αὐτῶν ἀρα-παύσων. Πλὴν δὲ τοῦτο ποιήσαι, δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν όμοιαν ἀγάθων, καὶ φησιν, ὅτι αἰεὶ βούλομαι προσαλείν ὑμῖν καὶ διαλέγεσθαι, καὶ ἀποποστόλως, καὶ μετὰ παραθή-σιας λαλεῖν τούτο γὰρ δῆλοι διὰ τοῦ, ἀνέφη τὸ στόμα. Also Theodoret excellently thus: Ἀπὸ τοῦ περὶ ύμᾶς ταῦτα λέγειν ἀναγκάζομαι φίλτρον· πάντας γὰρ ύμᾶς ἐν ἑμαυτῷ περιφέρων τοιαύτη γάρ τίς ἀγάθως ἡ φόσις, έιρυκάρας ἐγγάζεται τάς τῶν κεκτημένων καρδίας.

12. οὐ στενοχωρείσθε ἐν ἴμιν· στενοχωρείσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὀπλάγχιοι ύμῶν. The sense of this passage has been strangely misunderstood by some Commentators, who take the στενοχωρείσθε as an imperative. So the Arabic Version, Luther, Wolf, and Schleus., the last of whom thus translates: “rogo vos, me de nobis anxii et solliciti sitiis, quanquam vos, nostrum amore ductos sollicitos esse haud ignoro.” But this sense the following words will by no means permit. Besides, it would require, not οὐ but μὴ. The indicative is confirmed by all the antient Commentators, of whom Chrysost. best saw the complete sense, and from whom Theophyl. gives the following exposition: Ἡμεῖς μὲν, φησιν, ἐν τῇ ἐμῇ καρδίᾳ, πλατεῖα οὕτω, αὐτοκαθορίζωσι χαρέως, (read χαρεύοντες, from Chrys.), καὶ ταῦτα τοσοῦτον ὄντες. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὑμετέροις σπλάγχνοι στενοχωρίαν πολλὴν ἔχετε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε πλατέως χαρῆσαι με, καίτοι ἐνα ὑστε-τωτέ̂σιν, ἐγὼ μὲν σφόδρα ύμᾶς ἀγαθῶς, ύμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπαῖτε μὲν με, καὶ ἔχετε ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχνοις, ἀλλ' ἐστενο- χωρημένοις, καὶ οὐ πλατέως. Thus any one who is hated is said to have no place in our affections. The above interpretation is also supported by Theodoret and ΟΕcumen. and, of the best modern Commentators, by Beza, Grotius, and many others ap. Pole, especially Hamm., who explains, “Ye have no small place
in my affections; but ye are straitened in your affections towards me." And so Rosenm.: "Non exiguum locum possidetis in animo meo. Sed vos mihi non pariter locum facitis in animis vestris," i.e. justo paucioura documenta mihi datis amoris vestri." On the sense of στενω. See the note on 4, 8. It here signifies to be straitened.* The τὰ σπλάγχνα, by a common Hebr. metaphor, denotes the tender affections, which occupy the inmost place in the heart. (See Vorst., Est., Grot., and other Commentators ap. Pole.) Yet it sometimes occurs in the Classical writers; as Eurip. Med. 215. σπλάγχνοι ἐκμαθεῖν. Orest. 1, 201. δοκὸ μὲν χρῶνο μαλακεῖν σπλάγχνοι. Hipp. 118. σπλάγχνον ἑτέρον φέρων. Alc. 1012. μομφᾶς σῶς ὑπὸ σπλάγχνος ἔχειν.

When the Apostle gently reproved them for being straitened in their affection to him, he doubtless means, that they failed in giving them the most unequivocal proof of love, namely, obedience. They had not sufficiently observed his admonitions on abstaining from heathen society, &c.

13. τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν αὐτισμοθαν, (αἰς τέκνως λέγω) πλα-τύνθεται καὶ υμεῖς. Such is (I conceive) the true punctuation, by which the sense is much clarified. It is, too, adopted by the most eminent modern Commentators, and is also sanctioned by the Syr., Arab., and Theophyl. At τὴν there is an ellipsis of κατὰ; and after καὶ an ὀστός must be supplied. The literal sense is, "Be ye also thus enlarged in your affection for us, according to (i.e. by making) the same (i.e. an equal) return of affection, which is due to us." The parenthetical words αἰς τέκνως λέγω (similar parentheses to which are found with λέγω, &c. in Rom.

* The force of the metaphor Wets. has illustrated from the following Classical passages: Arrian. Epict. 1, 25. οὐ σαντῷ στενοχωρικὰς ταράχεις, οὐ σαντὸν θλιβεῖς—καθὼς γὰρ ἐκείνου μέρυσσο, ὅτι ἑαυτοῦ θλίβομεν, ἑαυτοῦ στενοχωρούμεν. Achmet 76. εάν τις ἵππη, ὅτι εὑρίσκεται καὶ ἑαυτοῖς στερεῦσα τὰ στήθη αὐτῶν—μετα-δοτικὸς ἔσται καὶ πλυντοδότης—εὰν δὲ τις ἵππη, ὅτι τὰ στήθη αὐτῶν ἑπενώθησαν καὶ ἑαυτοῖς γενήσεται.
7; 1. 1 Cor. 6, 5. 2 Cor. 11, 29. and elsewhere) suggest the ground of the claim, namely, as a debt due on the score of paternity. So Theophyl.: τὴν αὐτὴν αἵματι καὶ ἱσότητα τῆς φίλιας εἰσενέγκατε, καὶ πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς, αὐς καὶ ἑγοῦ.

14. μὴ γίνεσθε ἐτεροξυγούντες ἀπίστοις. Here the Commentators do not very clearly discern the connexion, which I would thus lay down: "Make me then this return of affection, and, as a proof of it, observe my admonitions, especially this, μὴ γίνεσθε, &c.

On the exact sense of the words themselves Commentators are not agreed; though, as it seems to me, there need have been no difference of opinion. Ἐτεροξυγέω is a very rare word, formed from ἐτεροξυγός, which occurs in Levit. 19, 19., and ἐτεροξυγία in Schol. Lucian 2, 35. The question, however, is, what is the ratio metaphora? Now as ἕλγος signifies both a beam, and a yoke, that may be thought uncertain. The former is adopted by Chrys., Theophyl., Æcumen., and several moderns, especially Cam., Hamm., Wets., and Rosenm. And as σταθμὸς ἐτεροξυγός was the name given by the Greeks to steelyards that draw wrong, i. e. draw one way, when they ought to hang equal, so they think the Apostle here means, as Theophyl. expresses it, μὴ ἀδικεῖτε τὸ δίκαιον, ἐπικλεινοῦντες καὶ προσεῖμενοι οἱ οἱ θέμα τε, or, as Phot. Epist. 135., οὐ δεί ὡς ἐπερροπεῖτο ἤχειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀπίστους, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι μᾶλλον μυθοὶ προσέχεις, ήπερ τῶν πιστῶν διδασκών. But this seems somewhat harsh. The latter therefore (namely, the allusion to a yoke) is (I think) with reason preferred by some antients, as Phot. and Theodoret, and almost all the moderns. It should seem, then, that ἐτεροξυγέω signifies "to draw on the other side of a yoke with another:" "be a yoke-fellow," like ὁμο-ξυγεῖν and συμενεῖν. So the Vulg.: "nolite jugum ducere cum infidelibus." And so Phot.: οὐ δεί ὡς ὡς οἰκεῖοι καὶ οὐαίρως εἰσιν τοῖς ἀπίστοις συμενεῖναι. The sense, therefore, may be thus expressed: "Do not maintain any intimate society, or form any close connexion or friendship with unbelievers." So I Mac. 1, 15. ἐσείσθησαν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. And this interpretation, which is supported by Grot., Erasm., Pisc. Sclater, and most modern Commentators, seems to deserve the preference.

I must not omit to notice one or two other opinions. Theodoret, and some moderns, as Schwarz, and recently Mr. Valpy, think there is an allusion to animals which, when yoked together, draw con-

* As in Phocylid. 13. (cited by Wets.) σταθμὸν μὴ κρούειν ἐτεροξυγίαν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. And Wets. compares many similar words as ἐτερόφυγος, ἐτερόφυλλος, ἐτερόφθαλμος, ἐτερόκλητος, ἐτεροσμήνης, ἐτερόφροσος, ἐτερόγκαθος, ἐτερόμαλλος, ἐτερόκτιος, ἐτερόσκελης, ἐτερόκοπος, ἐτερόγλαυκος, ὅτι οὕτω ἐτερομεγεθησάντες.
trary ways,* as if it were meant to admonish them not to make schisms from Paul and their brethren. But this is very hard, and at variance with the words following. Finally, Kypke and Schleus. think that the term has a sense the opposite to ὑμετέρων and συν-γείτων, and denotes, metaphorically, to associate themselves with persons unequal, dissimilar, &c. And Schleus. renders: "nolite societatem inire cum paganis, vobis planè imperibus, eorumque mores imitari, et ista consortio, vobis indigno, uti." Such seems to have been the opinion of our common translators; and it is countenanced by the use of ἐρεποδόγος in Levit. 19, 19. τα σήματα τῶν οἱ κατοχούνεσ οὐρὰς (as a horse and an ass, or an ox or an ass). And this interpretation (which differs very slightly from, and indeed comes to the same thing with, the second mentioned one) may be admitted; but it seems scarcely accordant with the usus loquendi and the analogia linguae. At least it seems incongruous to jumble the two allusions together. If the Apostle had a reference to the passage of Levit., then he could not also have in view συν-γείτων in the military sense.

I cannot conclude without advertin to the opinion of almost all Commentators (though few else), that the Apostle had here no reference to matrimonial connections. This is (I think) ill founded; since the spirit of the Apostle's injunction must be contrary to such connexions. For a marriage with a heathen could not but bring the Christian party into close contact with heathen society, in the family and connexions of the heathen party. And it is in vain to urge that the Apostle at 1 Cor. 7, 12—16. seems to permit this, since there he has in view only those cases where one of a married couple had been converted, and the other not, and he directed that the believing should not separate from the unbelieving, or break the marriage bond on the ground of the heathenism of the other party. But that will not prove that he authorized the marriages of Christians with heathens. To me it appears that the Apostle purposely used a word which admitted of a double sense, i. e. intimate connexion, or marriage, in order that while he condemned the former, he might delicately repress the latter. That the ζύγος suggests the idea of marriage, cannot be doubted; as appears from the following passages which I find noted down in my Adversaria. Eurip. Suppl. 791. οἱ γάμων ἄνεξίγητας and 893. ἤμων δὲ μὴ τιμι- 
τολάμενοι τινὰ ἀνδρὸς εὐνόμων. Yet that the Apostle had general society chiefly in view, is quite clear from the air of the words following; and that he meant habitual, and not casual society, and this did not intend to exclude all communication whatever,† I would infer from his writing μὴ γινεῖτε ἐρεποδόγοντες, and

* In which view I would compare Eurip. Med. 244. καὶ μὲν 

† Indeed otherwise, as he himself observes at 1 Cor. 5, 10., the 

good must go out of the world.
not μη διερευνείτε: for, though the two modes of expression are
thought by the Commentators synonymous, yet the former, I think,
generally imports what is habitual.

14. τις γάρ μετοχῇ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία—σκότος;
This and the next verse assign the reasons for this
keeping apart from heathen society; and as those
are expressed populariter, they must not be too
minutely scanned or pressed upon; it must, too, be
observed, that interrogative sentences with τις have
a strongly negative force. Schilting has therefore
well expressed the sense thus: "nullum est justitiae
iniquitati consortium." The Apostle means there is
no affinity, there is not the idem velle and idem nolle,
and thus there cannot be the firma amicitia. Oppo-
sites cannot unite any more than oil and vinegar can
amalgamate.*

Of these clauses one cannot but admire the δεινότης.
Wets. here compares Philo T. 2. p. 56, 29. τις οὖν
κοινωνία πρὸς ἀπάλλανα τῶν μηδὲν οἰκεῖον ἡ συγγενεῖς ἐπι-
τηθεύκοτι; I add Aristoph. Thesm. 137. τί βάρβατος
μέλει κροκατῶ; τί δὲ λύρα κεκρυφάλω; (So the Latin
proverb: Quid asinus cum lyrá.) τις δὲι κατόπτρω καὶ
ἐπούς κοινωνία; Comicus Epicharmus ap. Stob.
p. 501, 4. τις γὰρ κατόπτρω καὶ τυφλῷ κοινωνίᾳ; Phi-
lostr. p. 662. σοι δὲ τί καὶ Προστευσίλεως κοινών; & 867.
fin. τις ἡ κοινωνία δρακόντωσ τε—τοῦ τε ἱπτω. Eurip.
Iph. Taur. 254. καὶ τις θαλάσσης βυκίλοις κοινωνίᾳ;

Here there is, as in ver. 12., a parallelism of mem-
bers; and to μετοχῇ in the first correspond κοινωνία;
συμφαίνεις, μερις, συγκαταθεσις, and the following
ones.† Δικαιοσύνη and ἀνομία are for δικαίοις and
ἀνόμαις. Thus by φοτί (as Schilting well observes)
is denoted those enlightened by the Gospel, and by
σκότος those who are involved in the darkness of
Pagan ignorance. So Theophyl: Οὐκ εἰσεν, ὅτι τις
κοινωνία τοῖς τοῦ φωτός πρὸς τοὺς τοῦ σκότους; ἡ τοῖς τοῦ

* For as Philo Jud. says (1. p. 584.), ἀγαθὸν ὥς θελει (i.e. δύ-
νατας) καθε συνερχεσθαι.
† Theophyl. explains: Ὑμεῖς δικαιοσύνης αὐτόχρημα ἔστε· ἐκεῖνοι
δὲ ἀνομία· τις τοῖνυν μετοχῇ ὡμίν κακεῖνος;
Xristou prōs toû toû Beliaîp; ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα ἀντὶ τῶν προσαίκων τέθεικε, Φῶς καὶ σκότος, ὁ πλέον ἡν.

15. Here again, by Xristō and Belial (like the Heb. יְהֹוָה, who will do no one any good, i. e. who will do evil to him,* the author of all evil, the Evil Spirit, the Devil, the Prince of this world, who works in the children of men disobedience†) we are to understand the Gospel, as opposed to the systems and plans of the world and the flesh.

15. τὸς μέρις πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστω; The term μέρις is here rightly put in parallelism with κοινωνία. It primarily signifies portion, and party (as in 1 Kings 12, 16.), as cognate with society, communication, &c. Πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστω; “hath a believer with an un-believer.”‡ In believing and unbelieving is included the correspondent actions.

16. τὸς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῷ Θεοῦ μετ' εἰδελαγιῶν; Jaspis compares the well-known: Ἐκα. ἐκα. δυτις ἄλτρός! Here one cannot but remark the surprising copia verborum evinced by the Apostle, which cannot (I think) be easily paralleled in the best Classical writers.

By this vinculum συγκατάθεσις is brought into the parallelism. The word properly denotes assent; but that implies consent; and that, again, conjunction. It is explained by Theophyl. ὀραματίς, συνέλευσις. So the ancient Lexicographers explain it: adsensus and consensio; and Cyr. συμφωνίασις: both with a view to the present passage. Though Schleus. compares Polyb. 4, 17. It is well remarked by Theodore: διὰ τούτων δὲ πάντων ἐδειξε τοὺς ἐναντίους διδοκάλους ἀνώμαλος καὶ σκότους προξένους καὶ ὅπωργος διάβολος. The sense is: “What hath a temple of God

* So the Scotch A neer-do-weel.
† Theophyl. reads Beliap, and explains it the Apostate. And he observes that the term is used in terrorem.
‡ It is well remarked by Theophyl., that the Apostle makes a transition from things to persons, that he may not seem simply to censure vice and commend virtue." Would that some of those to whom is committed the preaching of the Gospel more followed this example, instead of confining themselves so much to generalities.
to do with (a worshipper of) idols?" For εἰς, according to the mode in which the former terms are employed, may very well be tolerated.

The words following ὅμεις γὰρ ναὸς Θεοῦ ἔστε γὰρτε are to be regarded as exegetical of the preceding. The sense is: "For ye (Christians) are (each of you) a temple of the living God." By temple is meant a place where He dwells, and exerts his influence, namely by the Holy Spirit. So 1 Cor. 6, 19 & 20. τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστιν where see the note. Compare also 1 Cor. 3, 16. and Eph. 2, 21. And so Hierocl. Aur. Carm. p. 24. καὶ ναὸς εἰς ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ φαντάζεται τὸν ἐαυτῷ παρασκευάσατε νῦν. Who can doubt but that the Philosopher borrowed this, as well as some other spiritual sentiments, from the New Testament? Some who aim at being exceedingly literal, here translate "a living God." But that would surely be frigid. The truth is, the article is often omitted when the participle to which it belongs is so common an epithet as to form a kind of regular appellative; as in the present case, and in that of παντοκράτωρ at ver. 18. Yet there is no doubt but that epithet was first applied to Jehovah, as denoting a real and existing God, as contrasted with the pretended Gods of the heathens which were but stocks and stones. On this subject, (on which omnia sunt prostrita,) it will be sufficient for me to refer my readers to an instructive note of Mackn. On the indwelling of God in all Christians by the Spirit, the theological Commentators must be consulted, and especially Dodd. in loc.

16. καθὼς ἔστε Θεοί, &c. See Levit. 26, 11 &

* Such is (I conceive) the true sense; notwithstanding that recent Commentators (as Rosenm.) stumble at it, and would understand the ὅμεις of all the Corinthian congregation, taking collectively, and forming a Church; than which nothing can be more harsh, frigid, and devoid of foundation. But why this tortuous interpretation? Is it to get rid of the doctrine of spiritual influence altogether? But as this is impossible, why baggle about a few examples of it more or less.
12, and compare Ex. 37, 27. The sense is: "to employ and apply the words of God to the present case." For there is some slight change in the words, in order to fit them for this accommodation; though the solid sense remains the same. Can any thing, I would observe, more strongly prove the Divine inspiration of the Old Testament, (even that of the Pentateuch, which has been so much called in question) than such language as this, so decided, and at the same time thrown out in a sort of way which least of all induces us to suppose that the New Testament writers meant formally to enjoin such a belief!

16. ἐμπεριπατήσω, "versabor inter eos." The Sept. render: καλ ὄροι τῷ σεγνῷ μου ἐν ὕμνιν, which is a free translation. I would compare Joseph. 1068. αὐτὸς (Deus) ἐκφώτισεν σωκηρῆς, παρατυχών ταῖς εἰσαίς. How this applies to the case of Christians, and in what respects it differs from that of the Jews is obvious, and may be sought in the doctrinal and practical Commentators.

16. ἔσομαι αὐτῶν Θεῖς. This promise (as Mackn. observes) which was originally made to the Israelites living under the Sinaitic covenant, was renewed to believers living under the Gospel covenant. See Jerem. 31, 33.

17, 18. διὰ εξίλατος. These words are taken, with a slight change, from Is. 52, 11; what is there said of the idolatrous Babylonians being here applied to the Gentiles in general. Ἄφωσθίε. A passive in a reciprocal sense: "Keep yourselves separate from them." Rosenm. observes that this means a separation of counsels and plans, not accompanied with that hatred in which the Jews always held foreign nations.

17. καὶ ἀκαθάρτει μὴ ἀπετεθη. Our English Versions (except Mackn.) render: "touch not the unclean thing;" which, though it admits of some sense, yet is very far-fetched and frigid.* It is therefore

* Though Grot. observes that the wiser Jews supposed that by the prohibition not to touch unclean animals, was also meant absti-
better, with some few Commentators (as Drus., Mackn., and Schleus.), to render it, "an unclean person." The sense, then, is: "have no close connection with idolaters, the singular being put for the plural." Now whatever may have been the meaning of the *Prophet*, this is clearly the sense (at least the primary one) of the *Apostle*.

The words following are not (it is supposed) to be found *totidem verbis* in any one passage of the Old Testament; though by some referred to *Jer. 31, 1.* or *31, 9., or rather 2 Sam. 7 & 14.,* where God says of David: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." There can (I think) be no doubt but that the *Apostle* especially meant to *apply* that very passage; though that he had some similar ones in mind there can be no doubt.

The *εἰσδέξομαι* signifies, "I will receive you to my especial society." Yet, as Rosenm. observes, "separatio hæc non pertinet ad externum discrimen agentibus et infidelibus, sed distinctionem internæ indolis. Hæc perfectior mentis indoles facit nos conjunctiores cum Deo." With this last reflection I would compare, from Theophyl.: *ἐστάν γὰρ ἄταλ-λαγῆς τῶν ποιητῶν, τότε ἐνωθήσῃ Θεὸς.*

On *παντοκράτωρ* it is observed by Wets.: "Deus omnipotens et vivus comm. 16. opponitur idolis et mortuis." And he gives examples of the term from Polycarp, Origen, and the Symb. Apost.

**CHAP. VII.**

After having adduced the *words of Scripture* to inculcate this important truth, and after comforting them with the promises therein attached to its ob-
servance, the Apostle proceeds to subjoin his own admonitions, and that in the way of inference.*

Verse 1. ταύτας ὅ ν ἐχεστε τᾶς ἐκκλησίας ἣν ἐ. ἀ. τ. π. σ. κ. π., "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us," &c. In these words the Apostle meant (I think) to more fully explain the ἀκαθαρτοῦ μη ἀπεστέλε just before, in order to still further extend its sense, and show that he intended it not only of persons, but of things. He says καθαρ-σαμεν ἐαυτοσ, "let us studiously keep ourselves pure ἁπὸ παραδρ—πειματος, from all pollution both of the flesh and the spirit." By the former are obviously meant not only the gross vices of lasciviousness, drunkenness, gluttony, and idolatry, but all such actions (including all such words as have the force of actions, namely, lies and slanders) as are inconsistent with the virtue and purity with which the body, as a temple of the Holy Spirit, should be kept holy. By the latter are meant all such thoughts as lead to evil actions, and therefore (to use the words of our Saviour) defile the man, such as lascivious or revengeful thoughts, or any meditation on future, or reflection on past sins. Thus Wets. observes: "Corpus pollutur impudicitia, animus cupiditate." And he cites Tacit. Ann. 5, 50. mentem suam et aures hominum polluerit. He also adduces several sentiments inculcating mental as well as corporeal purity (and the former, as tending to the latter, from the Philosophers and Philo Jud.); as Simplic. on Epict. 208 & 218. Lucian Vit. Auct. 5. καθαρὰς πρὸ τέρων

* And as such it is closely connected with the last verse of the preceding chapter; so that the division was here (as in many other instances) made at a very improper place. If the authority of Theoph. and Theodoret be pleaded in favour of the present division, I would answer, that those Commentators are too modern to be of much weight. Whereas it is certain that in Chrysostom the verse was not separated from the preceding; since he concludes his Homily with that verse, and commences a fresh one with the second verse of ch. 8. Cæcumen. also begins the new chapter with ver. 2.
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τὴν ψυχὴν ἐργασάμενος, καὶ τὸν ἐπ’ αὐτῇ ρύτου ἐκκλώσας. Porphyr. de Abstin. 1, 51.

1. εὐπερατοῦτες ἀγαπώνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ. Most modern Commentators (and the Syr. Translator) render this simply working, doing, studying. But the examples of this sense, adduced by Schleus., are all such as have a sacrificial sense only. I therefore prefer the usual signification of the word, and that adopted by most Interpreters, "ad finem perducentes; perfecting, accomplishing." This, too, is confirmed by the preceding καὶ πνεύματος. For he that is not pure in thought as well as action, does not complete and perfect the work of holiness. There is, however, another mode in which, if this signification be retained, the verb may be rendered; and this is supported by the ancient Commentators, and, of the moderns, by Grot. and Rosenm.; viz. not resting in mere mental resolutions and intentions, but accomplishing and carrying them into action by a virtuous life. On either of these latter interpretations the word must be emphatical.

The next words ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου are by some explained: "out of a fear of God rather than man: for there is a certain holiness which is intended to please men." But this would suppose another strong emphasis, and would therefore be too bold. They must, I think, be taken in the usual sense, "pœ revereintiâ Dei," "out of fear and reverence for God;" as in Acts 9, 31. Rom. 13, 7. 2 Cor. 5, 11. εἰδότες τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου. Eph. 5, 21. ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ. 1 Pet. 2, 18. & 3, 2. Ps. 5, 8. 101, 9. Prov. 1, 7, 9 & 10. 16, 4. 32, 4.

2. χαρήσατε ἡμᾶς. Most recent Commentators explain this: "locum date; admittite admonitiones meas. But the ancients rightly (I think) recognize here a continuation of the metaphorical language employed a little before at στενοχωρείσθε and πλατύνθητε: for the words following, μὴ γίνεσθε—παντοκράτωρ from ver. 14—18., are an independent paragraph containing the admonition concerning absti-
nence from heathen society. The sense therefore seems to be this: “give us a large place in your affections,* and (which is connected therewith), observe these our earnest and affectionate admonitions.” Then at the words οὐδένα ἡδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπελευκεκήσαμεν there is a clause omitted, equivalent to: “We may claim to possess, or retain this place in your affections, for we have injured none of you.” &c. These words all Commentators suppose to be levelled against the false teachers: and they think that the words also have reference to some charges against the Apostle, which had been made by the Anti-Pauline party at Corinth. But the latter opinion seems not well-founded. It is little probable that they would have brought any such serious charges against St. Paul, whose character was least of all liable to them. Besides, on this supposition, ἐφθείραμεν must signify: “we have not corrupted any by false doctrines, or deceiving words:” which is somewhat harsh: and ἡδικήσαμεν does not then admit of a tolerable sense; for it cannot be referred (as Mr. Locke would have it) to the Apostle’s decision in the case of the incestuous person. It is (I think) clear that the words are not (as the ancient Commentators have thought) spoken in the way of apology, any more than those of Samuel, which the Apostle seems to have had in mind (though the Commentators do not notice it), 1 Sam. 12, 3. “Witness against me before the Lord, and before his anointed: whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith?” The Apostle merely reminds them that he deserves to hold a place in their affections, since he has not, like the false teachers, been guilty of those actions which especially alienate the affections of a people from their ministers; q.d. “We have (as you know) injured no one,” &c. Perhaps the ἃς.

* So Thophyl. ἐξασθε ἡμᾶς πλαγίως, καὶ μὴ στενοχώρωμεν ἐν ὅριν.
may be better rendered, "we have aggrieved no one," viz. in the exercise of our ministerial office, by unjustifiable harshness, or undue severity."

2. ἔφθείραμεν seems to mean: "we have wasted no one's substance by extorting gifts." Pagninus well renders it expilavimus. Οὐδένα ἔπλενεντήσαμεν is well translated by Schleus.: "neminem pecuniâ emunximus (as 2 Cor. 12, 17 & 18. 1 Thess. 4, 16.);" "we have cheated no one of his money." This certainly refers to more than (what some would explain it of) receiving a stipend for the office of instruction.

3. οὐ πρὸς κατακρίσιν λέγω. The sense has here been best expressed by Theodoret thus: οὐ συμμερο-λογίαν όμιν οὐειδίποτα ταῦτα ἔχων; q. d. "I do not say this for condemnation, or to reproach you of want of liberality towards me (whatever you have shown towards others)." Grot. paraphrases thus: "corrigere vos volo, non traducere, ut ingratos." The antecedent (he observes) is here put for the consequent. By the Greek Commentators the words are explained: "I say these things not for reproach, but from motives of love and affection." And this latter exposition seems preferable. Though the sense may be better expressed thus: "I say not this to hint any reproach of illiberality to me; but I speak merely to show my claim to a large place in your affections (as ye have in mine); for, as I have before said, ye are in our hearts," &c. As to the προεδρηκα, it is not to be interpreted strictly of the very words, but similar expressions, which occur at 5, 13, 8, 2, 2, 4. 12, 13, 1, 6—8.

In the words ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις the phraseology is somewhat irregular, and, as it seems, idiomatic. It is for ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἵμαν (οὕτω) ἐστε ὅστε (ὑμῖν) συματοδανεῖν καὶ συγην (ὑμᾶς). Indeed εἰς τὸ and ὅστε are often interchanged. The εἰς τὸ συματοδανεῖν καὶ συγην savours of a proverbial phrase. So Athen. 249. (cited by Wets.) τούτων δ'[ο[ βασιλεῖς ἐχωσι συγενείας καὶ συμ-ατοδανείκοντας' and the well known Horatian; "Τε
cum vivere amem, tecum obeam libens." And so Mark 14, 31. έαν με βεν συναποθανείν σοι, &c.

4. πολλή μοι παρήσια πρός υμᾶς. This verse, like the last, is meant to soften the seeming harshness of the preceding expressions, as στεναχωριόσθε, χαρήσατε, &c.; q. d. "Out of the love which I bear to you (and which is, I trust, in some degree mutual,) I venture to use this freedom of speech to you, which, however, is not from any ill opinion of you, for great is my boasting concerning you to others, but rather for your good, and spiritual improvement." The words following seem added by way of climax; q. d. "not only do I boast of you to others, but your spiritual progress gives me the greatest private comfort in all my afflictions."

4. παράκλησει, solace, comfort. There is a climax in καίχησις, πεπλήρωμαι παράκλησει, and υπερεφεροσεύμαι. τη χαρή. On παράκλησις I have before treated. Υπερεφεροσεύμαι, which also occurs at Rom. 5, 20., is a very rare word, occurring (I believe) no where but in St. Paul. Indeed there is nothing like it but the υπερεφερσωσ at Mark 7, 37., from which it appears that the expression was in use in the common dialect; though it did not find its way into the Classical writers, who indeed never use an υπερ in composition with περι. St. Paul, however, from the fervency of his temperament, frequently employs this υπερ in composition, as in υπερωθάνα, υπερεκπεφερσωσου, υπερεκπερετείναι, υπερπληνώ, υπερπραγματικώ, υπερπλεονάξιον, υπερπληφσωσα. The other sacred writers use scarcely one of them. St. Luke, however, has υπερεκχύω, Gosp. 6, 38. The consolation and joy here mentioned were doubtless occasioned by the account Titus brought of their state.

4. ετι παύση τη θλίψει υμῶν. The ετι Rosenm. renders post. But it rather signifies at, in, under; a signification found sometimes in the Classical writers. It is well observed by Rosenm., that the Apostle, after mentioning this generally, proceeds to explain
particularly what were the tribulations, and the origin of this gladness.

5. καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμῶν εἰς Μ. "When, for instance, we went," &c.; for that seems to be the meaning of γὰρ. On the thing itself see Acts 20, 3. seqq. and supra 1, 16.

The expression ἐσάρξ ἡμῶν may be compared with similar ones at 2 Cor. 2, 12. Acts 29, 23. infra 8, 13., all which savour of Hebraism; the body or the soul being put for the person. The sense, then, is simply, "we had no rest," namely, from the perpetual persecutions and plots of our bitter and unrelenting foes, the Jews and Pagan zealots. 'Ἀλλ’ ἐν πονεῖ θλιβόμενοι (scil. ἔσμεν). Here must be supplied τόσον, or ἵνα τοῦτο ἐσώμεθα, or both. θλιβόμενοι may be rendered: "pressed down with affliction." So supra 1, 6. and 4, 8. where see the notes.

5. ἐξαθεὶς μάχαι, ἐσώθει φόβοι. These words are explained in two ways. Some, as the antient Commentators, and, of the modern ones, Cajetan, Est., Vorst., Sclater, and others, take the ἐξαθεῖν to have reference to the opposition of unbelievers, both Jews and Gentiles; and the ἐνδοθεῖν to the fear from false teachers, lest the weaker brethren should be drawn away by their seductive arts. And, in that view Wets. cites Thucyd. 7, 71. ἐλπίσας—χειρασθεῖν σφίσιν—διὰ τῶν ἐνδοθέν τε καὶ ἐξαθέν κατὰ τὸ εἰκῶς γενησόμενον δόρυσθων where the Schol. explains: τὴν πόλιν ἐνδοθέν τετεθεσμοθεμένην διὰ στάσιν, καὶ ἐξαθέν διὰ τῶν πολέμων. Others, as Pisc., Vorst., and most recent Commentators, take the ἐξαθεῖν to denote the body, or exterior state and situation; and ἐνδοθεῖν, the mind of Paul. Both interpretations, indeed, are supported by the usus loquendi, but the former far more than the latter; since for ἐξαθεῖν in the sense which the recent Commentators assign to it there is no decided authority; whereas in the other sense it is unquestionably used by the Apostle; as in 1 Tim. 3, 7. δεῖ δὲ αὐτῶν μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαθείν. And ἐσώθειν,
which must be interpreted according to the sense assigned to ἐξεδε, the plural φέλω is (I think) more agreeable to the former than the latter interpretation. On these accounts, then, and because it is supported by the united authority of the antients, it seems to deserve the preference. Yet it is not impossible that the Apostle had both in his mind.

6. ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν, τῶς τασείως "But God, who is the comforter of the afflicted, comforted us under these trials, by the coming of Titus, which was sufficient to dissipate our affection." This, Theophyl. observes, was mentioned, to do Titus credit in their eyes, and excite their reverence for him.

7. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει τῇ παρακλήσῃ ἐφ' ὣμίν. There is something in these words not a little awkward, and what we should have little expected. The sense is tolerably clear; but how to establish it on any principles of construction, is not easy. The best Critics, as Grot. and others, say that παρακλήσει is put, by a metonomy of the subject, or by a metaleipis, such as is found elsewhere, i.e. παρακλήσει is to be taken for the narration of the παράκλησις. And this is supported by Theophyl., who takes the words as if written thus; ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τοιαῦτα τὴν ἄφεται ύμᾶν ἀνήγγελεν, ἐξ ὧς καὶ αὐτὸς παρεκλήθη, τοιοῦτον, ἐγέρθη ἐφ' ὄμιν, ἀποδείξαμεν ύμᾶς διὰ τὰ κατορθώματα υμῶν. Perhaps, however, the sense may be expressed thus: "but also in the comfort and joy with which he rejoiced over you (and which he imparted to me) on telling me," &c. So ver. 13. ἐγάραμεν ἐπὶ τῇ χάρᾳ Τίτου, i.e. at the joyful tidings which Titus brought.

7. τὴν ύμῶν ἐκτισθήσειν. Some interpret this, "your love towards me." Others (with far less probabilit) "your desire to reform the abuses which I had censured." But both these interpretations are too arbitrary. The most simple and natural sense that can be assigned to the word here, and at ver. 11. is that adopted by the antient Commentators and some moderns, as Grot. and Rosenm., namely, "desire of seeing you." And this is confirmed by a similar use
of εἰσιν at Rom. 15, 23. Theophyl. explains it τῷ σφόδραν ἐν τῇ ζήτησιν.

7. τὸν ὑπαίτιον ἐδοξοῦν. By this some would understand penitence for sin. Others, with more reason, grief for sin, i. e. that it had been committed. It seems, indeed, to have been a combined feeling, consisting of mourning over sin, and deep regret that any thing should have happened to keep their beloved Father in God from visiting them. The term in question is a very strong one, and, as Theophyl. observes, imports more than δάκρυα. It is in Matt. 2, 18. joined with κλαυμάς.

7. τὸν ὑπάντον ζηλον ἢτε ἐμοῦ, "your zeal, and well affectedness towards me against calumniators, and your desire to fulfil all my injunctions." Both these particulars ought (I think) to be united, though almost all Commentators separate them; some taking one, and some the other. It is well observed by Theophyl. (partly from Chrys.) that the Apostle not only says this, to heal the stripes of former reprehension, but as really giving approbation to those who had conducted themselves aright; though there might be also some persons ill affected to him, and unworthy of these praises. Yet he draws no invidious distinction between them, but makes both the encomiums and the censures common and in medio, leaving it to the conscience of each to appropriate to himself what belonged to him."

7. ἔστε με μᾶλλον χαρίσαι. A very brief, and therefore somewhat obscure clause, which is explained by Theophyl. thus: "And, though rejoicing at his presence, I the more rejoiced at what he told me respecting you."

8. ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ—μεταμελήσων, "Wherefore if I ever did pain your feelings in the Epistle (which I wrote to you) I do not (now) repent; though I did repent (during the time after I had sent it off, and before I saw Titus)." On the sense of these words it is not necessary to minutely refine or press. For, after making due allowance for
the laxity of popular phraseology, it cannot be inferred, because the Apostle felt regret, that he had written with undue, or unjust severity. The warm-hearted kindness of his disposition might generate that feeling, though, strictly speaking, it were unwarranted. When, however, he found the good his well-meant rebukes had done, he would abandon all feelings of regret. Theophyl. says he so speaks, not as having really rebuked them too severely, but with a view to raise the encomium the higher. But this is one of those ingenious but too refined fancies which we occasionally meet with in the antient Commentators.

8. ὁ μεταμέλομαι, εἰ καὶ μετεμελήσης is rendered by Grot: “non doleo, quamquam doluit mihi,” namely, when I was writing the letter. (See 2 Cor. 2, 4.) But this is doing too great violence to the plain sense of μετ. to be admitted. Nor indeed is there any difficulty that requires to be removed by so desperate a method. As little necessary, and still more objectionable, is the mode by which Doddr. would elude the difficulty of supposing any actual repentance of what was done under the guidance of the Spirit. He renders: “However anxious I might before have been.” Yet his own excellent judgment and good taste, on after thought, guided him to the truth, which yet his timidity made him hesitate to embrace. “It may (subjoins he) also signify a kind of misgiving of heart, natural when the reproof, however necessary, is given to a person one tenderly loves, where the event is dubious, as in this instance it might be.” It is remarked by Wets.: “Interpretes, qui putant, et consilium scribendi epistolam, et ejus consilii penitentiam, et penitentiae penitentiam ab afflatus spiritus S. suisse profectam, parum consentanea dicere videntur.” But the remedy to which the learned Commentator alludes is too violent to be thought of, and most irreverent to be hinted at. It is strange that his acuteness did not at once
show him, that the inspiration of the Apostle at all the three times is not in the least affected.

8. βλέπω γὰρ—ὑμᾶς, “For I find (or understand) that that Epistle did give you pain, though it were but for a short season.” It is remarked by Theophyl.: πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἡ λύπη τὸ δὲ κέρδος διηνεκές.

9. τὸν χαῖρεν, οὐχ οτι ἐλυπήθητε—μετανοιαν. A sentiment more delicate than this is not (as far as I remember) to be found in the whole range of Classical literature. The words are very well paraphrased by Rosenm. thus: “Grata fuit mihi tristitia vestra, non in se, sed quatenus per eam declarastis vestram resipiscientiam.” See also the other Commentators. The delicacy of the expression has been alone seen by Chrysost. He observes that the Apostle ascribes the τὸ λυπήσας to the Epistle, yet does not expressly say: “but I rejoiced that it benefited you;” though that was true; but gives such a delicate turn to the expression as rather ascribes it to their own good feeling. This remark, indeed, is in the spirit of true Criticism, such as it was professed in the School of Longinus and the other mighty Aristarchi of antient times. Theodoret paraphrases thus: εἶπο δὲ χαίρων, οὐ γυμνὴ τὴν λύπην, ἀλλὰ τῆς λύπης θεωρῶν τὸν καρπὸν· ἡ λύπη γὰρ ἐκείνη βεβλάστηκε τὴν ἐπανυμένην μετανοιαν.

8. ἐλυπήθητε γὰρ κατὰ Θεόν. The sense of these words is somewhat obscure. Rosenm. renders thus: “Tali enim tristitia estis affecti, cujus Deus auctor et suasor fuit.” vel, “qua Deus afficere solet homines.” But this seems harsh, and is little suitable to the sense of κατὰ, which must here have its usual signification, suitably to, conformably with, &c.; and so it seems to have been understood by the antients. Thus ΟΕcum. observes, that this is the ἡ καλὴ λύπη, whereas the κατὰ ἀνθρώπου λυπεῖσθαι is κακῶν. Rosenm. remarks, that there is meant a sorrow which arises from causes out of which God would have it arise, and which has the effects which he
wishes them to have. "Now (continues he) God afflicts men by calamities with the intent of working reformation of mind, and promoting their true happiness." This is indeed very true; but the λύπη here seems simply to denote the pain they felt at the reproof of the Apostle; and that was κατὰ Θεὸν, because the tendency and result of it was moral reformation, and a life conformed to the will of God.

The next words, ἵνα ἐν μετάλληλῳ φημισθῇ εἰς ἄρτι, show the result, or consequence of that wholesome pain; ἵνα being put for ἵνα. Rosenm. lays down the sense thus: "Jam non opus fuit, fatali poenâ et morbo quodam corporis afficere santes." And he adds: "quod haud dubiè accidisset, sic auctoritate Apostoli temerè sprevisserent. De ejusmodi fatali et insuitato poenâ publico genere agitur, 1 Joh. 5, 16." But this seems to be founded in error. The term will by no means warrant any such sense, which involves something too serious to be introduced on such insufficient grounds, and is destitute of any authority from either antient or modern Commentators. In fact, though ζημίω signifies properly to impose a mulct, or punishment, and ζημία denotes a mulct, yet in the Classical writers the words are often used in the sense of injury, hurt, &c.; and in the New Testament, though often used, they have scarcely ever any other sense. Here, therefore, assigning the usual signification to ζημία, the sentiment will be simply this: So that no real injury was in any respect done you on my part.

10. ἦ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάλληλας εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀμεταμέλητως κατεργάζεται. The η κατὰ Θεὸν has already been explained at ver. 9. Wets. here refers to Sirach, 30, 23. and cites from a Rabbinical writer: "Sapiens quidam, videns hominem moestum et tristem, dixit ei; si mœror tuus est propter mundum hunc, Deus tibi eum minuat: si vero mœror tuus est propter mundum futurum, Deus illum tibi auget." And also Plut. de tranquill. p. 476 f. τὰς μὲν
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γὰρ ἄλλας ἀναπει λύτας ὁ λόγος, τὴν δὲ μετανοιαν αὐτὴς ἐργαζεται.

10. κατεργάζεται, efficit, produces; as Rom. 4, 15. 5, 8. θλῖψις ὑπομονῆς κατεργάζεται and elsewhere. In eis σωτηρίαν the eis denotes the end, result, consequence. The recent Commentators either pass over the σωτηρίαν, or explain it felicity. But the sense they assign is too vague. The word generally signifies the being placed, or kept in a state in which we receive the blessings, present and future, of the Gospel of Christ.

Μετανοια plainly here denotes not so much repentance (i.e. sorrow for sin) as the consequences of it in amendment of life, and moral reformation.

It is not so easy to decide as to the mode of taking ἀμεταμέλητον, on which Theophyl. and some Latin Fathers and modern Commentators, as Erasm., Zeger, Est., and Schleus., connect with σωτηρίαν. But on the sense they are not agreed: nor does it seem to admit of any but a very harsh one. Others, as CÆcumen., and most moderns (as Grot.) write it with μετανοιαν. Grot. notices the quasi antanaclasis; since had there been ἄμετανοιαν, it would have been perfect. And so also Wets., who compares Curt. 10, 7, 12. Nec velle nec nolle quicquam diu poterant; poenitebatque modo consili, modo penitentiam ipsius. Plin. Epist. 7, 10. ne rursus provinciae, quod damnasse dicitur, placeat, agatque poenitentiam poenitentiae suæ. I would also observe that there is a meiosis. Schleus. compares Polyb. 21, 9, 11. ἀμεταμέλητος προαιρεσις and 24, 12, 11. ἀμετ. κτίσις. Julian, Or. p. 447. ἀμετ. προδομία. I add Antisthenes ap. Athen. 513 A. Ἀντισθένης δὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἄγαθον (a good) εἴναι φάσκων, προσφέρηκε τὴν ἀμεταμέλητον. Max. Tyr. Diss. 1. ἡδονὴν ἀμετάγνωστον. Liban. Or. 683 D. οὐκοί λόγον τὴν λυσιτέλουσιν. Joseph. 737, 30. αἰς ἀμετάγνωστον ποιήσαι τὸ μίσος. See also some passages of Dionys. Hal., and Porphyry., cited by Wets. on Rom. 11, 29. Upon the whole, it seems advisable to take ἀμετ. with μετανοιαν. Yet I know not whe-
ther it might not be better to treat it as an adverb, and construe with it κατεργάζεται.

10. η δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύκη θάνατον κατεργάζεται. I am surprised Rosenm. should have rendered τοῦ κόσμου "hominum improborum et vanorum," by which he would understand, either the sorrow felt by worldly and wicked persons, or (with Schulz, Tittman, and Storr.) that produced by bad men. Both interpretations equally harsh and unsuitable to the words and the context. The true sense was (I think) best seen by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) observes, that the Apostle here φιλοσοφεῖ περὶ τῆς λύπης, and shows that it is not always an evil, but only when it is κατὰ κόσμου, i. e. on account of wealth, or honours, or death of friends [to which may be added sorrow from disappointment in our just expectations, or that from unmerited ignominy, &c. Edit.] : for the tendency of that is death, both spiritual and temporal." I would compare Soph. Λυ. 259. καὶ νῦν φρόνιμον νέων ἄλγος ἔχει.

11. ιδοὺ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ Θεόν—σπουδὴν. The ὑμᾶς is meant to be emphatical; q. d. "for see now in your own case," &c. So Theophyl. well paraphrases: οὐκ ἀπ᾿ ἄλλων δεικνυμι τῆς κατὰ Θεόν λύπης τῆς αφελείαν, ἀλλ` ἀπὸ τῶν καθ᾿ ὑμᾶς. Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οὐ μετεμελήθητε ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ-σπουδαίο-τεροί γεγόνατε. Here σπουδὴ, which properly signifies hurry, bustle, denotes diligence, industry, care, &c. Indeed it seems to be here used as a general term denoting the diligence with which they exerted themselves to remove the abuses complained of by the Apostle: and it is then followed up by a more particular detail of that disposition.

The ἄλλα signifies not simply καὶ (as some antient and modern Commentators explain it), but nay even. The πόσην, by the rules of all regular construction, must be repeated with every one of the following nouns of this chain. And it was by a most injudi-
cious deviation from our common version that Mackn. omits it.*

It is strange that Calvin and some other eminent Theologians should have here fallen into so gross an error as to suppose that these verses contain seven distinct marks of true repentance, to be found in every sincere penitent, whereas (as Doddr. observes,) these are not characters of the temper of each, but of different persons, according to the part they respectively acted in the affair in question. And so Mackn. Thus the ἀπολογία, addressed (we may suppose) to Titus, would be a justification of certain persons, by which the faults complained of would be confined to fewer persons.

11. ἀγανάκτησις, i. e. indignation against the persons who, by their individual sins, had drawn down this general censure. Φόβος, fear. This is variously interpreted. Some understand by it fear of the punishments which Paul might call down from heaven for their disobedience. But this is very harsh. It should seem to denote a combined feeling of fear towards Paul, and an anxious care that all he complained of should be corrected. So in Phil. 2, 12. “work out your salvation with fear and trembling.”

11. ἐπιθλησίν. Some interpret this “desire of removing the cause of complaint.” But, conformably to its signification at ver. 7. (where see the note) it must import, as the antient Commentators and the best modern ones are agreed, their well affectedness to Paul, and desire of seeing him, and evincing to him their repentance. It is meant to soften the Φόβος.

11. γίνον, seal. This, and the next word ἐκδίκησις seem to belong together: the former denoting zeal and diligence in inquiring into abuses and offences;

* He however well observes, that in describing the effects of the sorrow of the Corinthians, the Apostle speaks of the emotions of their minds, without mentioning the objects of these emotions. This he did (Mr. Locke remarks) from modesty, and from respect to the Corinthians.
and ἐγγονόν, the reforming of the abuses, and punishing the offences. (See Theophyl.) These words are rightly referred to the Presbyters and Ministers.

11. ἐν ταύτῃ συνεστικαὶ ταύταις ἐγγονόν εἰς τῷ πράγματι. Some antient and modern Commentators here seek needless refinements; and since ἐγγονόν seems to denote the not being guilty of any sin, and offences not a few had been laid to their charge by the Apostle; so Theophyl. takes ἐν τῷ πράγματι to allude to the being puffed up, with which the Apostle had charged them generally. "Now of this they had shewn themselves clear by their ready obedience."

But this exposition is harsh; and still more so Mr. Locke's version of ἐν τῷ πράγματι, in fact: a signification destitute of authority. He also stumbles at ἐγγονός, and thinks it can only mean that they are now resolved on a contrary course, and were so far clear, i. e. "were set right and in a good disposition again."

So Whitby (after Sclater) remarks, that true repentance clears us from the guilt of it, not only in the sight of God, but man: so that it is both unchristian and unchristian to stigmatize or reproach any man for the sin which we know or believe he hath truly repented of. But making the whole sense depend on a supplied now, is harsh and precarious. After all, there need be no difficulty raised, if the words be only taken in their plain and natural sense. ἐν τῷ πράγματι is used populariter, and can only denote the matter which the Apostle had had in hand with them, by his endeavours to reform the abuses mentioned in his former Epistle, and correct the unreasonable prejudices many had taken against him personally. Now the most effectual way of removing all scruples about the ἐγγονός is that which was first propounded by Sclater, and afterwards adopted (without acknowledgment) by Doddr.; namely, that the Apostle by you means the people as a body, or Church, and does not advert to individuals: for (as Sclater observes) the misconduct of a few had redounded to the disgrace of the rest; though it might
be displeasing to them. Thus Doddre paraphrases: "there is no further stain remaining on the church, where I was so much afraid of lasting infamy and reproach." In nearly the same way the passage seems to have been taken by Chrysost. And so Theodoret: 'Εσείσατε σαφῶς· ούς συνήσθητε ταύτα κακῶς ὑπ' ἐκένων γεγενημένως· τούτο γὰρ λέγει ἀγνὸς εἶναι. Even individually, indeed, those were pure that had no hand in the sins complained of, especially after they had shewn their non-participation by the measures they took to repress offences, and reform abuses. And to these only the Apostle's words properly belong; though, with his usual delicacy, he applies them generally. Whether the term ἀγνὸς is applicable to those who have repented of, and forsaken any sin, is only a question of words and names, tending to a mere λογομαχία.

12. ἂρα εἰ καὶ ἐγραψά όμι. This is meant to answer a tacit objection, namely: "Why, then, if clear, did you rebuke us." The Apostle, therefore, explains his purpose in writing as he did.

The ἂρα is by most interpreters rendered therefore. But it seems rather to signify sanè, profectò, utique; as a particle of asseveration. So in Gal. 2, 21. 1 Cor. 5, 10. and elsewhere. See Schl. Lex. in v. § 2. Εἰ καὶ ἐγραψά όμι, "if I wrote to you (what I did)."

Some Commentators, as Rosenm. and Mackn. supply harshly. But this is too bold. Οἰκ elvere, &c. "(I wrote) not so much on his account who had done the wrong," &c. This use of οἰκ ἀλλὰ, non tam quæm, is of perpetual occurrence; though (as here) it is seldom noticed by the Commentators.

In the interpretation of the words following, the antient and early modern Commentators raise needless difficulties. Some understand by the τοῦ ἄδικησατος the adulteress. But this is frigid, nay, even absurd, not to say ungrammatical. Theodoret, of the antients, and some of the best modern Commentators, have seen that it must refer to the father of the in-
cestuous person, who was especially the aggrieved party, and that whether he were alive, or dead. Though I think with Doddr. and Mackn. that one may reasonably infer that he was then alive. To refer the words to the family, or to the Corinthian Church, were absurd.

The next words show the purpose which the Apostle had principally in view, namely, to evince his affectionate anxiety for the spiritual good of the generality: for (as Theophyl. observes) he feared lest the contagion should spread to them also; for which reason he took measures that they should wipe away the stain.

The ἐνακρίνω τοῦ Θεοῦ, may be referred to φανερο-θύρα τῆς σκοτείν (as is done by Theophyl. and others), as denoting that it was genuine and true, i. e. "that it might appear to be what in the sight of God it is, namely, true."

18. ἰδίᾳ τούτῳ παρακλήμεθα ἐκ τῆς παρακλήσει ύμῶν. This sentence is obscure from its brevity, which brevity was occasioned by its being a repetition of what had been said more at large ver. 7., where see the note. The sense seems to be: "we were comforted in the exhilarating news of you which Titus brought." The next words περισσοτέρως δὲ μᾶλλον—Titou, are also best explained by comparison with ver. 7. The Apostle means, that his own joy was exceedingly increased at the evident satisfaction which Titus felt at his reception among them. The expressions, it may be observed, have great energy, and, at the same time, much simplicity and beauty. With the ἐγήρημεν ἐκ τῆς χαρᾶ Titou, we may compare "rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep." The use of μᾶλλον, with the comparison, is justified by the examples of the best writers. See the note on Mark 7, 36. It may be remembered that these double comparatives have great energy.

The words ὁτι ἀναπέπαυσαι—ὑμῶν are exegetical of the χαρᾶ. With this expression, which savours
of Hebraism, and occurs in the Old Testament, may be compared similar ones at 1 Cor. 16, 18. ἀνέπαυσε γὰρ τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ υἱῶν; and Philem. 7 & 20. Thus ἀνασ. signifies to recreate, exhilarate, or in a general way to make happy. From the above passage it appears, that we cannot infer from this word (as has been done by Rosenm.) that Titus had gone on his mission to Corinth in great fear and doubt as to what would be his reception there.

14. εἰ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ υἱῶν κεκαίρηκαί, κατηκρίθην. The εἰ τι is for ὅτι. And the sense is: "For, whatever I had boasted of you to him I was not ashamed of it;" i. e. (says Rosenm., from Grot.) "I could not in this be convicted of telling an untruth," in κατηκρίθην. the effect being put for the cause; "for those who are convicted of lying, are usually put to shame." It is a sort of meiosis very common. Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: διὰ τούτο ἐχάρην, ὅτι εὑρέν υἱῶν ὁ Τίτος τοιούτους, οἷος ἦγαν αὐτῷ ἔλεγον εἶπαί υἱῶν· καὶ ἀνεπαύσθη καὶ αὐτὸς εὑρέθην υἱῶν τοιούτους, καὶ οὐδὲν δυσχερέστα ἀντί ἂν ἄνδρες ἀφ' υἱῶν ἀπήντησε.

14. ἄλλα ὅς πάντα—ἐγενῆτη. The sense of these words is somewhat obscure, or at least uncertain, and this from the dubiousness of the expression εἰς Τίτον, which would seem at first sight to signify de Tito, for εἰς Τίτον. And so some antient and modern Commentators. And this interpretation, as is observed by Phot. ap. CÆcumen., who learnedly discusses the point, seems to be confirmed by what precedes. Yet the air of the whole context evidently points to the explanation of apud Titum, in which that most erudite critic acquiesces. And this is embraced by the most eminent modern Commentators, as Erasm., Beza, Grot., and almost all the recent Commentators. It is also confirmed by the antient Versions, the Vulg. and Syr. &c. This signification of εἰς is somewhat rare. Schleus. thinks it founded on a similar use of the Hebr. א, to which εἰς generally corresponds in the Sept.; yet he cites an example from Demosth., as Grot. had done be-
fore him from Lucian. As to the reading of some antient MSS., πρὸς Τίτου, it is evidently a gloss.

'Αληθεία is put populariter for ἀληθής.

15. καὶ τὰ στέλγχα αὐτοῦ. The word στέλγχα is used, after the manner of the Hebr. לְשׁוֹן, to denote the inmost affections of the heart. It is therefore a very strong expression, and Theophyl. says the Apostle uses it, ἵνα τὸ ἐνδιάβετο καὶ διάκυψον τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπης ἐπιλέσῃ. Grot. compares Ps. 145, 19., and renders ἐστὶν σεφτόρ. But Pagn., Fisc., and Beza supply affecta, which perhaps may be preferable. Theophyl. seems to have supplied περιμαίμενα. It is well observed by Theophyl., that this is intended to recommend Titus to their warm affections.

'Ἀναμμηναικεμένου τῆς πάντων ὁμαν ὄπασιν. The ἀμαμ. is put in apposition with αὐτοῦ, i. e. "while he remembers the obedience of you all." Ὄσ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πρόμου ἐδέξασθε αὐτοῦ, "that with great respect and deep reverence * ye received him," or "recognised his authority, and followed his admonitions, whenever he opposed them. For the expression implies obedience, as to a ruler; and as the Apostle had before mentioned the affection they bore him, so he now notices their obedience, (as Theophyl. says) ἵνα μήτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ χαρίς φόβῳ ὄνει ἐκλιθῇ, μήτε δ ὁ φόβος χαρίς τῆς ἀγάπης ὄν, ἀχαρίς ἐ. He also judiciously observes, that all this is meant to inculcate a continuance of the same feelings towards Titus.

16. χαίρω ἐτὶ ἐν παντὶ διαμφι ἐν ὑμῖν. These words, from their great brevity, admit of some slight variety of interpretation. In such a case, our best course is to carefully attend to the context. Ἐν παντὶ is used as at ver. 11., with the subaudition of ρεπεί, for παντικος. Theophyl. proposes two interpretations: 1. "I rejoice that I have found you not to have

* This expression occurs elsewhere; as in 1 Chron. 3, 3. Eph. 6, 5. Phil. 2, 19., and must (as Rosenm. observes) be every where interpreted according as the context may require.
falsified my commendations, but have enabled me to have confidence in you in every business, and at all seasons. 2. "I have a trust in you, that whatever I shall do or say ye will receive with alacrity, and apply to your improvement whatever I may have to rebuke, or commend, or enjoin, however irksome it may seem." These interpretations may, however, be conjoined. Θαρρῶ may (with Tirin. and Me-noch.) be taken populariter for "I may rejoice." And Grot. very well paraphrases thus: "Gaudet quod tales sitis, ut de vobis mihi omnia optima passim polliceri." Est. observes that there is a metonymy of the effect for the cause. The sense, then, is: "I rejoice that, from the experience I have had of you, I may in every thing feel confidence in your ready obedience to all my admonitions or suggestions." This forms a very easy and natural transition to the subject which the Apostle now enters upon, and which forms the second part of the epistle, namely, the exhortation to make eleemosynary contributions for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem, c. 8 & 9. Schoetg. observes, that the arguments by which the Apostle urges this liberality are (semotis ὑθυμοῦ interspersis) the following. 1. Because the Macedonians had afforded it liberally, 8, 1—8. 2. Because the Corinthians would thus testify their firm faith, 7 & 8. 3. Because they would thus imitate Christ, 9. 4. Because they had before been liberal, 10. 5. Since they will thus confirm the authority of the Apostle in what he had boasted of them, 9, 8—5. 6. Because the divine blessing would compensate all that they bestow, 6—11. 7. Because others would on that account praise God, and intercede with Him in their behalf, ver. 12—14.

CHAP. VIII.

The Apostle, having expressed his confidence in their ready obedience, paves the way for the requi-
sition he was about to make, that they should form a contribution for poor Christians at Jerusalem, by informing them of what had been done elsewhere, thus prompting them to follow so good an example.

Ver. 1. γνωσιμεν &c. "I have to announce to you, brethren, the grace," &c. The expression χαρι του Θεου της ενεργης c. t. c. has occasioned the Commentators no little trouble. Some take it to denote the virtue of patience in adversity. But that is refuted by ver. 3. τις, &c., which is an epanalepsis of ver. 1., and evidently has reference to almsgiving. Besides, ἐν would not then have been used. Others, as Hamm., Knatchb., and Pyle, take του Θεου as used, by Hebraism, for great; as the cedars of God, the mountains of God. But that idiom is confined to a very few nouns (of which this is not one), and is not of universal application. They were induced to have recourse to this idiom in order to avoid the difficulty of accounting for του Θεου, if την χαριν is to be interpreted, with Whitby and several others, of alms-giving to the poor. That χαρι does sometimes signify gift, is certain even from ver. 4 & 7.; and this signification is acknowledged by the antient Lexicographers. Some antients, however, regard χαρι as equivalent to χαρωμα. But this need not exclude the notion of eleemosynary gifts: for, as Grot. observes, the cause is put for the effect, in order to show that all that is done by Christians is owing solely to the goodness of God, who hath remitted so many sins, hath revealed his will so openly, hath, of his own good pleasure, called to him those that were alienated, and hath confirmed this call by so many miracles." These (he adds) are the causes why there is so much more said of grace in the New than in the Old Testament.

The above mode of interpretation is embraced by Wolf, Locke, Hardy, and Doddre.; and is perhaps the true one. The name denoting these alms may, however, be regarded as a compound appellative; q. d. God's-gift, i. e. something given for God's sake.
And this seems to be confirmed by the ἐν following. The alms were so called, as Theophyl. suggests, out of delicacy.

2. διὰ ἐν πολλῇ δοκίμῃ θλίψεως, &c. The Apostle now proceeds to show under what circumstances this gift was made, by way of enhancing its merit. "Or, namely, that. Εν πολλῇ δοκίμῃ, "amidst great trials of affliction," i.e. amidst much trial occasioned by affliction. So Theophyl.: πολλῇ δοκίμῳ, καὶ ὧτῳ ὡς ἔτε δοκίμῳ γενέσθαι διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἦμοι ὡς κατέστεθον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ καραγγέλεως. Here may be compared Rom. 5, 4., ἡ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμῳ καταργάζεται. The affliction in question was doubtless by persecution for religion's sake, both from the Gentiles (Acts 16, 20.,) and the Jews, 17, 5 & 13.

2. η ἐπιστεία τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν. An Hebraism for "your abundant joy;" namely, arising from the influence of the doctrine and precepts, the glorious hopes, supports, and consolations of the Gospel, in this age of the special outpouring of the spirit.

2. κατὰ βαθὺς πτωχεία αὐτῶν. Here we have a phrase for an adjective, which, in this instance, has not been exactly paralleled. Soph. Aj. 180. (cited by Schleus.) comes the nearest: η μακρὸν πλοῦτον βάθει. The reading βάθος found in some MSS. and in Theodoret, would be less harsh. Of κατὰ βάθος for βάθος, examples are adduced by Wets. from Theoph. H. P. 3, 10. ῥίγας οὔτε πολλὰς, οὔτε κατὰ βάθος, and 15. The adjective βάθος is often used by the Classical writers in a similar manner; as πλοῦτος βάθος, Σελέαν V. H. 3, 18., and the adjective βαθύπλουτος. Πτωχεία properly signifies beggary. But as that term, even in our own language, is sometimes used comparativė, of one in narrow circumstances, so such is the idiomatical use of the word here and at ver. 9., as also Apoc. 2, 9. Ps. 30, 11., and elsewhere in the Old Testament. (See Schleus. Lex. V. T. and Tromm.) Wets. too adduces an example from Lucian. Suid. (cited by Schleus.) explains it the being utterly destitute of property. Rosenm. thinks the
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term is applied to them, since the Macedonians were poor in comparison with the Corinthians. But the strong expression used by the Apostle seems hardly to admit of this exposition. Probably the converts were persons chiefly of the lower orders, and the poorer classes. Grot. thinks they had become poor by confiscation, and by the desertion of the rich converts. But this is little more than mere speculation.

2. ἐπερίστευσαν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν. This is a somewhat difficult sentence, and that from the antithesis in the words βαρεός and ἐπερίστευσαν. The sense of the latter seems to be redounded unto, tended unto; as in 2 Cor. 4, 15. and perhaps 9, 12. The meaning, then, of the words (by a sort of Oxymoron) seems to be this: “their deep poverty ended in their rich liberality.” Rosem. explains: “their liberality appeared much greater than could be expected from persons so poor.” And Theophyl. thus: ἀρχιτὰ τὰ πολλὰ βλάπτις ἐπερίστευσεν εἰς χαρᾶς, ὅτως ἡ πολλὴ αὐτῶν καὶ βαθεία πτωχεία, οἱ μόνον οὓς ἐνεπέτευσεν εἰς ἔλεησον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ περίεσθαι αὐτοὺς περέτευσεν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον. See also the elegant paraphrase of Theodoret. In πλοῦτῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας there is a Hebraism; as just before in ἡ περισσεία τῆς χαρᾶς. Yet I find in that classical jackdaw, Aristeneutus, 10, 3. ὅταν πλοῦτῳ τῆς εἰκονείας. It must be observed, that ἐκκλησία, which properly signifies simplicity, yet, like the Latin simplicitas (as in Tacit. H. 3, 86.) also denotes free-heartedness, and liberality; as in Rom. 12, 8. and infra 9, 12 & 13. Krebs observes, that this signification is frequent in Joseph. and the Sept. See Schleus. Lex.

It is remarked by Mackn. (after Grot.) that this is a very masterly, and yet delicate, mode of exciting the rich Corinthians to liberality.

3. ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν. Theophyl. rightly observes, that this is explanatory of the preceding. It is indeed a kind of ἐπαναλεπτικό, and γνωρίζω may be supplied from ver. 1., but with a slight accommodation of sense; q. d. “I say that,” &c. Μαρτυρῶ
cannot be used as the verb, since it is purely parenthetic. Yet again at ἀδιάφοροι, some verb must be supplied, namely, ἦσαν, or ἐγένετο. But some verb is yet wanting to complete the construction; and that (I think) is διδόναι, which may be supplied from the context; since δεδομένη has preceded, and ἔσκαψαι follows. Then δεόμενοι will be in apposition, and require a verb to be supplied after it. ἀδιάφοροι is a strong term, denoting what is wholly voluntary.

In the next sentence δεόμενοι—δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς, the construction will depend upon the question whether δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς is to be retained. The words are omitted in very many excellent MSS., almost all the Versions, all the Greek Commentators, and many Fathers, and have been rejected by the best critics. There can be no doubt but that they are from the margin; and this, indeed, is proved from the circumstance that this verb is proposed by the Greek Commentators to be supplied for the purpose of completing the construction; and yet this is not necessary. If the words were genuine, the construction and sense would be as follows: δεόμενοι ἡμῶν (οὗτος) ὑμᾶς δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν, &c. The τὴν χάριν, will denote the beneficium, like the χάριν τὴν δεδομένην, &c. at ver. 1, according to one of those words. But χάριν, in this sense, would scarcely be necessary; and there would be a dilogia in δέξασθαι, which, as applied to κοινωνίαν, must be for ἀναδέξασθαι. It seems better, therefore, to dismiss the words δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς, and then τὴν χάριν will have the sense of the favor, and there will be an Hendiadis for τὴν χάριν τῆς κοινωνίας, "the favour of taking part in," i. e. "they asked of us to do them the favour of taking part in the trouble of conveying this collection for the saints to Judas." Now the hendiadis was necessary, in order to avoid the offensiveness of having three genitives in succession dependent upon one another.

†. τὸς διακοσίως is put for the sum of money collected,
which was to be administered to the necessities of the saints. At Rom. 15, 31, it denotes the conveyance of the collections; and in some MSS. there occurs the gloss ἡμισάμεν.

5. καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἡμισάμεν. The Commentators here supply ἐποίησαν and μόνον. But ἐδίδοσαν, taken from the following ἐδοκαν, would be a more regular ellipsis. The sense is, “they did not give what we expected only,” i.e. some small sum. And so, I find, it was taken by Theodoret: for he says the words οὐ καθὼς ἡμισάμεν are not said peri τῆς γνώμης, but of the amount of the money. And he paraphrases thus: ἀφοριστεῖς συμμετέχας περὶ προσεδόκησαμεν συνελθόντεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐνίσχυτε τὴν πενίαν ἡ μεγαλευθερία. Ἐξήγει, in the sense expect, is not unfrequent; especially in Thucyd. as 7, 38. 5, 7 & 9. The most remarkable example I know is Aristoph. Av. 956. τούτο—τὸ κακὸν οὖστοι ἡμισάμεν and Thucyd. ἡ ἔλεις τοῦ φόβου.

The words following, ἀλλά ἐδοκαν—Θεῶ, are very energetic, and in some measure hyperbolical. The sense seems to be: “They not only gave more than we expected for the use of the poor, but they gave and devoted themselves first to the Lord, to do his will in every good work; and then to us, to fulfil all our wishes, and observe our admonitions.” And Theodoret well paraphrases thus: αὐτία δὲ τούτων ἡ περὶ τῶν Θεῶν ἀγάπη. ἐαυτοὺς γὰρ ἀνέλθετον τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἠμῶν δὲ αἰσχρῶς αἰς διακόνους Θεῶ. The phrase ἐαυτῶν διδόμεν is properly used of nations yielding themselves to the subjection of another power; of which Wets. adduces examples from Theodoret. 3, 19. 5, 13. 6, 108. 7, 190, 182 & 189.

We may observe that καὶ, when it follows πρῶτος, necessarily carries with it an ellipsis of some particle suitable to the sense of an ordinal, as ἐπείτα. The accompanying phrase διὰ θελημάτως Θεῶ is variously interpreted. Grot. and Rosenm. render it “Deo ipsorum animos moveunte.” But I should prefer taking it for “Deo ita permittente;” as 2 Cor. 1, 1. “Paul an Apostle διὰ θελημάτως Θεῶ and Rom. 1, 10.
2 Corinthians, Chap. VIII.

And so Est. and Calvin. Theophyl. explains: εἰς ἁρέσκει Θεῷ, καὶ εἰς ἀνθρωπίνην λογισμὸν.

6. εἰς τὸ παρακάλέσαι ἡμᾶς T., &c. There is, it must be observed, much sense concealed under the εἰς τὸ, of which few Commentators seem aware, since they simply render itaque, insomuch that. The truth is, εἰς here, as often, signifies result; and εἰς τὸ is for ἐστε. Yet the full meaning of the Apostle cannot be elicited without supplying more words than can regularly be accounted for by any principle of grammatical ellipsis. The sense may be thus expressed. "The result of this unexpected success with the Macedonians was, that (fearing lest you should be outstripped by the Macedonians) we desired Titus, that as he had formerly begun, so he would also go on, and finish among you this collection."

6. εἰς χρόνον, "apud vos," for εἰς χρόνον. The verb προει, which also occurs at ver. 10, is somewhat rare.

7. ἀλλ' οὖν εἰς ταῦτα περισσεύετε. The Apostle follows this up with exhortation; and ἀλλ' ought not to be rendered therefore, but "now then;" as is done by Mackn. This particle indeed is not unfrequently prefixed to hortative and precatory sentences; as Mark 9, 22. ἀλλ' εἰ τι δύνασαι, βοήθησον ἡμῖν. Schleus. well renders it quaeo, and among other Classical passages, cites Arist. Nub. 188. ἀλλ' ἄνοητε τὴν θύραν. See Hoogeve. de part. Now this hortative sense is here the more necessary to be insisted on, since from it alone can we account for the ellipsis of a verbum hortandi before ἐνα. Commentators subaud σεσυντάσσετε.

The words following (πίστει, λόγῳ, and γνώσει,) are too vaguely rendered by our modern interpreters. The scope of the Apostle seems to be, to remind them of their great obligations to God, in order thereby to excite them to make a due return, by charity, to men for God's sake; now of these obligations the most remarkable were the spiritual and
extraordinary gifts with which so many of them had
been favoured, and which are so copiously treated
of in the former epistle. Now these, as the antient
Commentators rightly saw, the Apostle here intends.
See Chrys. and Theodoret. The best commentary
on this passage may be found in 1 Cor. 12, 8 & 9. καὶ
μὴ γὰρ διὰ τῶν Πνεύματος ἡτοιμα ὅλης σαφέως, ἄλλος δὲ
ὁ λόγος γνώσεως, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα. Εἰτέρω δὲ τίττις,
ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι ἄλλος δὲ γρηγορᾶ ἀμήτων, ἐν
τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι (where see the notes). To these
extraordinary gifts the Apostle subjoins some ordi-
nary endowments; as πάσης στοργῆς, i.e. zealous perfor-
manoe of every religious duty, the following after piety and virtue; examples of which are found in
Rom. 12, 11. τῇ στοργῇ μὴ ἄντρεπης. Heb. 6, 11. and 1
adduces several Classical examples of the phrases
τῷ αὐτῷ στοργήν τυμείςκαί ὅτι δεῖκει.

7. καὶ τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀγάπῃ, “and in love
from you to us;” ἐν ὑμῖν being put for ἐς ὑμᾶς. The
ἐξ may seem pieonastical, and certainly is not Clas-
sical: but it answers to the Heb. ὅ. The Apostle,
it may be observed, with the most delicate address,
endeavours to work on them, by appealing to their
well-known affection to him: and this motive he
urges further in the next verse.

8. οὕτω κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω. The κατ’ ἐπιτ. is not well
rendered “by commandment,” as if it meant, by
command from God, as Rom. 16, 26.; whereas, it
simply signifies ex imperio, authoritatively; as 1
Cor. 7, 6. τοῦτο δὲ λέγον κατὰ συγγραφῆν, οὕτω κατ' ἐπι-
tαγὴν & ver. 25. So also μετ' ἐπιταγῆς at Tit. 1, 3.
& 2, 15. Theophyl. well explains it: οὗ κατωσκείας.
The Apostle then subjoins two reasons for the in-
junction.

8. άλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἐτέρως στοργῆς, “on account of the
alacrity shown by the Macedonians, lest ye should be
outstripped by them.” Καὶ τῇ τῆς ὑπερετής ἀγάπης
γνώσεω δοκιμάζων, “and in order to try the genuin-
ness of your love.” τῇ γνώσει being put for γνησιωτῆς.
So elsewhere ἀνυπόκριτος ἁγάπη. Δοκιμάζειν signifies to put to the proof; δοκιμήν πειράται. Some modern Commentators, as Grot. and Rosenm., interpret the ἁγάπη of love to the poor Christians in Judea. But I rather think, with Phot. ap. ÓEcumen., that it denotes their love towards God and Christ, and also towards the Apostle, (see the able note of Phot.); this indeed is required both by what precedes, and what follows. This, too, is further enlarged on in the next words, where the argument is the same as at 1 Joh. 4, 19. “we love him because he first loved us.” See ver. 7—21., which admirably illustrate this subject.

9. γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν—πλουτίσετε. This is meant to suggest another reason why they should give liberally, namely, as bestowing some portion of those riches conferred by the Lord of the universe, who, for their sakes, left his supremely exalted state in the bosom of his Father, and assumed the condition of lowliness and poverty, that they might become spiritually rich, rich in the blessings of his religion, in the means of grace afforded them here, and in the hopes of glory hereafter.

Such I conceive is the sense. And hence it is not without reason that this passage is thought to afford a decided confirmation of the pre-existence of Christ.* Theodoret well paraphrases thus: Ἄπο-

* It is truly remarked by Mr. Slade, that the Socinian interpretation, that he was rich in power and in the Holy Ghost, has no force at all; this might be said of the Apostles as well as of Christ; neither would there be, in this case, any remarkable contrast between rich and poor, nor any thing in the circumstance peculiar to Christ; since it was usual, at that time, for all who were rich in miraculous endowments to lead a life of poverty. The context (adds he) furnishes no argument in favour of such an hypothesis: Christ became poor that the Corinthians might become rich. Now this is addressed to the converts at large, for all were concerned in the Apostle's exhortation. In what sense, then, were all the disciples of Christ to be made rich? not merely in spiritual gifts, but also in the eternal "recompense of reward;" rich in glory, rich in heaven. It is consistent, therefore, to interpret the word πλούσιος, when applied to Christ, in a similar manner, viz. of the "glory which he had with the Father before the world was." Joh. 17, 5.
bleψατε γὰρ εἰς τὸν θάνατον ποιητήν καὶ δεσπότην, τὸν μονογενῆ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸν, δό τῆς ομοτραποίας ἑνεκα ὑποτήριας τὴν ἐσχάτην μεταλήψειν πειναν, ἣμιν τὸν ἐκ τῆς κενίας φυσικῶν πραγματευόμενος πλοῦτον. The word ἐλασθέος must here mean, "rich in dignity, greatness, felicity, as having the dominion of all things." So Schleus. in his Lex.: "Intelligitur autem διότι illa quam Christus ab æterno habuisse apud Deum ds-sértē in N. T. traditur, Joh. 17, 5." And he refers to Heb. 12, 1. The Vulg. well renders: "cum esset dives." And this is justified by the participle δὲν; since participles present (as they are called) are often used in a past sense. In fact, what is termed the participle present, might be called the participle present and imperfect, the imperfect having tōne.

9. ἐπισκέψεις is also well rendered by the Vulgate, "egenus factus est;" examples of which significatio may be seen in Schleus. Lex., who rightly regards this expression as equivalent to that of Phil. 2, 7. ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὑπομονῇ γενόμενος. Theophyl. well explains thus: εἶ μή γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐπισκέψεις, τουτέστι, τὴν κάτω κειμένην καὶ ἄτιμον σάρκα ἀνέλαβε, καὶ τάλα πάντα τῆς ἀτίμας ὑπέστη, καὶ ταύτα δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀναξίους, τοὺς ἐξόρους, οὐχ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπισκέψαμεν. Of course the πτωχεύει must be interpreted in accordance with ἐπισκέψεις.

The πλουτισμός (which Theophyl. explains of the riches of piety, purity, holiness, and all the other benefits which Christ hath given, and will give) may be understood of the various endowments and blessings of the Gospel, both in this world, and in the next. So πλουτιζόμεθα supra 6, 10. "making many rich;" where see the note. The argument is well stated by Whitby thus: "Now if Christ thus emptied himself of his glory, that we might be spiritually rich, it becomes us, in imitation of his great example, to part with our temporals, to supply the exigencies of his needy and afflicted members."

The words γινώσκετε—δίδωμι are supposed by many eminent modern Critics to be parenthetical.
And thus the words καὶ γνάφην ἐν τούτῳ δίδωμι will be united with δοκιμαζεῖν. For γνάφην δίδωμι the Classical expression is γνάφην ποιῶμαι (as at 1 Cor. 7, 25. γνάφην δίδωμι), or συμβουλεύω δίδωμι. It is observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle is here ἀνε-παχθει, merely gives counsel, does not issue orders. And Grot. remarks, that it was, indeed, a precept of Christ to assist the poor, but the degree of that assistance was left to every one’s liberty. Thus what the Corinthians had done was a matter rather of persuasion than order.”

10. τούτῳ γὰρ ὑμῖν συμφέρει. The γὰρ does not (I think) refer to what immediately precedes, but to ver. 7. (ἐπιστασιστε) ἵνα καὶ ἐν παιστὶ τῇ χαρίτι περισ-σεύκετε for I cannot but regard the whole of the words ὡς κατĽ ἐπιστασιστε—δίδωμι as parenthetical; q. d. “I bid you abound in this gracious and good work, for συμφέρει, which is rendered by the best Commentators, expedit, decet, decorum est. So Grot.: “expedit vobis tueri bonam famam quam ccepistis conseuisti. Vetustum jam vobis exemplum proponam. Non est pulcerum audire, cæpistī melius quam desinis : ultima primis distant.” Others, however, as Theophyl., Est., Menoch., Erasm., Montan., Pisc., and Beza, render conferri, conducit, utile est, viz. “for their spiritual and eternal profit.” And this may be very true: but the former interpretation is more suitable to what follows, which shows that the Apostle (as Vorst. observes) argues not et utilis, but et honesto. It was (he means to say) expedient for the support of their reputation, that they had begun they should accomplish. The words are plainly connected closely with ὀλίγος, &c. following. But in these words there is something not a little singular. One would have expected οὐ μόνον τὸ δελεῖν ἄλλα καὶ τὸ νοησαι. And so some have conjectured; but neither MSS. nor Versions support this conjecture. Others, thinking of the si superos non silectem, Acherontia movere, endeavour to work out the same sense by grammatical levers, calling in the Ὁ θεὸν and μηχανῆs, an
Hysteron proteron. Thus many Commentators suppose, with Grot., that we have here a genus loquendi inversum, where, in the comparison of things unequal, that precedes, which, by the natural order, ought to follow. And in this manner (they say) the words were understood by the Syriac and Arabic Translators. So, too, Doddr. But they appear to have alike founded their interpretation on mere conjecture, and thus their authority will be entitled to no more regard than that of other Interpreters. Indeed, the principle is too precarious, and too little established, to be safely admitted. Here we must recognize one of those things hard to be understood, which are found in this Apostle; and it must be laid to the account of Hebrew or idiomatic phraseology, and explained in the best manner we are able. All the antient Commentators, and some modern ones, as Cajetan, Est., Calvin, Vorst., Sclater, Beza, Whitby, &c. have (rightly I think) supposed that δέλεω must be understood of free will and zeal (ποιησιν being repeated after it) i.e. to do it μετὰ προθυμίας. And this interpretation is placed beyond doubt by ver. 11. καὶ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ δέλεω.

The ἐπιτελέσαι, at the next verse, is very significant, denoting the actual accomplishment of the thing. The expression ἀπὸ πέρυς (which also occurs at 9, 2.) is Hellenistical, and formed from the Heb., where there is a similar use of נ. The Classical writers only use the ἀπο; which, indeed, is harsh, since πέρυς is properly a dative plural of the obsolete word πέρος, and depends on the preposition ἐν; and πέρος comes from πέρω, cognate with περίω, transeo, and literally signifies time past, which, by usage, came to mean the year past. So the French l'année passée. The ἀπο, however, is not pleonastic, but answers to our back, or ago. It was (it seems) about a year since they had begun to collect. See 1 Cor. 16., and consult Whitby.

11. νῦν δὲ καὶ τὸ ποιήσας ἐπιτελέσατε, "But now accomplish the doing of it (and do not rest content,
with having begun it, with whatever alacrity).” Grot. notices this use of the infinitive of a verb in the place of a substantive; a very common Grecism. Yet a Classical writer would not have so written, but rather ἐργαὶ ἐπιτελεῖ. as in Thucyd. 1, 70. οἱ μὲν γε, νεαπεροτοῖοι, καὶ ἐπινοήσας ὁξεῖς, καὶ ἑπιτελέσαι ἐργα, δήν γνώσει. Isocrat. ap. St. Thes. ταῦτα τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιτέλει. Procop. 56, 20. ἐργαί ταῦτα ἑπιτελεῖν οὐδαμὴ ἔπειθεν & 77, 13. ἐργα ἐπιτελῇ.

On the present verse it is remarked by Theophyl., that as the Apostle had before excided them to give from the motive of others' zeal, so now he does it from their own past promptitude; q. d. ἐκτὸς ἑτερα ταῦτο ἑλβετε, καὶ ὅμως ἄρχην κατεβάλλεις πρὸς τὸ ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ βέλειν τουτέστι, πρὸς τὸ ἐκουσίας ποιεῖν, καὶ μηδενὸς προτρεψάμενον. Νωκ εἰς γνωφην ὑμῖν διδαμι, ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐπιτελέσῃς.

The words following further develope the idea; and in them two verbs must be supplied: both, however, the verb εἰναι, viz. ἴνα in the first clause, and ἴνα in the second. Ἐπιτελέσαι signifies to bring the thing ἐτι τέλος, to perfect it.

11. ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν. A very elliptical expression, at which must be supplied ὑμᾶς, and τὰ χρήματα, have to give: though a Classical author would not have thus written. So the Apostle elsewhere says: “be content with such things as ye have.” Theophyl. well illustrates the scope and sentiment thus: Ἰνα μὴ ἄρχει τὴς προδομίας στὶ τὸ καλὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐργασθῆ τελειώτερον. "Ωσπερ γὰρ τὴν προδομίαν καὶ προαιρεσίν τὸ βέλειν ποιεῖν οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν γίνεται.

12. εἶ γὰρ ἡ προδομία—ἔχει. Grot. remarks that here also, as at 1 Cor. 14, 34. 1 Tim. 4, 8., a verb is to be supplied; and he paraphrases: “Grata est Deo voluntas pro facultatibus; supra facultates non exigitur;” i.e. God does not ask impossibilities. So Luke 11, 41. “Give alms of such things as ye have.” Rosenmuller paraphrases thus: “Placet Deo ista alacritas pro facultatum præsentium ratione,
ut non opus sit, tentitatem praeteri a quoquam; quasi non sit Deo futurum gratum ipsius munus, nisi par fuerit locupletum collationi. Nam spectat Deus in probando munere, non id quod aliquid non habet, sed id demum quod habet: alioquin charitas esset divitum propria. Ef. Luc. 21, 3. Marc. 12, 43." There is, however, much acuteness in the observation of Theophyl. from Chrys. "Remark (says he) the wisdom of the Apostle. He bears testimony that the Macedonians gave ὑπὲρ δύναμιν: but he asks of the Corinthians only κατὰ δύναμιν, and tells them that God will accept it."

The Translators here do not attend to the force of the article; though the ἡ προδείκτα τῶν θέλειν just before, might have guided them to it. Kypke renders: "Si prompto et alacri animo consilium capimus beneficiendi." And he learnedly illustrates the sense of προκείμενον, by which (with the subaudition of κατὰ νοών) it signifies take counsel, and generally perform any thing: a sense which has been embraced by most recent Commentators. Yet it seems too refined and far-fetched to be ascribed to the Apostle. Far more natural is the common interpretation, adsit, or praecesserit. See Exod. 10, 10. Sept. Thus Hesych. explains: παράκειται.

At εἰπροδεκτας must be supplied ἔστι, "is accepted." Some modern Commentators, as Rosenm., apply this to the person. But this seems harsh. Far more natural is it to apply it to the thing, i.e. προδείκτα. So Rom. 15, 16. ἡ γένεσις ἡ προσφερα τῶν θεων εἰπροσδ. & ver. 81. Thus also, in the two other passages of the New Testament (1 Pet. 2, 5. & 2 Cor. 6, 2.) the word is used of a thing, never of a person. And so the antient Commentators, of whom Theodoret well paraphrases thus: Την μεν γαρ προδείκταν τελειαν ελθει προσφερει τα δε προσφερόμενα τη δυναμει: μετεριν ελασθεν α των θεων Θεος· ου γαρ την ποσοτητα, αλλα της γνωριμης φρα την ποσοτητα.

12. καθ' δ' is equivalent to κατα τοῦτο δ'. And ἐν
is not (as Roseaeus treats it) pleonastical, but is for \( \acute{\alpha} \varepsilon \); on which use see Matth. Gr. Gr., and especially Weinner's Gr. Gr.

With the sentiment I would compare Aristot. Eth. L. 10. C. 8. p. 493. καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ μετρίων δύναμιν ἀν τις πράττειν κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν, where some MSS. read κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν; others, κατὰ τὴν ἀρχήν: and others again, κατὰ τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν. \( \) But the common reading is preferred by Wilkinson, and with reason; since from it we may account for all the others.

13. οὖ γὰρ ἡν ἄλλοις ἀνείσι, ὑμῖν δὲ θλίψις. The force of the γὰρ is not well discerned by the Commentators. This particle refers (as often) to a clause omitted, and may be thus expressed: "Misunderstand me not; for I mean not that, " &c. Here there is an ellipsis of βούλομαι, on which see Boe Ellips. "\( \) ἀνείσι, after which \( \gamma \) is to be understood, is not well rendered by our English Translators, "that they be eased, and you burdened; which suggests wrong ideas. \( \) \( \) ἀνείσι (in which there seems a musical metaphor) properly signifies a relaxation from any labour or trouble, pain, distress, &c. Theophyl. explains: \( \omega \chi \) ην άλλοι μετα ἀνείσι τρυπάσων, \( \chi \rho \) ἱμας \( \upsilon \)κα τοῦ δύναμιν δούναι, \( \omega \)στει καὶ \( \xi \)νέεσιν, καὶ θλίψιν \( \iota \)μομεναι \( \epsilon \)κ τωνών. And some would take \( \) ἀνείσι to mean idleuses, and \( \)θλίψις work; q. d. "I mean not that they should be idle, and you work like slaves (to supply their wants)." But the Apostle could not suppose that they would so understand him. The same objection will apply to the explanation of Rosenm. and Schleus. prosperity, abundance. Now \( \)θλίψις evidently here means pinching distress, narrowness of circumstances; as in Phil. 4, 14. συγκοινωνιαῖς \( \mu \)ν τῇ θλίψει: and, ex ratione oppositi, ἀνείσι (I think) means relief from distress. So Acts 24, 23 (in a physical sense) \( \)ἐχειν τε ἄνεσιν. And as \( \)ἀνείσι and θλίψις are here-opposed, so in 2 Thess. 1, 2, οὐ μὴν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἀνείσι μὲν τῇ ἡμῶν. The sense, then, appears to be this: "My meaning is not that they should be relieved by you from dis-
tress, so as to occasion distress to yourselves, but that you should give what you can spare.” This sense is more fully developed by the words following, ἀλλ’ “but (my meaning is) that,” &c.

The phrase ἐξ ἴσότητος is parenthetical, and very elliptical. It may be rendered, “there being now an equality.” The construction is ἀλλ’ (ἵνα) γένηται τὸ περίσσευμα: and εἰς signifies “for the supply of.” Γένηται, tend, serve. The words may be rendered: “That, at the present time, your abundance may serve for the supply of their want, so that (at another time) their abundance may be for the supply of your want.” The words following ἄνω γένηται ἴσότης are explanatory of the preceding ἐξ ἴσότητος, and signify: “that there may be an equal reciprocity, of giving and receiving, or of good offices, between you.” The καλ after ἵνα must mean “and, on the other hand.” And there is an ellipsis of some phrase answering to ἐν τῶ νῦν κακῷ in the preceding clause.

Such appears to be the real sense of this somewhat difficult passage, in which certain Commentators, by not attending to the context and the real sense of ἴσότης, have assigned to it senses most wild, (as if an equalization of property were meant to be inculcated), contrary to the context of the Apostle, and at variance with the course of things which must ever subsist in the world. What the Apostle here says is only meant of the two countries, Corinth and Judea, and is not to be extended to the case of individuals, except with careful accommodation. We may, however, hence infer, that it is the will of God that every person should give out of his superfluity, in order that there may be a mutual reciprocation (ἵσοτης) of good offices; so that he, if he should ever fall into necessity, may receive out of the superfluity of others. And so the ἴσοτ. seems to have been taken by Theophyl., who thus annotates: Πῶς γένηται ἴσότης; ἐὰν καὶ ὰμεῖς καὶ ἔχειν τὰ περίσσευμα ἀντιδιδατε, καὶ τὰ ὑστερήματα ἀναπληρώτε. 

15. καθὼς γέγραπται: Ὅ τὸ πολὺ—ἡλαττώνησε. This
formula καθὼς γέγραπται must every where be interpreted suitably to the context. Here it may be rendered: “So that the saying of Scripture may be thereby fulfilled.” The words quoted are from Exod. 16, 18., and are said of the manna which fell from heaven.

At τὸ πολὺ and τὸ ὀλίγον there must be supplied συνλέξαμενος from the preceding συνέλεξαν. The verb ἐλαττώνει is found in no writer earlier than the Sept. translator, who appears to have used it to suit the antithetical term ἐξελίσσετε. It is sometimes employed by the Ecclesiastical writers. See Steph. Thes. in voc. Nov. Edit. The application of this to the point in question is too obvious to need explanation. The Commentators may be consulted. They have, however, fallen into great errors; and all omit to notice the intent with which the Apostle has applied the passage to the present case, namely, to teach that “as the manna gathered was from heaven, and the gift of God, and therefore to be equally distributed, so the riches which men ‘heap up;’ and ‘gather’ are also the gift of God, and therefore to be communicated to those that are in need.”

16. χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ—Titus. The Apostle now returns to the subject of Titus, of whom he had been speaking at ver. 6. For the intermediate verses are, in a manner, parenthetical and digressive. He thanks God for having put into the heart of Titus a readiness to hearken to his request, &c. Χάρις δὲ τῷ Θ. is, very improperly, degraded by Rosenm. to a common proverbial expression of little or no meaning; whereas, whatever may be the case with other writers, the Apostle is not accustomed to use such phrases as words of course. And here the force of his requisitions is evidently meant to be strengthened by his making what was done the work of God.

Διδόντι is used for the more Classical ἐνδόντι, and τὴν αὐτῇν σπούδῃ is an elliptical expression which the context requires should be expressed thus: “the same well-affect edness for you (that I feel).” Ὄπερ
2 Corinthians, chap. viii.

ἀποδοσία is by most Commentators explained, "for exhorting you to accomplish the collection." But this seems harsh. It rather (I think) signifies "for your good; for your credit and spiritual good," (as συμβεβεβηκεν ὑμῖν, ver. 10.), which required that the collection so voluntarily and zealously commenced should be completed.

17. ὅτι τῇν μὲν παρακλήσεν ἐδέξατο. The force of the apodosis μὲν and δὲ is here to be attended to.

'Εδέξατο, "received, granted my request; acceded to my exhortation," For τῇν has here the force of the pronoun possessive. Συνδαιστερος δὲ ύπάρχων. The δὲ may signify "nay, on the other hand." The συνδαιστερος is very ill rendered by our English Translators, who, though they variously express the force of the comparative, yet have all (I think) failed in discerning its true import. It should rather seem that no comparison is here intended; nor is any recognised by the best Commentators. But if such be expressed, it must (I think) be this: "he being readier to engage in this service than I to put him upon it; anticipating my request."

17. αὐθαίρετος signifies willingly; as a little before.

17. ἐξῆλθε is not well rendered "he went out:" for Titus had not gone when the words were written, since he conveyed the present Epistle. To remove which difficulty various methods have been devised. Beza and Pisc. render it iter suscipit. And so Grot. Est. renders: "paratus est ad professionem." But the same scruple might be raised on ἐπεμψαμεν just after. The true way of accounting for this expression is that which Est. (though too timidly) proposes, namely, to consider the past tenses as meant with reference to the time when the Corinthians would read the letter.

18. συνεπεμψαμεν δὲ μὲν αὐτοῦ τῷν ἄδελφῳ, "and we have sent with him the brother," &c. Who is meant by this brother has been variously conjectured. The ancient Commentators, and some modern ones, think it was Luke; others, Mark. Nor are there
wanting those who maintain it was Silas, or Barnabas. The first opinion seems to deserve the preference. See Whitby, Mackn., and Storr. Nothing positive, however, can be determined: and Chrys. himself regarded it as altogether uncertain. Indeed, the matter is not of much importance, if (as it seems probable) εν τω εὐαγγελίῳ signifies, not "for writing the Gospel," but "for preaching the Gospel." And such is the sense assigned not only by the best modern Critics, but by Chrysost.

19. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ, "and not only (that)," i. e. "and he not only deserves that praise, but also," &c. At καιροτομηδείς must be supplied εστί; as in the former clause. The word is not well rendered elected, or chosen; though that is its original sense, with allusion to the antient custom of publicly voting by the extension of the right hand. It merely denotes appointed, constituted; as in Acts 14, 23. καιροτομηδεῖς δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, where see the note. Συμεκωσίς signifies fellow-traveller. So Acts 19, 29. συμεκωσίς τοῦ Παύλου. The συν is used populariter for "to go with," i. e. in charge with. Χάρις here signifies the same as at ver. 1, namely, this gift of grace, God's gift, alms. Διακονία includes every trouble which accompanied the collection, namely, the procuring, conveying, and distributing this gift.

19. προς τὴν αὐτῷ—ὑμῶν. Many MSS. here read ὑμῶν, which has been received into the text by Griesb. and Vater; but (I think) on insufficient grounds. MS. authority, in so minute a variation, is of no weight. The question as to the reading must depend upon the comparative suitableness of the words. Now the ὑμῶν admits of a tolerable sense, but one by no means so suitable as ὑμῶν, which is read and explained by Chrysost. and Theophyl., and strongly supported by the context, supra 11 & 12. and infra 9, 2. At προςὑμῶν the preposition προς must be repeated. The expression is explained by the Commentators as put for εἰς δύον τῆς προσμήνας
καταδίκης; which may be admitted: or, more simply ἁμαρτία may denote "for the manifestation of."

20. ἴππος ὑπάρχει τῶν, ἐν τῷ ἴππῳ, &c. This participle depends upon the ὑπαρχεῖσθαι at ver. 18. ἴππος is here used in a somewhat uncommon sense, namely, to beware of. The antient Commentators explain it to fear. And so Hesych. ἴππειν, φοβεῖαι. But, from a comparison with a similar use of the word at 1 Thess. 3, 6. the former interpretation would appear to deserve the preference. The mode by which it came to mean this may be thus traced. ἴππειν, in the middle voice, signifies to go on an expedition, and, generally, to go off, retire, keep off. Hence it came to signify keep off from any person, or thing, beware of it, guard against it: and this seems to be the sense here. So Zonar. explains ἀναπλήρειαν. This use is rarely found in the Classical writers; though something like it is cited from Polyb. 5, 17.

20. μῆτις ἱππᾶς μακρῶσται, "lest any should have a handle for slander or calumny, as if I appropriated any part to my private use." So Hardy, who rightly observes that there is a metonymy of the adjunct for the subject. "Et seems to be used like the Hebr. ב, and to have the sense of אִל, on account of. Αἵπτης properly can only mean abundance, or greatness; but as ἄθροις was often applied to a sum of money, and thus of itself signified wealthy, (as in Isocr. cited by Wets. τοῖς ἄθροισι αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς βελτίστοις εἶναι δοκοῦσιν); so ἄθροις is here used to denote wealth, or rather a large sum of money; and (as Wets. says) it is four times used in Zon. to denote a great gift. It must be observed, that ἄθροις properly signifies heavy; and in Hesiod, Op. S. 71. (cited by Wets.) we have: ἄθροισιν στάχυς νεώων ἔραξε. So we say "a heavy crop."" With the sentiment Wets. compares a similar one in a passage of Maimonides, where he enjoins great caution to avoid scandal in the administration of charitable collections.

καλὰ ἐνότιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων, where see the note.
Here no further explanation of the expression can be
necessary, as the phrase ἐνότιον has been before con-
sidered. Wets. here compares a similar sentiment
from Tanchuma, 128, 2. Homini necessarium est,
σαπεὶς coram hominibus peccati suspicione carere, ac
coram Deo debet innocens esse. Also Cic. de Offic.
2, 21. Caput autem est in omni procuratione negotii
et muneris publici, ut avaritiae pellatur etiam mimma
suspicio: and Sueton. Jul. 74. Interrogatus, cur igi-
tur repudiáset uxorem? quoniam, inquit, meos tam
suspicione quam crimine judico carere oportere.

22. σωστέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν—οὔτα.
It has been much debated who is here meant by the
brother; as at τῶν ἀδελφῶν in ver. 18., and with as
little success. It is easy to raise objections to almost
every opinion that has been brought forward, but to
prove whom the Apostle had in view is scarcely
possible. See Whitby and Mackn. The least objection-
able opinion seems to be that of the antients, that
this was Apollos.

The words ὅν ἑδοκίμασαμεν—οὔτα may be rendered:
"whose diligence we have often approved in many
things." ὗντα is put, by a Hellenism, for ὅν, as
"whom we have approved and found to be diligent
and zealous." In the words following νυν δὲ πολὺ
posweetai, &c. there is an ellipsis, which must be
supplied from the context, namely, δοκιμαζεῖται (he
will approve himself) ἑδοκίμασαν. The words follow-
ing may be rendered: "by his great reliance on
you," i.e. hoping the best of you in this matter.
Theophr. well remarks on the energy imparted to
the sense by the union of ἐν πολλοῖς and πολλάκις.
Such indeed is not unusual in this Apostle. And so
Arist. (cited by Wets.) οἱ δὲ, τῆς ἀθηνᾶς ἐν πολλοῖς ἥδη
πολλάκις διείξαντες αὐτὸς ὁδῷς εἰςιν ἐπάνωρα. The words
are well paraphrased by Theophr. thus: 
Nυν δὲ
ποιήσως οὐκ ὑμᾶς δαφιστέ-
ραν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ποιήσετε, ἤν 
μελλει διακοινῆσαι. It
seems that he repeated ἑδοκίμ. before 
ποιήσως ὑμᾶς.
which is indeed more simple, but then σπουδ. must be interpreted rather of zeal and alacrity in undertaking: though it will have the same sense with σπουδαίων just before.

23. εἰτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου. Here again is a harsh ellipsis, on which Grot. remarks: "amat ἐλεεῖσθαι Paulus rem eloqui properans." Some supply: "If any enquire of Titus." But this is a peculiarly harsh subaudition; and still less admissible is that of Mackn.: "If any of the faction do enquire about Titus." Far milder is the ellipsis supposed by the antients, namely, δεὶ εἰπεῖν. Thus Theophyl.: δεὶ δεῖ τι εἰπεῖν ὑπὲρ Τίτου, ταῦτα ἔχω λέγειν. And he well explains the words κοινανός ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός by: διὶ κοινανός ἐμὸς, συνεργόν μοι εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν διδας-καλίαν καὶ αφελείαν. The Apostle seems to have felt, that after having made such honourable mention of Luke and Apollos, he must say something of Titus, and the brethren who were going with him to Jerusalem. This confirms the ellipsis at εἰτε just proposed. At the second εἰτε something similar must be supplied, namely: "If our brethren (are to be spoken of)," If I must speak of them too." In the eulogium "they are the ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, from a comparison of ver. 19. it is manifest that the word ἀπόστολος is to be taken in its proper sense, i.e. simply "one sent out as on any mission as a legate, to discharge business for others." Thus it is here well explained by Theophyl.: πο ἐκκλησιῶν περιβάλλεις καὶ χειροτονηθέντες. So it simply means one sent in Joh. 13, 16. Phil. 2, 25. These the Apostle calls the δόξα Χριστοῦ, i.e. (by metonymy,) instruments for spreading and promoting the glory of Christ and the Gospel. It is finely remarked by Theodoret: οἱ ὀρατεῖς αὐτῶν τὴν λαμπάδα τῆς ἀρετῆς, τὸν υπὸ τούτων κυριευόμενον ἀνυμμᾶνός Θεοῦ.

24. τὴν οὖν—ἐκκλησιῶν. The construction is: ἐν-δείξασθε οὖν εἰς αὐτὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν, &c. "Give therefore to them, in the presence of the churches, this evident testimony of your love to them, and of (the
truth of) our boasting concerning you." Ἐνδείξειν τῆς ἀγάπης is said to be put for ἔνδειξασθε ἀγάπην: but it is a stronger expression.

The chief peculiarity in the phraseology is the ellipsis of καὐχηθεμιν, which signifies "(of the truth) of our boasting." Compare 7, 4 and 14. The καὶ, which is an encumbrance to the sentence, may be removed, on the authority of many very antient MSS. Now whatever they did in this matter, might truly be said to be done in the presence of the churches, not only because Titus would proclaim it wherever he went (as Rosenm. suggests), but because Corinth was in all respects placed in excelsa, and, from its perpetual communication with all parts of the civilized world, the tidings would soon spread to all the Churches, i.e. the Gentile Churches planted by Paul.

Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: Νῦν δεῖξατε πῶς μὲν ἡμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἡμᾶς· πῶς δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐ μᾶς ἐχαρεῖμεθα ἐφ’ ὑμῖν δεῖξατε δὲ, ἐὰν ἀγάπην εἰς αὐτῶς ἔνδειξασθή. And Theodoret thus: Πάντα τοῖνυν τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν τὸν πλοῦτον γυμνασάτε, καὶ τὰς ἐμὰς περὶ ὑμῶν ἐφημερας κυράσατε· πάσας γὰρ τὰς ἐκκλησίας διὰ τούτων τιμῆσετε.

CHAP. IX.

Verse 1. περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς διακοινίας—ὑμῖν. The particle γὰρ shows that this verse is closely connected with the last of the preceding chapter. And this the Commentators have not failed to perceive: but they do not enough advert to the apodotic force of μὲν, which has δὲ opposed to it at ver. 3.; and to that of γὰρ, which is used not only in transitions, but sometimes in quasi-transitions, when a writer stops short; in which case, it has the same sense as ἀλλὰ γὰρ, and this is to be completed by supplying the elliptical words. Here it may be done thus: "But I need say no more, for as to the ministering," &c.
The διακονία must denote the *contribution* or *subsidiary* itself; as at Acts 11, 29. εἰς διακονίαν πέμψας τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ ἄδελφοις. 1 Cor. 16. 15. and supra 11, 8. Ἑρωσύν signifies *superfluous*; as in Matt. 5, 37. and elsewhere. After γραφεῖν must, from the nature of the subject, be supplied πλέον.

2. οἴδα γὰρ τὴν προθυμίαν ὑμῶν, "for I know your promptitude (on that head);" as 8, 12 & 19. Ην ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καυχώμασιν M. the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is treated as pleonastic by many eminent modern Translators; and yet it seems intended to add meaning to the sentence, and may be regarded as an elliptical phrase to be supplied by διαλεγόμενος or λαλῶν, and signify, "when speaking in your praise." So infra ver. 3. τὸ καυχήμα τὸ ὑμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. At δὲ there is the ellipsis of a verb of speaking, which may be supplied, either from the elliptical λαλῶν, or from the expression καυχώμαι, which sometimes bears that sense; "saying, or telling them that Achæa," &c. Here Achæa stands for Greece, of which Corinth was then the capital: and there were doubtless Christians in various parts of it, as well as at Corinth. Certain it is, this use of the word is fully justified.

2. παρεσκεύασται, "has been prepared." Some modern Commentators remark, that the force of the word παρεσκ. denotes the *intention* only, and the *will*; since the collection had never been made.* But this does by no means appear to have been the case, and is not at all probable. Nay, from the words of the former Epistle, 16, 2. κατὰ μίαν σαββατὼν ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν παρέσκαι τιθέαι, θησαυρίζειν, οὐ δὲν εὐδοκοῦσαι ἵνα μὴ, ἀπὸ θλίψεως, τότε λογία γίνονται, (where see the note). It may be presumed that much money had really been laid by for the purpose, and, it is probable, was partly brought together. Considering, too, the force of the παρεσκεύασται in the middle voice (on which see Dresig. or Schleus. Lex.),

* And in this view Mackn., after discussing the circumstances, says that the Apostle asserted what he firmly believed to be true.
to which this tense has a strong affinity, it appears to signify, "have been preparing themselves, preparing contributions, for a year past." Theophyl. paraphrases thus: καυχάμαι, ὅτι ἔτοιμη ἦστι πάσα ἡ Ἀχαΐα, οὐ μόνον ἡ Κορινθίας καὶ οὐδὲν λείπεις εἰ μὴ τὸ ἔλθειν τῶν δεξαμένων τὰ χρήματα. ὡστε αἰσχρῶν μοι ἐστιν εἰ φανήσομαι μάτη καὶ ἕυθε καυχάμενος. But this appears to be the other extreme. That the Apostle could not mean to say that they were ready, strictly speaking, is clear from the passage of 1 Cor. just cited.

2. καὶ ὁ ἐξ ἕμαν δήλος ἡρέθιε τοὺς πλείωνας. Grot. and Rosenm. regard the ἐξ as pleonastic. But perhaps a participle is left to be supplied, ἔρχομένη, or the like. It savours of Hebraism; for the ὁ is sometimes so used. Ἡρέθιε, "hath excited, roused, impelled (to give)." The Classical writers use the compound ἀνερθ., of which examples are given by Wets. Théophyl. needlessly stumbles at τοὺς πλείωνας, as if it meant the greater part: though the Apostle at 8, 3 & 4, says ὅτι αὐθαίρετοι καὶ δεόμενοι ἕμαν. He concludes that some few were willing of themselves, but the greater part required the incitement just mentioned. But this is refining too much. The Apostle is not so very exact in the use of the article that we must be compelled to explain πλείωνας of the greater part. For he not only uses πλείωνες for πολλαί, but also οἱ πλείωνες. So 1 Cor. 10, 5. ἄλλα ὡς ἐν τοῖς πλείωναν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς and 1 Cor. 9, 19, 15, 6. 2 Cor. 2, 6, 4, 15. et alibi. It is therefore well rendered by Beza complures, and by our English Translators very many.

Here it is acutely remarked by Theophyl.: Ὅρας τῶν κακεῖνοι διὰ τοῦτον καὶ τοῦτος δι' ἐκείνων ἐγείρει; διδάσκαλοι, φήσιν, ἐκείνως ἐγινευθεὶς μὴ οὐν φανήτε τῶν μαθητῶν ὑπερωντες οἱ διδάσκαλοι.

3. ἔκμησα δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς—τοῦτο, "I however have sent the brethren (just mentioned), that our boasting ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, in your praise;" as ver. 2, where see the note. Μὴ κενοθῇ, might not be found empty, vain, and false. So Theophyl.: μάταιον καὶ κενον
The diaconia, or diaconium itself; namely the chief of the congregation. So it is used, "that, as ye may be prepared with and expected, that there may be, when I come."

If any Macedonians were not prepared, we are not likely that they would have had intercourse of Macedonia or Greece, and the customs of the proemum, or ceremonies on their way, and bringing them, so as to bring them to the assembly congregation.

One cannot but remark on the elegant and delicate turn, inferior (I may say) to the best Classical writers. "Ec..."

Here is (like the account of," On ὑπόστασις and ὑποτάσσεσθαι in which he assigns the sense "in hac materiâ," p. 372, lines 27 and 28, it is pages just before. And so Theocritus and Juvenal, as also Grot., Erasm., But this would occasion a very and enervate a sentence which, therefore prefer, with Calvin, Pau..." Wits., the English Versions, but some recent Commentators, to assign to "..." Capellus rightly takes it as..." i.e. enervate repel its power. That it must have this sense, is clear..."
from a repetition of the clause in this very sense infra 11, 17.: and that passage establishes the genuineness of the word καυκάσεως, which is omitted in several good MSS., and has been rejected by many Critics. But how (it may be asked) can its omission here be accounted for? I answer, from the prurigo or cacoethes emendandi which seized so many librarii in the earlier ages. Thus among these MSS. we find the emended Codex Cantab. But why should they have thus altered? Because no Classical author (I believe) ever uses ἀποκτάσει otherwise than absolutely, and without any addition. See many examples cited by the Philological Commentators. It often occurs in the Books of Maccabees. By the Classical writers the word is used simply to denote fiducia in a good sense. And so Hebr. 3, 14, and Ps. 37, 11.

5. καὶ προκαταρτίσωσί τὴν προκαταγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, “and that they should make up before hand, and complete the before mentioned benefit.” Here one cannot but notice the energy imparted to the sentence by the reiteration of προ. Προκαταγγελμένη is for προειρημένη. Many MSS. and some Versions and Fathers read προεπαγγελμένη, promised. But that is by no means so apt as the common reading. Perhaps they meant προπαγγ. Neither, however, is that comparable with the common reading.

As to the term εὐλογία, I would observe that it may be numbered with the euphemisms which the delicacy of the Apostle so often employs, especially in terms denoting alms, (or what we call charity,) for which he substitutes names which spare the feelings of the receiver, and remind the giver that he is exercising a duty towards God. The Commentators, however, are not sufficiently aware of this custom of the Apostle, and therefore overlook it here, where they assign very insufficient reasons for this use of the word, which they term a Hebraism; referring to a similar use of רְאוּבָן in Gen. 28, 11. Jud. 1, 15. 1 Sam. 25, 27., and of εὐλογία in Eph. 1, 8. Gal. 1, 14.; which passages, however, are not to the pur-
pose. Rosenm. says the word is so used "quia pro beneficciis Deo alisque agimus gratias, et bona omnia precamur." And so Theophyl. But this seems harsh. I should rather think we may compare it with the use of εὐλογία for εὔχαριστία, in 1 Cor. 10, 16., and here render it a thanks-gift, "a gift bestowed on man, in grateful thanks to God for his goodness." Now this will enable us to fix the sense of εὐλογία immediately after, which otherwise must be used in a very different one to what precedes. That sense appears to be the same, and I would render: "so that it may be ready (as it ought to be), being thus (as it is) a thanks-gift, and not, as it were, a parsimony, niggardliness, or a niggardly gift, or as something wrung from * any one, as no such gift ought to be." Upon the whole this sense differs but slightly from that elicited by the Commentators; though we arrive at it in a more regular manner.

The use here of πλεονεξία is (I think) unprecedented in the Classical writers. Yet it has great spirit, and easily arises out of the common signification, avarice, for niggardliness is the daughter of avarice.

6. τούτο δὲ, ὁ σπείραν φειδομένως, φειδομένως καὶ θερισεί. The mention of πλεονεξία in the sense above assigned, naturally leads the Apostle to advert to a parsimonious contribution: and here he tacitly encounters the objection: "Well then, the gift, you admit, is to be voluntary, not to be wrung from any one, and is to be bestowed only from our superfluities; we may then give sparingly." This the Apostle denies.

Τούτο δὲ (scil. φημι), "This I plainly tell you." Ο σπείραν φειδομένως, &c. These words have the air

* It is acutely remarked by Theophyl., that he who gives an alms unwillingly, gives it as if he were over-reached or cheated. (So Shakespeare: "wrung from the hard hand of peasants their base self." And Dodd., in the same view, very well defines the πλεονεξία a kind of extortion, by which money is, as it were, wrung from covetousness, by such obstinacy as covetous people themselves use where their own gain is concerned.
of a proverb, and probably are such; as we may. judge from Cic. de Orat. 2, 65. (cited by Wets.) Ut sementem feceris, ita metes. As to the sentiment, it requires no explanation: but we may remark with Theophyl. on the delicacy of the Apostle, who uses the mildest term he could select to express a niggardly gift, namely, Φειδομένως, not Φειδωλῶς or μικρολογῶς or κυπασά (Anglice, nippingly.) It must be observed, too, that the Apostle has recourse to the present metaphor (calling the gift a sowing,*) to suggest the idea of the ἀντίδωσις or reward, and, moreover, to hint that it will be manifold, as is the produce of seed sown.

The εὐλογ. here is used to denote liberal gift, because the very idea of a thanks-gift for God's sake, necessarily carries with it that of a bounteous one. Schleus. explains the στείρων Φειδομένως "qui malignè dat pauperibus," and the στείρων ἐτε' εὐλογίας, "qui liberalis est erga pauperes." And he observes, that among the Arabs also spargere, in the sense copiosè distribuere, is used of alms and benefits.

7. ἐκατός καθώς προαιρεῖται τ. κ. Here there is ellipsis of διδότω. The Apostle resumes the subject of giving not ἁπτέρ πλεονεξία; as was said at ver. 5.: for ver. 6. is, as it were, parenthetical. So ὙΕκumen. ἐτε' το πρότερον πάλιν ἧλθε. Προαιρεῖται τῇ καρδίᾳ is not well rendered "hath determined or pur- posed in heart;" for the Apostle is here speaking, not of determination, or purpose, but will. His meaning is, that every one should give only what he pleases, and not grudgingly, or as of necessity; which would destroy the merit of the gift, and de- prive it of any reward. And so Theophyl. under- stands the word, as does also ὙΕκumen. And so many eminent modern Commentators, as Grot., who observes that it here signifies velle; as at Prov. 21,

* This is mentioned among the agricultural metaphors so frequent in Scripture. Yet it occurs in the best Classical writers; as Soph. El. 1291. παρώνεν κτῆσιν—ἀντλεῖ, καθ' ἑκεί, τά δὲ διασπειρέ.
The Greek Commentator concurs. *versatio animi, unwilling* signifies, "as if he were in the sense of οὐκέτα ἂν have indeed the same is found in 1 Pet. 2, 19.* sense is expressed as in the moral, or example of authority of others. Wets compares a beautiful Rabbinical writer: "Esto excipere cum aspectu vultus sereni. sed dedisset homo proximo suo suum in mundo, et vultus ejus suum cum terram despiciens, scriptu- sum si non dedisset: Sed si suum cum adspectu vultus omnium, quicumque illi dederit, scrip- ture, verum de omnibus non bona ei.

The following citations may there-

The classical Illustrators have here no-
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Annotates thus: ὢνησίς ἐστὶ τῶν διδομένων, ὅταν τις παρ. ἑκάστος λαμβάνῃ τὸ δὲ μετὰ βίας ἄγομενον κέρδος ἀνθυπότεν ἐστὶ. Thucyd. 2, 40. ult. where Pericles finely says of the Athenians: καὶ τὰ ἐστὶ ἄρετὴν ἱμανταίμεθα τοῖς πολλοῖς—μάνης ὡς τοῦ ἀποφέροντος μᾶλλον λογισμῷ, ἡ τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῷ πιστῷ ἄδειᾳ τινὰ αὐφελοῦμεν.

8. δυνατὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς—ἀγαθὸν. Chrys. and Theophyl. have rightly seen that this is meant to pre-occupy an objection: “But if I give, I shall impoverish myself.” To which the answer is; God is able (and, as he sees fit) will make,” &c. The χάριν is by Grot., Rosenm., and most modern Commentators understood of the gifts of God. So Rosenm.: “Πᾶσαν χάριν appellat Dei dona, ut rei domesticæ augmentum, opportunitatem commodam acquirendi hujus vitae bona,” &c. Theophyl., however, (from Chrys.) takes it to denote the beneficium itself, which is bestowed by man on man; and he explains thus: ἔφοιτο δὴ ὁ Θεὸς δύναται τοσοῦτῳ όμοιός ἀνεκδείξῃ ποιήσαι, ἀπε καὶ πᾶσαν χάριν, τουτεστι, πᾶσαν ἐλεημοσύνην δύνασθαι όμοιός, μετὰ περισσείας ποιεῖν. Δότε τοῖς δαυιδίσι, ἵνα ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη όμοιον ἄει καὶ ἄει περισσεύῃ. But the former is (I think) the more natural interpretation.

Περισσεύεις is here used in a Hiphil sense, and by ἔργον ἀγαθὸν, is meant every beneficent work, every work of beneficence.

9. καθὼς γέγραπται, “Thus the saying of Scripture will be made good.” Ἑσκορπίσειν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν, “he hath dispersed, expended for, he hath given to the poor.” Σκορπίζω properly signifies to scatter, as in sowing; for the same metaphor seems employed at ver. 7. Or rather, as in the Psalm (112, 9.), there may be an allusion to the Oriental custom of scattering money among an assembled multitude of paupers or others. So Prov. 11, 24. εἴη ὁ τὰ βία στείρουσθε, where Aquila, Symm., and Theod. have σκορπίζοντες. But the Apostle here seems to have taken ἐσκ. as the Sept. did στεῖρι, in the Psalm. It is observed by Theophyl., that the
word ἐσκορπ. imports abundance and exuberance, like (I would add) that of men when sowing, who know that if they do not sow liberally, they cannot expect to reap abundantly.

9. η δικαιοσύνη μένει. The best Commentators are agreed that δικαιοσύνη signifies beneficium (as often in the Old Testament and in Matt. 6, 1. and elsewhere. See Schl. Lex.). Μένει, remaineth, i. e. in its fruits or consequences. Eis τὸν αἰῶνα, i. e. “both in this world and in the next;” in this world, from “the blessings of him that was ready to perish,” a blessing attendant both on the giver, and his posterity; and in the next, in the rewards of Heaven. So the ancient and many modern Commentators. Schleus. too, refers to τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, in the next verse.* Yet that interpretation does not seem to be agreeable to the preceding verse, of which the present is an illustration. Preferable, therefore, seems the interpretation of most Commentators for the last century, as Doddr. and Rosenm., who take the meaning to be, (by a sort of oxymoron,) that the sums so distributed will, as it were, remain with him perpetually, inasmuch as, by the blessing of God, he shall never want wherewithal to supply future liberality. Thus the oxymoron is not dissimilar to that of Prov. 11, 24., which the Apostle possibly had in view: εἰς ὃι, ὅ τὰ δίων σπείρωντες πλέονα ποιοῦσιν εἰς δὲ καὶ ὃι συνάγοντες ἐλαττονοῦνται. He seems to have read ἐσκόρτωσεν, with Aquila, Symm., and Theod.

10. ὅ δὲ ἐπιχειρημ.—ὑμῶν. The connexion here is ably traced by Chrys. and the other Greek Commentators. Theodoret remarks, that the Apostle, together with exhortation, unites prayers and pious wishes; thereby teaching them the riches of the

* So Grot. observes, that in the Psalm the μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα signifies “leaves a lasting fame,” but in the Apostle, “remains perpetual in the memory of God,” or, “carries with it eternal rewards,” namely, if it be accompanied with the other Christian virtues, among which beneficence holds a distinguished place. And so Whitby.
divine power, and showing them that God can in all things liberally confer blessings, who, as he at first gives the seed to man, so does he nourish it when committed to the earth, and supply the food thence arising.” Theophr. also observes, that in the same expressions he entreats for them both temporal and spiritual blessings, and introduces, as a surety for it, the mention of the “**sensible and visible agriculture**.” The application is obvious. It is too refined an observation of Οὐκομεν., that under the form of prayer the Apostle hints that they ought not to be faint-hearted and apprehensive lest by giving much they should fall into need.” Now the sentence is couched in the form of a pious wish, but it seems to partake of the *predictive* as well as the *optative*. Hence many antient MSS. read the verbs in the future. And so the Vulg. But that seems to be a mere gloss. The predictive may be engraven on the optative; but not the contrary.

The words ὁ δὲ ἔπικρατήσῃ—βρῶσιν, are a very apt and beautiful periphrasis of God, namely, “the good being (for such is the import of the word), who give thus all things richly to enjoy)” and is, as Theophr. observes, taken from Is. 55, 10. ἄνω ἄν—δῶ σπέρμα τὸ σπειρομένα καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν. The verb ἔπικρατήσῃ usually carries with it a dative of the *end of action*; as Gal. 3, 5. and elsewhere.

In ἔπικρατήσῃ καὶ πληθώσῃ there is (I think) an hendiadis, i. e. “may he abundantly supply.” Τὸν σπόρον ὑμῖν, for σπόρον ὑμῖν, “may he abundantly supply the seed to you.” The next words are exegetical of the preceding, and show that the Apostle meant the former to be taken in a metaphorical sense. By your *seed* (agreeably to the metaphor in the verse preceding) is denoted the *means* whereby we give alms, or, as it were, “sow unto the Lord.” That *seed* the Apostle piously wishes and prays may be abundantly *increased* to them. Hence the sense of the next words καὶ αὐξήσαι τὰ γεννήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, is plain, and *ought* not to have been mistaken. They
are, I must think, strangely rendered by Mackn., "the fruits of your honest industry." One (by the way) among a thousand other instances of his gross ignorance of Greek idioms. The antient Commentators, and the most judicious modern ones, have rightly understood by γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς ζηκ δικαιοσύνης ταύτης θελετάνουσαν αφελελαί, "the fruits and effects of their beneficence." And Grot. truly observes, that the sense is the same as in the preceding clause. Though it is (we may notice) expressed in a more refined manner; for to wish the increase of beneficence in the charitable, is equivalent to wishing them an increase of the means, since their benevolent principles will always impel them to give in proportion to those means.

The Apostle in this clause is supposed to have had in view Hos. 10, 12. (Sept.) ἐστὶ τοῦ εἴδεις γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν. But I apprehend that he only borrows the expression γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης: and we are not compelled to confine the general sense of the Apostle to that of the Prophet.

11. ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι. This is a very singular construction, in accounting for which the earlier modern Commentators refer πλουτ. to περισσεώντες at 8, 9 & 10., and regard ver. 10 & 11 as parenthetical. But ver. 11. is plainly not so. The recent Commentators supply ἐστε, or ἐσεσθε; which, however, seems too arbitrary a subaudition. I should rather (with Sclater, Erasm., and Pisc.) regard the πλουτιζόμενοι as a nominativus pendens for πλουτιζομένων ὑμῶν, and that for ὑμα πλουτίζοντε. Schleus. well renders: "ut contingent vobis opes, divitiae, nempe ad summam liberalitatem exercendam." This (as Theophyl. observes) is meant to suggest how they ought to use their wealth, namely, not bury it in the earth, but possess it εἰς πᾶσαν ἀπόλοτητα. The εἰς denotes end, purpose. 'Ἐν παντὶ is for πάντως; as 1 Cor. 1, 5. ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίζοντε ἐν αὐτῷ. On ἀπόλοτ. in the sense liberality, see the note on 8, 2.

11. ητίς κατεργάζεται δι’ ὑμῶν εὐχαριστιάν τῷ Θεῷ.
The sense of these words is not very clear. Grot., Hardy, and Rosenm., assign the following one: "quæ causa est cur nos gratias Deo agamus." But this sense is frigid and feeble, and cannot well be elicited from the words. Est. rightly saw that δι' ἡμῶν, must signify per nos, i.e. "interveniente nostro, ut scilicet intelligatur gratiae quæ Deo aguntur a pauperibus sanctis in Judæâ, de quibus proximè loquitur." And so our English translators. And this mode of interpretation is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators, and is indeed placed beyond all doubt by the next verse, in which there is the same thought further developed. The Apostle here means to show the peculiar benefit of this γὰρς, or God's gift, namely, that it not only supplies the necessities of the poor, (and that, from its very nature liberally) but also excites and nourishes religion in the hearts of the poor, since they have to thank God, as well as their fellow-creatures, for what the Apostle further on calls this unspeakable gift.

12. δι' ἡ διακονία—Θεοῦ. This verse is entirely explanatory of the preceding, where see the note. Διακονία is well explained by Theophr. ἑπιχωρία. The term λειτουργία properly signifies a public office, a ministry discharged for the public service, which almost always carried with it a considerable expenditure of money. Hence the word is employed by St. Paul to denote the general ministration of alms for the service of the poor; and such is the sense here. This, the Apostle says, is productive of much good, since οἱ μόνον ἐστὶ προσανατελισμα, &c. The compound προσανατ. has nearly the sense of the simple; as infra 11, 9. τὸ γὰρ υστερημα μοῦ προσ- ανετελισμαν οἱ ἄδελφοι, and προσανατισκα, in Luke 8, 43. Yet, in these cases, the preposition has an intensive force. The word in question occurs in Sapient. 19, 4. and an example of it is cited by Wets. from Liban. and Athen. The use of the participle and verb substantive for the verb (though, as usual,
unnoticed by the Commentators), seems to be a stronger mode of expression, and is adopted to express what is habitual, and perpetually takes place.

In the next words, καὶ περισσεύωσα διὰ τῶν ἐυχαριστιῶν τῷ Θεῷ, Krebs, Wets., and Rosenm., regard the τῷ Θεῷ, as governed by εὐχαριστιῶν, “since verbs may have the sense of their verbs.” But εὐχαριστία is not a verbal; and περισσεύω is in St. Paul almost always followed by an εἰς, never by a διὰ, either in him or any other good writer. Περισσ. must be construed with τῷ Θεῷ, which is for εἰς τῷ Θεῷ; a very common change of construction. Now περισσεύω τῷ Θεῷ signifies “to redound to the praise and honour of God;” and διὰ τῶν εὐχαριστιῶν, signifies by the thanks offered to him by the poor-relieved, and by the blessing of all true Christians. This mode of interpretation is placed beyond doubt by a very similar passage of 4, 15. διὰ τῶν πλείονι τῆς εὐχαριστίας περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. where see the note.

13, 14. These verses are also exegetical of the preceding. The construction is δοξάζωτε τὸν Θεόν διὰ τῆς δοκίμου τῆς διακονίας τῶν, “glorifying God for this trial of your ministration (to the saints).” Δοξάζωτε is a nominativus pendens; as πλωτιζόμενοι at ver. 11. Δοκίμος τῆς διακονίας, the moderns say is an hendiadis; or the substantive δοκ. is, by a Hebrewism, for the cognate adjective: and this is confirmed by the antients. So Theophyl. explains: διὰ τῆς δοκίμου ταύτης καὶ μεραρτυμημένης ἐξίλοδον θράσιμον διακονίας. The next words εἰς τὴν ὑπναγγ., point at another reason for their glorifying God, namely, εἰς τῇ ὑ., “on account of,” &c. There is, however, in the expression an irregularity which has perplexed the Commentators. Hence various have been their explanations. Grot. (following the Syriac Version,) takes τῆς ὑπολογίας for διὰ τῆς ὑπολογίας: and he paraphrases thus: “gaudent fratres Judæi quod vos ψαυτευε, per professionem factam in Baptismo, sub Jehocritis vosmet Evangelio Christi.” But this is
doing great violence to the construction. The two most probable interpretations are the following. 1. That of Beza, Sclater, and Rosenm., who take τῆς ὁμολογίας for τῇ ὁμολογομένη; since (as Rosenm. remarks) those who were liberal to other Christians, by that very thing publicly professed their consent with them in the faith.” 2. That of Schleus., who renders: “ob obedientiam quam præstatis religioni Christi quam profitemini.” But this requires a very harsh transposition; and then τῆς ὁμολογίας must be taken for τὸ ὁμολογοῦμεν, which is nowhere applied to the Gospel itself. I therefore prefer Beza’s method, which is indeed confirmed by the words of the next verse.

18. καὶ ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας, &c. Rosenm. explains: Εἰ quod sincerè consentiatis (in religionis professione) cum iis (in quos liberales estis) et cum omnibus (aliis Christianis). But this sense, which is frigid, cannot be elicited from the words. Besides, the terms ἀπλότητι and κοινωνία have been so often, in this and the preceding chapter, used of liberality, and distributing to the necessities of others, that there is the more reason to think the same sense is here intended. And both the antient Commentators, and, of the moderns, Grot. and Schleus. interpret: “they rejoice at the free-heartedness of this your ministration (to the necessities) both of them, and of all (others who are in need).” So Theophyl. : “Δοξάζουσι γὰρ τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι αὐτῶν ὑπετάγητο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτε τὰ προστάγματα α’ τοῦ μετὰ δαυιδείας πληρῶν. Τὴν γὰρ ἔλεγομοῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδάσκει. Καὶ δὲ ἄλλα δοξάζουσι τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι ἡ ἀπλότης καὶ ἡ ἀγαθότης ὑμῶν, οὐκ εἰς αὐτῶς μόνον, ἄλλα καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστοὺς κέντηται εἰκεῖται.

14. καὶ αὐτῶν δεῦσει, &c. Notwithstanding what some modern Commentators think, (as Beza and others) these words form part of the same construction with εὐχαριστίαν τῶν Θεοῦ, at ver. 12.; and vv. 13 & 14. were rightly thrown into a parenthesis by Pagnin., our English Translators, and Wets. The
Commentators, however, are not a little perplexed to find a construction: and Doddr. observes, that he hardly knows any passage of the New Testament where the construction is more embarrassed. Yet if they had seen the true construction of \( \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\iota\omega\nu\tau\alpha\) — τοῦ Θεοῦ, as above laid down, they need not have been at a loss. The δεύτερον, is for εἰς δεύτερον: for, as the Apostle before said, that this supplying of the necessities of the saints would redound to the praise and glory of God, so here he adverts to another effect which would thence result. “It will also (he says) tend to (excite) their prayers for you.” And thus ἔπιστολοντος ὑμᾶς, is in apposition with ὑμᾶν. Ἐπιτ. is rendered by some Commentators “desirous to see.” And so our English translators, and Doddr. “longing after you.” But this appears to be incurring a needless harshness, and is by no means agreeable to the words following. It may be sufficient to regard the ἐπὶ as intensive, and (with Theodoret and, of the moderns, all the most eminent) regard the verb as simply expressive of warm affection for them. So, in a kindred passage of Phil. 1, 8. εἰς ἔπιστολον πάντας ὑμᾶς. On this interpretation (which is also supported by the Syr.) the words following yield a natural, and very convenient sense.

14. διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφ' ὑμῖν. The antient Commentators take the χάριν to denote the alms itself, which, they say, is so termed, in order to ascribe it to the grace of God. Thus (as I before observed) it is called a God's gift. So Erasm. : quia in vobis Deus tantam beneficientiam ipsis contulisset.” Many early modern Commentators take it to denote “the influence of God's grace on the minds of the Corinthians,” by which they were excited to bestow this gift. It, however, seems more agreeable to the context to explain χάριν the benignity of God, to which the words ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνεκδιηγήσθα αὐτοῦ δωρεᾶ just after exactly correspond, which seem to be exegetical. One thing is clear, that the Apostle means to strongly inculcate that the chief thanks
are due to God; it being his pleasure that it should be so: which would suggest to the Corinthians the strongest motive for contributing to their utmost ability. The ancient Commentators rightly observe, that the terms ἅπερθάλλουσαν and ἄνεκδηγήτω are meant to excite them to liberality in contributing.

15. ἄνεκδηγήτω, inexpressible. So Arrian, cited by Wets. πρὸς τὴν ἄνεκδηγήτων τολμαί ἐκπλαγέντες. This term may be compared with ἄνεκλάθητος; as in 1 Pet. 1, 8. ἁγαλλιάσθε χαρᾷ ἄνεκλ. These words are neither of them found in the Sept.

CHAP. X.

Now commences the third part of this Epistle, in which St. Paul vindicates himself against the false teachers and those that calumniated him. For there had come to the Corinthians certain false teachers (11, 13.) from among the Jews (11, 22.) who had calumniated the Apostle, had invidiously depreciated his gifts and denied his pre-eminences, and had even accused him of profanity and hypocrisy; (10, 2.) while, on the other hand, they had bestowed on themselves the most unqualified praises. To these, therefore, the Apostle adverts in what follows, in which he says, 1. That he had come to the Corinthians with no other but divine powers. 10, 4—7. 2. That he does not boast, except of the promotion of God's glory, ver. 18—18. 3. That his affection for the Corinthians is greater than that of false teachers, 11, 1—15. 4. And lastly, he compares himself with them, 16—12, 18. (Schoettg.)

On this portion of the Epistle many modern Commentators run into strange speculations. From a certain change which may here be observed in the phraseology, some have fancied that it was another Epistle, which was in process of time tacked to the first. But there is no appearance of another Epistle having commenced, nor have we here any of the
introductory matter observable at the commencement of all the other Epistles; and moreover the use of ἰδίω, which is never proemial, utterly discountenances the notion. As to the slight difference of style, it may easily be accounted for from the difference of subject, and perhaps from the difference of situation in which it was written. The preceding chapters (I think) bear some marks of haste, and slight incoherency, as if written on the spur of the occasion, in the course of journeying from place to place. The following portion is more connected, and elaborate, and was probably written at some fixed place, and with deliberation. As to what Rosenm. and some others urge, that the censures on the Corinthians here expressed or implied, are inconsistent with the laudatory expressions supra C. 7. 8 & 9., and therefore this must have been written at quite another time, that seems very frivolous, since neither the praises nor the censures were meant, or understood, to be general, but were only intended for those to whom they might apply. In proof of this, the reader may compare the laudatory and the incusatory expressions together, and especially recur to the annotations in loco; and he will find they are not irreconcileable.

The connexion of the present portion is ably traced, and the subject matter and scope admirably illustrated by Chrys., to whose remarks I can, however, only refer my readers. Rosenm. introduces this portion with the following prefatory observations. "Defendit suam agendi rationem et auctoritatem adversus adversarios, aliquos qui ipsi adhuc obtrectabant, epistolas ejus quidem severas esse concedentes, sed praesentem eum nihil valiturum, nec minis suis re ipsâ satisfacturum, v. 10. Primo igitur Paulus mansuetudinem suam defendit exemplo Christi; deinde ipsis illis amore et modestiâ plenis precibus confirmat, non modo absentem verbis, sed praesentem quoque re ipsâ castigaturum se esse immorigeros, si salus ecclesiae aliter non possit restitui, v. 8."
VERSE 1. ἀφίσης δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος. The antient Commentators well remark on the dignity comprehended in this expression. Δὲ is here copulative and transitive; as at Rom. 6, 18. ἐλευθερώθης δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, &c.

1. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς προφήτης καὶ ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This use of διὰ in the sense per in obsecrando et obtestando, occurs also in Rom. 12, 1. 15, 30. 1 Cor. 1, 10. In which cases the force of the per seems to be this: “by the instrumentality of,” or “especially adverting to any thing.” It here seems to signify “by the exercise of,” “exercising that mildness of which we have both the precept and the example in Jesus Christ.” Πράφτης and ἐπιεικεία are nearly synonymous.

"Οὐ, "(1) who." Κατὰ πρόσωπον, by the force of the antithesis, is for προσώπων; but its full sense seems to be “when present in person.” The μὲν and δὲ merely serve to point the antithesis, Ταπεινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, scil. ἐμί. By ταπεινός is meant meek, lowly, humble. Θαρρᾶς εἰς ὑμᾶς, “am confident towards you.” Such is the natural sense of the words: but, as it appears from ver. 10. (and Theophyl. notices it), that the Apostle is here adopting the language of his detractors, both the epithets must be somewhat modified. Ταπεινὸς may signify servilely meek and lowly, as opposed to εὐκαταφρονησθείς; and θαρρᾶς denote “am excessively confident.”

2. δεύμα—περιπατῶντας. The δὲ is resumptive.; q.d. παρακαλῶ καὶ δεύμα. Παραίνει is for παράντα. And θαρρῆσει is used ὑδατικῶς, for “have to be, be obliged to be confident towards you.” Our English Translators do not perceive the distinction between θαρρᾶ and τολμᾶ, in which there is (I think) a climax. The former of these the Apostle employs, as being the term used by his detractors. The sense may be thus expressed: “I beg that I may not, when present, have to be confident against you, confident, I say, in the determination wherewith,” &c. Theoph.
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offers the following paraphrase: Δέκας ἐν μῇ μὲ ἀναγκάσθης διαφωτίσται τῇ δυνάμει ἡ ὑπολαβο-βάσις τοῦμήας κατὰ τὸν διαβαλλόμενον ἤμας ὡς ύπο- κρίςει καὶ ἀλαφώς.

2. ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιτατοῦντας. This does not signify hypocrites, as Theophyl. and OEcumen. first explain it, but, according to their second exposition, τὸν ἀλάφονα and τὸν πρὸς ἐπιδείξειν ποιοῦντα. Or rather the sense of this phrase (which may be compared with the κατὰ σάρκα βουλένομαι at 2 Cor. 1, 17.) seems to be "to act merely from the dictates of frail and corrupt human nature," such as levity, inconstancy, boasting when absent, and timid when present, and, in a general way, "being guided by personal interests, and carnal and worldly views of ambition, avarice, or sensuality." The phrase, upon the whole, strongly implies the absence of every supernatural endowment and divine commission, such as the Apostle claimed. This I conceive to be the full sense of the expression, which both antient and modern Commentators limit too much; though with this difference, that the former assign too strong, and the latter too weak a sense.

3. ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιτατοῦντες, ὡς κατὰ σάρκα στρα-τεύομεθα. In this clause we must especially attend to the antithesis in ἐν σαρκὶ and κατὰ σάρκα, and that in περιτατ. and στρατεύομεθα. Περιτατεῖν here signifies to be or live; as in Joh. 8, 12. ὡς μὴ περιτατῇσει ἐν σκοτίᾳ. & 2 Cor. 5, 7. Ἐν σαρκὶ signifies "in subjection, through human frailty, to carnal and fleshly necessities," such as must necessarily, in some measure, influence the actions even of the most holy. So Theophyl. explains: σάρκα περικείμεθα. The modern Commentators do not sufficiently perceive (what was distinctly seen by the antients) that the Apostle is here especially vindicating and establishing his divine commission and authority as Apostle. (See Chrys.) Thus Theophyl.: περὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος διαξέγεται, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲ τῆς
καταμεθεν δεόμενον βοηθείας;" q. d. "though, in the ordinary affairs of life, we are compelled to endure the infirmity of the flesh," &c.

The force of στρατευόμεθα was better perceived by the antients than by the moderns, the latter of whom chiefly confine it to the powerful supports which the Apostle had to employ, in order to maintain his Apostolical authority. But the former (and, of the latter, Hamm.) have well seen that the term has reference, in a general way, to his office and commission. For as στρατεύεσθαι signifies "to go out on a commissioned warfare," so, by a military allusion, it may denote "to hold a commission, and exercise an office." And the same applies to στρατεία. So 1 Tim. 1, 18. ἵνα στρατεύῃ καλὴν στρατείαν, "that thou mayst discharge thy office diligently and faithfully. The sense therefore is this: "In the exercise and support of this our sacred office and Apostleship we do not depend upon carnal supports."

The following parenthetical sentence, τὰ γὰρ ἐπικα —ἐπαραμέναν, is explanatory of the preceding, and confirms the sense just laid down.

4. τὰ γὰρ ἐπικα τῆς στρατείας, &c. At σαρκικὰ must be understood μόνον. The sense, which is not very perspicuous, may be thus expressed: "The supports of our ministry are not merely carnal, and therefore weak, as resting on human force alone, but strong (as resting) on God and his aid." Thus the antithesis is more apparent, from which it is clear that the above is (as the antient Commentators point out) the true sense of ἑγὼ, and not that assigned by most recent Commentators, who explain it, "judice Deo," or "approved unto God;" or regard it merely as a phrase communicating a superlative force to διαναξα. There is (I think) an ellipsis of ἐπικά. The carnal weapons have reference to those human aids and supports by which the plans of men are carried into effect, as riches, fame, eloquence, and human policy of every kind. It is well observed by Theophyl., that the Apostle does not say, "we are power-
ful,” but our arms are powerful by God (i.e. God hath made them powerful); for the strength evinced by them is God’s, and it is he who energizes and wars, though we wear the armour.” Thus (I would add) when Patroclus, clothed in the armour of Achilles, conquered, he conquered by the strength of Achilles, not by his own.

The Apostle then follows up the metaphor, and further develops the sense (in order to introduce the words of ver. 5,) by pointing out the end to which these powerful aids must tend, namely, the removal of all impediments, however formidable, in the way of the propagation of the Gospel. This, of course, includes the overcoming of the more immediate obstacles in the Apostle’s course, arising from the perverse opposition, and crafty misrepresentations of the false teachers. The δύναται must be construed with the πρὸς: and the sense is: “have power, avail to the destruction of sin.” Ὀχύρωμα properly signifies a strong hold; yet it is sometimes used, as here, in a metaphorical sense, of which Schleus. adduces as examples, Prov. 10, 30. 2 Sam. 22, 2. And Wets. has numerous instances of cognate terms similarly used: as Philo 1, 32, 31. τὸν ἐπιτείχισμον τῶν ἐναρτίων δοξῶν καθαρεῖν & 31. τὸ κατασκευασμένον ὀχύρωμα διὰ τῆς τῶν λόγων πιθανότητος 424, 21. ἀνατρέπεται τὰς λόγους, ὅν ἐπιμελεύσθης ἀσθενεία.

5. λογισμοὺς καθαρίστε, &c. These words are meant to further explain the preceding ἀλλὰ δύναται.

For though the grammatical construction requires that ver. 4. should be regarded as parenthetical, yet here (as is often the case in Thucyd.) words placed out of a parenthesis refer to those within it.

As to the λογισμοὺς καθαρίστε, observe, that the Classical writers often use καθαρεῖν τὰ φρόνημα, ἀλαζονείαν, &c., and Euseb., cited by Wets., has τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἐπαιρόμενοι. The λογισμοὺς is rightly thought, by Theophyl. and Wets., to refer to the syllogisms and rhetorical strophæ of the false teachers, who were proud of their Gentile learning. The term has
here (as sometimes in the Old Testament), an ad-
junct notion of vanity and emptiness; as Ps. 98, 11.
Κύριος γινάσκει τοὺς διαλογισμούς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι εἰσὶ
μάταιοι.

5. τὰν ὄνομα ἐκκαίρομενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ
Θεοῦ. Some Commentators (as Grot. and Rosenm.)
introduce needless perplexity, by supposing here a
trajectio and an hendiadis. "Ωνομα is here used, by
a similar metaphor, with ἕχωραμα just before: and
as λογισμοὺς has reference to the false teachers, and
perhaps hostile Jewish doctors, so ὄνομα may (I
think with Strigel) be meant for the Heaten Philo-
sophers, since the pride of philosophy was the greatest
impediment to the admission and reception τῆς γνώ-
σεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, against which it raised itself like a
rampart, to prevent its entering the heart. The
force of the metaphor is well illustrated by Chrys.,
Theophyl. and Doddr.

In the next words τὰν νόμα I cannot, with Ro-
senm. and Schleus., recognize any military metaphor,
as if it meant machinations, since νόμα is never so
used, and the signification would not here be appo-
site. It rather seems to be used like the λογισμοὺς
just before, and to be meant of vain imaginations.
See Rom. 1, 21. Αἰχμαλώτιστοι is a stronger term
than νικῶτες. This also seems to be meant for the
learned Heathens at Corinth, who found it more
difficult to subject their imagination and reason to
the obedience of Christ than their actions. Against
this the pride of human reason has ever rebelled.
Thus it has been in every age; and such is the case
at the present day. Of those who reject the Gospel
few are indisposed to admit the excellence of its
moral precepts, but against any subjection of the
thoughts or reason of men they loudly protest.

At ὑπακοὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ the genitive is used, be-
cause ὑπακοῦνεν takes a genitive, and verbal nouns
often assume the case of the verbs from which they
are derived.

6. καὶ ἐν ἑποίμῳ ἔχοντες—ὑπακοὴ. In these words
the Apostle plainly reverts to those alluded to at ver. 1. Ἐν ἑταίρῳ ἔχειν signifies "to have in readiness," ἑταίρῳ ἔχειν. It not unfrequently occurs in the Classical writers. The sense, which is not fully developed, may be expressed in the following paraphrase: "We are also ready to punish all disobedience when (we be present, and) your general obedience* be completed:" for the Apostle deliberately hints that it is as yet imperfect. The ἐκδίκησαι may be compared with the rod threatened, and sometimes exercised, by the Apostle; as in the case of Elymas, the incestuous person, and Hymenas and Philetus.

7. τὰ κατὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς βλέπετε; It is well remarked by Theophyl., that the Apostle here turns from the deceivers to the deceived, and as he threatens the former, so he rebukes the latter. Some antient Commentators read this annunciativē, or without an interrogation. But the latter mode is far more spirited, and suitable to the context, and agreeable to the style of the Apostle. The sense is: "Do ye then (think it right to) judge, or form an estimation of things (i.e. concerning an Apostle or teacher) according to the outward appearance?" Here there is an evident allusion to the false teachers, who in person, manners, learning, eloquence, the influence of wealth, birth, rank, and all other outward advantages, were greatly superior to Paul. Storr and Rosenm. also think there is a reference to the advantages of having been converted under Christ's own ministry, or being, in some way, related to him, &c. But this seems very improbable. One may compare the saying of Christ in Joh. 8, 15. ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε; where see the note.

7. εἰ δὲ τοῖς πέτοιμον ἐνυπτὶ Χριστοῦ εἴην. This, again, is evidently levelled against the false teachers. In πέτοιμον αὐτῷ. Rosenm. thinks there is a Hebraism; by being so used. By trusting or relying

* So Rosenm.: "Postquam in ցետու vestro omnia fuerint Christo subjecta, tum etiam membra se mihi opponentia in ordinem regigam."
upon himself is (I think) meant placing reliance on some especial personal merit of his own: and there may perhaps be an antithesis between πέποιθεν αὐτῷ and λογιζέσθω αὐτῷ, where αὐτῷ signifies of himself, i.e. without any suggestion from me. On the exact force of the words Χριστῷ εἶναι Commentators are not agreed. Theophyl. thinks that some boasted of being especially Christ’s disciples, as having been αὐτοποιητα. Which may probably be true. But we want the light of contemporary history to illustrate the obscurity. Some antient and modern Commentators think that Χριστῷ εἶναι signifies to be a minister of Christ: and it is observed by Theophyl., that when the Apostle says ὁτασ καὶ ἡμεῖς, he speaks by condescension only, since he was greatly superior. But this seems very harsh. The opinion of Theophyl. above mentioned seems to be the true one, since by it the phrase Χριστῷ εἶναι has in both clauses a sense far more worthy of the Apostle. He might very well say that he was Christ’s, in the sense which they affixed to the expression, namely, Χριστοῦ αὐτοποιητα, since he had as truly seen Christ as they had, namely, in the journey to Damascus. On this point he has touched in his former Epistle, 7, 8., where see the note. This view seems to be confirmed by the words following.

8. εἶν τε γὰρ καὶ περισσότερον, &c. The sense is: “Nay if I should boast somewhat more (than I have done) of my power,” i.e. “if I should even make greater claims than I have already done to a divine commission.” This (I think) plainly alludes to that ἐξουσία which was given him by the personal revelation of Jesus Christ. Οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, “I should not be convicted of falsehood,”* or “feel the shame which accompanies the detection of falsehood.”

In the words Ἡς ἔβαλεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν there is (I think) plainly an allusion to the commission given to him personally by Christ. The words following

* So Theophyl.: αὐ διαχθήσομαι ζεύγη τῇ ἀλαζω.
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perfections, most probably to the Apostle’s very diminutive stature,* and ungracious air and manner. The τρόπος is used in the same manner as the σχίμα of the Classical writers, and the French maintain (whence our mien) countenance, presence. See Steph. Thes. in voc., and Blomf. on Æschyl. Theb. 484.

10. καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος, “and his words and elocution contemptible, of the lowest estimation;” so 1 Cor. 1, 28. Schleus. renders it vilis et meticulosis. On what is denoted by the term, there has been much discussion. Some think that the Apostle had a very weak and squeaking voice; others, that he had an impediment in his speech. Both, indeed, may be conjoined; or we may suppose a mean address, and a great defect in elocution: and, considering the little power which the Apostle possessed of Greek style, and that his phraseology was, no doubt, idiotsical, provincial, and popular, the expression (especially when considered as the satirical exaggeration of an adversary, and bearing in mind the fastidiousness of the Greeks in such respects) will not seem strange.

11. τούτῳ λογιζόμαι ὁ ταὐτός, &c. Λογιζόμαι is well explained by Theophyl. γινωσκέτω. The expressions τῷ λόγῳ und τῷ ῶγῷ are (as in a thousand other cases) opposed; and at παράντες must be supplied ἐσφυμα, from the verb substantive which occurred in the former clause. Wets. compares from Gabrias: πρὸς ἀνθρώπους θρασεῖς πρὸς λόγους, καὶ πρὸς ἔργα δεινός. The sentiment is thus paraphrased by Theophyl.: οὐ μόνον ἀπειλοῦμεν βαφέα, ἀλλὰ καὶ δυνάμενα παράντες εἰς ἔργον τὰς ἀπειλὰς ἐξεγενείην. But

* Pseudo Lucian, in his Philopatris, gives the following description of him: “corpore erat parvo, contracto, incurvo, tricubitali,” i.e. a petty, crooked, shriveling of four feet and a half. There is little doubt, however, but tricubital is no more to be taken for the exact measure than triobolarius necessarily signifies of the exact value of three oboles. It seems to have been a proverbial exaggeration for one of very diminutive stature. Considering, too, the hand which drew this sketch, there can be no doubt that it is in en caricature.
this is making the Apostle's expressions more minatory than they really are. The sense is: "as my letters have been (viz. fearless, reproving, authoritative, and denouncing punishment), so my presence shall be."

12. ὥ γὰρ τολμᾶμεν—συνιστάμεθα. The Commentators do not perceive the force of the γὰρ in this passage, which seems to be nearly that of ἀλλὰ γὰρ in the Classical Greek; q. d. "But we will say no more, since we cannot venture to," &c. ὥ τολμᾶμεν, i.e. "non sustinemus," "we venture not," "we cannot bring ourselves;" as Rom. 5, 7. and 1 Cor. 6, 1., where see the notes. The ἣμεῖς is emphatic; this (as Theophyl. well observes) being levelled against the false teachers, who exceedingly boasted of themselves.

Ἐγκρίναι and συγκρίναι are well explained by Theophyl. συναριθμῆσαι and ἀντισταθείναι. The force of the terms has been learnedly discussed by Hammond, who shows that ἐγκρίνων ἑαυτῶς τοῖς ἄλλοις signifies "aliiis accensere. Schleus. defines it catalago ac numero insero, socium me addo. Numerous examples of this signification are adduced by Steph., Thes., Budæus, Hamm., Wets., and Schleus. Lex. The word, however, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament; and this sense of it was probably not very familiar to the Apostle; for which reason he seems to have meant to further explain it by συγκρίναι, which, though it generally denotes to compare, yet as comparison is supposed to be made by ranging objects together, and by the side of each other, so it here must have the primary sense, no idea of comparison being included. It is evident, too, that irony is couched under the expression.

The term συνιστάμαι, commend, has been before treated on. That the false teachers did so, and boasted, often very groundlessly, of their labours in propagating the Gospel among foreign nations, there is no reason to doubt.
The words following ἀλλὰ αὑτῷ—συνιοῦσιν contain a very acute dict, which would not have been unworthy of Thucydides himself. There is, however, as Theodoret remarks, some obscurity, and this is rightly (I think) attributed by that Commentator to the Apostle’s backwardness to deal too plainly with them. The obscurity, however, has (as usual) occasioned much variety of interpretation, and (as is not unfrequently the case) some variety in the reading, which may be fairly ascribed to the methods adopted by the early librarii for clearing the sense, though these (as in many other cases) were rash enough. A few antient MSS. (most of them interpolated), and the Vulg., omit the words οὐ συνιοῦσιν Ἡμεῖς δὲ. But this is discon tentaneous by the antient Versions, Chrys., and the other Fathers and Commentators, and is plainly a paradiorthosis. Had the words not been written by the Apostle, no one would have thought of inserting them; whereas, as they stand, they have been thought to involve some difficulty; and hence we may account for their omission. As to the difficulty, however, I confess I see it not. The construction is sufficiently clear, and the sentiment by no means obscure. The words are well rendered by Wets.: “Illi vero semet ipsos in semet ipsis metientes, et semet ipsos sibimet ipsis comparantes, non intelligunt quicquam, i.e. stultti et inflati.” Phot., however, and Boe, and also some recent Commentators, as Rosenm. (supported by Bengel and Kypke), think that the Apostle is speaking of himself, and not the false teachers. They think that the phrase to measure oneself by oneself is meant to express modesty, and that συνιοῦσιν is the participle dative plural, οὐ συνιοῦσιν, not with the wise. But to this sense the article would be indispensable. The common interpretation is ably maintained by Grot., and has surely nothing objectionable. The only difficulty is in συνιοῦσιν, which involves an ellipsis, though not unfrequent in other similar words, nor even in the one in question. Thus Matt. 15, 13, 14 & 15. καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ οὐ συνιοῦσι. Mark 6, 59. οὐ γὰρ συνίκαν ἑκατον ἄποιεῖς 7, 14. 8, 17. οὐξ νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνιεῖτε; & 21. τὸς οὖν συνιείς; and other places, in which the verb is used absolutely, and something is meant to be supplied from the context to complete the sense. Here we must supply ἐν εαυτοῖς εαυτοῖς μετροῦντες, i.e. “while they thus measure themselves by themselves only, and not with the true Apostles, they perceive not what they are doing, and the self-delusion into which they are fallen;” which is the greatest mark of folly. Such (I conceive) is the sentiment the Apostle meant to express. And thus our common version is sufficiently defended. Theophyl. very well paraphrases thus: ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔλειν οἱ τῆς οἴνου ἀνθρώπων συγκριθήσαντι, ἂν αὐτοῖς εαυτοῖς συγκριθὼν καὶ ἀμηλώνται πρὸς ἄλλους, καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνονται τῶς εἰς καταγέλαστοι τοιαῦτα ἀλαζομένους. Ἐκατός γὰρ εαυτῶν κρείττω λέγων, τὸν ἐστίν καταβάλλει καὶ οὕτω πάντες δὲ ἄλληλον εὐθακάμους φαίνονται ἕξερ γελοῦν διὸ οὐ συνιοῦσιν αὑτοί. Among the numerous passages of the Classical writers which Wets. here compares with the present, the following are the most apposite. Hor. Ep. 1, 7, 98. Seneca de Irā, 2, 21. Non pro fastigio.
2 CORINTHIANS, CHAP. X.

18. ἡμεὶς δὲ οὐχὶ εἰς τὰ ἀμετρὰ καυχησόμεθα. The same metaphor is here continued: though there is some obscurity, arising from harshness in the metaphor, and excessive brevity in the expression. There is evidently a verb wanting in the second clause. Some recent Commentators, as Morus and Rosenm., supply "gloriam quaero." The truth is, καυχησόμεθα must be repeated. At ἀμετρὰ must be supplied μέρη: but it is not necessary, with Morus and Rosenm., to interpret "extra diocesan meam," which is too formal. The sentiment intended is simply this: "I will not boast, or seek glory in respect to any parts further than the limits God hath assigned to my evangelical labours." The next words κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὐ ἐμερίσθην ἡμῖν οὐ θέος μέτρον are exegetical of the preceding, and there is somewhat of pleonasm in the expressions, which, however, is not unusual in similar cases.*

* The phraseology is thus illustrated by Rosenm., from Morus: "Κανὸν h. 1. est certum, finitumque doctori spatium, uno verbo diœcesis; et igitur κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος καυχησάμενοι dicitur, qui in tantum gloriatur, in quantum sua diœcesis patet, sive intra fines
In the words ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὕμᾶς there is another ellipsis. We must understand ὅστε, and supply something to complete the sense from the preceding, as: "And these limits extend so as to reach even to you. Of you therefore I may justly boast."

14. οὐ γὰρ—Χριστοῦ. This verse is parenthetical, and explanatory of the preceding. The phrase ὑπερεκτείνεις εἰς αὐτὸν is compared by the Commentators with the Greek ὑπερπαράν τὸν δεόν, ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα πτηὰν. (Other similar phrases may be seen in Pollux Onom. 3, 151.), and therefore it well corresponds to the εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχάσθαι at ver. 13. At the words ὥς μή ἐφίκνουμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς some Critics stumble. Morus conjectures ὥς οἷ μῆ. But no change is necessary. The present reading is quite accordant to the style of the Apostle. The sense is: "as if we did not reach to you," i.e. as if our boundaries did not extend so far as to comprehend you. Ἀχρί γὰρ—Χριστοῦ. "For I advanced as far as you also, in (preaching) the Gospel of Christ." This verb is often used in Scripture with an εἰς following; as in Matt. 12, 28. Luke 11, 20. Rom. 9, 31. Phil. 3, 16. where see the notes. The verb properly denotes, as here, an arrival first at any place. For the Apostle plainly alludes to the right of pre-occupancy.

15. οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχάσμενοι ἐν ἀλλοτρίωσ κόσμοι. Vater here points as if καυχάσμενοι were dependant on the 13th verse. But by what verb? Καυχησάμεθα? That, however, were harsh. It is better to suppose that the Apostle here, as often, separates the participle from the verb; or the participle may be a nominativus pendens. There is, however, an epanalepsis. The Apostle resumes the sentiment of ver. 13.
in order to ingraft another on it: “We do not boast beyond our limits upon other men’s labours.” Here there is an evident allusion to the false teachers, who had actually done this at Corinth. The sentiment is too obvious to need explanation. Wets. compares Hor. 1 Epist. 19, 12. Libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps. Non aliena meo pressi pede.

In the words following the Apostle hints at the result which he hoped for from his labours, namely, not merely acceptance and honour at Corinth, but, yet more. Ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχωντες, “We have, moreover, a hope αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως υἱῶν ἐν υἱῶν μεγαλυθήναι, namely, that as your faith increases, i. e. as the profession of the Gospel extends further among you, &c. The Apostle seems to have in view the further perfecting of the faith in some, and the extension of it to others at his next visit to Corinth. The expression ἐν υἱῶν μεγαλυθήναι signifies “to gain fame and glory by you,” namely, as the teacher justly may by the improvement of his pupils. In μεγαλύνεσθαι, to be praised for, get honour by, there is a sort of Hebraism; and this use also occurs in Acts 19, 17. Phil. 1, 20. and sometimes in the Old Testament. See Schleus. Lexx. Nov. et Vet. Test.

15. κατὰ τὸν κανόνα signifies the same as at ver. 13., namely, “within my limits, and according to my just right.” Εἰς περισσείαν is to be construed with μεγαλ. and signifies “ad abundantiam usque;” an adverbial phrase.

16. εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκειναι υἱῶν εὐαγγελίσασθαι, &c. The construction of these words is obscure; though it is not touched on by the Commentators. At εὐαγγελίσασθαι I would supply ὄστε, which is equivalent to εἰς τὸ. Now εἰς τὸ often denotes result. The sense therefore is: “The result which I hope for this abundant success of my labours among you is εὐαγγελίσασθαι (scil. με) εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκειναι υἱῶν, “that I may spread the Gospel to the parts beyond you.” To what part the Apostle here alludes we can only conjecture. Rosenm. observes, that as the Corin-
thians carried on extensive navigation and commerce, the Apostle hoped that some tidings of the Gospel would, by them, reach to the regions beyond them, and thus an opportunity be afforded to him of preaching there; as was formerly the case at Antioch. I should be inclined to think that the Apostle had chiefly in view the parts beyond the Isthmus, namely Peloponnesus, and perhaps Acarnania and Epirus, which had a close connection with Corinth. Mackn., however, is of opinion that he alludes to the regions of Italy and Spain, whither he intended to go. “For (continues he) in Laconia, Arcadia, and the other countries of Peloponnesus, which composed the Roman province of Achaia, he had already preached the Gospel; as is plain from the inscription of both his letters to the Corinthians.” Yet Doddr. denies that there is “any thing to be found in the New Testament of planting churches in these parts of the Peloponnesus.” I am certainly not aware of any such.

16. οὐκ ἐν ἄλλοτρὶ κανόνι εἰς τὰ ἔτοιμα καυχᾶσθαι,
“so (however) as not to aim at boasting over that which is readily obtained, and in another person’s bonds.” The sentiment is similar to the preceding ἐν κάποις ἄλλης καυχᾶσθαι. At τὰ ἔτοιμα must be supplied ἔργα.* The whole passage is thus paraphrased by Theophyl.: Τι οὖν ἐπέλεγομεν: ὅτι καὶ εἰς τὰ ὑπερεπέ-
κεικα ὕμων εὐγεγελισθεῖθα καὶ τυχῶν καὶ ἐπ’ ἐκείνος καυ-
χῆσθαι, εἴγε ἰδελήσομεν αὐτούς.

17. The Apostle concludes with a most weighty dict, which would be especially valuable to all such as were in the ministry (for whom it is evidently meant), but which is also introduced, (very judiciously,) in order to lessen the feeling of disgust, which is apt to rise on hearing any one excessively commend himself. In this view Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) ex-

* So Appian, Syriac. p. 151. (cited by Wets.) διαπλέειν εἰς τὸν ἄλ-
λαδα ἢ ὑπερεπαλαύνειν, ὡς ἐπὶ ἔργον ἔτοιμον. Schol. on Aristoph. 
Equit. 391. Thucyd. 1, 70. σαίνει δὲ τῷ ἐπέλεγον καὶ τὰ ἔτοιμα ἄν 
βλάψαι, 4, 61. χρῆ τὰ μὴ προσήκοντα ἐπικυτωμένου μάλλον, ἢ τὰ 
ἔτοιμα βλάπτοντα.
celently paraphrases thus: ἔχεστε γὰρ τοιαύτα ἔργα, οὐ κομπάζομεν, οὖθε εἰσταί τι λογισμοῦθαι· ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ τὸ παῖν, καὶ αὐτῷ ἐφθάσαμεν μέτρων· ἔδει οὖν κακεῖνος ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθαι. Compare 1 Cor. 1, 31.

18. οὖ γὰρ—συνίστησιν. The Commentators do not perceive that this is directly levelled against the false teachers. See ch. 1. Δοκίμως, accepted, approved: a metaphor taken from coins, which are approved by the Prince, and accepted by the subject, and pass current. So δοκίμως ἐν Χριστῷ in Rom. 16, 10. It is not necessary to refine so much as some do on the sentiment, which must be taken in its plain import. By συνίστησιν is meant “commends by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the evident blessing on his ministry.” Such is what the Apostle seems to have intended: and to this he might safely appeal in his own case; though he delicately suppresses all mention of himself. Theophyl. well annotates thus: Οὐκ ἔθεν, ἥμεις ἐσμέν δόκιμοι, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὧν ὁ Κύριος συνίστησιν τουτέστιν, ὧν ἡ ἀληθεία τοῦ ἔργου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου μετὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεικνύει δόκιμον.

CHAP. XI.

VERSE 1. ὧφελὼν ἀνεξεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἄφροσύνῃ—μου. As ver. 17. of the preceding chapter was intended to deprecate the τὸ φορτίῳ, or indignation, which arises at hearing self-praise, so is the present verse, where it was the more necessary, since he had to subjoin more of such praise. The words may be rendered: “Would that ye could bear with me a little in my folly (of boasting). Now do bear with me!”* On this sense of ὧφελὼν, utinam, see Matth. Gr. Gr. or Schleus. Lex. Here there are two read-

* Rosenm. thinks that the words ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνεξεσθε are ironical: and he paraphrases thus: “Vos nihil libentius auditis, quam si quis se laudat.” But that is far-fetched, and inconsistent with the words immediately following, which assign a reason why they should bear with him.
ings, ἀφροσύνη and ἀφροσύνης. In the former case must be understood ἐπὶ; in the latter ἐνεκα, and this reading seems to be the best founded. Ἀφροσύνης, "folly of boasting." To this the Apostle has often before adverted. Ἀλλα καὶ, quinimo, quinetiam; as Luke 12, 7, 16, 11. where Schmid. says it is εἰς
cαινεσθω.

It is plain that this self-praise is compulsory, arising from necessity, and employed with a view solely to the good of his converts, lest they should be alienated by the false teachers, who so studiously depreciated him.

2. ἔγνω γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεόν ζηλῶ. "I love * you with a divine affection," i. e. not through any human motive, but solely for the sake of God. (See Theophyl.) This metaphor suggested to the Apostle's mind the comparison which follows, of which the imagery and cast is Jewish and Oriental, and therefore not very distinct to our Western conceptions. The question is, whether by ἔρμοσάμην the Apostle had an allusion to the ἄρμοσταλ, those friends who made and procured the marriage for the bridegroom; as is the opinion of the Greek Commentators, and some moderns, as our English Translators, Wets., Raphel, Elsner, and Wolf; and in this sense the word often occurs in the Classical writers, and so it is used in Prov. 19, 14. See also Rom. 7, 4. † or, whether he has an allusion to persons who, like the ἕρμοσάμην, among the Lacedemonians, formed the lives and manners of virgins, making them virtuous and discreet, and so prepared them for marriage. The point, though of little importance, is indeed perplexing, and hardly admits of determination. It should seem better not to press on the nuptial allusion in the term, but, with Krebs and Mr. Mall ap. Parkhurst, render thus: "adaptavi enim vos (Christianis.

* Or rather "I ardently love you;" for, as Theophyl. observes, ἔγνω γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεόν ζηλῶ. See also Rom. 7, 4.
† Krebs, too, refers to the example of Esther, ch. 2, 12. and Joseph. 11, 6, 2.
doctrinis et virtutibus . . . ornavi) ut uni viro, tan-
quam virginem puram sistam, nempe Christi.” If
there be any metaphorical allusion in ηρµ., it may be
not so much to the αἱμοσύναι as the offices of guar-
dian and preceptor, &c. See the note of Krebs,
whose objection to the common nuptial sense of the
term cannot (I think) be removed by throwing the
words ηρµοσύνην γὰρ οὕμας ἐν ἄνδρι into a parenthesis
(as is done by Schleus. and Dodd.). Thus joining
ἡλίῳ with παραστήσαι: which is offering great violence
to the construction, and can by no means be ad-
mitted.

3. φθεοῦμαι δὲ—Χριστόν. Rosenm. remarks that
the Apostle proposes the example of the woman
being deceived by the serpent, because he had just
compared the Church to a virgin. And Wolf ob-
serves, that the Fathers, and the best modern Thea-
logians, have from hence rightly inferred that Satan
used the serpent as the instrument wherewith to
seduce the human race. See Suic. Thes. 2, 536.
and see Joh. 8, 44. Rev. 12, 9. 20, 20. Wisd. 2, 24.
Besides, as Mackn. observes, the serpent, in the his-
tory of the fall, is said to be punished as an ac-
countable agent. See more in Mackn.

3 ἐν τῷ πανουργίᾳ. An adverbial phrase for παν-
ουργῶς, craftily. See more on the sentiment in
Dodd. and the other practical Commentators.

3. οὕτω θεωρῆτα—Χριστόν, “so your thoughts and
reasonings be corrupted and perverted from the sim-
ple, pure, and unadulterated truth as it is in Christ.”

4 ei μὲν γὰρ ὤρχομενος, &c. In these words there
is no little obscurity; and hence there has been some
difference of interpretation. (See Pole.) Rosenm.
paraphrases thus: “Si quis istorum, qui ad vos
veniunt, alium Jesum vel Salvatorem (verum) aliud-
que Evangelium (verum) commendat, (quod tamen
fieri non potest), rectè sanè eum toleraretis.” He
also proposes another mode of interpretation, but ex-
ceedingely harsh. The former (which is adopted by most
modern Commentators) is greatly preferable. Ro-
and most moderns treat the sentence as ironical. But this seems to be utterly unfounded, and is without any warrant from the antient Interpreters, who, after all, have (I think) best discerned the true sense. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrys.): ἐκόμωσαίον οἱ ψευδαπόστολοι, αἱ πλέον τι τῶν ἀποστόλων εἰσφέροντες· ἐπέδωκαν τοῖς πολλαῖς ἐφιλαμάραυν ἀνόητα, τῇ ἐξωθεὶς σοφίας χρηματοῦν, φησὶν ὅτι εἰ μὲν ἐκφύσεων ἔτερον Χριστὸν, ἰδον κηρυχθήναι ἔδαι, ἡμεῖς δὲ παρελείπομεν, καλῶς ἡνεῖχεσθε. So also OEcumen., and Theodoret. The scope of the Apostle, and the nature of the subject is ably treated on by Phot. The ἡνεῖχι, he remarks, implies censure; since, as appears from the γὰρ, it must be taken in connection with the preceding sentence, where a corruption of the Gospel is imputed to them. The ground of censure (he adds) is this: "Your being deceived is inexcusable, since, when both we and the false teachers say the same thing, you abandon us, and hold with them: you have not to plead novelty and variety, which are usually so attractive, and mislead the simple."

By ἔτερον, as applied to Saviour, Spirit, and Gospel, is meant (by a not uncommon ellipsis) another and better. Now had that been the case, they would have been excusable. To complete the argument, there must be supplied, at the end of the verse, "But that is not the case; therefore ye are inexcusable." So that it is not true that the Apostle (as many recent Commentators tell us, and to which Mr. Valpy assents,) supposes an impossible case. He merely means what actually is not the case.

After all, however, one difficulty remains. ἡνεῖχεσθε is rendered "you might bear with them." But in this term, upon every interpretation yet offered, there is something peculiarly strange: for they are reproached not only for having borne with them, but admitted their pretensions, nay preferred them. Nor can the ἡνεῖχεσθε be so tortured as to yield the sense "ye might admit their pretensions." And to suppose any irony would be very frigid. I
cannot but suspect a corruption: and this is counte-
nanced by the variety of readings; though, by a
strange coincidence, they afford no clue to unravel
the difficulty. I have however little doubt but that
the true reading is ἐνέχεσθε: and this is preserved in
at least one very antient MS. F (of the ninth cen-
tury), and (if I am not mistaken) it was read in the
MSS. from which the MSS. D, E, and many others
which read ἀνέχεσθαι, were copied; a and ε being
perpetually confounded. Nay, Phot., when he ex-
pounds προσέχειν and προστίθεσθε, seems to have so
read. Certainly ἐνέχεσθε yields an excellent sense,
since it is not only very applicable to the evident
intent of the Apostle, but is a more cutting expres-
sion, as if their putting themselves under these men
were a kind of bondage. And the truth of this read-
ing is placed beyond doubt by a kindred passage of
the Apostle himself at Gal. 5, 1. μη πάλιν ἀνομία
δουλεῖας ἐνέχεσθε, where there is the very mistake in
many MSS. which read ἀνέχεσθε. Examples of the
term it were unnecessary to adduce, as they may be
found in the Greek writers passim.

5. λογιζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν, &c. Here there is left to
be supplied, in order to complete the sense, a clause
to which the γὰρ refers, namely, "(No, you can
pretend to no such thing. They have not
found you another and better Saviour, more ample en-
dowments of the Holy Spirit, nor have promulged
better doctrines than those ye have received from
me; nor can any others) for I account myself to be
nothing inferior to the first Apostles." Theophyl.
remarks on the modesty of the expression, which is
not directly affirmative. By the "chief Apostles" the
antient Commentators justly conclude are meant
Peter,* James, and John. So, in Gal. 2, 9. they
are called the pillars of the church. He had (I
think) Peter chiefly in view; since it appears from
1 Cor. 1, 12. and 3, 12. that there was a party at

* I leave it to the Roman Catholics to determine how this is
consistent with the superiority they maintain of that Apostle over
the rest.
Corinth who were followers of Cephas, i. e. Peter. Against these persons, therefore, the present sentence seems to be levelled.

Τοστερηκέναι, “to be inferior;” as 1 Cor. 8, 8 and 12, 24. and frequently in the later Greek writers. Τιτερ λιαν, highest; the adverb being put for the adjective. The Commentators compare ὑπερε, to which may be added ὑπερτερισται and ὑπερεκτεριστοι, both used by our Apostle, who is indeed much attached to compounds in ὑπερ. I would also add Thucyd. (7, 70. T. 3, 10, 13.) τὸν κτότον μέγαν λιαν. Wets., too, aptly compares Eustath. on Hom. Od. a. p. 27, 35. καθ' ὦ σημανισμένον λέγομεν τις ὑπερ λιαν σόφον.

6. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἴδιατης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὕ τῇ γνώσει. The Apostle (I think) here adverts to what was urged by the Antipauline party, as the grounds of inferiority in him. The παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενῆς, he does not deign to advert to; but in respect to the other charge, he admits that his phraseology is not polished or elegant: for that is the sense of ἴδιατης, which signifies one of the common people; q. d. “My language is that of a plain unlettered person.” The term here signifies rude, unskilled. So Gloss.: ὁ μη νοήμων. Hesych.: ἴδιατος, ἀπεφων. And this sense is very frequent in the Classical writers. So Themist. 10. p. 194. (cited by Wets.) προσγορον εἴχεν—οὕτε ὑπερ γλώσση βάσβαρον, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῇ διαλογίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ συνέναι μάλλον σοφότερον ὡς τοῖς διπλοῖς. Diogen. Laert. 87. τῇ τῇ διαλέξεσι λόγῳ, ἐν οἷς ἴδιαται διάλεγομαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὁ δὲ καὶ τῇ διαλόγους προσαγορεῖται ἴδιατος. See also the note on Acts 4, 13. and 1 Cor. 14, 16. To the faculty of learning and eloquence, he says, he makes no pretensions; but, he adds, he is not an ἰδιότης, ἐν γνώσει. By γνώσει is here meant divine knowledge, the λόγος.

* Thus, we may observe, every one is an idioles to a certain degree; as he must, in some things, be deficient: since, non omnia possimus omnes.
γνώσεως, as the Apostle elsewhere calls it. So Theodoret: τὴν μὲν γλάστραν ἀπαίδευτον ἔχω, τὴν δὲ διανοιαν τῇ θεογνωσίᾳ κεκοσμήμενον. See the learned note of Elsner, who, among other passages, cites the following from Origen contra Cels. L. 3. p. 122. εἰς οἷς, ὅτι ἦθελας τὸν νοῦν τοῦ ἄνδρας ἐν ἰδιωτικῇ τῇ λέξει μεγάλα περισσότερον ἢ μὴ θαυμάσας, αὐτὸς καταγέλαστος φανεῖται. Ἀλλὰ οὐ, γενοῦτ' not.

The words following, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ φανεροθεῖτε—ἡμᾶς (in which the antient Commentators recognise a reproach on the false Apostles) seem to merely contain this sentiment: “But I need not enlarge on this point, having sufficiently manifested myself to you as such, or being manifested as such to you at all times, in all businesses, and on all occasions.”

Ἐν παντὶ ἐν πᾶσιν is an intensive form elsewhere used by the Apostle: and φανεροθεῖτε, is for φανεραθεῖσα which propriety of language would have required.

7. ἡ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα—ὦμῖν. There is here a somewhat abrupt transition, which may be softened by supplying the following links in the chain of connexion, which seem to have existed in the Apostle's mind, though not expressed in words. (Having thus granted my inferiority, where it affects not the objects which my evangelical office is especially meant to serve, and having asserted that dignity and rank which the grace of God warrants me in claiming, I may well ask where is my offence.) Have I committed an offence in humbling myself, that you might be exalted,” &c. The interrogation has great force and energy; nor is there in it, what some modern Commentators fancy, irony; which might be the case, if the interrogation were removed, thus: “It seems then that I have done wrong by,” &c. But the mode pursued by the Apostle is justified by the example of the greatest writers, and in δεινοτες is scarcely inferior to the most admired passages of Demosthenes and Cicero.

7. ἐρωτῶν ταχεῖον, humbling myself, i.e. by labouring with my hands, submitting to a voluntary po-
verty,* and by not claiming the privileges of my equals, thus, as it were, tacitly admitting inferiority." "Τὰν υψωθήτε. Theodoret well explains this: ἵνα οἰκο-
δομηθῆτε πρὸς τὴν πίστιν, built up in the faith. See
the Commentators ap. Pole, who trace various senses
in which this might be true, all of which, however,
could not have been meant by the Apostle: but
they omit what it is probable he had chiefly in view,
namely, the fame and reputation which the church
of Corinth sustained among the Christians, from the
pre-eminence of the spiritual gifts of its members,
and which might fairly be ascribed to the labours of
the Apostle. It is justly supposed by Theophyl.,
that in the τακεινών and υψωθήτε, the Apostle means
to play upon his own expressions; as in 10, 10. ἐὰ
παρούσα σαίματος ἀσθενής.

The δωρεάν is a noun, with a subaudition of κατά,
taken adverbially; as in Matt. 10, 8. δωρεάν ἔλαβετε,
δωρεάν δέτε. And so also in the Old Testament. See
Schl. and Tromm.† The note of Mr. Locke may
also be consulted; but it seems too hypothetical,
and far-fetched.

8. ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα, λαβὼν ὑψώσων, πρὸς
τὴν ὑπαρχόν διακοιλαν. It is observed by Theophyl. that
he might have said, "but I lived by the labour of
my hands," he, however, adopts this mode of put-
ting the case, to make his language the more cut-
ting; q. d. "nay, I even abandon my rule, to render
you service, and advance your spiritual welfare."
When he speaks of other churches, he is supposed
from Phil. 4. to have reference to that of Philippi
only. On this idiom see the note on 10, 10.

The word ἐσύλησα must be understood comparatè.

* So Chrys.: ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ διαγεγέρνται and Theophyl.: λιμωτῶν.
Also Eus. Capp.: ἔμαυτον λυμῷ τακεινώσα. Perhaps he had in
mind Ps. 35, 13. "I humbled my soul with fasting."
† Here I would notice an evident imitation in Philostr. V. Ap. 8,
21. ὃ δὲ (i.e. Apollonius,) ἐσπερ τοὺς Γύγας φασὶ, καὶ τοὺς Κροίους
ἀκλειστοὺς παρέγιν τὰς τῶν θησαύρων θύρας, ἐν ἐπαντλείν εἰς,
tοῖς δειμένοις, οὕτω παρείχε τὴν έναυον σφιάν τοῖς ἐρωτώσι.
For, by making an exception in that case, he, as it were, spoiled them. This, it seems, he was compelled to do in this instance, since we may suppose his close attention to the forming such a church as that of Corinth would prevent his so labouring with his hands as to altogether support himself. However, the little he would want was gladly supplied by the Philippians for so important a service; and, be it remembered, that he had previously earned it by his evangelical labours at Philippi. Some think that he even contributed something out of what he had received from the Philippians for the maintenance of a minister, after he had left Corinth. But this is not countenanced by any antient authority, and is in itself very improbable.

8. καὶ παρὰν πρὸς ὅμας καὶ ὑστερῆσις, “and when, on having come to you, I was in need.” So in Phil. 4, 12. ὑστερῆσις is opposed to περισσεύω and so also 1 Cor. 1, 7. ὥστε ὅμας μὴ ὑστερῆσις ἐν μηδεὶ χαρίσματι and Heb. 11, 37. This signification is, however, more frequent in the active voice, as Heb. 4, 1., and often in the Gospels. It may be hence inferred that he only accepted assistance when he was ὑστερῆσις, put to streights; and therefore there is the less reason for the supposition adverted to in the verse preceding.

8. οὕτω κατενάρκησα οὐδενός, “I was heavy on, or burthensome to, none of you;” or more literally, “I did not lie a dead weight upon you.” The term properly signified to affect any one with torpor, from ναρκή, a fish possessing that power (See Athen. and Philo, cited by Wets.; and this is confirmed by Mr. Humboldt), and κατά, down. Thus it merely signifies to weigh any one down with an overpowering load;* like that of the torpedo, or incubus. Of this

* The word is thought, by Jerome (Algas. 2, 10., cited by Wets.), to be a Cilician. His words (which deserve attention) are these: "Multa sunt verba, quibus juxta morem urbis et provinciæ sum familiarius Apostolus utitur; a quibus exempli gratiâ paucâ ponenda
te'm the words further on, καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἀβαρίᾳ—τηρήσω are explanatory. The words τὸ γὰρ ὑστέρημά μου—Μακεδονίας are parenthetical. The προταναγκήρωσαν is explained by Rosenm., "suppleverunt, sī quid deesset ad meum victum, quod manuum labore non poteram parare." So 9, 12, where see the note. By the brethren coming from Macedonia the Apostle is supposed, from Phil. 4, 11., to mean the Philippians. Some of them were probably brought to Corinth by commercial business.

9. καὶ, yea. Ἀβαρί, unburthenome. The word occurs no where else in the New Testament, and no where in the Old Testament. It is, however, cited from Plut. by Schleus. And Wets. adduces examples of it, as from Diotogenes ap. Stob. ἀβαρεά δεὶ ἤμεν τοῖς πάντας ἀνθρώπως, μάλιστα δεὶ τοῖς μηνας καὶ καταδεστέρος ταῖς ψυχαῖς. Inscript. οὐ μον οὐ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀβαρεί ἑαυτῶν παχέσκεται. These writers seem to have had in mind this passage of the Apostle. The words ἀβαρεί ἤμεν ἐμαυτῶν ἐτήρησα, καὶ τηρήσω breathe most dignified magnanimity; as at ver. 12. δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ τοίς. Theophyl. remarks that this is as much as to say: "I mention not this in order that I may henceforward receive of you."* There is something, too, very cutting; q. d. "I cannot so far rely on you as to take aught of you."

10. The Apostle follows this up with a solemn asseveration, and that confirmed by an oath; for both are included in the formula ἐστὶν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ εἰν ἔμοι. The form of asseveration is found in 1 Tim. sunt—οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν, h. e. non gravavi vos. Quibus et aliis multis verbis usque hodie utuntur Ciliciæ. Nee hoc miremur in Apostolo, si utatur ejus lingua consuetudine, in qua natus est et nutritus. I see no reason why the Apostle may not be allowed his Cilicium as well as Livy his Patacintius. But it may be questioned whether use of the word was confined to Cilicia. Thus Plut. 2, 8 v. (cited by Wets.) ἀπανακόψω γὰρ καὶ φίλτρους πρὸς τοὺς κόσμους, τὰ μὲν διὰ τῆς ἀληθείας τῶν πληγῶν, τὰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ὑβρίσεως.

* One may compare a very kindred passage of 1 Cor. 9, 15. ἐν τῇ δὲ ἑγερσίᾳ ἐν τούτων. Οὐκ ἐγραϕα ἐν ταύτα, ἐνα τούτῳ γένηται εἰν ἔμοι.
2, 7. Both are united in Rom. 9, 1. ἀλλάζειν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, which is exactly of the same import with the present formula, though much plainer. The phrase here used is very harsh, and the ratio of it has not been satisfactorily pointed out by any Commentator. Piscator does the most towards it, who renders: “ne censeatur in me esse Christi veritas, nisi affectus sim,” &c. Perhaps the sense may be more literally expressed thus: "There is the truth of Christ in me as (ὅτι) this my boasting,” &c., or “Let the truth of Christ, i.e. the real truth before Christ, be thought to be in me, as I shall do what I protest, namely, when I say that this my boasting shall not be stopped (by any) in the regions of Achaea.” I am surprised that the Commentators should not have compared an altogether kindred passage of 1 Cor. 9, 16., where, after making the very same protestation, that he will take nothing of them, the Apostle subjoins: καλὸν γὰρ μᾶλλον ἀξομανεῖν ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου Ἰα καὶ τὸς κενόσθη.

10. η καύχησις αὖθι οὗ φραγχῆσται, “this boasting shall not he hindered, obstructed, taken away.” On the general sense intended the Commentators are agreed; but not on the ratio metaphore. The antient, and some modern ones (as Grot.) think there is an allusion to a river which is dammed up, and has not free course. And to that use this verb is often applied, both in the Old Testament and in the Classical writers, but not in the New Testament, where it is only employed of the stopping of the mouth, physically (as Hebr. 11, 33. and 2 Macc. 14, 36. 1 Macc. 2, 60. Dan. 6, 22.), or metaphorically; as in Rom. 3, 19. ἡν ὅν στόμα φραγῇ where see the note. And this, it should seem, is the allusion in the present passage, since he who is convicted of falsifying a solemn asseveration in the sight of God, may be said to have his mouth effectually stopped. So Theodoret: Οὐδὲς, φησί, ἐμφράξει μου τὸ στόμα, οὐδὲ ἁπατήσει με τού τῆς ἀθετεύω τῆς φιλοτητίας αὐχήματος. The el is ἐμὲ is thought to be equivalent to μοῦ or ἐμὴ. But
why did not the Apostle use one of those words? Because the κατ' ἐμὲ, which signifies quod ad me attinet, was better suited to his purpose, which seems to me to have been to glance a reflection on the false teachers, who were so burthensome to the Corinthians. Thus ver. 20. ἂν ἐχοῦσα, εἰ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλω, εἰ τις κατευθεία, εἰ τις λαμβάνει.

11. διατί; ὣτι δὲκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς. Being about to introduce the reason why he took not of them, namely, because of the false Apostles, he first destroys the supposition of the Corinthians, (because, forsooth, he did not love them,) replying that it is rather because he loves them more, and therefore does not wish them to be injured by the false Apostles. Theophyl. It is rightly observed, too, by Theophyl., that this is said to soften the preceding. The Corinthians might, without knowing the Apostle’s private reasons, think it a token of less unreserved affection, that he had deigned not to take any thing of them. This, it seems, they had thought, and to this the Apostle adverts: and in the answer to the interrogation, the words ὁ Θεός ἀδέν, which contain a most solemn asseveration,* imply a strong negation of the preceding. Yet he does not plainly tell them his reason for so acting. Nor does he express it directly, but leaves it to be inferred from what follows.

12. ὁ δὲποιμ. καὶποιήσα, “But what I do, I will also continue to do.” Ἰνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμήν—ἡμένς, “that I may cut off a handle from those who seek a handle, in order that wherein they boast they may be found even as we.” The sense of this pointed and sarcastic sentence, according to the opinion of the best antient and modern Commentators, is this: “that wherein they boast, not really act, namely, in teaching gratis, that they may be found to do even as we.

do (viz. if they would aim at the reputation we have), i. e. "to take nothing, which now they are not found to do:" for (as the Apostle proceeds to say further on) they shamefully pillaged the converts. Such I conceive to be the true sense of the Apostle in this very brief and obscure passage, which some Commentators ap. Pole strangely misconceive.

12. οἱ γὰρ τοιούτοι ἰεωδαποστολοὶ—Χριστοῦ. The Apostle now proceeds to more plainly designate the persons against whom the above sentences were levelled.

The γὰρ has reference to a clause omitted; q. d. "It is no wonder that the persons I allude to should seek a handle to censure me, and should boast of themselves falsely, for such are false Apostles." Here must be supplied εἰς. Ἠργάται δόλων, "crafty, fraudulent, and hypocritical teachers;" for such is the sense of Ἠργάται, and not workers (on which it would be vain to cite Luke 18, 27. οἱ Ἠργάται τῆς δοκίμασι. So the word is used in Matt. 2. 37 & 38. Luke 19, 2. Phil. 3, 2. βλέπετε τοὺς κακοὺς Ἠργάτας" and 2 Tim. 2, 19. Ἠργάτης ἀνεπαίσχυντος. And so the Schol. on Aristoph. Pace 1068, Σπάρτης ἐνοικοῦ δόλια βουλευτία.

The next words μετασχηματίζομεν οἱ ἀποστόλους Χ. are explanatory of ἰεωδαποστολοὶ. Μετασχημ. is of the middle voice, and signifies "changing themselves into, assuming the appearance of:" a direct charge of hypocrisy.

14. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός. "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of life." The present tense here denotes custom. As an example of this Mackn. thinks Satan did so when he tempted our Saviour in the wilderness. Φωτός may here be taken both physically and metaphorically to denote virtue. (See Rosenm.) Thus it corresponds to διακαιοσύνης in the next verse. Here Theophyl. draws the following inference: Μανδάσμους δὲ ἐντεύθεν, διὸ τὸ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν τι ποιεῖν, μάλιστα πάντων διαβολικῶν.

15. οὐ μέγα ὁμι, sub. ἔργον. This formula is equi-
valent to the ὑπερμαστῶν just before: for μέγα signifies wonderful; as in 2 Cor. 11, 15. Stob. Hor. Serm. 1, 9, 52. "Εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτῶν μετασχηματίζονται ἀσ τοὺς διάκονος δικαιοσύνης, "if his servants also change themselves (and become) as the servants of righteousness." Wicked persons are, throughout the Scripture, described as being servants of Satan. So Joh. 8, 44. "Ye are of your father the Devil, and his works ye will do." And in 1 Joh. 3, 8. sinful actions are said to be the works of the Devil. Now these persons were especially servants of Satan, as being false teachers, since nothing is more promotive of the Devil's works than false doctrine.

15. δικαιοσύνης, truth, virtue, as opposed to the hypocrisy, craft, and injustice of the false teachers. Ἠν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν. The Commentators take τέλος to denote punishment; as in Rom. 6, 21. τὸ γὰρ τέλος αὐτῶν βάναυσος. But it may be better to keep close to the proper sense, and render, "who shall come to the end suitable to their works, namely, a bad end;" as Hebr. 8, 9. ἦς τὸ τέλος εἰς καύσιν. So Theophyl.: ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐκθεσθοῦσα εἰς τέλος κατὰ γὰρ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἔσται τὸ τέλος αὐτῶν, τουτεστὶ, πονηρὸν τὸ γὰρ τέλος κατάληλον τοῖς ἔργοις ἔξουσιν.

16. πάλιν, λέγω, μὴ τίς μὲ δόξη ἀφρονέ εἶναι. The πάλιν has reference to the ἐφελὼν ἤνεγχεσθε—ἀφροσύνης at ver. 1, and as there, so here, being about to speak very much in praise of himself, he deprecates envy, or censure, by the use of such softening expressions as this and that at ver. 1. The sense is: "let no one charge me with the folly of vain glory and self-praise." For, as Theophyl. says, τὸ καυχασθαί ἀπλῶς ἀφροσύνης ἔστιν. The Apostle does not directly say on what ground he deprecates the censure, but that appears from what he is about to say, and indeed from what he has said.

Theophyl. thus admirably depicts the state of mind in which the Apostle wrote this passage: Πολλάκις ὑμήμερας διὰ τὴν τῶν μαθητῶν ὑπέλειαι τῶν οἰκεῖων πόνους διεξελθεῖν, ὅταν τοῦ οἰκείου πάλιν ἐχαλίνασθι φρονή-
16. εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, κἀγὼ ἄφορον δὲξασθεὶς με. The sense is: "But if ye will not acquit me of this charge, nor allow my reasons for so doing, why then even (κἀγὼ) regard me as a foolish boaster." So Theophyl.: οὐ παραίτομαι, "be it so." For (though the Commentators have failed to perceive it) the force of the phrase is the same as in 1 Cor. 11, 16, where see the note. So that, upon the whole, it is equivalent to ἀνέχεσθε μου at ver. 1. It also occurs in Plut. de Orac. Def. p. 412. (cited by Elsner) δὲξασθε ἡμᾶς ἐφι —καὶ ὅπως οὐ συνάξετε τὸν ἀφρὸς σκοπείτε.

The next words ἦνα μικρὰν τι κἀγὼ καυχήσαμαι are sarcastic. The καὶ is emphatic, and has reference to the false teachers; q. d. "that I also, as well as some other people, may boast of myself a little." There is also something sarcastic in the μικρὰν τι, as if they to whom he alludes boasted a great deal.

17. ὅ λαλῶ, οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον—καυχήσεως. On the interpretation of these words, which are somewhat obscure, Commentators are not agreed. Theophyl. (after Chrysost.) expounds thus: ὅ λαλῶ οὐκ ἐστι κατὰ Κύριον, τοινυν, τὰ βήματα· ὃ δὲ σκοπός τῶν βημάτων σφόδρα κατὰ Κύριον. But in this there seems something very subtle and precarious. Hardy (after the early moderns) offers the following exposition: "Non dico ex mandato Christi; vel secundum regulam modestiae quam Christiana religio passim præscribit; sed pro meo affectu." And Rosenm. remarks: "Non negat Paulus se optimo consilio hæc scribere, sed modum hunc defendendi hominem, sibi non placere, fatetur. Alio modo hominem suum defendisset, si per rerum circumstantias potuisset fieri." Doddr. paraphrases thus: "What I speak on this head, I speak not after the Lord, not by any immediate direction or inspiration from Christ; nor is it so evidently in his spirit as I could wish, or so apparently conformable to that example of modesty and humility which he hath set us; but I speak it, as it
were, foolishly in this confidence of boasting; on which account I return to this subject with some sensible regret." But in all these expositions there is something very precarious and unsound, not to say dangerous. I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen, that as both the verse preceding and that following are ironical and sarcastical, so is this. The Apostle is not speaking seriously: and we are to repeat the formula be it so, which, we have seen, was implied in the verse preceding. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: "Be it so, if you think that what I speak, I speak not (as I profess to do) according to the Lord, or with a view to serve the purposes of his religion, but, as it were, in folly, in the confidence of boasting," i. e. in the use of this confident boasting. Thus all will be clear; and the sentiment in the verse following will be extremely apt. This mode of interpretation (which appears to be the only admissible one) was (I find) thought of by Mackn.; though (as usual) he has much matter that is too hypothetical. He thinks that these were the sarcastic words of the false teachers.

The sense of the ὁσ, as it were, must also be attended to; since by it the Apostle hints that he does not really admit that he speaks ὡκατὰ τῶν Κήριων. On the sense here of ὑποτ. see the note on 9, 4.

18. ἔτει πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κατὰ τῶν σάφκα, κάγω καυ-
χίσομαι. This is said similarly to καὶ ὡς ἄφρονα—καυ-
χίσομαι at ver. 16. The sense is: "since many boast of these external advantages, as learning, elo-
quence," &c. So the κατὰ σάφκα is explained by the best Commentators; and though it is a phrase of ex-
tensive signification, to this mode of taking it the verses following confine it.

19. ἤδεις γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε τῶν ἄφρονων, φρόνιμοι ὑπετε. This is perhaps the most sarcastic sentence even penned by St. Paul. Yet what the Apostle said was as just as it was severe. It was indeed folly and sot-
tishness in the extreme for persons so well informed as were the Corinthians to bear with the boast-
ing, hypocrisy, and arbitrary conduct of the false teachers.

19. ἰδέως, lubenter, is used in the same sense as in 2 Macc. 2, 28. ἰδέως τὴν καταδολῶσαν ἤχοσμεν. To the Classical authorities cited by Wets. I add Thucyd. 5, 10. and 8, 89.

20. ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ, εἰ τις, &c. The γὰρ signifies exempli gratia. These words place in a strong light the faults both of the teachers and the taught. To the former the Apostle imputes 1. a haughty, violent, domineering spirit, which is included in ἐκατηρεταί, καταδολῶσαι, and εἰς πρὸσωπον δέρει. The first denotes hauteur in general, and is well explained by Theoph. κατατηρεταί. And he adds: οὐδε γὰρ ἤμεροι οἱ διεσπάται, ἀλλὰ ἡρτικοὶ καὶ ἐπαχθεῖς. The καταδολῶσαι denotes a despotic, arbitrary conduct, as especially shown, we may suppose, in the imposition and enforcement of the external forms and ceremonies, after the example of the Jewish Rabbins. So Gal. 2, 4. ἦν ἡμᾶς καταδολῶσανταί and Is. 43, 28. (Ac. & Symm.) οὐ καταδολῶσαμεν σε εἰ θυσίαις. The word is also used by the Classical writers in a metaphorical sense. The εἰς πρὸσωπον δέρει is not to be taken literally (as it is done by Whitby). It is an hyperbolic expression, implying the greatest disgrace; since a slap on the face was considered most ignominious. See 1 Kings 22, 24. Matt. 5, 39. Luke 22, 64. And I would compare Joseph. 1172, 12. ἀγαθόμενοι γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε καὶ τυπόμενοι συνήθετε. It therefore seems to denote the most violent injurious treatment, like that employed by brutal pedagogues towards their pupils, or cruel masters towards their slaves. No doubt this has reference to the violent means whereby they supported the rights and ceremonies they enjoined, and the severity with which they punished any breach of their orders.

The words εἰ τις κατεσθεῖς and εἰ τις λαμβάνει are to be taken together, and understood of capacity. Yet it seems strange, and contrary to the Apostle’s cus-
toin, to introduce the weaker term after the stronger. To avoid which difficulty, (I suppose,) some Commentators, as Schleus., take κατεσθίει in the sense worry, vex: and they appeal to Gal. 5, 15. But there it is subjoined to δάκωσε: whereas here it would be harsh, and the sense thence arising frigid. I would therefore retain the sense usually ascribed to it, which is adopted by all the antient and almost all modern Commentators, and is supported by the very same metaphor used in Matt. 25, 11. Mark 12, 40. Luke 20, 47, where see the note. See also the Classical passages cited by Wets. in loc. What, then, is the difference between κατεσθίει and λαμβάνει? Grot. would take the latter of private receiving. But it should rather seem that λαμβάνει refers to their taking, or receiving the ministerial stipend (perhaps from the sums collected for the poor), though they pretended not to do it. Thus λαμβάνει is often employed to denote taking, or receiving money; which use Wets. illustrates from Isocrat. Panathen. τῶν μὲν ἄρτων τολμοῦσιν υἱῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς πόλεως σζμφερόντων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἀν αὐτοὶ λήψεθαι προσδοκῶσι, δημιουργεῖν τολμοῦντας. Aristid. in Antonin. p. 65. ἀπλήστασ πρὸς χρήματα καὶ τῇ λαμβάνει διακειμένους. So λαβὼν ὀναίνων, vér. 8. The κατεσθίει may be understood of those various devices of rapacity which they practised by wheedling the superstitious out of valuable presents of money or goods, or eating at their tables, and thus living upon them, and (to use our common expression) eating them up. That such is the way in which the words of the passage may be understood I have shown in the note in loc.

21. κατὰ ἀτιμῶν λέγω, ὥσ ὃς ἡμεῖς ἡθενησαμεν.

The sense of these words is by no means clear. Chrysost. and the other antient Commentators notice the obscurity, which, they think, was purposely introduced by the Apostle, out of modesty. But this principle is (I think) scarcely admissible. The truth is, they needlessly increase the obscurity, by joining the words κατὰ ἀτιμῶν λέγω with the preceding sentence: whereas it is clear that whatever be the sense, that clause must be taken with the words following. And so almost all modern Commentators, who, how-
ever, are not agreed on the sense. Considering the air of the whole of the preceding verses, I think there is little reason to doubt but these words also contain irony, or sarcasm. Extremely ingenious is the interpretation of Storr. (for which, however, he was indebted to Camerari.), who paraphrases thus: “Cun dedecore fatear, quod ego, si iste (ver. 20.) sunt virtutes, imbecillius fuerim, camame, si placet, διάθεσις assequi inter vos non poterim.” For the adversaries (he observes) had reproached Paul with his ἀδικείας and ἀδίκεια. (See ch. 10. 1 & 18.) He therefore here opposes his own ἀδίκεία to their δικαιομαι. They could domineer, eat up, &c.; but in these things he confesses he is weak. Yet he says that it is to the disgrace of the false teachers, inasmuch as they boasted of their similarity to the Apostle. Rosenm. offers the following exposition: “In dedeas (vestrum, vel, ut ali volunt, falsorum Apostolorum,) hoc dico, me nimis fuisea timidum, i.e. me nanquam hajusmodi aliquid esse ausum: ut ἂς redunet.”

These interpretations indeed coincide on the sense of ἄς ὅτι Ἰδεῖς ἀδικείας, which (I think) may have the signification there ascribed; but on the sense of καὶ ἀδικεία λέγω (on which the difficulty chiefly hinges) the above Commentators differ materially: and I cannot but differ from both; since the signification they assign is frigid, and not agreeable to any regular use of καὶ ἂς. And moreover the interpretation of Rosenm. sinks the sense of ἄς, which so far from being pleonastic, appears to be very significant and of importance in guiding us to the sense. It seems to mean is reference to, quod attinet ad: and ἄδικεια must (I think) signify the disgrace cast on Paul by the false teachers. Thus καὶ ἀδικεία λέγω may have the following sense: “I say this with a reference to the disgrace which has been cast on me.” The ἄς ὅτι may be rendered as if namely; which sense of ἄς ὅτι is found in 2 Cor. 5. 19, and in Isocr., cited by Wets.: καρχυρόν δὲ ἀποτι, ἄς ὅτι καὶ δαμασία ἐπιφέρει. The Apostle means to say: “I speak this with reference to the reproach cast on me, and to excite you to make a comparison of their conduct with mine in such respects, that you may see how little similitude they bear to me as an Apostle, and that you may determine which party has the better claim, to the title of real Apostle.” He then follows up this indirect comparison of the mode in which he exercised his ministry with that of the false Apostles, by a direct examination of the qualifications on which they prided themselves, in order to show that they also exist in himself: and he then points out in what respects his qualifications and merits in the cause of the Gospel were vastly superior to theirs. This he introduces with the words ἐν τῷ διὰ τοὺς τολμᾶς—καθὼς, of which the sense seems to be this: “If any one be so bold as to enter into comparison with me, I may be so bold likewise as to enter into comparison with him.” Yet he softens this with the parenthetical clause ἐν ἀδρούντει; q. d. “I know I incur the imputation of foolish boasting, but I am compelled to it, and so let it pass.”

22. Ἐφαρμοι εἰς, καθὼς Ἰσαακλήνει εἰς; καθὼς. Here there is little that needs explanation. It may
suffice to refer the reader to Mackn. and Rosenm., the latter of whom observes (from Carpzov), that the name Hebrew was one rather designating religion, that of Israelite and Jew, race and nation. By Ἰσρα-ηλᾶται we must understand Israelites born, not proselytes. The false teachers were, it seems, Jews.

23. παραφρονῶν λαλῶ. The Apostle here, by a sort of climax, applies to this boasting not the preceding term ἀφρῶν and ἀφροσύνη, but παραφρονῶν, which term properly signifies to be beside oneself, or mad.

23. ὑπὲρ ἐγὼ. The preposition is here used for an adverb, and is explained by the antient Commentators πλέον, more. Some other prepositions, including πρὸς and μετὰ, are also used as adverbs by the best authors, but never (I think) ὑπὲρ. This should therefore seem to be a Cilicism or an idiotypical use. A Classical writer would have written ὑπερφέρω. So Soph. Ed. C.1006. εἰτὶς γῆ Θεῶς ἐπίσταται Τίμαις σεβίζειν, ἢ δὲ τοῦτο ὑπερφέρει.

23. ἐν κάποις περισσότεροι, sub. εἰμι, “more frequently have I been,” &c. Wolf observes, that according to Clemens. Rom. Eph. 1. to Corinth. § 5. St. Paul was seven times in bonds. And he refers to T. Ittigii Selecta Capita Hist. Eccl. Sec. 1. p. 469. Εἶπα ἐν τῷ, Rosenm. remarks, here signifies to be subject to any thing, to be obnoxious to any thing; as in Luke 23, 40. Ἔν φυλακαίς, prisons. See Mackn. and other Commentators. θανάτωις, mortal perils; as supra 1, 9 & 10. and often. See Schleus. Lex.

24, 25. These verses are (I think) rightly put into a parenthesis by Vater. Certainly by this method the construction is much cleared, and the matter seems to be explanatory of the word θανάτωις.

25. ὑπὸ Ιουδαίων πεντάκαις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν ἐγκαθ. The noun πληγᾶς is omitted, since it may very well be supplied from the πληγαῖς in the preceding verse, especially as this is directly explanatory of that. Though even had it not preceded, the noun in question might have been omitted; for the
ellipsis is frequent in the best writers, from whom many examples are adduced by Bos Ellip. p. 385—7. Edit. Schæf. The sense here of παρὰ, except, is found elsewhere in Scripture, and also in the Classical writers. Now the number of stripes was by law limited to forty: but to prevent the accidentally exceeding that number, it was, with prudent humanity, confined to thirty-nine. So Joseph. Ant. 4, 8, 21. ἤπειρα ταῦτα τοιχύσας πληγάς μιᾶς λειτούργας μ. τῷ δημοσίῳ σκύτει λαβαν τιμαρίαν ταῦτην αἰσχύστην ἑλεύθερος ὑπομενέτω & Ant. 4, 8, 23. πρῶτω μὲν ἐκτεινῶ ἱληγάς μ. μιᾶς λειτούργας λαμβάνων both passages cited by Wets., who also adduces some curious passages from the Rabbinical writers on this subject (on which see also Wolf’s Curæ, and the copious Collectanea of Schoettl. to which Wets. was much indebted). And he adds, that the Rabbins infer from thirty-nine being the number acted upon in practice, that three parts of the body were to be flagellated with an equal number of stripes.

25. τρὶς ἤγαθισθην, “thrice was I beaten with rods;” namely, by the Gentiles: for this was a Roman punishment, of which only one instance is recorded, namely, that in Acts 16, 22. Of stripes no mention is made anywhere. Ἐλθαπόθην. See Acts 14, 19. Τρὶς ἐναυάγησα, “thrice I suffered shipwreck: and that in the service of the Gospel, for which alone I exposed myself to this and all other dangers.” Where and when this took place is uncertain, since no mention of it is made either in Scripture, or in the Ecclesiastical writers. As to the shipwreck recorded in Acts 27., there is every reason to think that this took place much later, and thus it must have made at least the fourth.

25. νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βοῶδε πετοῖσα, a day and a night; which must, in its full sense, signify a complete natural day, or twenty-four hours. Νυχθήμερον is a rare word, which occurs in two passages cited by Wets. from Alex. Aphrodis. τὸ νυχθήμερον μμηνέται τῶν ὀρῶν τῆς κράσινς and Proclus in Tim. Platonis:
η εν τω κεντρω βέσις της γης ανάλαγον ποιει την των νυχθημέρων ἐξαιλαγὴν. To which I add Tzetz. Comment. in Lycoth. Cass. 818. Θ. νυκτήμερα δεινοῖς ἀνεμοῖς ἐφέροντο δεκάτη δὲ ἡμέρα κ. τ. λ. & Tzet. in Lycoth. 1204. So the Latin trinocitum, which is used by Gell. Anson. and Am. Marc. 14, 2. Πεποίηκα, have passed; as Acts 20, 3. ποιήσας μὴν τρεῖς and Acts 15, 38. 18, 23., where see the notes. So the Heb. דָּשָׁע in Cohel. 6, 12., and the Latin facere, which occurs in Seneca and Cicero. See Schleus. Lex. 'Εν τῷ βυθῷ, “in the deep or abyss.” It is absurd to explain this (with some) of a well or a dungeon; or (with others) to suppose that he supported himself by swimming. Most Commentators, antient and modern, rationally conclude that he supported himself on some rafter, or other fragment of the ship, on which Mackn. thinks he reached land. But that is mere speculation. As to the conjecture of some Commentators, that he spent the time on some rock on which the ship was wrecked, it cannot be reconciled with the sense of εν τῷ βυθῷ: whereas, according to the common interpretation, he would be really in the deep, though supported by a rafter. Βύθος in this sense, like the Latin altum and our deep, is used by the best writers. So Αἰλιαν H. A. 8, 8, 7. (cited by Wets.) ἄδειατον νῆσον οὐ ἔσπεσεν εν βυθῷ. A similar passage to the present occurs in Lycoth. 753. Πάντων δ᾽ αὕτως ἐνσαρκώμενος μυχοῖς.

26. ὁδιοτορίας πολλάκις. Here εν must be repeated from ver. 28., with which this is closely connected in construction. Κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις ληστῶν. So I would point; for (though the Commentators do not notice it) it seems proper to take these three particulars, the ὁδιοτορίας πολλάκις, κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, and κινδύνοις ληστῶν in a group, and keep them apart from the rest of the context. And, if I mistake not, the Apostle added the second and third terms to further explain the first. For to the great fatigues and privations which he would have to undergo in his long peregrinations, were to be added the danger
to which he was thereby exposed, both in crossing and sometimes making his passage along broad and deep rivers in petty boats, and also the perils from robbers, with whom, at that time, even the most thickly inhabited and civilized parts of Europe swarmed.

This passage is imitated by Heliod. 2, 4. (cited by Wets.) κινδύνωσις βαλασσῶν, κινδύνωσις πειρατηρίων ὑποβαλλοῦσα, λησταῖς παραδοῦσα πολλάκις. Wets. also compares Plut. 2, 603 ε.

The two next particulars form another group. Κινδύνωσις ἐκ γένους, scil. ἐμοῦ, "from my own countrymen; and these perpetual and formidable from the unrelenting hostility of those blind bigots. Κινδύνωσις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, "perils by the heathen." These are sufficiently manifest from the Acts of the Apostles, though doubtless the persecutors there recorded formed but a small portion of what St. Paul suffered.

The next three particulars form (I think) another group. Κινδύνωσις ἐν τόλμῃ, κινδύνωσις ἐν ἐκρίσει, κινδύνωσις ἐν βαλασσώγ. This is (I conceive) a refined mode of saying that dangers met him wherever he turned himself, whether in the busy haunts of men, or in the solitudes of the desert, or on the bosom of the mighty deep. It is to be observed (what has, however, not struck the Commentators) that the dangers here adverted to are dangers from the persons alluded to in the last group. Of these, such as he encountered in cities will occur to any one. Those in the deserts are unrecorded; but, considering that such places were well adapted to ambushes, they may easily be imagined. Of the same kind (and not from tempests or pirates, as Grot. supposes) must be understood to be those in the sea. To which purpose Menoch. and Est. aptly refer to Acts 20, 3. γενομένης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς ἕως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν. This passage had occurred to myself; and from the words of it, when properly understood (see the note), there can be no doubt but that the Apostle here has it in view.
To the other dangers from men, whether Jews or Gentiles, he adds κινδύνοις ἐν ψευδαδελφοίς, where the ἐν is used conformably to the ἐν of the preceding particulars of this group; otherwise εἰς would have been clearer. These false brethren are supposed by Grot. to have been heathens who pretended to be Christians, in order to gather a knowledge of the businesses and practices of the Christians, that they might betray them. He, however, adduces no proof of this; nor do I know any passages of the New Testament that afford any countenance.* As to the present passage, I am surprised the Commentators should not have seen that the Apostle has especially in view Judaizing Christians, who might very well be so called, since they were sometimes Jews at heart, seldom more than half Christians, and always bitter enemies to Paul, as being the Apostle of the Gentiles. The Acts and the Epistles supply abundant proofs and illustrations, of which I need only instance Gal. 2, 4. διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισόκτοις ψευδαδελφοὺς, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατακοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἢν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλάσῃσαν.

Thus the Apostle enumerates his perils from the Jews, the Heathens, and the Judaizing Christians. He then subjoins to perils of life, and great personal violence and danger the less remarkable, but, as of continual occurrence, scarcely less difficult to bear, grievances to be endured in the course of his perpetual peregrinations, and, indeed, at all other times, namely, personal fatigues, sleepless nights, hunger and thirst, nay, destitution of food, the suffering from cold, and want of convenient clothing, &c. On which Theophyl. observes: Οὐκ ἢρκει τὰ παρὰ τῶν

* For as to 1 Cor. 11, 10. "because of the angels." And 1 Cor. 14, 25. "the secrets of his heart are made manifest." It would be vain to cite these passages, since the interpretations of them, which alone would make them apposite, are (as I have shown in the notes there) quite unfounded.
ἐξεδεχόμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς οἰκοδεχόμεν πόνοις καὶ μόχθοις ἐπέτρεψεν ἐκείνον, καὶ ἁγροτικιάς.

In κότοις and μόχθοις there is a climax; since the latter is the stronger term, and denotes such labour as it is miserable to have to sustain. Τυμπότης signifies a want of necessary clothing, which would be especially felt on journeys; though I cannot think, with some recent Commentators, that this whole passage has reference only to the hardships he suffered on his journeys. It is (I think) to be extended to all other times, whether travelling or sojourning. And this view is supported by the terms κότοις καὶ μόχθοις, which, considering how the Apostle’s time was occupied by his labours at his trade, in conjunction with those of his ministry, are very applicable; and thus the force of ἁγροτικιάς may very well be comprehended. This view of the passage is, moreover, countenanced by an altogether kindred passage supra 6, 4 & 5. ἀλλ’ ἐν παντὶ συνεστῶς αὐτοῦς ἀἷς Θεοῦ διάκονοι ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψει, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις. Ἑν τῇ γειώτις, ἐν φυλακαίς, ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις, ἐν κότοις, ἐν ἁγροτικιάς, ἐν πτωτείαις, where see the notes. The two passages serve as a mutual commentary on each other.

28. χωρίς τῶν παρεκτῶν. On the sense of these words Commentators are not agreed. Some, as the antients, and, of the moderns, Caub., Wolf, and Rosenm., interpret “præter cætera,” besides other things, παραλειφθέντα here not enumerated. But of this signification no sufficient proof is adduced; not to say that that sense is frigid, since it would be difficult to imagine any toils or sufferings which may not be thought included in the above particulars. Other interpretations, less probable, I shall omit, and content myself with subjoining one which I doubt not is the true one, namely, that of our English Translators, and also Beza, Erasm., Pisc., and Schl., “quæ extrinsicus eveniunt,” sub. γενομένων, i.e. things out of the regular routine of his office, as perigrina-
tory and the usual course of his labours therein. To which purpose Wets. aptly cites Fragm. Pythag. p. 670. τι [τ. ἕτε] δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἐπιστολικῶν κατὰ τὰς ἐπομοδίας, καὶ αὐχμᾶς, ὑπερθόλας καμμάτων, ὑπερθόλας ψύξις;

The words following ἡ ἐπιστολας μου ἡ καθ ἡμέραν, &c. are explanatory of the τῶν παρεκτῶς: and here Rosenm. would supply οἷον: but ἐστι must also be supplied. Hence the antient Commentators and the Syriac Translator have done wrong in taking ἐπιστολαις to denote the successive attacks of enemies, since those would not be ἐκ τῶν παρεκτῶς, and may be supposed included in the above mentioned particulars. The word does, indeed, properly denote a "multitude making repeated attacks one after another;" and therefore most recent Commentators take it to mean the impetus interpellantium. Thus Schleus. explains: "strepetus eorum, qui confluent ad aliquem et aliquem adeunt, distractio et perturbatio ex multitudine adeuntium et sollicitantium orta, familiari et amica incursio cum temporis dispensio et animi perturbatione conjuncta." And he compares Cicero, Or. p. Archia C. 6. quotidianos hominum impetus. But this is somewhat harsh. Far more natural is the sense assigned by Sclater, Beza (and, I imagine, our English Translators), who understand it of the multiplicity of cares with which he was overborne, as with a column. So Chrys.: ἀπαγορῶς τὰς συνεχεῖς τῶν θηρίων, τὰς περιστάσεις. Thus the ἐπιστολαις and the μέριμα (the latter of which is in apposition with the former) constitute a sort of hendiadis; q. d. "the overwhelming and daily cares and anxieties which beset me." So Sext. Emp. a. Eth. 127. (cited by Wets.) ἄστε καὶ τὴν διάσπαρτας τῶν λεγειμένων ὑπάρχειν ἁγαθῶν οὐκ ἀταλαίπταρον εἶναι καὶ τὴν περίκτησιν πλείωνας κακῶν ὑπάρχειν ἐπιστολας. These would press heavy on his mind, since he had to maintain a correspondence with the various Churches he had planted in the most distant parts of the civilized world; though these cares, as they came
upon him one after another, would be ἐκ τῶν παρεκτῶς. So that one may apply to him the words of Ἀσχυλ. Eum. 129. μέριμναν οὕτως ἐκλιπῶν πόνον.

28. ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, "the care of all the churches." By these are especially meant the churches he had planted, all of which would successively demand anxious care;* though the words must be extended to others also, and so may be taken as a kind of hyperbole. That his anxieties were sometimes called forth by congregations he had never seen, is clear from Col, 2, 1. "For I would that ye know what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh."

29. τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἁγιασθεῖ; Τίς σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; This further illustrates the nature of the μέριμνα. On the sense of ἀσθενεῖ Commentators are not agreed. Many modern ones take it to denote worldly calamity; and thus ἁγιασθεῖ will be for σωθεῖν, and denote sympathize with him. The antient, and many eminent modern Commentators, however, take it of spiritual weakness, i.e. weakness in the faith. And thus ἀσθενεῖ denotes "comply with his weakness;" for it was the Apostle's plan in non-essentials to thus accommodate himself to all. So 1 Cor. 9, 22. "To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak." This sense of ἀσθενεῖ is supported by the antithetical clauses τίς σκανδαλίζεται, which latter designates the effect of the former. So the terms are also united in Rom. 14, 21. "any thing whereby thy brother stumbles, or (even) is made weak." By ἁγιασθεῖ he means ὁς αὐτὸς ἁγιασθεῖ, as in the passage of Corinthians just cited. For we are not to suppose he became really so.

The πυροῦμαι represents, in a lively manner, the

* In this use of μέριμνα there is (I think) an allusion to the etymology or primary sense of the word, quia dividi (μερίζει) et distrin- hit animum et in partes rapiit varius, to use the words of Virg. Æn.
excessive agitation of mind he would experience on hearing of any scandal, or falling off from the faith having occurred, especially from the neglect of those persons who were not (as he was) careful to avoid giving any occasion for scandal, and the anxiety he would feel to have it repaired. See 1 Cor. 8, 9, & seq. Bulkley here compares Cic. pro Milone. "Quis tum non gemuit. Quis non arsit dolore?"

30. ei χαυχᾶσθαι δεϊ, &c. These words are (I think) said (by way of epanalepsis) with reference to ver. 21. : for the whole of the portion 22—29. is parenthetical. The sense is: "If, then, I must needs boast (as I am compelled now to do), I will boast of my weakness." For τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας is put, by a common idiom, for τὴν ἀσθενείαν, or rather τὰς ἀσθενείας. Here, however, it has especial propriety, since there is no doubt but the Apostle, by the τὰ, means to refer to the preceding particulars of his labours and sufferings: and the best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that ἁσθ. here (as at Rom. 8, 26. συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἁσθενείαις ἡμῶν; Gal. 4, 13. Rom. 9, 5., and elsewhere) denotes affliction, calamities, and troubles. It is not improbable, however, that the Apostle may mean also to rebut the charge of ἁσθενεία, which the false Apostles had cast upon him; as appears from ver. 21. κατὰ ἀτυχίαν λέγω, ὡς ὦ ἡμεῖς ἠδενήσαμεν, where see the note.

31. ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ δε, ὃ ἐγὼ εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ὦτι ὦ ψεύδομαι. It is strange that the antient and some modern Commentators should refer these words to the narration which follows of his escape from the plots of Aretas. Surely the Apostle would not have employed so solemn a form of asseveration on an occasion which so little required it. The best modern Commentators have rightly seen that the words must be referred to the preceding, and be regarded as a general confirmation by oath of the truth of the foregoing statements of his merits and sufferings. And though it is true that
some of the things were so well known that even his enemies could not deny them, yet others, in which he has entered into particulars, were probably not known, even to his friends, nor would have been known to us, but for this passage, not being recorded in the Acts of the Apostles.

The clause ὅ ὑπὲρ εὐλογηθεὶς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is put somewhat out of its regular order; since it should have come after Χριστοῦ.

32, 33. ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐθνάρχης—αὐτῷ. This circumstance, which is brought in as a kind of ἐξηγήσεως to the above detail of his perils and sufferings, was probably written at another sitting. The story is related in Acts 9, 23. seqq. (though without mention of the name of Aretas.) It may suffice to refer the reader to the note on that passage.* I will only

* I cannot, however, omit the following judicious summary, offered by Rosenm., of the best information on the subject, almost entirely formed from an admirable Dissert. of Walch. "Tres hujus nominis reges Arabes habuerunt, probè a se invicem discernendos. Aretas primi mentio fit 2 Macc. 5. 8. secundi apud Joseph. Ant. 13. 15. 9, 16. 1, 4. Aretas 3. Herodis Antipas socer, est is, de quo h. 1. sermo. Indixerat is tum ab illo uxorem sibiit suam, ejusque copias fuderat. Hinc factum est, ut a Tiberio, cui societí insolentiam per litteras Herodes significationaret, Vitellius, mitteretur qui Arabem coerceret, enique aut vivum abduceret, aut occisi caput Roman mitteret. Vitellius aliquamdi in itinere haurit; Tiberius moritur; Aretas vero ab imminenti periculo praeter spem liberatum se videt. Joseph. Ant. 18. c. 5. Quid tum Aretas gesset, quaececeperit consilia, veteres scriptores quidem haud referunt; haud improbabile tamen est, eum de Tiberii morte certiorum factum, ne opportunam hanc occasionem dimitteret, ex improviso in Syria impetum secessit, urbeque Damascum occupasse. Quis hujus Aretæ ethnarcha fuerit, Damascenorum civium, an solummodo Judæorum, Damasci habitantium, præfectus? de eo non consentiunt eruditi. Videtur autem intelligi ἔθναρχης Judæorum; nam vocabulum hic plurimam partem, ut patet ex Josepho Ant. 13. 8. 6, 14. 7, 9. alisque testimoniiis, de Judæis præfectis adhibitum est; habuerunt porro Judæi eo tempore in nobiliis extra Palestinam sitis civitibus suos Ethnarchas; neque ullo testimonio probari potest, eos, qui ab Imperatoribus, aut tum Arabum regibus Syria, imprimis Damascenses regundae impositi fuere, Ethnarcharum genesiis nomen. Nominat autem Paulus Regis Aretæ Ethnarcham, quia ut conjicere licet,
observe, that what is there called στόμις, is here termed σαργάς, which signifies either a large wicker hamper, from σάρτσις, oneiro (according to the Etym. Mag.), or rather, as the most judicious modern Critics are of opinion, from τὸν, to twist or braid. (See Ἱσχυλ. Suppl. 801.) So Hesych. σαργάς: ἔστιν καὶ πλέγματα γυργαβαίνη. It should seem, therefore, to have been not so much a hamper as a sort of very stiff net work, formed of stout cord, for catching fish. See Athenæus p. 119 b. & 407 f. referred to by Schl. Lex.), probably left in the sea for some time. The Etym. Mag. defines it ἄναθεν οὖσαν εἰς ἐκπνος ἵκων. Whether it was a large fish-hamper, or stiff fishing-net, is not certain: but either would be suitable to the purpose.

I cannot but advert to a trifling apparent discrepancy in the accounts of St. Luke and St. Paul. In the former it is said that the Apostle was let down διὰ τοῦ τέλεως, which is rendered "by the wall," by which is meant over the wall, or, as Doddr. explains, "by the side of it." Now this will not agree with St. Paul's account. Yet there is no contrariety in the original; for διὰ may mean through the wall, i.e. through an aperture of the wall, a loop-hole, embrasure, window, (or, as it ought to be spelt, in reference to its true origin and real import, windore; and so, indeed, it is pronounced by the Lincolnshire people), i.e. an orifice through which to let in the wind: though it was sometimes applied to the lattice, or moveable casement by which the orifice was either opened or closed. See the note on Acts 20, 8. Such is the sense of διὰ τέλεως in St. Luke: but St. Paul makes the thing clearer by using both διὰ τοῦ τέλεως and διὰ θυσίας. Besides the passages cited on the note on Acts, many might here be adduced of a

...
similar mode of escape: but the expedient was so common that I omit them.

The ἐξαλάσθην has reference to the chain or rope by which the σαργάνη was let down. With ἔξεφυγον Wets. compares from Polyb. 6, 1424. ἐὰν τὰς τούτων διαφύγοις χεῖρας.

CHAP. XII.

Verse 1. καυχᾶσθαι, &c. As ver. 32 & 33. seem to have been a supplement added to the preceding detail of the merits he could boast of in the cause of the Gospel, and written (as it should appear) at another time, so was the following portion, which some think was also a supplement to the preceding; though, in fact, it contains things quite of another kind, of which he might boast, and which are not hinted at in the preceding, namely, the supernatural gifts he had received, and the revelations with which he had been favoured from Heaven, both which might, in a popular sense, be said to be matter of boasting, and, at all events, sufficiently established his claim to a high superiority over his opponents and depreciators, the Corinthian teachers, who pretended to the dignity of Apostles. Yet, in introducing these further grounds of boasting, the Apostle, with the prudent caution we have seen above at 9, 1 & 16, 21 & 23., commences with a formula meant to soften envy or disgust. It is remarkable that these formulas all differ. The present is καυχᾶσθαι δε οὐ συμφέρει, which words must not be pressed on, as has been done by the antients. Συμφέρει signifies decet: and the sense is well expressed by Schleus.: "quonquam indignum mea persona gloriam de rebus externis videtur." Hence it will appear that there is no reason to adopt that change of reading which Storr, Semler, and Rosenm. propose, and which Griesbach puts nearly on a footing with the textual one, namely, καυχᾶσθαι δέ. This, indeed, is found only in about a dozen MSS., both
Syriac Versions, and the Arab. To me, this and the other various readings on the next words ό, σύμφερει, and μόι only appear to deserve notice as bearing marks of the passage having been tampered with by the antient Critics, and arose (I imagine) from a misapprehension of its true nature, and an unfounded fear that it was open to censure. Now δει would seem to remove the objection: but then the sequel of the sentence would no longer be suitable to the commencement, according to the words of Hor. Art. Poet. "Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam Jungere si velit, et varias inducere plumas; Undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum Desinat in piscem mulier formosa supernè." Whereas the sense they aim at producing by the change of δη into δει is, in fact, inherent in the context, being contained in a clause omitted, to which γερ (as often) has reference. The sense, then, may be thus expressed:

"I know, indeed, that it is unbecoming in me to boast (but I am compelled to do so, and I have causes enow to justify me), for to proceed, as I shall now do, to visions and revelations from the Lord," &c. Thus all will be clear: nor will there be any occasion to resort to the methods adopted by Doddrt., Mackn., and Slade. Ellipses, as remarkable as the present, are of no unfrequent occurrence in St. Paul's writings.

On the scope of the Apostle Chrys. has here admirably treated, whom see, and Theophyl. Theodore, too, very well illustrates it thus: Ἐκεῖνο μὲν ὁ λαυτέλης ῥ τοῦτον δυνητὸς, ὡμὲν δὲ σύμφορος ης ὁμετέρας τοῖν προπηθοῦμενος ἀφελείας, ἀναγκαζομαι λέγειν ἀπερ ἐμαυτῷ συμφέρειν οὐκ οἷομαι. They evidently adhered to the textual reading.

On the words ὄπτασιας and ἀποκαλύψεις I would observe, that the latter is a much stronger term than the former, since, as Theophyl. says, ἡ μὲν μόνον βλέπειν διδασκων, αὐτη δὲ καὶ τι βαθύτερον τοι διαφανένον ἀπογιμνο. Ὅπτασια answers, in the Sept., to the Heb. תגזר and לְשׁון in Dan. 9, 23. 10, 1. 7, 8, 16. It is
used, in Luke 1, 22, of the vision of Zacharias; in
Luke 24, 23, of the vision of the angels to the women
after our Lord’s resurrection; and in Acts 26, 19,
and elsewhere, of the vision of the Lord to Paul, in
order to his conversion; all which were visions
clearly seen by day, and not night visions beheld in
dreams.* Ἀνάγλυφος denotes properly a revelation
of some secret or mystery, and is, in 1 Cor. 14., ap-
plied to one of the supernatural gifts in the Corinth-
ian Church. But, as applied to St. Paul here (and
compared with Gal. 1, 2, ἐν ἀνάγλυφῳ ἡ τρισσοῦ), in
connection with what we learn from the New Testa-
ment of the events which accompanied his conver-
sion, it must signify a direct and extraordinary com-
unication of Divine knowledge and Gospel mys-
teries, derived from the fountain of all truth.

2. ὡδὲ ἐδέχομαι τὸν Χριστὸν, sub. ἔτος, “I know a
disciple of Christ.” In this mode of speaking we
have another instance of the modesty with which the
Apostle brings forward the grounds of boasting and
superiority over the false Apostles; which, for the
good of the Church, he was obliged to do. So (on
the contrary (as Rosenm. observes), when any thing
odious is introduced, he assumes the first instead of
the second person.

It is rightly remarked by Chrys. and Theophyl.,
that he, not without reason, mentions the time, in
order that they may learn (as Theophyl. says) ἵνα εἰ
τὸ δικαστήριον ἐτῶν τῶν ἤτοι τῶν γενέσεως νῦν
ὑπάρχει μετὰ τῶν τῶν ἤτοι Ἰησοῦν καινόνως. “So,
Doddr. observes, that it appears that the Apostle
had concealed this extraordinary event fourteen
years; and if this Epistle was written about the

* Made defines it “a supernatural communication, during which
the inspired person was awake with his external senses bound up,
and, as it were, laid in a trance.” And he refers to Bp. Lowth on
oberves that by visions of the Lord must be understood his seeing
the Lord Jesus on many occasions after his ascension, Acts 9, 27.
18, 9. 22, 18. 23, 11. And, above all, those visions of Christ which
he saw when he was caught up into the third heaven.
year 58, as we suppose it was, this vision must have fallen out in the year 44, which was so long after his conversion, as to prove it quite different from the trance mentioned, Acts 9, 9. with which some confounded it.” Dr. Benson thinks this representation was made to him while he was praying in the temple, in that journey (Acts 11, 30. 22, 17.), and intended to encourage him against the difficulties he was to encounter in preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles.

2. εἰτε ἐν σῶματι,—εἰτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σῶματος, ὡς ἦσαν δ ὅσος οἶδον. Dodd. observes, that as St. Paul must know his body was not actually dead during this trance, but that the animal motion of his heart and lungs continued, it would lead one to imagine that he really apprehended the principle of animal life to be something distinct from the rational soul, which he calls himself. “It appears at least (continues he) that he lost all consciousness of any thing about him at that time; and what the presence of an immaterial soul in a body can be, distinct from the capacity of perceiving by it and acting upon it, I am yet to learn.” Whitby and others have observed, that this is a proof of the Apostle’s persuasion, that the soul may have perception when out of the body; and therefore that it was an independent existence. Others, again, have supposed the Apostle to mean, that things were represented in so lively a manner, as to leave it doubtful whether they had not been really seen and heard, that he was—quasi raptus extra se, &c. (See Bp. Law’s Appendix, p. 395. Philo ap. Wets. ver. 3.), and that the Apostle is accommodating to his case the Jewish notion. So Rosenm. : “Homo nempe spectatur quoad animum. Putant quidem Judæi, animam hominis interdum eo corpore duci, et rapi in cælum; aliis vero totum hominem rapi putabant, ut ex apocrypho narrat Clemens At. L. 5. Strom. de Sophonise raptu in cælum quintum. Dicit autem Paulus, nescire se, utro modo ei, id, de quo agit, evenerit.
I must here imitate the modesty of Doddridge, and candidly avow, that I am yet to understand the mode in which this most wonderful circumstance took place; and I cannot but think that due reverence, in such mysterious cases as the present, ought to restrain us from a vain curiosity on such points as it is not granted to our human faculties fully to comprehend; and that we must cautiously beware (to use the words of the Apostle), *α μη ἵσαρκακας ἐμβατευειν.*

2. ἀρχαγέντα τῶν τοιούτων ἐστὶ τρίτον οὐρανοῦ. The Jews, in the Apostolic age, divided the heavens into three. 1. The aerial, including the clouds and the atmosphere. 2. The sidereal. 3. The habitation of God, and his angels. The names of these are thus detailed by Wets. from the Rabbins, many of whose passages he quotes (chiefly from Schoettg. whom see): 1. Vetus. 2. Expansum. 3. Nubes. 4. Habitaculum. 5. Habitatio. 6. Sedes fixa. 7. Arabia.

4. ὡς ἡράγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον. The obscurity which involves the preceding verse also overhangs this. Hence the variety of opinions entertained by Commentators. The most antient one deserves our first attention, especially as it will, perhaps, be found the best founded. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) remarks: Ἀπὸ τοῦ τρίτου, φησιν, οὐρανοῦ ἀδίστη ἡράγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον. Ἡράγη μὲν οὖν ἦν μηδὲ ἐν τούτῳ ἐλαττῶν ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων τῶν συγγενέσθων τοῖς Χριστῷ. Καὶ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον δὲ, ἐπειδὴ πολὺ τὸ ὅνομα τοῦ χωρίου τοῦτοι ἐφημιζέτο, οὕτως καὶ τῷ ληστῇ τούτων ὁ

* I read Joseph, 151, 30. καὶ ὁ μὲν τοιαύτα ἐκθειακέν, οὐκ ὡς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, i.e. extra se raptus.
κόρον. And such was the general opinion of the antients, namely, that this is another vision, and that by Paradise is to be understood the place of departed souls. So also Grot., Bp. Bull, Whitby, Dodd. Mackn., and Rosenm. Others, as Beza and Hamm., think the same circumstance is meant. And the same it may, in a certain sense, be accounted, though in another, a different one; i.e. it was probably a different part of the same vision. For a vision (if we may venture to speak on so mysterious a point) it seems to have been, and not (as Whitby thinks) a reality. Indeed (as Dodd. remarks) if the Apostle had thought it so, he must surely have concluded that he was not then in the body. Sed ेटेकά.

α. καὶ ἦκουσεν ἄρρητα ρήματα, ἀ νεκ εἶδον ἀνθρώπον λαλήσαι. Ἄρρητα may signify either what cannot be uttered, or what ought not to be uttered. If the latter sense be the true one, the words following ἀ νεκ εἶδον, &c. are explanatory of the preceding; and yet ἄρρητα, in that sense, required no explanation, since it was the common signification of the word; as, for instance, when applied to the τῷ, the Tetragrammaton, called the ἄρρητον ὄνομα. And Wets. adduces an example of it from Sotades ap. Stob. 3. ἄρρητα μὴ λέγε. Plut. Symp. 4, 5. τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τῶν εἰς τούτο τεκμηρίων μόνοις ἐστὶν ἄρτα καὶ διδακτὰ τῶν μυρωμένων παρ᾽ ἦμιν τὴν τριετηρίκην ταυτελίαν. Which passage is imitated by Soph. Οἰ. Τyr. 308. ὁ πάντα νομών, Τειρεία, διδακτὰ τ᾽ ἄρρητα τ᾽, ὑφάσα τε καὶ χθονοτιθῆ. The former signification, therefore, seems to deserve the preference, viz. ineffably, inexpressibly sublime, such as no human and unenlightened intellect could comprehend, "verba (to use the words of Horace) sacro digna silentio."

The words following ἀ νεκ εἶδον ἀνθρώπον λαλήσαι signify, "and which, if they were capable of being expressed, it would not be lawful for me to communicate;" and that (Schoetttg. observes) because the Apostle had not the authority to declare the mysteries revealed to him, this having been done not σ
much for the sake of the Church, as for that of the Apostle himself, who had these convincing proofs of the divinity of the Christian doctrine vouchsafed to him, that he might be enabled to bear cheerfully all labours and all afflictions.

Upon the whole passage, it is well remarked by Rosenm. : "Though the manner in which these things happened is unknown to us, yet they can by no means be ascribed to mere imagination. For the Apostle mentions it as a singular favour vouchsafed to him by the Almighty, that he tasted the happiness which is in Paradise."

5. ὑπὲρ τοῦ τωιοῦτον καυχήσωμαι. The Future has here a mixed sense, compounded of the Future and the Potential, i. e. "I may and will boast." At τωιοῦτον we must subaud χρήματος, or πρᾶγματος; for that it cannot (as some fancy) be referred to a person, is plain from what follows. The sentiment is well explained by Rosenm. thus: "I can indeed boast, and justly, of my being caught up to heaven, as of a thing, the whole glory of which pertains to him from whom it came; but of myself, or any thing that it is in me, I will not boast." The sense, then, is: "But as to myself, or any thing in myself, I will only boast of my ἀσθένεια, i. e. (as the antient and most modern Commentators are agreed) my afflictions, &c. (detailed in the last chapter, and there called by the same name). We must also, after boast, understand, ‘when necessity requires it.’

The humility of the Apostle is truly edifying.

6. ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχήσωμαι. Here the exposition of Commentators, both antient and modern, are by no means satisfactory. Rosenm. explains: Licet, sic de factis meis loqui vellem, non essem vanus, i. e. non opus esset mihi vaniloquientia; satas rerum mihi suppeteret. Ne quis in eam partem hæc accipiat, quasi ostentem ea, quæ neque verbis, neque re apparent; ne quis majorem de me opinionem habeat, quàm dicta et facta mea merentur." See also Whitby and Doddr. But neither their exposi-
tions nor those of the antients are satisfactory. I cannot but suspect that all the Commentators are on the wrong scent. Surely the Apostle here alludes to the high visions and revelations before mentioned; and, after having before assigned them, in some measure, to another, he here thus delicately appropriates them to himself. Now this he had (I think) partly done in the preceding verse, in the words ὑπὲρ δὲ ἐμαυτῶν, &c.; q. d. 'As to myself, I will boast of nothing but my afflictions; though I could boast of far more.' Thus it is of these further grounds of boasting (namely, the visions and revelations) that he now speaks of. And the sense may be expressed by supplying a clause through modesty (which indeed caused the obscurity) omitted, as follows: ' (Of these further grounds I shall not speak in my own name; though I might do so) for if I should chuse to boast of them, I should not be foolish (i. e. it would not be foolish boasting), since I should tell the truth: but I forbear to do it, lest any one should fancy of me beyond what he seeth me to be, or heareth of me.' And, for this plain reason, since to claim merit for what had not, and could not fall under the observation of men, would have been too much in the manner of the false Apostles, who claimed credit for those internal and rapt feelings of sanctity, which, if real, admitted of no evidence, or proof to others, and therefore ought not by them to have been claimed as any ground of superiority. As to the other claims, namely of the preceding class, of these he might and did boast, insomuch as they were things which fell under common observation.

6. φείδομαι, 'I refrain (from saying it).'</p>

So at 1 Co. 7, 28. ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῶν φείδομαι. Εἰς ἐμὲ, in respect of me;' as Matt. 6, 34. Acts 2, 25. λέγει εἰς αὐτῶν. So also 4, 20. Gal. 5, 10. Eph. 5, 32. λέγω εἰς Χριστόν. Other passages, too, may be seen in Schleus., who compares the Hedr. 7 for ἐν in 2 Sam. 11. 7. Ps. 91, 11. Ob. 5, 1. and the Latin is for de in Martial. Ep. 1, 68. And he also cites Diod. Sic. 11, 50. εἰς
it is clear that this idiom is chiefly confined to verbs of speaking. The έξ is put for αφ'.

7. καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων, &c.

The καί signifies, not for (as Mack.), nor simply and (as the E.V.), but however. And so autem in Latin. The ὑπερβολῇ seems to be governed of an ἐκ understood, and is for υφ' ὑπερ. Ὑπεραλώμα, lest I should be (too much) exalted, or become proud. This use of the word is also found in Thes. 2, 4.; but not (I think) in the classical writers, who so employ ἐπαλώμα. Thus Appian 1. 551, 552. τοῖς Ἀττικῶν ὑπερεπαλώμοις where there was formerly read ὑπεπαλώμοθα, for which Schweigh. rightly edited ὑπερεπαλώμοθα. Indeed the term ὑπερεπαλώμα is of frequent occurrence in Appian.

The mention of the circumstance, which follows, of the thorn in the flesh, is introduced most judiciously, and from a thorough knowledge of the human heart, namely, in order to lessen that spirit of envy, and consequently ill will, which a disclosure of his high privileges might excite in the breast of not a few. Ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σάρκϊ. Here ἐδόθη is used, populariter, in the sense inflicted; as in Joh. 18, 92. ἐδωκεν πάντως τῷ Ἰησοῦ & 19, 3. And the Philologists compare the Hebr. ἤτοι. Yet this use is found both in the Latin dare, and our give, by a sort of popular sarcasm. Sometimes, too, it occurs in the Greek classical writers: to which purpose Schleus. refers to Markl. on Lys. 545. It is of more importance, however, to consider the sense intended by the Apostle to be conveyed in this σκόλοψ τῇ σάρκϊ, thorn in the flesh, than which there is scarcely a more controverted expression in the New Testament, nor one that has more exercised the powers of Commentators and Theologians, to whom, and indeed to their readers, it has been really a thorn in the flesh. To detail all the opinions and speculations on this obscure mysterious point, is impossible for me to do; nor indeed is it necessary. Those who are disposed for such discussions may fully satisfy themselves in the Collectanea of the Crit. Sacr. Pole, Wolf, Esbn. &c. I shall content myself with detailing and reviewing the principal opinions of the Commentators, and endeavouring to point out what may be thought to approximate to the truth. Chrys. and Jerome suppose that the Apostle means by this term an head-ache: Tertullian, an ear-ache; Rosenm. and most recent Foreign Commentators, the disorder called the Kopfsicht or Migraine. And Rosenm. thinks it was a periodical disorder, and such as affected him also when he was with the Galatians, since he alludes to it in his Epistle to them, 4, 13. All severe disorders (he observes) were supposed to be inflicted by Satan, &c. R. Baxter thinks it was the stone and gravel. But any other painful disorder might be as well imagined. All this seems mere harrulatio. In truth, all these opinions seem liable to this objection, that one can hardly suppose the Apostle would have expressed such exceeding anxiety for its removal, nor thought it of so much consequence
as to ascribe it to diabolical instrumentality. For, as the Poet says; "Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus Incident." As to the opinion of certain Latin Fathers, and some moderns, that it is to be understood of temptations to lust, it is utterly inadmissible. Such a mode of humiliation (as Mr. Slade observes) would be unworthy of the Almighty to inflict and the Apostle to receive. Indeed it were more suitable to some of the redoubted saints of the Romish church than of the great Apostle; and it is quite negatived by what follows. For, as Mackn., (with more than usual shrewdness,) remarks, how could an unruly lust, which certainly was restrained by the Apostle, hinder him from being exalted above measure?" Or how could it make him appear contemptible to others, unless he discovered it, which he was under no necessity of doing? Or how could he take pleasure in such an infirmity. Some refer it to the false teachers (appealing to 11. 15.); as the Canaanites are said (Num. 33. 55.) to have been to the Israelites, σκλόνες εἰς ὀφθαλ-μοῖς, καὶ βαλίδες εἰς ταῖς πλευραῖς, which signifies eye-sores and grievances. But this, like almost all the other interpretations, is utterly inconsistent with the verses following. Besides one adversary cannot be supposed to have been so formidable as such an appellation would suggest; I say one, for it cannot be extended to the plural (as is done by Chrys., who understands Hymeneus and Phileatus), since had that been intended, the singular would not have been used. Indeed, were it not for the messenger of Satan and the glorying in the grievance, mentioned further on, many of the interpretations might seem admissible. It should appear, then, to refer to some bodily and chronic infirmity which was calculated to hinder his usefulness. Now we have no reason to suppose him to have been affected with any of the violent disorders imagined by some, since, otherwise, he could never have gone through such incessant labours, peregrinations, &c. It is plain, too, that the Apostle cannot allude to any radical defect of body, such as had chiefly caused his adversaries to say ἥ δὲ παρούσα τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενείς, so far as that may refer to his diminutive size, and crooked form; since to have prayed even once for the removal of such disadvantages would have been presumptuous. Besides that, these could not be imputed to the instrumentality of Satan. Upon the whole, I see no opinion but what is liable to insuperable objections, except the one which I shall now detail, and which is not only highly probable, but, if I am not mistaken, absolutely true. It was first propounded by Whitby, and afterwards confirmed and illustrated by Lord Barrington, Benson, Dodd., Mackn., and Slade, though they do not quite coincide on the particulars. They are all agreed that it was a paralytic affection brought on by his vision, which occasioned a distortion of countenance, stammering, and paralytic affection of the nerves. But I do not see that the words of the original, ἥ ἑπερβολὴ τῶν ἀποκαλύφθη τὸν ἔνα μὴ ἑπεραιρμα, ἐδήθη με κόσκομαι, compel us to suppose that the infirmity was absolutely occasioned by his vision, since that would exclude the instrumentality of Satan. There is an ἐκτι understood; and all that,
we can infer is, that it came on after the vision. It is probable, however, that the high excitement of that vision, and of the other revelations with which he had been favoured, (and was afterwards favoured; see note on v. 9.) and the excessive and constant ferment of mind, joined to fatigues of body, would bring on chronic infirmities of the paralytic sort, such as, especially with diabolical co-operation, might occasion distortion of countenance, and some slight defect in utterance, yet fatal to oratory, not to mention hypochondriac and nervous affections (to which last the sacred medical writers, Weddel., Barthol., &c. confines it), all which would tend to raise contempt with the multitude, and which, joined to his diminutive size, and crooked form, will readily account for the ἀθετεῖα τοῦ σώματος dwelt upon by his adversaries. This, therefore, as it must have materially impeded his acceptableness and usefulness, he might well pray to have removed from him. I see not any objection to which this interpretation is liable; and it is quite agreeable to Gal. 4, 14., where, speaking of this same subject, he says, "my infirmity in the flesh, which they did not despise." It is scarcely necessary to add, that grievous afflictions, whether bodily or mental, are in all languages expressed by metaphors taken from severe pain inflicted by the piercing of thorns or sharp splinters of wood driven into the flesh, as being one of the most severe of bodily tortures.*

But to proceed to notice the terms δυγγελός ζωτάν and κολαφές, the method of taking the words employed by Whitby and Doddridge can be admitted on no principle of sound criticism: and by bringing in the false teachers it embarrasses us with a needless difficulty. Disorders, whether acute or chronical, were by the Jews commonly ascribed to the instrumentality of Satan; and considering the prevalence of diabolical influence, then permitted by the Almighty, might sometimes truly enough be referred thereto. At least, in the present case, we have it on the Apostle's word, and therefore that ought to be sufficient. This affection he calls δυγγελός ζωτάν (I think), by a sort of Hebraism, after the manner of ῥῆθι; q. d. "immisit a Satano." (See Gesenius. Lex. Hebr. in v. ῥῆθι.) As to κολαφές, it is very applicable, since the term was used of violent beating; as 1 Pet. 2, 20.; but is explained by Schleusner. Lex. gravissimē afflīgo: and I have shown that such is the sense of the word in a passage where the Apostle is in like manner speaking of his afflictions, 1 Cor. 4, 11. καλωμένον καὶ δυσώμεν, καὶ γυμνήτωμεν, καὶ κολαφεῖόμεθα, where there is no reference to person. Here the term may very well designate any afflictions, mortifications, and hindrances occasioned by the infirmities in question.

Bp. Bull has, very rightly, contended for the natural sense of the words, by which diabolical influence must be inferred; yet he embarrasses us with needless difficulties, by supposing the κολαφιν ῥηθέω to

* I have somewhere read of splinters of wood being employed by the savage Indians of America as instruments of torture on the most sensible parts of the body.
have been a malady altogether supernatural, and inflicted on him (with God's permission) by Satan.

8. ύπερ τούτων τρίς τόν Κύριον παρεκάλεσα, ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἡμῶν, "On this account (i.e. for the removal of this) I thrice besought the Lord." I cannot but agree with those Commentators, who (as Whitby and Mackn.) represent this as an instance of prayer addressed to Christ. Nor do I see why Mr. Slade should think it "not sufficient to prove, that Christ was the object of divine worship:" though he admits that from the answer of Christ it appears that the Apostle's address was regarded in the light of a prayer. Schleus. renders it "precibus adii."

The τρίς is by most recent Commentators taken in the sense sæpius, or aliquoties. And so Chrys. and Theophyl., who explain it παλαιός. A certain for an uncertain number. And Schleus. cites Soph. ap. Stobœum de Amore vel in ipso Deos dominante: τωι οἵ παλαιούς ἐσ τρίς ἐκβάλλει. But in that passage there is merely an agonistical allusion; which cannot be the case in the present one. The very learned Lexicographer might more aptly have compared Eurip. Hippol. 45 & 6. "Ἀναξ Ποσείδών ἀπασαν Θεοῖ γέρας, Μυθινόν μάταιν εἰς τρίς εὑβασθαι Θεῷ" and Hor. Carm. 3, 22, 3. (to Diana) Virgo quæ laborantes in utero puellas ter vocata audis, and especially Job. 33, 29. which may be literally rendered: "Lo all this worketh God as far as three times with man," where our common Version renders oftentimes; Symmachus, δις τρίς (I would read εἰς τρίς). Yet even those passages will not prove that the Apostle did not intend a certain number. It were indeed quite contrary to his custom so to do. However, considering the above passages of Eurip., Hor., and Job, (and others which only float in my memory) it should seem to have been an antient maxim with the Israelites to prefer prayers to God as far as thrice (and no farther) for deliverance from danger. From them it appears to have passed, together with some
other Jewish notions, to the Greeks, and from them to the Romans.

8. ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, "that it might depart from, be removed from me." For the Aorists active of this and other compounds of ἀποστῆμι are often used passively. Or it may have reference to the infliction of it, Satan. So in a not very dissimilar passage of Job 7, 16. ἀπόστα ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, κενὸς γὰρ μοι ὁ βίος, "depart from me; let me alone:" said of a delirious disorder which affects the patient with frightful dreams. So also Sirach, 29, 12. καὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν ταῦτα πάντα ἀποστήμεθα. It is evident that this expression is quite irreconcilable with most of the interpretations that have been brought forward of the σκόλοψ.

9. καὶ ἐπιρήκε μοι. Slade observes that "the request was granted, not exactly as the Apostle desired, but in a way which the Lord saw fittest for the accomplishment of that purpose which the Apostle had in view." It may rather be said, that his prayer was not in vain, since it produced a gracious assurance of support under his infirmities. See the excellent note of Whitby. It is here remarked by Rosenm.: "Non mediate ἐπιρήκε. Apostolus suos animi sensus, et solatium in his afflictionibus Christo ejusque doctrinæ tribuit." But surely this is a presumptuously irreverent way of treating the Apostle's words, which plainly hint (as Mackn. observes) at another revelation from Christ, made (as Grot. with great probability thinks) by the ἥρα, the Beth Kol. the still small voice mentioned in 1 Kings, 19, 12. Indeed what but this could have instilled such heroic confidence? Theophyl. (from Chrys.) excellently paraphrases: Ἐπιστάμων ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀπαλλαγήνας τῶν δεινῶν ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡκουσά ἐπὶ καὶ καυχώμαι καὶ εὐδοκία, τοιτέστων ἐπιστημόνως, εὐαρέστωμαι εν ἀσθενείας.

9. ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου. Many recent Commentators (after Kyrke) take ἀρκεῖ for ἐπαρκεῖ, advut, auxilio est tibi. And this signification is not unfre-
quent in the Classical writers, though almost entirely confined to the Poets. (See the example adduced by Kypke.) But it is no where found in the New or the Old Testament, where the word has always the common signification sufficient. And this indeed is here far more apt than the other; since the ἄριστος seems to have a double sense, and to signify "is sufficient for thy help and support, (which implies a promise of support; as supra 9, 8. "God is able to make all grace abound to you, (where see the note.), and is sufficient to work out my purposes, though in so weak an instrument."") Thus, in connexion with the following words, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις, &c. χάρις signifies the gracious support of God, as shown both internally, in supporting and comforting his mind, and externally, in imparting to him such supernatural and miraculous powers as should overshadow his infirmities.

9. ἡ γὰρ δύναμις μου ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖσθαι, i.e. is more completely manifested, plenius sese exercit. For, as Grot. remarks, this verb has sometimes a sort of Hiphil sense, referring to the effect of knowledge." So James 2, 22. ἐκ τῶν ἐργῶν ἡ πίστις ἐτελείωθ. 1 Joh. 2, 5. ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείσται. and 4, 12, 17, 18. On the sentiment I must refer to the learned note of Grot., who, however, only gives a collection of interesting Classical dicts on the advantages of sickness over health. The same arguments might be used to prove the advantages of age over youth, (and indeed have been eloquently employed by Cicero de Senectute), since the mercy of God hath, in all that respects his gifts to man, preserved a wonderful balance. Yet all this seems here not apposite.

9. ἡδίστασα εἰν μᾶλλον καυχησόμαι. Grot. would take the ἡδίστασα μᾶλλον for ἡδίστον; as καλὸν μᾶλλον for καλὸν, in Mark 9, 42. But the idioms are not of the same nature: and certainly the mode proposed ἀπείρα down the solid sense. Both Grot. and other Commentators seem to have perceived a sort of...
awkwardness in the words; and there is indeed a little incongruity between ἢδιστα and καυχόσομαι. But that may be best removed by supposing that the Apostle, in his usual elliptical mode of expression, has melted two verbs into one; for ἢδιστα would properly require ἐποίησομεν; as in 2 Macc. 2, 28. (which passage the Apostle seems to have had in mind), ἢδεως τὴν κακοπαθείαν ἐποίησομεν. And so supra 11, 19. ἢδεως ἀπεχεσθε μου. The sense may, then, be best expressed in a paraphrase thus: "Most willingly, therefore, will I bear with, nay, rather will rejoice in, and boast over mine infirmities." In the next clause part of the sense is likewise left to be supplied, and may be expressed thus: "since I know that they are therefore sent, that the power of God may rest upon, exert, and show itself in me, and amply suffice for my defence, and the illustration of his glory." So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): ἀγαθὸν γὰρ πλείους εἰσι αἱ ἀσθενείαι μου, τοσοῦτο δαμαλέστερα τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ προξενοῦσα μοι.

10. διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, &c. "I willingly acquiesce and rejoice in" (as Hebr. 10, 6 & 8. Matt. 8, 17., and this signification is found in the Old Testament, and sometimes in the latter Classical writers) "not only this particular thorn in the flesh, these weaknesses, but in all contumelies, necessities," &c.

10. ἄταν γὰρ ἀσθενῶ, τὸτε δυνάτος εἰμι. It is not necessary to press on the words of this sentence, which is expressed populariter. It may be thus paraphrased: "The more I am pressed with calamity, the more do I feel the efficacy of divine strength, and the more do I rejoice." So Deut. 33, 25. "as are thy days (of trial), so shall thy strength be:" and Hebr. 11, 34. "who out of weakness were made strong." In illustration of this spiritual strength, Theophyl. remarks: οὗτοι δικαιτη παρέστη δεδεμένος, τοτε αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κατηγορῶν περιεγένετο, and Wets. compares the following beautiful passage of Philo T. 2. p. 92, 3. μὴ ἀναπίπτετε, τὸ ἀσθενὲς υμῶν δύναμις ἐστι, κεντεῖ καὶ καταστραφῶσκει μορίωσ, ὅπο
τῶν ἐξαιρέσθαι ὑμᾶς γλυκόμενον τὸ γένος ἀκίνητων διασωθήσετε μᾶλλον, ἢ ἀπολείπετε τοῖς κακοῖς οὐ κακοθησθεῖτε, ἀλλὰ, ὅταν μάλιστα προθείνῃ νομίσῃ τις ὑμᾶς, τότε μάλιστα πρὸς εὐκλεῖαν ἐκλάμψετε.

11. γέγονα ἄφραν καυχόμενος. The sense of these words has been too much pressed on by the antient and some modern Commentators: though this is here not judicious. As the Apostle began the detail of his merits and endowments with the deprecatory softening ἀνεγέρθης ἡμῖν ἀφροσύνης and ἀς ἄφρωνα δέχασθε με, so he ends with a similar apology for his boasting, accompanied with the reason for it, namely, ὑμεῖς μὲ ἵνα γυγάσητε, “you have compelled me to do it, by rendering it necessary;” I have been compelled to do it for your good and benefit, in order to disabuse you of the prejudice you had in favour of false teachers; and therefore you ought surely to excuse me for this boasting.

Καυχόμενος is omitted in many antient MSS. and some Versions, and has been, with reason, suspected by many Critics, and is thrown out by Griesbach. This criticism, indeed, is confirmed by all the previous passages where the Apostle excuses his boasting.

11. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄφειλον ὑπ' ὑμῶν σωτισταθαι. Theoph. καὶ εὐφημεῖν ἐστι δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐποίησατε, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἐκεῖνος he well explains thus: 'Εστι δὲ ὑμᾶς μᾶλλον τὰ ἐμὰ καταλέγειν προσεῖχε καὶ διερθέας ἐποίησαν ταῦτα διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν σωτηρίας. The sense, then, seems to be: “My merits, virtues, and endowments ought to have been summed up by you rather than by myself.”

11. οὖθεν γὰρ ὡστέρησα τῶν ὑπὲρ λίκαν ἀποστόλων. The γὰρ has reference to a clause omitted, i. e. “Which they might justly have been; for I am nothing inferior to the highest Apostles:” a repetition of what was said supra 11, 5. (where see the note), except that (as Theoph. remarks) what was there said somewhat hesitatingly, is here asserted ἡγομαιστικότερον. The εἰ καὶ οὖθεν εἰμι may be regarded either (with the early modern Commentators) as spoken seriously, and with humility, i. e. considered by himself, with-
2 Corinthians, Chap. XII:

out a reference to Christ; as 1 Cor. 13, 9. "for I am the least of the Apostles, that am not worthy to be called an Apostle:" or (with Sclater and most recent Commentators,) as said "pro concessione, et ex opinione Pseud-apostolorum;" q. d. "though I am, it seems, nothing, a nothing;"* which is more agreeable to the sarcastic air of the whole of this portion of the Apostle. I cannot but think (though the Commentators do not notice it,) that the words have reference to the contumelious expression of the false apostles respecting him, mentioned at 10, 10, ἢ δὲ παρωσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής.

12. τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, &c. These words have reference to the ἀποστόλου, the last clause of the preceding verse being, in some degree, parenthetical; q. d. "And that I am such you know; since the signs of an Apostle," &c. The μὲν is put for γὰρ; as in Rom. 14, 20. Nor is the article τοῦ without its force. It may be rendered "signs of the Apostle." So we say the hero, the general. Κατευγράφη ἐν ψυκ., "have been effected among you." Schleus. renders "exhibita sunt." And he compares Isocr. Evag. c. 10. ἕως μὲν ἔγνω καὶ πλείων ἔξις κατευγράφησαν. See also Thucyd. 7, 21. The Apostle modestly leaves ὡς ἐμῶ to be supplied. Σημεῖα signifies documenta, proofs; as in Matth. 16, 3. 28, 3. 26, 48. Rom. 4, 11. and 1 Cor. 14, 22. where it is said tongues are εἰς σημεῖον τοῖς ἄνωτοις. So Thucyd. 1, 10. οὐκ ἀπεκτάσας σημεῖον. The σημεῖον just after is to be taken in the more common Scriptural sense of miracles. In the Gospels the word is often associated with τέρατος. And so in Acts 2, 22. we have δυνάμεις καὶ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα.

The words ἐν τάσι τιμωμένη, on which the early modern Commentators say much to little purpose, are to be taken as an adverbial phrase, perseveringly, and are used for want of some abverb, as τιμωμένως. The

* To which purpose I would compare Sophocel. Trach. 1100. καὶ τὸ μηδὲν δ. & Aj. 76, 7. καὶ τὸ μηδὲν δὲν.
accumulation, too, of in different senses obscures the sentence. The first signifies inter; the second cum; the third per.

13. τι γὰρ ἐστὶν καὶ ἡττηθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς λαοῦς ἐκκλησίας. Having shown that no signs of an Apostle were wanting in him, he enquires whether there be any other deficiency, namely, any neglect on his part, which should leave them inferior to other churches. It is strange that he does not remind them of the supernatural gifts which had been imparted to so many by him. However, he does not enter regularly into the enquiry, but asks merely in what they are inferior to other churches; which carries with it the answer—in nothing. And then, by a fine mixture of sarcasm and irony, not exceeded by any example in Demosth., he adds εἰ μὴ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ οὐ κατενάρκησα ὑμᾶς; καθίσασθε μοι τὴν ἄδικων ταύτην, where the αὐτὸς ἐγώ and the ὑμᾶς are both emphatic; q. d. "I have not, whatever others have done; I have never been burthensome to you, whatever I have been to others." On the sense of κατενάρκησε see the note on 11, 8. Χαρίσασθε, forgive. This verb has a dative of the person, and an accusative of the thing; as in Col. 2, 18.; though the accusative is sometimes omitted; as in 2 Cor. 2, 7, 7, 12. Eph. 4, 32. I must not omit to observe, that in ἡττηθητε, just before, there seems an idiomatic use; and in ὑπὲρ, which is well rendered by the Vulgate praec, there is a Hebraism, formed on ἐπί.

14. ὑπὸ τρίτον έτοιμας ἦσαν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐ καταναρκήσας ὑμᾶς. There is no little address shown in this sentence. The most prominent circumstance is, by a delicate turn, put last. For the scope of the whole seems to be to reply to a calumny, which might possibly be thrown out by the false teachers, that he had only urged to them his previous moderation, in order that he might now receive of them: and the τρίτον έτοιμας ἦσαν, though put first, is a very inferior circumstance. So that the true sense of the Apostle may be best represented by the clause being thrown into a parenthesis, thus: "I have not, I say,
budensome to you (heretofore); and when I come to you again (as I am now for the third time purposing in mind to do,) I will not be burdensome to you.” The χαρίσασθε μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην is parenthetical; and in υἱῷ κατανάξησα and υἱὸν καταναξάσθω there is the same elegance as at 11, 12, 5 δὲ τοιῶ, καὶ τοιῆσο, as said of the same subject. The ἔτοιμως ἔχει is an idiom occurring also at Acts 21, 13. 1 Pet. 4, 5. and sometimes in the later Classical writers. And the τείτων is to be taken with it, and not with ἔλθεῖν; since the Apostle’s purposed visit would only be the second;* having been disappointed in one he had before contemplated.

The words οἳ γὰρ ἡνῶ τὰ ὑμῶν, ἀλλ’ ὑμᾶς have great energy, point, and elegance. At τὰ must be supplied ὑπάρχοντα, or χρήματα. The sentiment may be thus expressed: “I seek not your money,” but your souls (i. e. your salvation); your welfare, not my own, is my aim.” So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): ἡνῶ τὴν ὑμετέραν σωτηρίαν καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς, οἳ τὰ χρήματα. Wets. compares a similar sentiment of Cicero, de fin. b. & m. 2. 26. Me igitur ipsum ames oportet, non mea, si veri amici futuri sumus.

This the Apostle follows up with a sentence in which may be discerned exquisite delicacy and address; though it has not been fully seen by the Commentators. It is strange they should not have perceived that it is an adagial sentence, and that (as is usual in such) the terms are not to be pressed on, but understood comparate. Thus οἳκ ἀλλὰ signifies non tam quam. The ἔφειλε may be rendered must: but the must has often a very feeble sense. It refers to what is usual, natural, and in the regular order of things; for (as Cæcumen. says) ἀλλὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ λογίσμω καὶ τὴν φυσικὸς πιστεύως τῶν λόγων. No other antient Commentator saw this; and of the moderns only

* So Rosenm. : “Apostolus, ex quo primum adierat Corinthum, (Act. 18, 1. sq. 1 Cor. 3, 6 & 10. 4, 15.) interea non reedit; Act. 18, 18—20, 1. quomque e Macedoniis in Achaian proficiisci nunc pararet, secundum; non tertium iter suscipit.” Act. 20, 2. 2 Cor. 9, 4. 15. plura vid. ad. c. 13, 1 & 2.
Est. (from T. Aquin.), Selden, and Grot., which last Commentator cites the following law dict: Ratio naturalis, quasi lex quaedam tacita, liberis parentum hereditatem addicit. And he refers to his own remarks de Jure, b. & p. 2, 7, 5. This therefore will not prove that children need not provide for their parents, nor disciples for their masters. For the right is assigned by Christ, and often asserted by St. Paul. It is plain the Apostle here waves this right, and says what he says out of a refined delicacy. This indeed is plain from what follows, εγὼ δὲ δακτανησω, &c.: for it is neither enjoined, nor would it be possible for ministers to spend their substance upon their people: and the rules of natural paternity will not apply here.

15. εγὼ δὲ ήδιστα δακτανησω καὶ εκδακτανηθησομαι. There is infinite spirit and beauty in this sentence, which is admirably paraphrased by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) thus: Ἔγω οὐ μόνον οὐ μὴ λήψομαι ἄφ’ ύμων, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον προσθάνω (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ δακτανησω.) Καὶ τί λέγα χρήματα δακτανησω; αὐτὸς ἕγω εκδακτανηθησομαι; τοιτ ἐστι, καὶ τῇ σάρκῃ δὲ δακτανησαι υπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, οὐ χείσομαι. It is well rendered by Schleus. thus: “ego vero lubentissimè sumptus faciam, immo me totum dabo saluti vestrae, me ipsum, meas vires, vitam adeo meam planè exhauriam et profundam.” The ἕκ has an intensive force, of which Kypke cites an example from Polyb. 17, 11. κατὰ γην πλείστων αὐτῶις χορηγιῶι εκδακτανημενω, and Wets. has one from Josephus. He has also illustrated the force of the verb, as applied to denote the gradual consuming or wasting of the body by disease, or excessive labour, &c.

This unequivocal proof of his affection the Apostle follows up with a gentle reproof, that they have not hitherto returned his love. So Theoph.: Kαλ τοῦτο μετ’ ἐγκληματος ὑμῶ καὶ ἀγαθής. For I would not apply the words (as is done by most Commentators) to what would hereafter take place. The Apostle was too delicate to augur so ill of them. The sense may
be thus expressed: "though indeed (I am sensible, and by past experience may say it,) the more I love you, the less I am loved by you."

Chrysost. (with his usual exquisite taste) points out the kind of climax which may be traced in the virtues shown by the Apostle towards the Corinthians: Δέως λαβεῖν, οὐκ ἔλαβε· δεύτερον, υπερουμεντικον τρίτον, καὶ αὐτῶν κηρύττων τέταρτον, οτι καὶ προσωπικοι απεικονισαντε· οτι καὶ οὗκ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ φιλοσοφίας· ἐκ του υπεροχιατος γερα· ἐκτὸς, οτι καὶ ἐνωτερει· ζεβδομον· ἀληθείη των μη σφόδρα φιλοσοφον· ὤγεσθε, οτι καὶ σφόδρα φιλοσοφομένων.

16. ἔστω δὲ—ἐλαβον. The Apostle seems to speak, as it were, in the person of his calumniators; or at least he adverts to a charge which they might possibly make against him, namely, that his not taking a stipend of them was a piece of refined policy, the more effectually to attain the same purpose by means of another. This objection the Apostle anticipates, and refutes. I cannot think with the Commentators, that they had actually made this charge; since there was not the slightest ground for it: for it is clear that the Apostle had enjoined both Titus and the brother minister who accompanied him (namely, Luke or Mark,) to take no money from them.

17. μη τινα ἀν—ὑπαρ. This is, as Rosenm. remarks, a Hebrew mode of expression, for μη δια τινος ἀν, or δια τινος ἐκεινων, αὐς ἀπεσταλκα προς υπαρ. ἐκπεπεικησα ὑπαρ;

18. παρεκάλεσα Τιτος—Τιτος; This has reference to what was said supra 8, 6. εἰς το παρεκάλεσον ὑμᾶς Τιτος, ἵνα ἐπιτελεση την ἁριν ταυτην· & 18. συνεκαμψησαν μετ’ αυτοι των ἁδελφων. The Apostle appeals to their own conscience, asking: Μητι ἐκπεπεικησεν ὑμᾶς Τιτος; "did he?" &c. No. The whole sentence, if changed from the Oriental, and written according to the forms of Occidental and regular composition, would run thus: "Did Titus, whom I requested to go to you, or the brother whom I sent with him, make a gain of you?"
This the Apostle follows up with a sentence in which there is, by a sort of delicate turn, the consequent put for the antecedent. He does not say, "No, they walked in my steps," but delicately substitutes: "Have we not walked in the same disinterested spirit, pursued the same course?"* As to the speculations of Rosenm. and Storr on this verse, they are (I think) ill founded.

It is remarked by Theoph., that by using παρέκκλησα for ἐπεμψα he increases the merit of Titus's moderation, since κατὰ παράκλησιν ἦλθεν. The other brother is not mentioned, since he seems to have acted a subordinate part; yet he is included in the we all.

19. πάλιν δοκεῖτε δι᾽ ύμων ἀπολογοῦμεθα; The Apostle says this out of fear lest, the anxiety he shows to justify himself in all respects should be ascribed to improper motives, whether timidity, or selfishness. The πάλιν refers to 3, 1, & 5, 12. This the Apostle checks, by making a solemn protestation κατενάθην τοῦ Θεοῦ—οἰκοδομής; q. d. I protest before God and in the presence of Christ, or in the spirit of Christ's religion, τὰ δὲ πάντα, ἀγαπητοῖς, υπὲρ τῆς ύμῶν οἰκοδομῆς: where εἰς (quint) is to be supplied. The δὲ signifies autem; and the sense may be thus expressed: "All that I have done, either before, or now, in writing as I have done, has been from disinterested motives, and for your spiritual good alone, to promote which I have now ventured to disabuse you of those prejudices against me which the false teachers instilled." On οἰκοδομή I have more than once treated.

20. φοβοῦμαι γὰρ, μὴ πῶς ἐλθὼν οὐχ οίως θέλω εὐρεῖ ὑμᾶς, κἀγα ἐφέσοι υμῖν ὅσον οὐθέτε. In this antithetical sentence there is great elegance; and it is intended still further to apologize for saying so much in refu-
tation of the calumnies against himself, and finding such fault with them.

Οἶνος οὗ θέλει, “such as I would,” viz. reformed of the offences for which I have rebuked you, and not corrupted by the misrepresentations of the false Apostles. By κατὰ εὐρεθὸν οἷον οὗ θέλετε is denoted (though spoken with exquisite delicacy) a punishment; as is clear both in itself and by comparison with 10, 2. and infra 18, 2. καὶ φείσωμαι.

The words following are explanatory of the preceding οἷος θέλει. Αὐτῷ ἔρεις, ἐγγίζῃς, &c. must be repeated φθορὰς μείνας; and some verb must be supplied, namely, the verb substantive ἔστι, “lest there be found.” The change of construction is (I think) to be imputed to delicacy. For if he had finished the sentence as he had begun it, he must have used instead of nouns denoting vices, nouns denoting the persons guilty of those vices, q. d. lest, namely, I should find you zealots, quarrelsome, back-biters, &c.; as Rom. 1, 30. It is manifest that the charges here indirectly made are not to be supposed as levelled against the generality, but against certain persons (chiefly of the Anti-Pauline faction), and even in them in different proportions. The nouns by which these vices are denoted need little explanation. Schleus. Lex. may be consulted. It may, however, be observed, that ἔρεις, ἐγγίζῃς, θυμὸν, and ἐρπεῖς seem to denote the vices of strife and angry contention in its more violent forms: and καταλαλια and ψευσώμειον, those lower and meaner modifications of the same spirit, by which the flames of discord are blown up. The last words may seem to denote the effects of a party spirit, φωτισώμειον, with which the Apostle reproaches them at 1 Cor. 4, 6. 18 & 19. 5, 2. 13, 4.; καταστασίαι, refers to that state of universal confusion and disorder which would be the result of such strife, to which the Apostle adverts at 1 Cor. 14, 33. and of which St. James 3, 16. justly says: Εἴπων ἐγένετο καὶ ἐρπεῖσθαι, έκεί διὰ καταστασίαι.

21. μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα—ἐπράξαν. In these words
the Apostle hints at something yet worse than strifes and disorders, namely immorality. Yet he expresses his fear with equal delicacy and affection.

The πάλιν may be taken either with ἐλδοντα, or with ταξινασθή. But the former mode seems preferable. Μὴ μὲ ταξινασθή ὁ Θεὸς μου περὶ ὑμᾶς, lest my God should humble me in respect of you, i.e. lest I should be mortified, and grieved to find in some of you so little profit of my labours.” In order, however, that they may not think he means this generally, he adds, μὴ πενθήσω πολλοὶς τῶν προσμαρτηκότων, for πενθ. πολλοὶς προσμαρτηκότας, as at 10, 12. See Casaub. ap. Crit. Sacr. The sense, then, is: “I fear I shall have to bewail many who have not repented, and forsaken their sins.” The Apostle then adds yet more, and ventures even to specify vices of a very foul sort, ἀκαθαρσία, πορνεία, and ἀσελγεία, all which terms have been treated on in the note on Rom. 1, 24. Theophyl. explains ἀκαθαρσία by τὰς τῶν σωματικῶν μίζων αρήτοτοικας. Πενθήσω is rightly rendered by Chrysost., Theophyl., and Grot. “have the grief not only of seeing impenitence, but of punishing it.” So, Grot. remarks, the Romans when about to condemn a citizen put on a black robe. On this sense of πενθεῖν he refers to his note on 1 Cor. 5, 2.

CHAP. XIII.

VERSE 1. τρίτων τούτω ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. These words involve some uncertainty, if not obscurity. In their plain and obvious sense they would seem to signify that this was to be the third visit made by St. Paul; and yet, from the Acts of the Apostles, it would appear to be the second only. Those, therefore, who take the words in their literal acceptation (as do Mackn. and Slade) are compelled to suppose that one visit has not been recorded by St. Luke. And if the words of the present passage were alone to be considered, I should agree with them: but since these words are evidently introduced per epa-
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mallepsin, and by way of resumption of what was said a few verses before, 12, 14. (where the sense is more clearly expressed, namely, τρίτος είτεπος ἐγώ εἰκόνος), I cannot but assent to some antient and most modern Commentators, who take the sense to be: "this is the third time that I am about to come; i.e. am preparing and purposing to come. So Grot., Whitby, Wolf, Dodd., and Wet., which last Commentator renders: "Semel et iterum et nunc tertio consilium cepi, ut ad vos venirem. Bis quidem nullâ meâ culpâ impeditus sum. 2 Cor. 1, 15 & 16. Spero tamen jam denique mihi successurum, ut vobis demonstrem, seriò me desiderasse ad vos venire: Sicut ea, quæ trium hominum testimonio probantur, in judicio fidem faciunt." See also Dr. Paley. On the epanalepsis see Mr. Locke. It is truly remarked by Dodd., "that such interruptions are frequent in St. Paul, and in many other writers who have not a regard to an artificial dress, and do not stand to correct every little inaccuracy, but abound in quickness and variety of thought, as Mr. Locke justly observes."

1. ἐν στόματος διὸ μακτώραν καὶ τρίῳ σταθήσεται τῶν ῥημάτων. The sense of these words has been somewhat controverted. The law maxim alluded to is found in Num. 35, 30. Deut. 17, 6. 19, 15., and it is sanctioned by Christ himself, Matt. 18, 16. Those who interpret the last words literally pursue the same course with these, and think that the Apostle means to say, that in any examinations before him on the accusations respecting the vices imputed to the Corinthians, every question (or thing) would be established and determined according to the above mentioned law. But this seems too formal a mode of interpretation; nor is it necessary to resort to such a sense, which indeed, if it were the one intended by the Apostle, is expressed very imperfectly. Still more unfounded is the opinion of Lightfoot, who supposes the witnesses to have been Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus. It is far more rational to understand by the witnesses here mentioned the Apostle's own admonitory Epistles: and such is the
Opinion not only of the most eminent modern Commentators, as Grot., Hamm., Locke, Rosenm., and others, but also of the antient Commentators. There is surely no occasion to stumble at a figurative mode of expression like this, which is quite agreeable to the genius of Oriental thought and expression.

It is remarked by Rosenm.: "Mosis dictum transfert. Voluerat nempe bis ad eos venire, sed noli fecerat; nunc tertiâ vice venturum se dicit; ergo tandem aliquando verum fore id, quod promiserat; q. d. Quemadmodum res, in judiciis duplici aut triplex testimonio probata, est certa, sic etiam nunc id erit verum, quod bis atque adeo ter promissi."

2. πρεείσθησα καὶ προλέγω, "I have (just) signified, and I (hereby) say it beforehand." Οὐς παραὶ τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἄπαν νῦν, "as if I were present the second time; though now (as yet) absent." This is (I think) rightly supposed to be the sense by the best Commentators; though the phraseology is so lax and indeterminate, that nothing but the context and the scope of the Apostle can fix it. Πρεείσθησα is used as at 1 Cor. 4, 21. Νῦν may be taken either with προλέγω or ἄπαν. The sense will be much the same either way; but the latter is the more natural construction, and is more agreeable to the Apostle's style. Καὶ in the sense although is very frequent. Τοῖς προηγαρησκότας must be understood as at the last verse of the preceding chapter, where see the note. By the τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν is meant all the rest of the congregation, who, it is hinted, are to bear witness that he has said it, and take warning, should they be tempted to sin.

Εἰς τὸ τάλιν. A very rare phrase, which occurs no where else in the New Testament, nor (as far as I know) in the Classical writers. The Commentators subaud μέρος χρόνου, which seems as frivolous as to attempt to supply the ellipsis in the correspondent English particle again, which, by the way (though the Etymologists have not perceived it) is derived through the medium of the Anglo Saxon āgen, from
the Greek aieL, sometimes written aiev. Eis aies often occurs in Thucyd., and eis aies in the Poets, as Ap. RHod. 2, 714. But I must find some more suitable occasion of further illustrating this matter.

2. ou λεισορμαι. An euphemism for "I will punish;" examples of which might be adduced in abundance.

3. eteI dokoimh eite toV en emoi kalouNtov Christov, "Since (as it seems) ye seek a proof of (the reality of) Christ dwelling in me." Theophyl. (from Chrys.) well annotates thus: Met' a polloV tou thumou pros touV ektusenontas autoV ou aivenei kal ektusenontes, tauta fhsin eitei de ypar boiLesthe dokoimazin, eV en emoi ou CristoV oikei, kal die touV me kaiwdeite ou aivenei kal egh- mon touV Christov, gnwseste pantas, esthe adiaphorstoi meinhte. Deiknvai de ou pneumatiká eiV ta býmata á légei, kal laiVou dei fereisbai tin aneileh, ouV touV Christov kalouNtov. Oi die touV de ekolaizhen ouV dokoimh au- toV kal peirVn diwVn eif V eteinoV anVama aigraptaste, ei anagkasth, Fhsw, kolaicai umas, elwseste die touV egrwn auVwn tin dokiMh ouV eitei.

3. ou eis úmas ouk aivenei, allá dwnatEi en umin. The force of this sentence is strangely enervated by most recent Commentators, as if it only had respect to the great efficacy the doctrine of Christ had had among them. But surely, in connection with what went before, there is reason to think, with the antient and most early modern Commentators, that the Apostle has reference to the effects of Christ's power as exercised in the supernatural infliction of disorders on certain persons. See 1 Cor. 4, 21., and Ephes. 2 30., where see the notes. So Theophyl.: fhsin, ou ti aiv ou an peirVn eilhpete, ginwskete pantas, ou ti eis umas, ouk aivenei, allá dwnatei. See also Bp. Burnet ap.-Doddr. There may likewise be an allusion to another mode in which the power of Christ was mighty among them, namely, by imparting the supernatural sarkismata treated of in ch. 12—14. of the former Epistle.

The ouk aivenei, allá dwnatei, like a similar expression infra ver. 8. ou dunamevá ti kata tHs alebélas,
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dall' οὐρὰ τῆς ἀθνείας, has great energy: and δούατεί is a stronger term than δοὐαται.

4. καὶ γὰρ εἰ ἔταυράθη ἐκ ἀθνείας. There are several ways in which this brief and somewhat indeterminate phrase ἐκ ἀθνείας may be explained. Rosenm. expounds it thus: "Ἀθνεία hic est conditione caduca et infirma, quam Christus nostri causâ susceperat. Christus nempe, provocatus ad auctoritate et suam miraculis firmandam, Matt. 27, 40 seqq. Luc. 23, 1. ad salutem hominum infirmam videri, et contemptus mori non dubitavit. Hujus exemplum imitari se, Apostolus dicit. Se libenter velle opprobria pati, si modo salutem Corinthiorum inserviat." Schleus., in his Lex., offers the following exposition: "qui habebat naturam humanam infirmam et debilem, aut, quod, eodem redit, secundum humilem conditionem, quam Jesus his in terris usus est." But it requires a much fuller paraphrase to do justice to the sense, which is well expressed by Whitby thus: "For though he was crucified through (the) weakness (of that human nature which he took upon him, and in that appeared to others as weak), yet he liveth (and discovers efficaciously that he doth so) by the power of God (so gloriously attending the invocation of his name, and faith in him, we also (Gr. and so we also) are (as yet in your apprehension) weak in him, but we shall (appear to) live by the power of God (exerting itself by us) towards you." See also Dodd.

In the latter clause of this antithetical sentence ἐκ δυνάμεως must be taken for διὰ δυνάμεως.

4. καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀθενοῦμεν—ὑμᾶς. Slade renders: "Though we appear weak and contemptible in ourselves, yet by the power of God we shall be found strong in the working of miracles on your behalf, especially for the infliction of punishment, just as Christ appeared to be weak when crucified, but was re-animated and glorified by the same divine power." At ἀθενοῦμεν must be supplied εἰς ὑμᾶς. The sense is: "Thus I only show myself as weak, abstaining for a time from severity." Ἔν αὐτῶ, "after
his example.” Ζησώμεθα, “will show myself vigorous; and, contrary to your opinion of my timidity and weakness, will, if need be, and by the help of God, exhibit my strength and firmness by punishing.”

5. ἑαυτὸς πειράζετε. The connexion is thus ably traced by Theophyl. (from Chrys.): Καὶ τὴ λέγει, φησί, περὶ ἑαυτὸν, δι', ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν ἐμοί, λαλεῖ, καὶ ὅτι δύναμιν μὲν, πλὴν ἑκεῖνον μιμοῦμεν τὸν σταυρωθέντα, οὐκ ἐπεξέρχομαι ὑμῖν; καὶ ὅμεις γὰρ εἰ βουλήθητε ἑαυτὸς ἐξετάσαι, δεσθε ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκεῖνο ἐκείτε πάντες τῇ πίστιν. Phot., too, discusses the sense in a very ingenious and masterly manner. Yet the former seems to be the more natural and satisfactory one. The context shows that the Apostle refers them to the miraculous powers in some, and the total reformation of life in others, as a proof of the divine authority by which he imparted the one and produced the other.

Δοκιμάζετε is a much stronger expression than πειράζετε. There is in it a metaphor derived from metallurgy. So Wets. paraphrases: “Qui aurum ad lapidem lydium explorare vult, prius lapidem lydium ipsum exploratur habere debet. Vos ergo, qui me examinatis, comm. 3. explore prius vosmet ipsos.”

In οὐκ ἐπιγίνοσκετε there is a very common Hellenism, in which ἑαυτὸς is pleonastic. There is here a further unfolding of the sentiment in the preceding clause. The words may be thus paraphrased: “Do you not, on examination, find (as ye will do) unless ye be not genuine Christians, that Jesus Christ is in you (by his power);” a power evinced in the two ways just pointed out. Nothing is more certain than that ἀδοκίμω cannot be interpreted, with the Calvinists, reprobate (in the sense they affix to the word), that having no connection whatever with the subject of the Apostle’s present discourse. See the notes of Whitby and Mackn. on this word, and also Bp. Tomline’s Refut. p. 225. All the antient Commentators, and the most judicious modern ones,
are agreed that the Apostle solely has reference to the corrupt lives of some, and those vices with which he had charged them in various parts of both his Epistles, and indeed just before at 12, 21. And this yields a very good sense. (See the paraphrase above.) As, however, the Apostle has just before used the terms ἀδικομένος, πειραζότες, and ἀδικομαζότες, and, on other occasions, deals much in the paronomasia, it is probable that he alludes to that primitive sense of ἀδικομένος, by which it means not genuine, adulterated. Thus Schl. Lex. compares 2 Tim. 3, 8. ἀδικομένος περὶ τῆς πίστεως. It may, however, have a middle sense between the two, namely, that of rejectanei. So Hesych.; ἀδικομένων ἀπόβλητων. Wherever else the Apostle has used the word he has intended by it corrupt, worthless, good for nothing.

6. ἐξελέγον δὲ τῷ γενέσθαι ὅτι ἢμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμέν ἀδικομένοι. Here there seems to be a clause omitted, which may be thus supplied: “(But, whatever may be the result of your own examination of yourselves,) I trust that you will discover that we are not ἀδικομενοί, i.e. “that I am a true Apostle, and have the proof (δικαιομέν) of it in still retaining those Divine energies which are the strongest proof,” namely, in the supernatural infliction of disorders, as well as cure of them. Many Commentators, antient and modern, go much further in assigning the sense; but they seem to wander too far, and involve all in uncertainty.

It is rightly remarked by Theophyl., that this carries with it a threat.

7. εὐχρηματί δὲ πρὸς τῷ Θεῷ—ἀγεν. The harshness of the preceding sentence, which implied a threat, is here softened.

By δικαιομέν is meant “giving proof of our divine commission,” namely, in the way hinted at in the last verse, i.e. by punishment. It is also proper to notice the ellipsis in ἡ χρήμα, &c., or rather the diologia in εὐχρηματί. The sense is: “However, I pray to God
that ye may do nothing evil, and deserving of punish-
ment (for it is my wish), not that our divine com-
misson be thereby approved, but (rather) that ye
may do what is right, and we may thereby be, as it
were, without that proof, by not having to exercise
the power."

8. οὐ γὰρ δυνάμενα τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τῆς
ἀληθείας. It is evident that a clause is here omitted
to which γὰρ refers; q. d. (nor need you fear any
unjust or partial construction of your conduct), for
we can do nothing against the truth, but for the
truth," i. e. "in the exercise of those powers we can-
not but be subservient to that system of truth which
is contained in the Gospel;" or, "our decisions can-
not but be agreeable to the truth, being preserved
from error by the same power that has entrusted us
with these exalted faculties." That such is the sense,
the best Commentators, antient and modern, are
agreed; though from the extent and uncertainty of
the terms variety of interpretation must be expected.

9. χαίρομεν γὰρ ἤταν ὑμεῖς σωθενήμενοι, ὑμεῖς δὲ δυνατόν
 XmlNode. This seems to have reference to the preceding
words οὐχ ὑπὰ ὑμεῖς, &c. And the intermediate ones
οὐ γὰρ δυνάμενα—ἀληθείας are, I think, parenthetical.
The sense may be thus expressed: "Nay, so far are
we from wishing to give proof of our power, by
having to punish your irregularities, that we rather
rejoice when we are thus weak (i. e. seem weak, by
not having our power shown by the proof), and you
are strong (in faith and good works)." That the
above is the sense the best Commentators are agreed.
It is probable, however, that in ἁσθ. the Apostle may
have also a reference to the ἀδικεία, or timidity,
charged upon him by his adversaries. So Theophyl.:
χαίρω γὰρ μαθηταὶ ὅταν αὐτῶν μὲν ἐγὼ ἀσθενῶ, τοιτέστιν,
ἀδικείας νομιζώμεα, ὅσῳ ἐπειδευκνύμενοι δύναμιν τινα ἐν
τῷ τιμραφέσθαι ὑμεῖς δὲ δυνατόν ἤτε, τοιτέστιν, ἐνάρετοι,
ἀπαντῶμεν.

9. τούτῳ δὲ καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν. The
and is emphatic; q. d. "This we not only wish, but even pray for (namely) your reformation and perfection, that we may have no occasion to exercise severity towards you." Kατάφρους is a somewhat rare word, though sometimes occurring in the later Greek writers, yet only in the physical, not in the moral sense, as here. It is derived from καταφρήσκω, to be perfect; ἄγων bearing the same sense as ἄγως. See the note on ver. 11.

10. διὸ τῶν ταῦτα ἄγων γράφεις, &c. This is (as Theophyl. observes) intended as a sort of apology for the reprehension and threatening language he had employed, namely, as wishing that it would have to be extended no further than ἐν καί τῶν γραμμάτων, and not shown in deeds.

"Ταύτα γράφωμαι is a popular mode of expression for: "that I may not have to treat you harshly." Ταύτα is, through delicacy, left to be supplied: and γράφωμαι signifies treat, by an idiom common both to the Latin uti, and our verbs use. The sentiment is the same as at 10, 1. δέξασθαι δὲ τῇ μῷ πάροι, &c.

The next words are a repetition of what was said at 10, 8.; where see the note. Wets. compares Joseph. Ant. 2, 6, 9. όμοιον, ὃ παράσχει τίμην ὁ θεὸς ταῦτα ἔχουσα ἔξωθεν ἀνθρώπων, διὸ καί μοναδικόν διενεργεῖ τῇ σάρκι τῷ μνῷ ἐν ἀρχιπέρας ἀνθρώπινες παρακαταθέτεται κατὰ τοῦτον ἐκάθεν ἐκτελέσθαι ἐν τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς ἐπιδεικνυόμενοι καί ταῦτα καί ἀπολαμβάνει, τῆς μὲν κατὰ τῶν ἐξώθεις, αἱ μὴ ὑπαρχόντες, ἐπιλαμβάνεται, μάνοι ὁ ἐπιτελόμενοι τοῦ σφέτεν ὑπολαμβάνει. Rosenm. unwarrantably, limits this power to imprecation ad terrorem, and excommunication, either temporary or final: whereas, it is clear from various passages of both these Epistles, as well as from the Acts of the Apostles, that it extended to the actual infliction of disorders as temporal punishments for sin.

11. Now follows what may be called the Coda to the Epistle; as in Rom. 16, 25—27.

On the τοῖς Grot. observes: "est properantis.
sermonem absolvere." But its force has been better discerned by Theophyl., who well expresses it thus: "Εγω τα ἐμαυτω ἐπτησα: υπολοιπον ου δι εστιν ὑμας τα ἐκατων συνεισενεγκειν" διαφθαρθεῖτε γαρ, ἀμαραντων κτησεθε την ἀνδρα του συνεδριος χαραν, ει καλ λογις ἐμαυτα ὑμιν εἰπον.

11. χαίρετε. This is rendered by Rosenm. : "hilar estote animo." And so Schleus. and others. But the passages cited by Schleus. Lex. as examples of that sense are none of them quite to the purpose. I see no reason to desert the interpretation of the early modern Commentators (supported as it is by the antient ones), who render it farewell; a formula which the antients were accustomed to subjoin to their Epistles : on which see Schl. Lex. in voc. § 2. 11. καταρτίζεσθε. See the note on ver. 9. In this moral sense the word occurs in many passages of the New Testament; as Luke 6, 40. and 1 Cor. 1, 10. ης de καταρτισμενου εν τω αυτω νοι, and Elsner inculcates the same sense here; but (I think) erroneously. Almost all the Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that it refers, not to the removal of discord, but to the removal of vices, by moral reformation. It seems to have a reciprocal sense, literally: "make yourselves reformed and perfect;" i. e. strive after reformation and perfection." Thus our Lord says, Matt. 5, 48. ἐσεσθε ου τελειων, by which can only be meant "aim at, strive after being perfect." That God hath his part in this as well as man, is clear from Heb. 13, 10. καταρτισεi (scil. δ Θεος) εν παντι ἐργῳ ἀγαθῳ; also 1 Pet. 5, 10. Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: τελειων γίνεσθε εντε δογμασι καλ. εν βιω, καλ ἀναπληρωτε τα λειτουργα υμιν.

11. παρακαλεσθε. The antient Commentators and, of the moderns, Schleus. have rightly regarded the word as used in a reciprocal sense, namely, "comfort each other;" though it may include the sense comfort yourselves, take comfort, namely, under the trials which are continually befalling you.
11. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε. Doddr. ap. Slade explains thus: "Attend to the same thing," pursue with the greatest unanimity of heart and intenseness of affection that which ought to be the great end of all our schemes and designs, the care of glorifying God and adorning the Gospel." He argues that to be of one mind might, in some respects, have been impossible. But this seems founded on a mistaken view. There is no occasion to press on the sense be of one mind, which, as in the case of the καταρατιζομένης, is to be modified by aim at it. Grot. renders "concordes esti:" observing that this is to be referred ad affectum, non ad intelligentiam. But I rather assent to the opinion of the antient and some eminent modern Commentators, that it denotes "aim at concord in your religious sentiments, avoid dissensions and factions (one saying, I am of Paul; another, I am of Cephas). It is not probable that the Apostle would have omitted an admonition so seasonable; and which he gives at Rom. 15, 5. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. Besides, the sense assigned by Grot. and others is expressed in the next word εἰρηνευτε. This it was necessary to mention, since (as Theophyl. observes) this might agree in doctrines, and yet not live in peace and concord one with another.

11. καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης ἐστιν μεθ' ὑμῶν. The Apostle fortifies his exhortation by proposing a strong motive to the practice of this unanimity and concord, namely, that the God of all love, the Giver of peace and all other blessings, will be with them, namely, for their protection against all who seek to interrupt that peace and concord.

12. ἀσπασάσθε ἀλλήλους ἐν ἀγίῳ φιλήματι. The same direction is found in Rom. 16, 16., where see the note.

12. ἀσπαζόμενοι ὑμᾶς οἱ ἁγιοὶ πάντες, "all the Christians (here) send their salutations."

13. ἡ χάρις—ὑμῶν. It is evident that in this sen-
tence the Optative εἰη is to be supplied. Χάρις τ. ξ. 1. X. is explained by Roseam.: "universitas beneficiorum, quae nos Christo ejusque religioni debe-mus." And the Πνεύμα άγιον he explains "beneficia religionis, sensus Christianus." But in the former case his interpretation is too vague; and in the latter he unwarrantably curtails the sense. I would render: May the favour of Christ, from which so many blessings flow, rest upon you, and the love of God, which bringeth salvation, be upon you, and may the Holy Spirit impart to you his Divine gifts and graces. "Here (as Whitby rightly observes) the Father and Son being mentioned as distinct persons, we have no reason to doubt of the personality of the Holy Ghost thus mentioned with them." And it is justly observed by Mr. Slade, that "the remarkable analogy which the latter clause bears to each of the two preceding, must naturally lead us to understand that the Holy Ghost is not here spoken of as a mere quality, or agent."
EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

EPISTOLÆ ARGUMENTUM.

AUCTORE E. A. BORGER.

VIRUS acerbitatis, quod in Paulum evomuerant homines malvolentissimi, epistolam peperit, quæ universa in frangendis adversariis corumque retundenda improbitate consumitur, cujusque argumentum trifariam dispersum est:

1. Pauli doctrina ad Deum, non item ad humanam referenda est auctoritatem.

2. Sequuntur doctrinæ Paulini ab adversariorum calumniis vindicæ.

3. Paulus, quam doctrinam jam antea tradiderat, cændem et nunc probat et praedicat.

Ad primum igitur, quam commemoravimus, epistolæ partem, quà monet Apostolus doctrinam suam originis esse divinæ, neque eam pendere e reliquorum auctoritate Apostolorum; ad hanc ergo partem quod attinet. Paulus apertis verbis falsitatis arguit scelestorum hominum criminationem, cap. 1, 1, 11, & 12. In Christianorum enim ipsum se contulisse castra, religionisque Christianæ doctrinam se tradere gentibus, non humanæ auctoritate adductum, sed divinitus admonitum, cap. 1, 13—16. Imo tantum absesse, ut munus docendi ab Apostolis sit sibi oblatum, suamque ipse doctrinam ex horum consortione traxerit, ut potius per longum satis tempus nulla cum iis sibi fuerit familiaritas, sed, simul ac sacra Christianæ approbasset, in longinquas regiones secesserit, cap. 1, 17—2, 1. Se quidem dein fatetur itineria feicisse Hierosolymam, (que erat religionis veluti sedes); ut vero suspicionem propulset, se eo tetendisse discendi causâ, monet, cùm primum illuc profectus esset, se in ea fuisset urbe, quindecim tantum dies commoraturum, (quod temporis spatium brevius erat, quàm ut universa religio Christianæ discendo perciperetur), neque alium præter Jacobum, se ibi reperiisse Apostolum, cap. 1, 18, 19. Secundum vero, quod commemorat, iter factum esse divinæ admonitione, eam potissimum ob causam, ut doctrinæ suse omnibus patet puritas, ac præsentientium convelleretur opinio: neque hac occasione novi se quid aut incogniti ex Apostolis didicisse, cap. 2, 1, 2, 4, & 6. Sed bonos, divinam se legationem gerere intelligentes, ipsum in Apostolorum tamquam collegium co-optare haud dubitasse, 11, 7—10. Quinimo Petrum, magnum virum famæ, legis Mosaicæ studium simulantium, palam a se fuisset reprehensum; adeo nihil esse, quod

Obiectam dein iìdifficultatem ex eo petitam, quod, Pauli probata doctrina, legislationis Mosaicæ nulla fuerit utilitas, egregiè diluit, cum ostendit, legem istam hominum, tamquam puerrorum, fuisse moderatricem, quæ juvenilem petulantiam coereret, usque dum, ad eætatis maturitatem perducti, sua futuri essent tutela, leniori ac paterno moderamini subjecta, cap. 3, 19—4, 7. Inspera dein incepta longiore levitatis reprehensione, (cap. 4, 8—20.) redit illuc, unde delexerat oratio, iterumque Christianis legis Mosaicæ immunitatem asservit Paulus, servâ Hagaræ comparatione institutâ et Saræ ingenuæ, quorum altera similis fuerit Judeis, Christianis altera, cap. 4, 21—31. Hinc usque ad finem epistolæ, in eadem quidem persuasendâ causa literæ versatur, simul vero Apostolus suam ipsa doctrinam ad virtutis exercitum revocat, et cum hoc quasi commissit. Continet nimirum haec epistolæ pars admonitiones efficacissimæ, ac libertatis doctrina in mollem agendi desidiam turpemque scelerum praetextum trahatur: amabilem enim virtutem colendam, amoris ac benevolentiae legi suspendendum, cap. 5, 15—15.

De tertid autem, quam supra memoravimus, epistolæ parte, non est quod multa dicamus, cùm Paulus in hæc epistolæ nusquam suam in docendâ religionè constantiam, continuæ quodam orationis perpetuitate, teneatur, sed omnia hujus argumenta per universum scriptum diffusa sint ac dissipata. Itaque in epistolæ explicatione notabimus passim loca, quæ ad hanc causam pertinent. Vid. Gal. 1, 1 & 8, 2, 18. (sive hunc locum de solo Paulo, sive universè de omnibus accipiendum esse existentes), 19—21, 4, 12. (si quidem nostram de hoc loco sententiam probaveris), 5, 2, 3, 10, & 11, 6, 11, 12, and 14. Alia videbimus in ipsa literarum enarratione. Ex eâ autem ipsa, quam his literis Apostolus exponit, doctrina, intelligere omnino Galatens poterant ipsius de legis Mosicæ vanitate et Christianæ præstantiæ religionis sententiam a vetere illâ, quam anteab tradiderat, nil fuisset mutatum.

CHAP. I.

VERSE 1. Παύλος ἀπόστολος. St. Paul commences this Epistle with that which was intended to form the chief subject of it, the assertion of his Apostleship and Divine commission, i. e. claiming it as an office not derived from men, but from God alone. So Theophyl.: Εὐθέως ἀναίρετο τὸ εἶναι ἀνθρώπων μαθητής, οὐκ ἀπʼ ἀνθρώπων γὰρ, ἀλλʼ ἀνωθεν, καὶ ἀπʼ οὐρανοῦ ἐκλήθη. This rushing at once in medias res, and, as it were, by an insertion made in the inscription of the Epistle (for the words οὐκ—ἐκεκράων are parenthetical) is very agreeable to the ardent temper and disposition of the Apostle. Of this insertion we have another example in the beginning of the Epistle to Titus.

At ἀπόστολος Rosenm. would supply κλητος. But that is not quite necessary; though the word is some-
times added; as in Röm. and 1 Cor. Yet in those cases it is not followed by ἀπό: and some past participle is required by the prep. It should rather seem that ἀποστελλόμενος is to be supplied; which is the less harsh, since ἀπόστολος, answering to the Heb. past participle שָׁמַע, was thought equivalent to the past part. of the cognate verb. And thus T. Mag. explains it by ὁ ἀποσταλμένος.

The expressions οὐκ ἀπό ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲ δι' ἄνθρωπον are regarded by Koppe, Borger, and most recent Commentators, as synonymous: at least they will not allow any difference between the ἀπό* and διά. The latter position may be true; but not (I think) the former. The error has arisen from this, that it seemed difficult to account for δι' ἄνθρωπον; though some have, not absurdly, conjectured that Peter might be meant. (See ver. 18.) But this would destroy the climax which seems to exist in the sentence. By ἄνθρωπον the best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed is meant the Apostles and Presbyters at Jerusalem.† By ἄνθρωπον is (I think) to be understood (with the Greek and Latin Fathers and early modern Commentators) any mere man; and the expression is used with accommodation to the third step of the climax.

1. ἄλλα διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ. He means to say that his Apostleship is not of mere human authority, but rests on Divine appointment.‡ Theophyl.

* This is said to be for ἀπό, by a Hebraism. Yet examples are to be found in the Classical writers, and are here referred to by Borger, as Chariton, Ἑλιαν, and Diodor. Sic. And he might have added, that it is one of the peculiar idioms of Thucyd. ; which seems to me to prove, that it is not properly an Hellenistical idiom (as Gataker supposed it), but probably a relic of Oriental idiom.

† As Matthias had been by them chosen, and others had been appointed to the ministry, as Judas and Silas.

‡ This view of the subject is supported by the following able annotation of Wets. "Qui ab hominibus mittitur, opponitur miss o Deo ut Gen. 45, 8. et qui per homines mittitur, opponitur ei qui per filium mittitur, ut Heb. 7, 28. Matthias electus fuit Apostolus a Deo per homines. Titus et Lucas electi fuerunt a Paulo: Paulus vero electus est per Christum, adeoque ab ipso patre, qui filium a
explains: ἀναβεθ, ἀπ' οὐράνων. It is true that in the Acts 13, 2, we are told that the prophets at Antioch laid hands on Paul and Barnabas, for the work of the ministry, (or rather of a ministry; for it was a particular work, namely, a deputation to Cyprus, &c.) (See the note there.) But then the laying hands on them was done at the especial command of the Holy Spirit. Thus it is said: ἐστὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον· Ἀφοίησατε δὲ μοι τὸν τε Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον δ' προσκέκλημαι αὐτοῦς. And at ver. 4. οὕτω μὲν ἐν ἑκτερευθέντες υπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἅγιου. Besides, that was nine years after Paul's conversion. This, therefore, will only prove (what indeed is remarked by the antient Commentators) that the Holy Ghost is the same with the Father and the Son.

1. πατρὸς is for τοῦ πατρὸς, the, or his, Father. At the words τοῦ ἐγείρατος αὐτῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, Koppe strangely stumbles; and Borger cannot see why mention should here be made of the resurrection, unless that the Apostle (like St. Peter) omits no opportunity of bringing to his own mind, and that of others, this important particular.* This remark has, I think, much truth, as has the following of the same learned Commentator, that the Apostle adds this, in order that that most illustrious proof of the dignity of Christ and of his own office, conferred upon him by Christ, might the better appear: all tending to repress the calumnies of his adversaries, who represented him as an Apostle merely of men, and without Divine appointment.

mortuis reducendo demonstravit, se illi omnem potestatem dedisse, et omnia, que agerit rata habere. Manifestum autem est, silium Dei, qui hominibus opponitur, ex hominum communi sorte eximi, adeoque non merum hominem, sed divinioris naturae esse.” Very similar is the commencement of Ignat. Ep. to the Philad. c, 1. (cited by Borger): “Οὐ κτισκότον γεγονος υπί αφ’ οὐατον, οὗδε δι’ ανθρώπων, κεκτηθην τὴν διανοιαν.” Borger also compares Joseph. Ant. 14, 2, 6. καὶ Δέλλως ἐπιτραπέζῳ, λέγων ότι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ δοκεῖν, ἄλλα τινες Θεον γεφέσαι τούς καιδας.

* It was chiefly indeed intended (as usual) to hint at the superiority of that religion which had brought life and immortality to light, over the law, which supplied no such hopes. So Chrys. and Theophyl.
2. καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί. It has been much discussed who are here meant by οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί. The opinion of the antient and many eminent modern Commentators, as Par., Hamm., Beza, Whitby, Koppe, Rosenm., Dodd., Michaelis, Jaspis, and others is, that it denotes the brother ministers who were with him. And it is truly remarked by Koppe, that in no other Epistle are general Christians united with himself in these ἑπιγραφαί. Thus at 1 Cor. we have ἀδελφοί for a brother minister. And so 2 Cor. ὁ Ἰωάννης. At Philipp. he associates Timothy without adding “my brother.” At Coloss. he adds καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφός. At 1 Thess. and 2 Thess. Paul, Timothy, and Silvanus are associated. All this seems to supply a strong reason for adopting the above interpretation. Borger, however, who supports the opinion of several modern Commentators, that by ἀδελφοί are meant all the Christians where Paul was resident, treats this as a very weak argument: though it is surely far stronger than his own, that the name is often used of Christians in general: which will prove little, as no example can be admitted to be apposite but one found at the commencement of an Epistle. Besides, where does St. Paul call the Christians of any place the brethren who are with me? And would not such an expression be harsh? Whereas in Phil. 4, 21. we have this very expression οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί, where it must mean Paul’s colleagues then with him; since to it is subjoined the general expression καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι. It is frivolous for Borger to ask, why should the Christians in general not be joined in a salutation? That we are not bound to answer. Neither is this properly a salutation, but rather an address. As little to the purpose is it to pose us with the question, who were these? Silvanus and Timotheus? and if so, how can they be called all? It is not, I would answer, improbable that there were (as Michaelis thinks) more: and the term πάντες is sometimes applied to only three or four. Besides, if we consider the especial purpose and intent
of the Epistle, we shall see that it is far more probable that Paul meant brother Ministers than brother Christians. For, as Theophyl. truly observes, ἐκείδὴ διέθακαν αὐτὸν ὁς μᾶνον ταύτα κρύπτοντα, δεικνυσὶ νῦν ὁς πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοις ἔχει τῆς γνώμης κοινωνίας. So Οἰκυμεν.* See also Chrysost. And for this reason he has been rightly supposed to have associated Soethenes with him in his first and most objurgatory Epistle to the Corinthians.

Ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τ. Τ. Koppe and Rosenm. observe, that St. Paul does not say to what churches of Galatia (as of Ancyria, Tavia, Pessinus, &c.) the Epistle is addressed; and that he mentioned that circumstance to the bearer of it. And in this view the learned Commentators might have adduced Thucyd. 7, 9. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἄχρονοι φέροντες, οἴς ἀπεστείλε, τὰ γράμματα καὶ δεσί ἔδει αὐτῶς εἰσεῖν. And further ὁπ : ἡκοντες ἐς τὰς Ἀθηνας οἱ παρὰ τῷ Νίκιον, δεσί τῇ ἁγίᾳ γλασσης ἔρημο τοιοῦτος, ἐπειν, καὶ εἰ τίς τι προῦτα ἀπεκρίνοντο, καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπέδοον. But, after all, the opinion is unfounded and visionary. By ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις are doubtlessly meant all the churches (as indeed the article requires), all of which might be, more or less, guilty of the faults the Apostle purposes to correct; and (I think) the omission of the usual epithets, τῶν ἁγίων, or ἀγαθῶν, may be considered, not (with Koppe) as accidental, but intentional; and (as Chrys. also suggests) seem to savour of the reserve which it was proper for him to assume, on having to write what may be called a reprehensory Epistle: for (as Mr. Locke says) "he deals very roundly with them."

8. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰ. X. A form of salutation frequent in St. Paul’s Epistles, and both in construction and sense

* And so Rosenm. "Hoc laudat Paulus, ad auctoritatem et fidem doctrinæ sum afferendam, quippe secum in hac causâ et aeveritate sentimentes."
formed on the Hebr. model. Thus ἀνά τὸν παραδίκην corresponds to ἡμᾶς ἔρωμ; χάρις to ρεῖν γῆν; and εἰρήνη to ἔλνυ. A Classical author would have written Παῦλος ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις χάριν. (Kop. and Borger).

I cannot agree with Koppe in regarding χάρις and εἰρήνη as put for the happiness and the benefit itself. It should rather seem to denote that favour and peace with God which is the fountain of all good, and the pledge of all blessings. See the note on 2 Cor. 13, 13.

4. τοῦ δόμου εαυτῶν. Borger takes δόμου for παραδίκην; as Rom. 4, 25. Eph. 5, 2. But this is confusing two expressions which differ in these respects, that παραδίκης is ascribed to God the Father, and shows his will and good pleasure; δόμ. to God the Son, and shows his ready acquiescence, and perfect willingness. So in Matt. 20, 28. and Mark 10, 15. he is said δούκαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀνὴρ τολλῶν.

4. ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. These words express the purpose of his yielding himself up to death. For ὑπὲρ Griesbach has edited τεφί, from many antient MSS., some Fathers, Theodoret, and ΟΕcumen. On either reading, indeed, the sense is much the same: but ὑπὲρ seems more significant and agreeable to the style of St. Paul. Τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is taken by Kop. and Rosenm. for τῶν ἁμαρταλῶν, by an Hebrew idiom frequent in Scripture, and sometimes used by the Classical writers, abstract for concrete. Yet that is in the New Testament confined to certain particular words, of which this is not one: and the idiom would here be very harsh, nay, inadmissible. For thus ἡμῶν would have been placed before τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. The present position fully establishes the common interpretation, which, moreover, is far more agreeable to the scope of the Apostle, which (as Chrys., Theophyl., and Theodoret suggest) was to show the vast superiority of the Gospel over the law
in respect to the expiation for sin.* I have been the more anxious to defend the common interpretation, and refute the novel one of Koppe and others, since (though it is said by Borger to yield the same sense) it is capable of that perversion which the Socinians never neglect an opportunity to use with passages connected with the doctrine of the atonement, namely, by representing the benefits to sinful men of Christ's death, as having been only in the example he set them of a life of virtue, and submission to death in its cause. Nay, I find, the great Grotius himself (unaccountably) fell into this very error (though on other occasions he has shown himself an unequivocal supporter of that fundamental doctrine,) since he here remarks: "Mors Christi multos habet effectus, hunc inter alios, ut admirabilis obedientiae exemplo nos a peccatis abstrahat, 1 Pet. 1, 18." Here Wets. aptly compares 1 Mac. 6, 44. ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ σώσαι τῶν λαίων αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιποίησαι αὐτῷ θνημα αἰώνιον.

The next words, ὅτως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ, show the purpose, or rather final cause, of this submission to death for our sins. They seem to be meant indirectly to refute the slanders of those who represented the Apostle as preaching continuance in sin, that grace might abound. See Rom. 6, 1. and the note.

Έξαριέσθαι here denotes vindicare, liberare, like the Hebr. Ἰς, in Is. 70, 16. and ἀφετέ, in Jer. 42, 11., and is sometimes so used in the Classical writers, as (among others cited by Munth and Wets.) Liban. 491. ἔξαριέσθαι τῆς αἰείας. Lys. p. 734. Edict. ἐξαριέσθαι τίνα εἰς ἐλευθερίαν. Polyb. 15, 42. ἔξαριέσθαι τινὰς ἐκ τῶν περιστώτατον κακῶν.

* The words of Thenphyl. are as follows: "Εδωκε δὲ ἑαυτῶν, ἵνα ἀπαλλάξῃ ἡμᾶς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὥς ὁ γὰρ ἀπαλλάξας ὅσιον ἀρχῶν ποιόν τὸν ἀπαλλάξαντι ἀφέσεις, τῷ γὰρ προσέχεις, τῷ μὴν ὥστελθαι; And those of Theodoret, these; Ἐδειξε τὴν εἰς γὰρ γονέων πολιτίδων τῶν ἁμαρτιμάτων ἀπαλλάξας μὴ διερθείσαν, ἀλλὰ τῶν Διονυσίου Χριστοῦ, τὸν ἐν πρός ἡμῖν καταδεχάμενον θάνατον, καὶ τῶν τῆς ἁμαρτίας φθλημάτων τὸ γένος ἐλευθερώσατα.
By ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος is meant the present state of being, this life, filled as it is with calamity, sin, and sorrow (see Gen. 47, 9.), or rather the sin itself,* and the misery consequent upon it. By the term τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος, is indirectly contrasted this present state, or this life,† with the future one, in which all tears shall be wiped from all eyes for ever.

4. κατὰ τὸ βέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. Borger well translates: "Ita nimirum placuerat Deo;" sive "ex voluntate Dei, qui idem noster est Pater, factum est, ut Jesus Christus expiaret peccata." And Theophyl. rightly remarks on the scope of the Apostle: Πανταχοῦ συντάττει τῷ Χριστῷ τῷ Πατέρα, διδάσκαναι ὅσ' καὶ αὐτῷ συνδοκεῖ, μὴ νομικῶς ἡμᾶς ἀλλ' εὐαγγελικῶς τοιμαίωσαί. By βέλημα is here meant good pleasure, εὐδοκία, τινός καὶ is, I think, rendered even.

5. ὃ, ἢ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων Ἁμήν. It is observed by Theophyl., that, struck with the magnitude of the benefits of God, the Apostle can say no more, but concludes this his preface with a doxology. Koppe remarks that, in treating of the divine wisdom and God's benefits to men, the Apostle's pious feelings frequently burst forth into

* Chrys., Theophyl., and the other Greek Interpreters explain it τῆς πονηρᾶς (as Rom. 12, 2., 1 Cor. 2, 6.); which comes to much the same thing; though it is hardly admitted by the words; since thus the article would be indispensable after αἰῶνος.

† Koppe compares the Jewish phrases מִרְיָם, which meant the times that should precede the coming of the Messiah, a state of servility and misery, and מַעְלָיָה, which denoted that which, during the reign of the Messiah, should bring with it freedom and happiness of every kind. This opinion is nearly the same as that of Schoettg., who explains the phrase of the times of the Old Testament; and the word πονηρός, he renders laborious, referring it to the yoke of ceremonies under which the Jews laboured. And so also Locke. But the Galatians were not Jews, and could not be said to be under the dispensation of the Old Testament. I cannot but regard both these opinions as visionary and unfounded; and αἰῶν is so often synonymous with κόσμος in sensu deteriorior, that I think with Dodd. that it would be very unreasonable to limit so noble and expressive a clause by so narrow an interpretation. I can recognise no further use of the Jewish formulas than that of the term מִרְיָם.
such praises; as Rom. 1, 25. 2 Cor. 11, 31. Rosenau.
thinks that the doxology is used to show that the
true honour of God is not diminished by this doc-
twine of a Saviour, but rather increased. But this,
which would require an emphasis to be laid on the
article, yields a very harsh and strained sense.

6. θαυμάζω ἃτι—Χριστῷ. It is remarked by
Borger: "Cernitur in hoc versu levitatis et incon-
stantiae Galatarum reprehensio, ex servidá profectá
mente, ob rei turpitudinem; est nimirum inconstantia
μέγιστον οὐείδου, ut ait Demosth. apud Liban.
tom. 4, p. 261."

On the sense of this passage there has been no
little difference of opinion. The difficulty hinges
on τοῦ καλέσαντος, which some modern Commen-
tators, (as Dodd., Chandler, and Mack., and re-
cently Koppe) refer to Paul. But though that
might be justified (see the notes of Dodd., Mack.,
and Koppe), yet as the expression is elsewhere ex-
clusively used of God, I cannot think there is any
reason to deviate from the opinion of the antient
and most modern Commentators, (and among these
Wets., who has several illustrations,) that it is here
also so applied. Most moderns who adopt this
interpretation take ἐν χάριτι Χριστῷ for χάριν
Χριστῷ. On this signification of ἐν see Schleus.
Lex. and the critics referred to by Borger, who
adduces as an example Achmet Oneir. 1, 98. συμεκα-
λεσε πολλοὺς ἐν τῷ γάμῳ αὐτοῦ, where he takes ἐν τῷ
γάμῳ for ἐν τίν γάμῳ, but wrongly; since ἐν is there
simply for at; and we have not ἐνσακλέω, or καλέω.
Indeed I cannot but suspect that ἐν is not meant by
the Apostle to be taken for εἰς. We have here (I
think) a popular, and somewhat vague expression,
and of which the sense seems to have been best
seized by the antient Commentators. Thus Theo-
phyl., from Chrys., explains it: οὕτω διεκαθόρησεν ὡτὸ
Χριστῷ, οὐκ εἰς ἔργαν, ἀλλὰ χάριτι: ὁ μὲν γὰρ Χιλα
παρέχει τῷ ἀφεσιν ἐν χάριτι: ὁ δὲ Παλαιὸς πρὸς ταύτην
καλεῖ. And so Koppe, who renders: "Deus, qui
vol. vii.
(non propter ullam meriti dignitatem, sed) ex sola gratiâ Christi vos populum sibi carum adscivit." And he also remarks: 'Ex χάριτι accommodâtē ad totius epistolae consilium additur: Christiani legum Mosaic. tenaciores spernere videbantur gratiam Dei per Christum 2, 21." Some Interpreters, as the Syr., Erasm., Grot., and Vitringa, refer the τοῦ καλέσαντος to Christ, and render in χάριτι benignē, separately from τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and uniting it with τοῦ καλέσαντος. But this does too much violence to the construction to be admitted.

I cannot but notice the omission of τοῦ Χριστοῦ in a few MSS. and Latin Fathers, which, though it is approved by many modern critics, appears to have arisen solely from emendation, namely, to prevent the mistake of connecting it with καλέσαντος.

I must not omit to observe, that this use of βαυμάζω has been illustrated by Wets. from the Classical writers. The only apposite passage is Dinarch. Orat. adv. Polych. init. πάλιν βαυμάζω ύμας. He might more aptly have cited Thucyd. 3, 38. 6, 36. and 4, 85.

As to μετατίθεσθε, I would observe, that though most of the early modern Commentators, and also Elsner and Raphael, take it in a passive sense, yet I think it has been better regarded by Crell., Dresig, Rosenm., and Borger as of the middle voice. It signifies properly, and in a physical sense, to change one's place; and it was often used (by a metaphor taken, as some think, from playing at dice, or chess) to signify, with and or eis, change sides, as in war, or to change one's opinions, and go over to another sect or party (examples of all of which senses may be seen in Wets., Koppe, and Borger), or generally, like μετανοεῖν, to change one's own opinion. See Hebr. 7, 12. The force of the word here is, however, not to be pressed upon: for, as Rosenm. well observes, though these Christians had not absolutely revolted from God, yet they had departed from this new dispensation of God; since they had begun to
mix Judaism with the Christian religion, and thus had passed over to another religion.

By ἑτερον εὐαγγέλιον, I think with Borger, is meant not absolutely another doctrine (as it is explained by Grot.), but a sort of mixture of the Gospel with another religion not wholly different.

7. δὲ οὐκ ἦστιν ἄλλον εἰ μὴ, &c. There is here a slight deviation from the general usus loquendi, and somewhat of obscurity, which may be perhaps imputed to modesty, and backwardness on the part of the Apostle to deal too plainly in a matter where the credit of the law of Moses was concerned. The obscurity, however, has given occasion to diversity of interpretation. Thus some modern Commentators, as Grot., Locke, and others, rather following the usage of Classical than Scriptural phraseology, and without sufficiently adverting to the scope of the Apostle, render: "quæ res in se habet nihil aliud quàm, &c." But, as Koppe and Rosenm. remark, those who render thus do not sufficiently attend to the usage of the Apostle, who joins periods to periods by means of the pronoun relative. The antient Commentators, Chrys. and Theophyl., rightly refer it to the preceding εὐαγγέλιον. And Theophyl. offers the following masterly annotation: Ἐπειδὴ τῇ ἔκαστῇ ἑαυτῶν αὐτῷ οἱ πλάνοι, εὐαγγέλιον ἐκάλουν, αὐτὸς καὶ πέτο τὸ ὄνομα μάχεται, καὶ φησίν, διδοκινεῖν ἄλλο εὐαγγέλιον παρ᾽ ὅ παρελάβετε, ἐν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ τῆς ὁρθός ὀδώρξησαν περιέχον, ὅ ἐγὼ ἐκφέροντα: εἰ μὴ, ῥα τινὲς τῶν φθαλμοῦ τῶν ἐνεχθνῶν ὁμοίως ταράτσουσι, καὶ ποιοῦσιν ἕτερα ἄνδραν ἑτέρων ὃς ἄροις ὑπολογεῖται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καὶ μὴ, οὐκ ἔστω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἀνάτρεπον, ἀλλὰ τῇ περὶ τοῦ σαθράτου καὶ τῆς περιτομῆς μόνῳ ἐντολῆς παραποιήσον, ἄλλα ὄντωσιν δείκνυσιν, διὰ τὸ καὶ μικρὸν παραποιηθεῖν, τὸ ἔστω εὐαγγέλιον ἀνατρέπει: ἀδερφῶν καὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ νομίσματος μικρὸν τι περικύψας τὸ ἔστω νόμισμα κίβδηλον εἰργάσατο.*

* The sense may be thus expressed: "which (however) is not another (Gospel), nor indeed the Gospel at all, or true, but," &c.
Of this and the preceding verse Theodoret gives the following excellent paraphrase: Αὐτὸς ὡμᾶς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ τὸν νόμον δεδωκὼς, εἰς τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κεκληκε, τοῦτο τοῖς καταλημώντες, καὶ εἰς τὸν νόμον πάλιν δραμήσαντες, αὐτὸς τῷ κεκληκτῷ ἀκέστησε, καὶ τοῦτο δὲ καταλημύνετε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐτερον, ὅχε εὐρίσκετε. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλα μὲν διὰ ἡμᾶν, ἄλλα δὲ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων ὁ Δεσπότης κηρύσσει· ἄλλα τὸ αὐτὸ κηρύττομεν ἀκαντες, δόσι τῆς ἀλθείας ὑπάρχομεν ἑφασταί, οἱ δὲ τάνατοι φρονοῦσθεν, οὐδὲν ὡμῶς θείον προσφέρουσιν, ἄλλα τὰ θεῖα παραφθείρεις ἐπιχειροῦσιν.

7. ei μὴ τινὲς. But, in fact, some there are, &c. Οἱ ταράσσοντες. The word ταράσσω, as I have observed on Acts 15, 24. signifies properly to stir (up), as mud in water: but it is applied, metaphorically, to perturbation (or harass) of the mind, especially by the verbal representations of others. Thus in a kindred passage of Acts 15, 24. ἕταραξαν υμᾶς λόγου· where see the note. So the classical writers use ταράσσειν τῶν δήμων, or τῆς πάλιν. (See the passages of Dionys. Hal. and Demosth. cited by Wets.) Here the sense is: “harass your minds with vain doubts whether the Mosaic Law is to be retained in the Gospel of Christ.” So σαλεύως in Acts 17, 13. where see the note.

7. καὶ θέλουσι μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χ., “and who wish to pervert you.” So the words are usually interpreted: but it must be remarked that ἥλ. here imports rather result and end than study and endeavour in. For μεταστρέψαι signifies literally “to change the nature of any thing, by the introduction of something else.” Now in this sense the persons in question would not have denied the charge: but as the introduction of any thing extraneous, whether from the Law of Moses, or from that of nature, which the Heathens followed, would be corrupting the

For that is the meaning of ei μὴ; as in Matt. 13, 4. and elsewhere. See Schl. Lex. and the learned authorities referred to by Borger and Hoogeveen de Part.
Gospel, so the Apostle can only mean the word to be taken in that sense, and also that of overturn; as Mackn. renders. The word is rarely so used in the Classical writers: yet Wets. has the following example from Aristotle. Rhet. 1, 15. καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἐνοφάνους μεταστρέψαντα φατένω ὅτες.

8. ἄλλα καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἢ οὐρανῶ—ἔστω. Theodoret, with great taste remarks: ἔρρεω μεθαλῆτο τῆς μνήμης τῶν ἐναντίων, καὶ τὸ δικαίον γένος θυμᾶ, ἀλλάτιον τῆς εὐσεβείας καλεί τὸν ἔτερα κρύστεις πειραμένην, καὶ βοᾷ. Borger has here the following observation: "Gravissimè Paulus retundit eorum columnias, qui, ut suam de lege Mosaicà opinionem stabilirent, eamque aliis persuaderent, contenderent, Apostolum suam ipsum sententiam mutavisse, neque, ut antea, ἵτα nunc, vim et efficaciam religionis Judaicæ sublatam esse, docere."

Ἀλλὰ καὶ, quinimo; as Luke 12, 7. And so in the Classical writers. See Borger's examples. Ἡμεῖς. Plural for singular, after the manner of the Apostle. There may seem some abruptness (arising from the fervour of his indignation on such a subject) in the ἄλλα καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἢ οὐρανῶ: but the connexion is satisfactorily traced by Chrys., who rightly thinks that he had in view the Apostles Peter and James, whose authority was, no doubt, often pleaded (though fasely) in behalf of the retaining of the rites of the Mosaic Law: ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ εἰς ἀξίωματα κατέφευγον, Ἰάκωβον, καὶ Ἰωάννην, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἄγγελον ἐμνησθῆ, μὴ γὰρ μοι Ἰάκωβον ἐπιτῆς, φησι, καὶ Ἰωάννην, καὶ γὰρ τῶν πρωτῶν ἄγγελου ἢ τῆς τῶν ἢ σώματος διαθείματο τὸ κήρυγμα, αὐτες ἔστω. This was done, as Theophyl. remarks, ὅταν μὴ τις ἐπιτῆς, ὅταν διὰ φιλοδοξίαν τὸ ὀικεῖα συγκροτεῖ δόγματα, καὶ ἐκτὸς ἀναθεματίζει.

There is great delicacy shown in the omission of the names of those Apostles.

It must be observed, that in the words ἢ ἄγγελος ἢ οὐρανῶ, there is a very common Rhetorical mode of expression; nor is it hence to be inferred
that the Apostle imagined it was possible that an angel from heaven could or would teach any doctrine at variance with the Gospel. So Theophyl. and Theodoret: ἄγγέλων δὲ ἐμυμόνευσεν, οὐ τούτο ψευδομένως, μὴ τις τῶν ἁγίων ἄγγελων ἐναντία διδάξῃ τῷ θείῳ κυρίῳ· ἵνα γὰρ οὐς ἀδύνατον τούτο· ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτων πᾶσαν ἄθροισιν καινοτομίαν ἐκβάλει. It was too bold in Grot. to deny the impossibility of this; and indeed it were frivolous on the present occasion to discuss the question at all, and perhaps irreverent on any occasion, as partaking τοῦ ἐμβατέων ἢ μὴ ἐξαρκεῖν.

ἦν γάρ. παρ’ ὅ signifies to preach a Gospel varying from our Gospel, i.e. to preach the Gospel with any alteration. (See the note on ver. 6.) For I cannot assent to many modern Commentators, as Grot., Rosenn., Koppe, and Slade, who render παρὰ contra. Such cannot have been the Apostle’s meaning, since the doctrines in question could not be said to be contrary to the Gospel, though they deteriorated it by the addition of rites now become vain and useless. This did not escape the penetration of the antient Commentators. Thus ÓEcumen. and Theophyl. (from Chrys.): καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἐναντία καταγγέλωσιν, ἀλλὰ κἂν μικρὸν τι εὑραγγελίζουται, παρ’ ὅ εὑραγγελισάμεθα. Dia mēn oμν τοῦ ἄγγελου ἀναθε- ματίζου, πάν ἀξίωμα ἐκβάλλει· διὰ δὲ τῶν ἑωτῶν, πᾶσαν οἰκειότητα. So also Augustin. Thus there was no occasion for Mr. Slade to censure our Version “other than.” Other does not imply contrariety, and than only imports comparison, as I shall find some other opportunity of proving and illustrating.

8. ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ, “let him be held in the greatest abhorrence, and incur the highest anathema;” in being excluded from a religious society. See the note on 1 Cor. 16, 22. and Suic. Thes. in v.

9. οἷς προειρήκαμεν, καὶ ἑρτὶ πάλιν λέγοι. Here we have a repetition of what was said in the preceding verse, the reason for which is sought by the modern Commentators in the ardent and vehe-
ment temperament of the Apostle. But it is (I think) better accounted for by Theophyl. thus: ἢ ἡ νομίσμασιν ἀπὸ θυμῶν, καὶ κατὰ συναρταγῆν ταῦτα εἰσεῖν, αὐτῷ δεύτερον αὐτὰ τίθειν, δεικνύως ὅτι οὐκ ἀκριβῶς, ἀλλὰ βεβαιῶς καὶ παγίως κύρωσιν ταῦτα παρ' ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως ἀπεφησάτο.

It has been matter of discussion what the Apostle meant by προειρήκαμεν. The recent Commentators, as Koppe and Borger, take it to refer to some previous admonition which he had addressed to the Galatians, when with them. And indeed such would be the use of the word in a Classical author. But very different is the usage of the Apostle. Thus in 2 Cor. 7, 4. προειρήκαμεν γὰρ is said of what had just preceded. And such seems to be the case in the present passage; since it was not likely that St. Paul was then aware that his doctrine would afterwards be corrupted by the Judaizers. This interpretation is supported by the authority not only of the antient but of many eminent modern Interpreters, as Crell., Grot., and Est. At παρέλαβετε must be understood ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, for ἐδιδάχθητε παρ' ἐμοῖ; as in Mark 7, 4. (Cor. 11, 23. (where see the notes) 13, 3. Phil. 4, 9. ἂ καὶ ἐμάλαβετε καὶ παρελάβετε καὶ ἢκούσατε. And so ἦλθεν in Prov. 1, 3, 4, 10. Job. 22, 12.

10. ἅρτε γὰρ ἀνθρώπος πείθει ἡ τῶν Θεοῦ; The sense of these words has been not a little controverted; and no wonder, considering the obscurity. That (I conceive) has arisen from the quick, and almost abrupt, transition which is here made by the Apostle. Many eminent modern Commentators, as Luther, Erasm., Vat., Crell., L’Enfant, and others mentioned by Borger, render it: “divinè suadeo, an humanè?” Not very different from this is the interpretation of Theophyl. (from Chrys.), which is as follows: Μέλεις ἀπολογήσασθαι περὶ ὧν ἐγκαλεῖται· ἵνα τοῖνοι μη ἐπαρθῶσιν αὐτῷ οἷς ταὶ διδασκάλια δικαζόντες, Φησίν· μὴ μνημεζέτε ὅτι ἦμων ἀπολογοῦμαι· ἦμας δητῶν πείσαι, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεοῦ μοι ὁ πᾶς λόγος· ἢ τεν οὐδὲ ταῦτα γράφω,
GALATIANS, CHAP. I.

The sense first detailed is, however, not easy to be elicited from the words, and is not agreeable to what follows, which is evidently exegetical of the preceding. The second interpretation is less objectionable; but I greatly prefer that of Ecumen., Theodoret, and, of the moderns, Grot., Hamm., Elsner, Wolf, Krebs., Wets., Koppe, Rosenm., Schleus., Borger, and others, who assign the following sense: "Do I seek to conciliate the favour of men?" Thus the interrogation involves a strong negation. The two last interpretations, in fact, merge into each other. It is plain that the verb must be understood rather of endeavour, than of action itself, according to Glass's Canon, p. 202 & 203, which he exemplifies from John 5, 34. Acts 17, 15. Rom. 2, 4. Gal. 5, 4. And it is rightly remarked by Borger, that this idiom (which is also found in the Classical writers) most frequently has place in the verb πειθω.

With respect to the sentiment, there is a similar one in 1 Thess. 2, 4. Wets. has adduced a great number of illustrations from the Classical writers, of which, however, few or none are to the purpose. The following therefore may be acceptable. Heliodor. 2, 263, 10. οι γὰρ τῷ άπερω δαμασκικῷ δοξαίει—τούτο αὐτό κατὰ κατάλογον τηλείωτε, ἐνώτερος πειθῶν ἄγανερμος.

The ἀπεί is justly thought to point out the contrast between his former state, when a zealot of the Law of Moses, and studious to approve himself by every means to its supporters, and his present state under the Gospel.

The sentiment contained in the clause εἰ γὰρ—ἀμιθ., (which is confirmative of the foregoing assertion,) is not (I think) exactly such as is assigned to it by the Commentators. If εἰ be understood of the time when the Apostle wrote, the ἄπερω and the ἀμιθ. will be very incongruous. It rather seems to
refer to the time of his conversion: and the sentiment intended appears to be this: “For if I had yet (or then) strove to please men, I should not have become a servant of Christ, nor, bidding adieu to friends and fortune, subjected myself to the various miseries to which the profession of his religion has rendered me obnoxious.” And this mode of interpretation is confirmed by Theophyl., who thus paraphrases: Εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐσπούδαζον, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέστη τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν, καὶ προσῆλθον τῷ Χριστῷ, οὐκ ἂν καταφράσας συγγενῶν, φίλων, δόξης τοσιάτης, καὶ εἰλόμην διαγγελόντως, καὶ κινδύνους, καὶ ἀτιμίας. So also Theodoret, who paraphrases: Εἰ θεραπεύειν ἀνθρώπων ἐθεωρήσων, οὐ τῶν διαμονοῦσιν συγκυβεβούσιν, ἀλλὰ τῶν τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ πολεμοῦσιν συνεταττόμην μηδεὶς με τοῖς ἡγείσθαι τῆν παρ’ αὐθαίρεσιν ἀξίμαν θεραπεύσαι, καὶ τοῦτον χάριν τῶν τῶν λόγων ύπολίειν ἐπέτειλεν λοιπὸν διηγεῖται δύναται ἡμέν ὑπὸ τῆς θείας ἐκλήθης χάριτος, δύνας ἵνα τῶν κοφυματίων τῶν ἀποστόλων τὰς περὶ τοῦ παράκλητος ἐκφώναζε σωθήκας.

11. γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν—ἀνθρώπων. The connection between this verse and the preceding is not very clear. Jaspis gives the following as the usual mode of tracing it: “Religionem Christianam cum Mosaica ideo conjungendum esse negat Apostolus, quod sua doctrinæ origo non ab autoritate humana, sed ad ipso Deo repetenda sit.” And so also Chrys. and Theophyl. There may be a slight connection between this and the preceding verse; but I most approve of the opinion of Theodoret and some moderns (including Boerger), that this verse commences in some degree a new subject, namely, the proof of his dignity and authority as an Apostle; after which he inculcates some further precepts of Christian doctrine. Now, in establishing the point in question, he commences by showing the mode in which his total change from the profession of Judaism to that of Christianity was effected, namely, that it was altogether a work of God, and not of man.

Γνωρίζω cannot signify “I make known to you,”
since this was by no means unknown to them, though it had been too little heeded or attended to. It simply signifies *moneo, commonefacio*; as in an altogether kindred passage of 1 Cor. 15, 1. γνωρίζετο δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὁ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, &c. where see the note. It is surprising the Commentators should not have perceived this sense, nor recollected the passage by which it is confirmed.

Borger remarks on the *synchysis* in τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν being brought in before the οἷς: and he cites Liban. T. 4. p. 458. καὶ πρῶτος ἦτα, οἷς πάντων ἔσομαι: for ἦτα, οἷς πρῶτος ἔσομαι. He also notices the idiom in εὐαγγ. — εὐαγγελ., by which a noun and verb of the same origin are conjoined, of which he adduces several examples. It is indeed very common, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers (see Matth. Gr. Gr.), and is not without example in the Latin language, though rejected and avoided in the later languages, from that, perhaps, excessive fear of tautology which distinguishes the moderns. I cannot but consider the idiom in the Greek language as a relic of its Oriental origin, and as a remnant of the simplicity of diction of the primitive ages.

11. κατὰ ἀνθρωπον, for ἀνθρώπων, is explained by the words following. And here it is observed by Rosenm.: "Refutat eos, qui Galatis persuaserant, Paulum non amplius convenire in tradendâ religione cum Apostolis, penès quas tamen sit omnis auctoritas." The οἷς ἔστι κατὰ ἀνθρωπον is rendered by Borger, "superat quicquid est humanum, non est humanae originis neque humanis præceptis perficitur ac continetur." And he cites the Schol. Matth.: οἷς κατὰ ἀνθρώπων συγκεῖται λογίσμων and compares Plut. de Sera Num. Vind. p. 77. ἐκεῖνο δὲ οἷς ἔστι καθ' Ἡσιόδον, οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπυος ἔγεν σοφίας, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ. The above interpretation may (I think) be so far admitted, as to be included as a secondary one: but the primary and principal sense intended is, I conceive, that laid down by Theophyl. as follows: οἷς ἀνθρώπων ἔσχον
12. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἕγαν παρὰ ἄνθρωπον παρέλαβον—Χριστοῦ, "For I neither received (or was taught) it of men, but I derived it from the revelation of Jesus Christ." The scope of the verse is thus traced by Borger: "Evidentissimis Apostolus argumentis demonstrat summo se jure extraordinariam prorsus originem suæ vindicare docet, quippe quæ ad ipsum Christum sit referenda, excludam omnibus humanis institutionibus." It is well remarked by Theophyl., that this was what the Apostle's calumniators had pretended, namely, that he was not, like the other Apostles, an ἀυτόκειος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but had received everything he knew from man. He means therefore to say, that he had enjoyed a revelation of the Gospel from the same source as Peter and the rest derived it, namely, from Christ himself.

The δι' ἀνακαλύψεως is strangely perverted by Bardt, Bolten, and others of the recent Foreign School of Rationalists, as if Paul's instruction were to be referred to natural causes, namely, the information of eye-witnesses and Apostles, and the use of his own private study and reflection. At that rate his doctrine would really have been what his calumniators represented, κατ' ἄνθρωπον: whereas he here positively asserts, that it was ὁ κατ' ἄνθρωπον. Besides, this is totally at variance with what is said in the Acts of the Apostles. The only interpretation consistent with the context and the rest of Scripture is that of the antient and the best modern Commen-

* This is by many of the Fathers maintained to be a proof of the divinity of Christ, and rightly, since the Apostle, in having received the Gospel from Jesus Christ (ver. 1.) could not with propriety say, that he had not received it from man, if Jesus Christ were a mere man. See Whitby.

As to the method of Koppe, who takes ἄνθρωπον for τινα, it is quite inadmissible.
tators, who understand it of instruction immediately derived from Christ. This, as Theophyl. well remarks, is called ἀποκαλύψις, not only with reference to the time when Christ ἀποκαλύφθη αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἑων, but also with reference to Christ’s state after having left this world, when even an appearance would be an ἀποκαλύψις, much more an interview. There is also reference (I think) to the mysterious nature of the things revealed, or taught, namely, what are called the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, the knowledge of which we owe, almost entirely, to this very ἀποκαλύψις.† So Rom. 16, 25. κατ’ ἀποκαλύψιν μονατηρίου. It is plain that the singular in ἀποκαλ. is not to be dwelt upon, since the revelations were, we know, many. Nouns of this sort with διὰ or κατὰ make up a phrase denoting repetition, or continuity of action, in which case the article is unnecessary.

13. ηκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφὴν, &c. The connexion here is not well traced by the Commentators, owing to their not attending to the omission of a clause to which γὰρ refers, and which may (I think) be thus supplied: “(It is scarcely necessary for me to prove and illustrate this Divine origin of my doctrine, as I am about to do, by a reference to the events of my earlier life, which are, I suppose, known to you,) for ye have heard of,” &c.

12. ἀναστροφὴν here is synonymous with βίωσιν at Acta 16, 4., or βίων, manner of life and conduct: a signification frequent both in the New Testament and the Old. It rarely occurs in the Classical writers: though Wets. adduces some examples, as Polyb. 4, 82. κατὰ τε τὴν λοιπὴν ἀναστροφὴν καὶ τὰς

* So Markland observes, that he is proving that he had it immediately from Jesus himself, and therefore had no need of instruction from the other Apostles.

† The term is well explained by Koppe on Eph. 1, 17. thus: “Ex perpetuo S. S. usu est scientia ea, quæ non naturali quodam ingenii humani vi, sed divinio quodam modo homini contingere existimatur.
Galatians, Chap. I. 383

It is plain that ἐντε refers to ἀναστραφήν, adverb for adjective, as often, "my once or former life and manners." So Eph. 4, 22. ἦ προτερεῖ ἀναστραφή.

12. ἐν τῷ Ἰνδαίσμῳ. Borger supplies ὅτε ἦ. By Ἰουδ. is meant the state and condition of a Jew, especially the profession and practice of the rites of the Jewish religion. Most recent Commentators explain: "in a studious zeal for the Jewish rites." But that is harsh and unnecessary. It may suffice to take it in the sense just detailed, and assign to ὅτε the signification nempe, how that.

The clause διὰ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδιακω ὅν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπάθου αὐτὴν, is explanatory of the τῇ ἀναστραφήν. Borger refers to Ignat. Ep. ad Magn. c. 8 & 11. and ad Philip. c. 6. Καθ' ὑπερβολὴν is a frequent phrase with St. Paul for ὑπερβολικῶς, σφόδρα, &c. See Schleus. Lex. It is also very often found in the Classical writers. At ἐπάθου we may again recur to that frequent idiom by which the endeavour, or aim is meant rather than the effect. So Kuttner, Koppe, and Semler. Perhaps this may be derived from the proper force of the imperfect, which denotes action commenced and carried on, but not accomplished: and certainly Paul was destroying Christianity. Borger would regard ἐπάθου as synonymous with ἑδιακων. But that mode of reconciling a difficulty (however common with the Foreign Scholars) is little satisfactory. The antient Commentators, as Chrysost. and Theophyl., with more judgment, remark on the ἐπίτοσις here employed. In ἐπάθου, which is a much stronger term, there is a climax. The scope of the argument is well stated by Rosenm. thus: "From his former life, he says, it is plain that he received his doctrine by divine revelation. For, since he was such a persecutor of the Christian religion, how could he have been so suddenly changed, had not a certain Divine revelation influenced him?"
14. καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ μέσῳ ὑπὲρ πάλλων συνηλικιάτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου. The sense of these words is well explained by Borger thus: "When as yet a young man, I possessed such a knowledge of the Jewish religion, and was fired with such a desire to acquire glory from the defence of it, as could hardly be expected from so early an age, and therefore I, in this respect, greatly excelled other young men of the Pharisaical sect."

Προέκοπτεν properly signifies to cut one's way forward, to advance, to make a proficiency: and here the term, I think, designates both progress in the knowledge of Jewish literature, and a forwardness in defending the interests of the Jewish religion. By συνηλικιάται are meant those who were of the same age with him, and (I think) especially those who, with him, attended on the Lectures of Gamaliel. See more on this word in Schleus. Lex. ἐν τῷ γένει, "of my nation." So 2 Cor. 11, 26. ἐκ γένους, "a gentile Judaicā." And so often in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Hence the Latin genus and our kin.

14. περισσότερον ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τ. π. μ. π. It must be observed (though Commentators have omitted to notice it) that verbals of this kind have the force of adjectives, and hence carry an adverb. And as adjectives of desire take the genitive; such also is the construction this noun always has; as in Acts 21, 20. ζηλ. νόμου 25, 3. ζηλ. Θεοῦ 1 Cor. 14, 12. ζηλ. πνευμάτων. It signifies desirous of, studious of, zealous for, ἡρ. The word παραδόσεις is well adapted to denote the Jewish faith, not only as being a religion handed down from their fathers, but (at least as far as the sect of the Pharisees was concerned) as containing, together with what was of divine institution, much of tradition, and what pretended to no other than human authority, even that of their ancestors. Wets. compares Ant. 12, 6, 2. εἰς ζηλωτῆς ἐστὶ τῶν πατρίων ἔθους, καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ θησείας, ἐπέστω βοι. The same Historian tells us.
that the Sadducees τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως τοῦ πατέραν οὐκ ἐτήσια. We may compare πατεικαλ μου παραδόσεις in Acts 26, 4 & 5., where see the notes.

15. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ καλλιὰς μητρὸς μου, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. The verb εὐδόκ. is here used in its primary signification, to think good, to be pleased; as in Rom. 15, 26. Luke 12, 42. (where see the notes) and elsewhere. Ὁ ἀφορίσας με, who separated me, destined, &c. Borger thinks that no distinction is to be made between ἀφορίσαις and καλέσας, since they mean the same thing at Acts 13, 2. and Rom. 1, 1., where we have κλητὸς and ἀφορισμένος. See also Heb. 5, 4. But this seems a precarious principle carefully to be avoided, and which is here unnecessary, since the former term signifies simply to choose and destine; the latter, to call, constitute, and appoint. To secure the words from doctrinal perversion, it is only necessary to resort to the principle suggested by the Greek Commentators. Thus Theophyl.: Ἀφορίσε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς, οὐ κατὰ ἀποκληρίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πρόχρημα τοῦ ἀξίου εἶναι.* He then, on the words καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, excellently annotates thus: Ὅ μὲν Θεὸς διὰ τὴν ἁρετίν αὐτοῦ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν· σκέψοις γὰρ ἐκλογής μοι, φησίν, ἐστὶν αὐτὸς δὲ μεταφράζω, διὰ τῆς χάριτος, φησὶ, κληθήναι, οὐ κατ᾽ ἄξιον, ἀλλὰ δι᾽ ἔλεον. The above Commentators also remark, that God permitted him to remain so long devoted to the Jewish religion, in order that his sudden

* So Slade: “God foresaw that he would be a fit instrument for the propagation of the Christian religion, and therefore decreed, even with the fore-knowledge of his bitter enmity against the Church, “to set him apart” for the Apostleship; just as the Gentiles were chosen, though in a state of actual idolatry.” And it is well observed by Hammond, that this, being a designation only to the dignity of the Apostolical office (as Jeremiah, ch. 1, 5., and John: the Baptist, and others appear to have been prophetic) can with no reason be so understood as to imply any irrespective decree or distinction of his person to heaven and bliss; that being laid up for him as a crown of righteousness, as a reward of the finishing of his course, and his perseverance, 2 Tim. 4, 8.”
and total change might be so much the more a confirmation of the truth of the Gospel.

15. *ἐκ κοιλιάς ματρός μου* is a formula derived from the Heb. דְּנֵי עַבְרֶה, frequent in the Old Testament, and which merely signifies *from one's earliest infancy*; as in Matt. 19, 12. The Classical writers never use it: but they have a similar one in *ἐκ παιδός*.


16. *ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑμοί*. 'Ἀποκαλ. depends upon the preceding εὐδοκ., which must be repeated. The sense of the words *ἀποκαλύψαι—ἐμοί* is not very determinate. Hence there has arisen some diversity of interpretation. Many, as Grot. and Rosenm., take them to mean: "propagating the religion of his Son by me." And thus the words of the following clause would be exegetical of the present one. But this interpretation is liable to strong objection. It is truly remarked by Koppe and Berger, that *ἀποκαλύπτειν* and *ἀποκάλυψις* are nowhere in the New Testament used in that sense, but solely of divine appearances and revelations. *Ἐν ἑμοί* (they remark) may be taken (as often) for *ἐμοί*; as Is. 53, 1. Jer. 10, 20., compared with Matt. 10, 32, Rom. 1, 94. The latter criticism, however, is somewhat precarious, nor is there any need to curtail the full sense of *ἐν ἑμοί*, the force of which is (I think) best seen by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. : *οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀποκαλύψαι ἑμοί*, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑμοί. δεικνύει δή οὗ λόγῳ μόνον ἔπαθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ πολλοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιθραύση τὴν καρδίαν, εἰς τὸν ἐκτὸς ἄνθρωπον τῆς γνώσεως ἐμβαφείσθη, καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν αὐτῷ λαλοῦσιν. So also Ecumen. 722 β. ἐν ἑμοί δὲ εἶπε, δείξας θέλων οὐ λόγῳ μόνον μαθύον αὐτῶ, ἀλλ' ἐκ πολλῆς καὶ καρδίας ἕ ποτε ἐν τοίς ἄνθρωποι τῆς γνώσεως ἐνθυμάσθης. This interpretation is, moreover, strongly confirmed by ver. 12. οὐδὲ παρέλαβαν—ἀλλὰ δὲ ἀποκαλύψεως Ι. Χ. Indeed, ver. 14, 15 & 16. are closely connected together: for (though the Commentators do not notice it) I cannot but consider ver. 13 & 14.
στοιχείαν as altogether parenthetical, and that οὖν δὲ is said *per epanalepsin*. Indeed δὲ has often that force. The words ἀφορίσως are also parenthetical. Thus the words following yield a much more suitable sense, since, instead of being a repetition of the preceding sentiment, they state the *purpose* for which this revelation was made, namely, that he should preach Christ, and propagate his religion among the *Gentiles*. So Theophyl. paraphrases: “not that I should see him only, but that I should publish my revelation to others, even the Gentiles. How, then, can I preach circumcision to them?”

Εὐθείας is thought, by Koppe, to belong to ἀνευρήσων, though, in consequence of the long interposed clause, a change of construction is made by άλλα. This, however, is regarded by Borger as harsh; and he joins it with προσανεθέμενην. But this cannot be admitted, any more than the method of Rosenm., who supposes some words to be omitted after εὐθείας, as “ipse consensi;” which would be too arbitrary an ellipsis. The first mentioned construction seems to deserve the preference, and is supported by the authority of the antient Commentators.

It is remarked by Theodoret, that “what is said in this and the following verses is meant to refute the calumnies of his opponents, who represented him as having received instruction from the Apostles, and then set at nought their rules and directions. Thus the Apostle is compelled to descend to a narration of the private circumstances of his life, such as he has done in no other Epistle.”

16. οὐ προσανεθέμενην σαρκὶ καὶ αἷματι. The verb προσαναθέμενην properly signifies to *commit* any thing to another, and, *speciatim*, to deposit any secret, or communicate any information to another, lay one’s cause open to him, refer it to him, confer with another, and consult him upon any thing. Wets. cites Diod. Sic. 17, 116. τοῖς μάντεσι προσαναθέμενος περὶ τοῦ σημείου. Lucian 2, 246. ἐμοὶ προσανάθου, λάβε μὲ σύμβουλον πῶς. Σαρκὶ καὶ αἷματι. It is strange

**VOL. VII.**
that Koppe should have regarded these words as "put for ἐμαυτό, with an adjunct notion of vice.' It is plain, from the whole of the context, and the scope and purpose of St. Paul (which is, to show that he owed none of his knowledge to man, but derived it all from Christ himself), that these words can only be referred to the Apostles as mere men. And such is the opinion of all the antient, and nearly all the modern Commentators. He means to say that he did not consult or seek instruction from any man (not even the Apostles). Thus there is a tacit opposition to God and Christ, both of whom have been named in the preceding verses. This interpretation, moreover, is placed beyond doubt by the words following ὦδὲ ἀνήλθον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμὸ ἀποστόλους, "nor did I even go up to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before me."

17. ὦδὲ ἀνήλθον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμὸ ἀποστόλους. The modern Commentators do not sufficiently notice the expression τοὺς πρὸ ἐμὸ ἀποστόλους, which shows that by the ἀποκάλυψις he had received the information necessary for the office of Apostle, and was invested with that office by Christ himself. Hence, as Theophyl. remarks (from Chrys.), this step was not taken in the conceited spirit of an empty and puffed up neophyte, but was fully warranted by the wonderful circumstances that had happened to him. He was become an Apostle, and had received the illumination in a more extraordinary and direct manner than even the previous Apostles themselves. Therefore it had been absurd for him who had been taught of God to apply for instruction to man. This, again, entirely refutes the interpretation of δι' ἀποκάλυψις supra ver. 12., brought forward by some recent foreign Commentators.

17. ἀλλ' ἀνήλθον εἰς Δαμασκόν.

Of the circumstances of this journey we know nothing, it not having been recorded by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. On the causes of this silence Commentators variously speculate. Some think that he knew not of it; others, that he did not judge the events of sufficient importance to be recorded. The former suppo-
edition is both improbable and irreverent; nor can I quite approve of the latter. It seems to me that St. Luke purposely omitted many circumstances, for reasons which, unless we knew the plan and system he laid down for his work, we can never fully ascertain. Nay, so little is here said, that it is difficult to adjust the chronology of the events of this part of the Apostle's life. Compare Acts 9, 19., where I cannot entirely acquiesce in any method yet proposed of reconciling the accounts of St. Luke and St. Paul. I am, however, moreinclined to agree with Bp. Pearce (See the note in loc.), except that his method is too arbitrary to be confided in. Doddridge's supposition, that the Arabia here mentioned was only the vicinity of Damascus, is equally arbitrary and unauthorized. And his opinion that St. Paul first preached at Damascus, and then went into Arabia, is at variance with the present passage, which is, of course, unexceptionable, and must not be tampered with, but some means found of reconciling St. Luke's account with St. Paul's. In order to the adjustment of this diversity, I would observe, that there seems to be nothing in the words of St. Paul to lead us to suppose that his stay in Arabia was otherwise than short; nor need we suppose that the journey was a very long one. It was probably taken, in a great measure, for the sake of restoring his health; since it is said at Acts 9, 19. εἰνεχώρσεν, which implies that he was then only in a state of convalescence. And to this very period (when, according to the words of St. Luke, we find St. Paul had remained at Damascus some days,) I would fix the journey into Arabia, which, as having occupied but a short time, and affording no circumstances of moment, St. Luke omits, continuing his narration with εὐθέως ἐν ταῖς συναγώγαις ἐξῆργασε. And surely the propriety of the εὐθέως will not be affected by this short interposed journey. And it is certain that the portion καὶ εὐθέως—Χριστος must refer to another narrative. For I cannot acquiesce in the opinion of Kuinoel, that with the icavai ἡμέραι may be numbered the ἡμέραι rives mentioned at ver. 19. The state of the Apostle's health would not admit of his immediately resuming his evangelical labours at Damascus; and that, as we see, is not at variance with St. Paul's account. Finally, I would understand the words of Luke ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο ἡμέραι icavai of the whole time of St. Paul's second sojourn at Damascus, which, by his own account here, must have extended to not much less than three years. And though this may seem hardly warranted by the words, yet let it be remembered, that the expression ἡμέραι, by an Hebraism, has often only the general signification of time: and icavai is a term of extensive application, and is often used of a somewhat long period. The sense may be expressed by a similar idiom in our own language, namely, a "good long while," which often signifies a pretty considerable time, and which is generally used when we know not the exact extent of its duration. So Luke 8, 27. ἐκ χρόνων icavai & 93, 8. Acts 8, 11. icavai χρόνος, which Schleus. renders "inde a longo tempore." See also 14, 3. 27, 9. Thus he renders the present passage multo autem tempore elapso. The use of icavai for πολύς and μεγάς is common in the Classical writers. So that there can be no
difficulty in understanding St. Luke's words 'of as considerable a

time as St. Paul's words require.

And thus, I trust, I have shown that the accounts of St. Luke and

St. Paul are by no means at variance, but quite reconcilable.

18. ἔσευτα μετὰ ἑτη τρία ἀ. ἐ. 'I. i. Π., "Then after
three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." As

to the question whether the three years here

mentioned are to be reckoned from his return to

Damascus out of Arabia, or from his departure from

Jerusalem to Damascus, on which the learned have

been long divided in opinion, I must agree with

those who maintain the latter. See, however, Koppe

and Borger.

"Ἐσεύτα, then. The purpose of this journey, the

Apostle says, was ἱστορήσαι Πέτρου, i.e. to obtain a

personal knowledge of Peter, then very celebrated,

and as he is called, 2, 9. στύλον ἐκκλησίας. This

sense of ἱστορ. is somewhat rare; though Borger

adduces an example from Chariton, p. 47. μὴ φοβη-

θῶμεν, ἀλλὰ πλησιάσωμεν ἱστορήσωμεν τὸ παράδοξον.

And Koppe cites Plut. 1, 14 c. τὴν χαρὰν ἱστορήσαι

and Joseph. B. 6, 1, 8. ἁν (Julianum) ἱστορήσαι,

"whom I came to know and be acquainted with."

The expressions ἱστορήσαι and ἐσεύτα εἰς αὐτὸν are

(as Koppe observes) very guarded, so as to afford no

trace of any doctrines either received or expected

from Peter. 'Ιστ. expresses no more than respect,

does not, as the Romanists say, imply the supe-

riority of Peter.

He remained fifteen days i.e. (as I understand it)

departed on the fifteenth day, after staying a fort-

night: and I imagine he would contrive so as to let

the fortnight include three Lord's days. Thus at

Acts 28, 14. we found brethren, and were desired to

tarry with them seven days;" by which I under-

stand another Lord’s day.* Beza assigns, as a reason

for Paul's staying no longer, the plots of the Hel-

* And here I beg to correct my opinion in the note on that pas-

sage, by which it is supposed they arrived the day after the Lord's
day. It should rather seem that they arrived the day before.
19. Ἰάκωβον τοῦ ἀδελφον τοῦ Κυρίου. Which of the James's this was (for the Constit. Apost. L. 2, 55. & L. 6, 12 & 14. clearly recognizes three), the learned are not agreed. Some take ἀδελφον in its usual sense, brother, supposing that the James here mentioned was not the same either with James the son of Alpheus, or James the son of Zebedee, and consequently not an Apostle. But the construction and air of the sentence plainly requires us to suppose that Paul meant to include this James amongst the Apostles. To take it in any other way would be very harsh. After a careful examination of what has been written on this obscure point, especially the long and elaborate annotation of Borger, I cannot but acquiesce (as he does) in the opinion of almost all the antient, and most modern Commentators, that this James was a cousin of our Lord, and a son of Alpheus. The arguments stated by Borger are these: 1st. There is no necessity for taking ἀδελφον of a brother. It may be understood of a near kinsman. See Schl. Lex. 2. Of James and Joses, who, at Matt. 18, 55., are said to be brothers of Jesus, the mother was Mary. (See Matt. 27, 56. Mark 15, 40., where James is called ὁ μικρός, by way of distinction from James son of Zebedee.) Now this Mary was a sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, and wife of Cleophas, who is, with great probability, supposed to have been the same with Alpheus. It is therefore highly probable that at Matt. 18, 55. 27, 56. Mark 15, 40., we are to understand cousins of Jesus. 3dly. Among the brothers of Jesus are mentioned James, Simon, and Jude, at Matt. 18, 55. The same names also three of the Apostles bear, in Acts 1, 13., James, son
of Alpheus, Simon Zelotes, and Jude, son of James. It is, indeed, possible that three brothers of our Lord and three of his Apostles might bear the same names, and yet be different persons; but it would be a very strange coincidence, and not easy to be explained, if we suppose that those brothers were no other than the Apostles. But if this be true, it is clear that James, the brother of our Lord, was James, son of Alpheus, an Apostle of Jesus, and likewise his cousin. That an Apostle must be understood, is plain from 2, 9.; and this is required by Acts 9, 27 & 28., where Barnabas is said to have introduced Paul to the Apostles; and it is added ἐν μετ’ αὐτῶν εἰσελθὼν, & c. As to the arguments to prove this James not to have been an Apostle, derived from 1 Cor. 15, 7. and James 1, 1., they are too frivolous to deserve attention, and are satisfactorily answered by Borger.

The Apostle's argument, (Whitby observes,) is to this effect: "Having, therefore, preached the Gospel so long before I saw them, and staying so little while with them, and going then only to see, not to learn of them, it cannot be conceived I should receive my instructions how to preach the Gospel from them."

On the particularity of the statements in ver. 17—19. as compared with Acts 9, 25—28., it is observed by Paley: "The historian delivers his account in general terms, as of facts to which he was not present. The Apostle who is the subject of that account, when he comes to speak of these facts himself, particularizes time, names, and circumstances."

20. καὶ γεγραμμένον ὑμῖν, ἵδιον ἐνότιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι οὐ πονηροὶ. To remove all suspicion of falsehood, the Apostle has here recourse to one of those solemn severations on oath which are found in other passages; as Rom. 9, 1. 1 Tim. 2, 7. 2 Cor. 11, 31., and elsewhere. The ἵδιον has an intensive force. The ἐνότιον τοῦ Θεοῦ answers to the Heb. וֹיָתָן, with which the Philologists compare the γεγραμμένον of the Greeks. But they do not sufficiently see that
both in this passage, and all similar forms, the verb ἔχειν is left to be understood. Here at ἂ δὲ γέραφω must be supplied καθ. Ψένδομαι is, as every where else in the New Testament, a Deponent.

It is proper to observe, that the Apostle nowhere employs these forms except in cases of real necessity, and everywhere introduces them with the greatest solemnity. It is well remarked by Doddrr., that "a revelation of the facts and doctrines of Christianity immediately from Jesus Christ himself, without the assistance of any human teacher, so wonderfully agreeing in all its branches with that which Christ had taught on earth both before and after his resurrection, was so extraordinary an event, and of so great importance to those whom St. Paul visited, and to whom he wrote, that one cannot wonder he should think proper to assert it in so solemn a manner."

21. ἔστιν ἡλευ εἰς τὰ κλῆματα τῆς Σ. κ. τ. Κ. It is observed by Koppe, that the Apostle passes by what is related in Acts 9, 29. of the discourses held by him with the Hellenists, and the imminent peril thence arising, and hastens to relate what is mentioned at ver. 30.

Κληματα, regions; as in Rom. 15, 23. 2 Cor. 11, 10, where see the notes. On Σωφία see Acts 9, 30., and the note there. And on Κιλκία see Schl. Lex.

22. ἔχειν δὲ ἄγνωστον τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τ. Ἱ, ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. Borger rightly regards this and the next verse as parenthetical. The antient Commentators, and, of the moderns, Grot., think that this passage is meant to show that he had not taught them (as he had been represented) the necessity of circumcision and the other Jewish rites. But I rather assent to Crell. and Borger, that it is intended to establish what St. Paul here chiefly labours to prove, namely, that he was not a disciple of the Apostles.

By the churches of Judæa Koppe thinks are meant those of the country, as opposed to that of the me-
tropolis of Jerusalem, since to the latter he could scarcely be unknown. At ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ some participle is to be understood. The phrase signifies, "consecrated to the religion of Jesus Christ."

28. μᾶλλον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἤσαν. Here we have a construction κατὰ τὸ σημαίνομεν, not only found in the Scriptural, but in the best Classical writers, and not only the later ones (from whom Borger adduces examples), but the earlier and purer ones, especially Thucyd. It is chiefly used when there would be an incongruity in the use of the feminine, the nature of the subject requiring the dignity of the masculine gender.

29. ἀκούοντες ἤσαν is for ἡκοῦν; though in this use there is, I think, generally a reference to any thing being customary. The ἤ is not pleonastic (as Koppe supposes), but is here necessary, from the change of the oratio obliqua to the oratio directa, as in Mark 11, 32. Acts 1, 8. (on which see the Critics referred to by Borger), and also from the omission of τοῦτο.

29. τῆν εἰσαγενεῖται τὴν πίστιν ἢν πότε ἐκτόθη, "that belief in the Gospel, that Christian faith," or simply "the religion that once he aimed at destroying." It is not necessary to refine on the sense of πίστις here so much as is done by Koppe.

24. καὶ ἐδόξασον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν. Here ἐδόξασο signifies "to address praises and thanks to." Ἐν ἐμοί signifies for me. ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐμοί, or ἦστε ἐμοί, "on my account, on account of my conversion," for, (as Theodoret say) that "the wolf had become a shepherd." It is well observed by Theophyl., that the expression plainly shows that they ascribed the merit to God, who had been alone the cause, and regarded the whole as a work of God. And certainly, considering the circumstances of this sudden and total change, which involved an abandonment of honours and riches, and an embracing of poverty, persecution, and peril, they could not reasonably do otherwise.
GALATIANS, CHAP. II.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἡμερῶν πάλιν ἀνεβηκαί εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα, “after the lapse of fourteen years I again went up to Jerusalem.” This use of διὰ (as it were for διαγενέσαν) is frequent both in the Scriptural (as Mark 2, 1. and Acts 24, 17.) and the Classical writers. See Borger’s examples, or Schleus. Lex., and Matth. Gr. Gr. Here, however, a difficulty meets us similar to that supra 1, 17. The question is, from what period are these fourteen years to be reckoned? Some modern Commentators, as Capell., Wets., Gabler, Keil, Rosenm., Pott, and others, think from his conversion. And (as Koppe says) it is probable that that event would be ever after looked back upon by him as an ἀερα from which he would compute all future time. But (as Koppe also observes) the particle ἔπειτα, and the sense of the διὰ in this idiom are both adverse to this. It would seem that there is no reason to take the words otherwise than in their plain and obvious sense, as they were understood by the antient and earlier modern Commentators, namely, as calculated from his last journey to Jerusalem. And this opinion is also supported by Borger. It is evident that, according to the former computation, the journey will be A.D. 52.; according to the latter, A.D. 49. The best Commentators are agreed that the journey in question is the same with that recorded at Acts 15., the circumstances of each being the same. See Koppe, who remarks that it is no wonder the Apostle makes no mention of the Decree of the Jerusalem Synod, since he did not wish the Galatians to rest on the authority of any Apostle but himself, and also because his own doctrine on the subject of non-observance of the Mosaic Law went much further than that Decree.

makes mention only, besides Barnabas, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, of some others. Of these we find Titus was one.

2. ἀνέβησεν δὲ κατὰ ἀποκαλυψιν. There is no inconsistency between this account and that of Acts 15, 2. : for though it would seem from that passage that Paul went up, as being appointed so to do by the Antiochians, yet, as Borger observes, who shall venture to deny (especially as the Apostle himself here asserts it) that he went up in consequence of an immediate revelation from God or Christ? since (as Koppe remarks) that revelation might determine him to comply with the request of the Christians, and thus the divine order and impulse would not (as some pretend) be unnecessary. Many reasons may be imagined which might have induced Paul not to go, and these (Borger says) are stated at large by Michaelis in an annotation in loc. Thus there is no such difficulty as need have induced Wlithby to take the desperate course of interpreting the phrase κατ' ἀποκαλυψιν ἀνέβησεν, “I acted according to the tenour of my revelation, which constituted me Apostle of the Gentiles:” which is most unwarrantable, and is in the worst spirit of the innovating interpreters of the present German school. Theophyl. well explains it: τοῦ πνεύματος υπερβάλλοντος αὐτῷ.

2. καὶ ἀνέβησεν αὐτοῖς τὸ εἰς ἐναγγελίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐρωτείας. Here ἀνατίθημι signifies to communicate, explain, set forth, &c.; as Acts, 25, 14. (where see the note) and 2 Macc. 3, 19. By αὐτοῖς are meant those of Jerusalem, and, from the context and nature of the subject, the Christians, and especially (as we may suppose, and infer from Acts 15, 22.) the Apostles and Presbyters; which indeed appears from the words following, κατ’ ὅπιαν τοῖς δοκίμωσι. By setting forth the Gospel he preached is (I think) meant setting forth those peculiarities as to the disuse of the rites of the Mosaic law, the free admission of the Gentiles without binding them to it, and perhaps some of the humbling and peculiar doctrines of the
Gospel which seem to have been especially treated on by St. Paul; on all which accounts he might well style it his Gospel. For all these he had, doubtless, been caluminated; as the doctrine of free grace and the abandonment of all claims to salvation by human works, could be no more agreeable to the Judaizers (the law being a system of works) than his doctrine of the abrogation of the law.

At τοῖς δοκοῦσι must be understood εἶναι τί, which is supplied further on at ver. 6. (See the note infra 5, 3.) So Theophyl. explains τοῖς μεγάλοις, τοῖς ἐνδοξοῖς. Wets. here adduces numerous examples of this idiom from the Classical writers, and upon this interpretation the best Commentators are agreed. Some, however, deny that τοῖς δοκοῦσι can have this sense, without the special addition of a τί. But to this it has been well replied by Borger, p. 119. "At verò nemo nescit, Paulinam scribendi rationem minimè ad rigidam Grammatices normam esse exigi-gendam, imprimis ubi ardo et vehementior animi affectus subest." Besides, the learned Commentator subjoins an unexceptionable example of this ellipsis from Porphyri. de Abstin. p. 179. de Rhoer. τὰ πλήθη σύμφωνα τοῖς έκατοίνα δόξας παρὰ τῶν δοκοῦσιν ἀκύρωτα, ἐπερεύθη φρονέων ἐτι μᾶλλον περὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν τὰ τιμωτά, where τὰ πλΗθη and τοί δοκοῦσι are plainly opposed. He also cites Philostr. V. Ap. p. 121. The persons alluded to are doubtless Peter, James, and John; as appears from ver. 9.

2. εἰς κενὸν answers to the Hebr. כָּבָר, and occurs also at 2 Cor. 6, 1. (where see the note.) In τρέχω there is an agonistic metaphor; as at 1 Cor. 9, 26. 2 Tim. 4, 7. Phil. 2, 16. Nor is it unknown in the Classical writers. Thus Poet. Gnom. p. 305. (cited by Borger) ἀνὴρ ἀβουλος εἰς κενὸν. To which I add a similar passage of Menander ap. Corp. H. Byz. Par. 1, 98. ἵνα μὴ κεναμβατοίην. The sense of μὴ πῶς εἰς κενὸν τρέχω, ἦ ἐδικασμόν is by most modern Commentators supposed to be this: "lest, by not making this communication, I might be misrepresented by
my calumniators, and misunderstood by the Apostles, by whose discountenance the good effects both past and future of my labours would be diminished." This may be very true, and probably formed part of the Apostle's reasons; but such a sense cannot well be elicited from the words. I prefer the interpretation of Chrys., Theophyl., ÓEcumen., and Theodoret, namely: "lest I should be really thought to labour, or have laboured in vain," i.e. erroneously, and under mistake; which was what his calumniators pretended.* This interpretation is also embraced by Borger, who refers to Hyperii Comment. ad loc. and Camer. Not. fig. p. 86.

3. ἄλλωσε Τίτος ἵνα ὑπάρχη τὸν ἡμῶν ἡμᾶς. I agree with Borger and Jaspis that these words are parenthetical. Their true scope has been best seen by the antient Commentators, as ÓEcumen. : ὁ γὰρ ἡμῶν παρὰ τῶν ἡμῶν ἀυτοῦ περιτιμηθηκέναι, ὥστε ἦταν ἡμῶν, μηδὲ τοὺς περὶ Πέτρου καθότι συνεχεῖν περιτιμήν, διὰ δὲ συγκατάβασιν τῶν ἐξ Ἰσραήλ πιστῶν, συνεχέοις τὴν περιτιμῆν. See also Theophyl.†

It is truly observed by Doddr., that "this conduct of Paul with respect to Titus, in not submitting to his being circumcised, when it was insisted on as

* Thus Theophyl.: ἵνα διδάξω τοῖς σκανδαλιζόμενοι ἐπὶ ἐμοί, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν τρέχων οὐχ ἵνα ἔγερσιν πᾶσι γὰρ, ὅ ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῆ, παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν Υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ ἐναγγέλων τούτου; And so Phot. ap. ÓEcumen. 725. οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἔγερσιν, ὅτι ἴδω εἰς κενὸν τρέχω, ἢ ἐκδομοῦν.

necessary to salvation, is very consistent with what he afterwards did without constraint, to promote the circumcision of Timothy in different circumstances." (Acts 16, 3.)

4. διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδελφοὺς, οἵ τινες παρεισηκόντων κατασκοπήσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἦ.

This passage, as it stands, is liable to an objection. If Titus remained uncircumcised on account of the false brethren, it might be inferred that, if there were no false brethren, he would have been circumcised; which would not have suited the Apostle's argument. Whitby joins the words διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ἀδελφοὺς with τοὐμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον, ver. 1. Macknight has "on account even of the false brethren;" but it may be doubted whether such a construction (though it is not entirely without defence, Rom. 3, 22. Phil. 3, 8.) is suitable to the present passage. There are some reasons which might incline us to adopt an interpretation altogether different from what is commonly received, and to suppose that Titus actually was circumcised. The particle δὲ does, in this case, naturally suggest an opposition, and the verb ἠμαγκάσθη, as followed by this particle, may reasonably imply that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised (i.e. it was not enjoined as a seal, or token of Christianity), yet that it was judged expedient on account of the Judaizing converts, upon which very account St. Paul himself circumcised Timothy, Acts, 16, 3. The words οἵτινες πρὸς ἡραν (if such be the true reading in ver. 5.), may seem to oppose, but do not subvert, this hypothesis. For the Apostle might justly contend, that, as circumcision was declared by the council to be unnecessary for a Christian, they did not yield in principle at all. But the reading in the Clermont MS. puts another construction on the text: Nonnulli interpretantes, Codicis Clarmontiani et Tertulliani auctoritate moti, οἵ εἰδε οὖν τὸν ἔλεγχον εἰσιν, εἰ χάρις, ut loci sensus sit permisse Apostolum, ut Titus circumcideretur in gratiam Judeorum." Rosenm. It is not impossible, as Griesbach intimates, that this omission gives the true reading. See also Mill. Wets. "We consented for a short time," thus more effectually consulting the permanent interests of the Gospel (ἳνα διαμείνῃ). And so, in one sense, the Apostles yielded to these false brethren; in another they did not. It is possible, that the Galatians might have heard of the circumcision of Titus, which circumstance the Apostle may here mean to vindicate and explain. (Slade.)

I have inserted the above, as being an able representation of the opinion which has been gaining ground for the last century, that the common reading is corrupt, and that the words οἵτινες οἴδας are to be thrown out, and that the sense to be ascribed to the passage is that above detailed. I must, however, observe, that I think the common reading has been rejected on very insufficient grounds. Its correctness has been indeed almost demonstrated in a very masterly critical note of Borger, who has established it both by
external and internal arguments. He has shown that the var. lect. arose from the difficulty of the passage; and, by the most ackn. wledge of critical canons the more difficult reading is to be prefered to the easier. Finally he embraces the interpretation of Stroth, Rosenm., Storr, and others, who think that the words διὰ δὲ τῶν παρεισάκτων ἡευναδέλφους, are not to be referred to εἶξαμεν at ver. 5. (since that would require the δὲ οὐδὲ to be cancelled, at variance with all critical canons), nor that περιερήθη is to be understood, but rather ανέθην to be repeated from ver. 2., profectus scil. sum propter illos ἡευν. Thus δὲ will signify nimiumscilicet: as in 1 Cor. 6, 14. (And see Glass 1, 533.) And it is observed by Borger, that the Greeks use the particle in the continuation of a sentence after the interposition of parenthetical matter. See Hoog. de Partic. and Schweig on Pol. 5, 232 & 292. Borger also remarks that there is no objection to referring it to ἀνέθην. As to the sense, it will remain nearly the same. This interpretation, the above Commentators think, is very suitable to Acts 15, 1 & 2., where is mentioned the same cause of the journey and necessity for it: and such a construction is not unexampled. See Acts 24, 18 & 19. The interpretation is also adopted by Jaspius, who translates: "(Id quod vero iter suscepit) potius ob falsos Jesu cultores," &c. And, upon the whole, this may (I think) deserve the preference, as involving the least difficulty.

Παρεισάκτων ἡευναδέλφους. The word παρεισάκτωσ (which may be compared with the Classical from ἐπεισάκτω) often signifies one who is privily (παρά) and in a sidelong and underhand way, introduced. So Gloss Labb. παρεισάκτωσ, obinductus. (1 conjecture subinductus. The s was absorbed by the s preceding.) The Greek Lexicographers explain it ἀλλότριος, νόθος. But as verbs passive are sometimes used as deponents, so are verbs passive; and here the term seems to denote those who have clandestinely insinuated, literally wriggled themselves into the Christian society. This sense of παρά is frequent, and is found just after in παρεισάκτωσαι, παρεισάκτωσαι, and many other verbs, on which see Borger in loc. and Pott on 2 Pet. 2, 1. Now these are called false brethren, not as being no Christians, but as being Judaizers, who pretended to hold the abrogation of the law, contrary to their real opinion.

Κατασκοπησαί τ. ε. δ. δ. ε. Χ. Ι., i. e. “to act as spies (κατασκο- ποι), watching the liberty which we exercise in the profession of the Christian faith.” So Borger, who renders: “libertatem quâ nos beat religio Christiana.” “Ina ἡμᾶς κατασκοπησαίσαι, “that they may bring us into bondage (to the law).” Various are the passages in the New Testament where this metaphor is used. The ἡμᾶς is usually understood by Paul and Titus: but it may be better extended (with Borger) to all the other Christians of Antioch.

5. οὐδὲ πρὸς ἀπαν εἴξαμεν. Agreeably to the interpretation of Stroth, Rosenm., &c. of the preceding words, these admit of a very natural and easy sense,
since (as Borger remarks) Paul was likely enough to go to Jerusalem on account of the cabals of those false brethren; nor is it inconsistent with the Divine revelation mentioned at ver. 2. Πρὸς ἀπαν is by general usage appropriated to denote a very short time, or interval; as Joh. 5, 35. 2 Cor. 7, 8. Borger observes, that in what he did not yield to them, does not clearly appear. The Apostle, he thinks, only means to say, that his doctrine received no tarnish, sustained no change from the journey, but remained pure. It seems to me, however, that the not yielding to them may be understood of some compromise of the matters in dispute which had been proposed.

The words τὴν ὑποτάσσῃ (which depend upon ἐπι understood) are exegetical, and have an intensive force, for ὡστε ὑποτάσσεσθαι. And after ὑποτάσσῃ there is the omission of a word or two, as καὶ ἔπιστομεν. By ἄλληδελε is meant the pure and unadulterated truth, namely, that old things are passed, the Law abrogated, and circumcision of no avail, which assuredly would not have remained with them, if Paul had yielded ever so little.* By ἡμᾶς are, I think, meant principally the Galatians, but secondarily all other Gentile Christians, whose religious interests were equally at stake in the affair.

6. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι τι—προσανεβερο. There is here an irregularity either of phraseology, or of construction, perhaps both: several ways of remedying which have been proposed. Passing by some which do violence to the principles of language and the usus loquendi,† and Whitby's construction, which is un-

---

* So Borger truly observes: “Profectò metuendum erat, ne, si Apostolus aliquà re cessisset, universus religionis salus in summum discrimen adduceretur; cum hac ipsa Pauli indulgentia apparet, neque Paulini animi eam esse fortitudinem, neque ipsius religionis firmitatem eam, quin, strenuè modo pugnes, titubent ac labantur et Paulus et religio. Verissimum enim est, quod dicit Hermocrates apud Thucyd, L. 4, c. 61. p. 273. Duk. πέφυκε τὸ ἀνθρωπείου διὰ ταύτα ἄρχειν μὲν τοῦ εἰκονος, φυλάσσεσθαι δὲ τὸ ἐπιον.

† As when certain Commentators (as Locke and Wells) say there is an ellipsis of οἱ before ἀπὸ τῶν δοκοῦντων.
warily adopted by Mr. Slade, the most probable opinions are those 1. of Grot., Hamm., Koppe, and others, that there is an anaculuthon, the Apostle intending to write ἀρα τῶν δοκούντων—οὐδὲν μοι προσανετέθη, οὐδὲν προσελαιβόμην; though by reason of a somewhat long parenthesis he lost the thread of the construction, and thus changed the genitive into a nominative, as it were resuming what was said before the parenthesis.* 2. Of Rosenm., Burger, and others, who, thinking that somewhat harsh, take ἀρα for ἐπί, quod attinet ad, something like the nominative absolute. And so the Syriac. But this (I think) involves more harshness than the former method; can I find any sufficient authority for this sense of ἀρα.

6. τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τί. This is rendered in the E. V. "those who seemed to be." But the sense seems to be rather "those who were thought to be, reputed:" on which signification of δοκεῖν I have before treated. The force of the phrase depends upon this sense of δοκεῖν, and on the ellipsis of μέγα after τί,† which here denotes excellence.

6. ὅπωρ πότε, whomsoever, qualescunque. Thus the πότε answers to our ever. The Apostle does not deny their dignity, or merited reputation; yet he hints that it was not so great as to render it necessary for him to submit to, or be taught of, them. This sense is (I think) especially contained in the words following οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει, which Burger well renders "mea non interest." But the words may be best rendered "it maketh no difference to me," i.e. it does not affect my authority as an Apostle. Nor

* Such anacolutha occur in the best writers, especially Thucyd., from the excessive length and involuion of his sentences. But I cannot agree with Krebes on 2 Cor. 9, 13. that this is no defect.
is μοι redundant, as Koppe supposes. Theophyl. paraphrases not amiss thus: οὐδεμία μοι φρονίς περὶ τῶν
dοκιμῶν εἰναι τι, τῶν μεγάλων δηλαδή ἀποστόλων, εἰτε
περιτομῆν ἐκήρυτον, εἰτε μη.

6. προσαυτὸν Θεός ἄνθρωπον οὐ λαμβάνει. The Commentators very well illustrate the sense of this phrase, as
taken from the Hebr. דִּבֵּר נַעַל, which, as Borger remarks, signifies 'to favour any one on account of
any external advantages of wealth, honour,' &c. And he thinks that the Apostle meant here to hint at the
inferiority of external condition and corporeal com-
forts which existed between himself and the Apo-
stles in question; and to show that his Apostolical
dignity was not affected by any thing of that kind.
This interpretation is highly ingenious, and perhaps
ture. One may here compare James 2, 9. Rom. 2,
and Phocyl. (frag. 13, 7.) μηδὲ κρῖσιν ἐς χάριν ἐλκειν.
Μη βίνης πενιῆν ἀδίκας μη κρίνε προσαυτὸν.*

6. ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκιμῶν οὐδὲν προσανέβητο. The γὰρ
is referred by Borger to διαφέρει; q. d. "quales fue-
runt illi non curo, nihil enim illis debo." 'Εμοὶ οὐδὲν
προσανέβητο, "added, communicated to, me no-
thing," i. e. nothing new, or of which I was ignorant.
On the sense of προσαυτὸν see the note supra 1, 16.
Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: 'Εκεῖνοι μὲν οἱ ἄν
ήσαν, τῷ Θεῷ μελήσει τούτῳ δ' οἶδα, ὅτι ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐδὲν
ψευδοράθησαν, οὐδὲ προσεθήκαν τι τῷ κήρυματι μου, ἡ
διαφεράσκητο.

7. ἀλλὰ τοιναντίου, &c. There is much meaning
couched under the τοιναντίου, which does not import
(as some fancy) that Paul added somewhat to them,
or that they were taught of him, but merely (I
think) signifies this: "nay, so far from teaching me:
any thing, or supposing that they had any thing to
teach me, they acknowledged my divine commission,

* This countenances the opinion of Brunk, that Phocyl. is either
a fabrication of some Monk of the fourth century, or was much
interpolated by some person.
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and seeing that I was instructed, &c.—they gave the right of fellowship (as Apostles) to me and Barnabas. Such is (I think) clearly the sense* and the construction; (for the words ἔστειλεν—μας are parenthetical).

7. ἔστειλεν, “when they saw.” Ἐπιστεύσας τὸ εἰκόνος, “was entrusted with;” as in 1 Cor. 9, 17. Rom. 3, 2. where see the notes. Τὸ εἰκόνος τῆς ἀποστολῆς signifies the preaching of the Gospel to the uncircumcised. The nouns ἀποστολή and περιτομή are frequently, as here, put for the participles of περιτομέας, &c. The term περιτομή implies a divine commission, as if ὑμῖν τῷ Θεῷ were understood. This, Grot. observes, is to be understood ἐξ ὑμῶν, or καὶ ἐκπορευόμενοι; for Peter converted Cornelius, an uncircumcised person; and Paul some Jews, as we learn from the Acts of the Apostles (see Acts 9, 15.); though Peter was chiefly occupied with the Jews, and Paul with the Gentiles; Peter had for his assistants principally James and John; Paul, Barnabas, himself divinely appointed to this office, whom the Greeks have, therefore, not ill styled the fourteenth Apostle. So Doddr. observes, that there is no reason to believe the labours of Peter, James, and John were entirely appropriated to those of the circumcision; as, on the other hand, we are assured that those of the Apostle Paul were not confined to the uncircumcised Gentiles; for we often find him preaching to the Jews, and indeed, wherever he came he proposed the Gospel in the first place to them.

It is well remarked by Theophyl., that he here shows his equality with Peter, as also soon after in rebuking him.

* And so Theophyl.: τοιούτον γὰρ μὲν ὡς διαφόροντο, διὸ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν, καὶ συνεφόρησαν, ἵνα ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ Βαρνάβας εἰς τὴν ἀποστολὴν, ἦτοι εἰς τὰ ἔθη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν, τούτων τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εὐαγγελίζωντας. So also Paræus: “Adeo nihil reprehenderunt, ut contra comprobaverint doctrinam et Apostolatum meum.”
8. ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας—ἐδιν. These words are entirely parenthetical, and the γὰρ (I think) refers to a clause omitted; thus: (And this is very true;) for he, &c. i. e. ὁ γὰρ, namely, God. Ἐνεργήσας ἐν Πέτρῳ. This term has great force; though that has been too little attended to by Commentators. Ἐνεργῶ properly signifies "to work, act, effect, produce an effect upon," and, with a dative, "produce an effect in, impart strength, help, and ability to effect any work." It is especially applied to the communication of extraordinary and supernatural help, both in the communication of divine truths, and in the working of miracles. So 1 Cor. 12, 6. ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσιν. So here it must be understood of that powerful supernatural help in every way communicated to the Apostles Peter and Paul.

The εἰς in εἰς ἀποστόλην, &c. and τὰ ἐδιν denotes the end and purpose of that Divine help; and the words may be paraphrased thus: εἰς τὸ ἀποστόλον εἶναι τοῖς περιτετμημένοις. And so in the other clause, where εἰς τὰ ἐδιν is for εἰς ἀποστόλην τῶν ἔδοξαι.

9. καὶ γινώσκεις τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσην μοι. By τὴν χάριν are meant the supernatural χάρισμα necessary for the discharge of the Apostolic office, not the office only, as some suppose. So Theophyl.: Ὁμως τῶν ἐδωκόντων τῷ καθαρῷ ἐκ τῆς ἑξάρατος ἐδώκει τὸ κύριο-μα αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὸύτο ἐδώκει. εἰ ὁ γὰρ ἀπόστο-λος γινώσκεις, φησί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The sense is: perceiving that the office of Apostle was committed to me (as well as to them), they," &c.

The words Ἰάκωβος—ἐδώκει are (as Theophyl. remarks) parenthetical; q. d. they (i. e. James, Cephas, and John) of δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι. The oi δο- κοῦντος is taken by some Commentators, as Koppe, for oi ὄντες, of which he and Beza give examples from the Classical writers. But in most of such cases, I believe, there is a concealed nicety of acceptation, which the Critics, through ignorance of it, pass by, huddling all up by taking δοκεῖν for εἶναι; and in these the δοκεῖν will be found (I think) to have the
sense which it here bears, namely, to be accounted, reputed, &c. See the note supra ver. 6. In στοάς there is an architectural metaphor, by which the Christian society is compared to a building like Solomon’s Temple (as we say the Church), of which the pillars or supports are the Apostles. See 1 Cor. 3, 16. 2 Tim. 3, 15. Eph. 2, 21 & 22. 1 Pet. 2, 5. and Suic. Thes. in voc. Other references may be seen in Borger.*

9. δεξιὰς θώαν εξαι καὶ Βασιλέα κυριεύει. By this we are not (I think) to understand (with Koppe and Rosenm.) to have been only indicated friendship and consent in doctrine, but communication in the Apostolical office, which it seems to have been a principal purpose of the Apostle to bring them to acknowledge, since it had been denied by his opponents. It, then, denotes Apostolical association; as is implied by the following words. So Gomar: “quod. scil. et muneris Apostolici, et puritatis doctrinae socii essent.” And so Grot., who renders: “me collegam agnovere, et ut tali dedere dexteram.” And he observes: “Nam dextrae dare apud Hebreos signum societatis, ut videre est Levit.” 6, 2. Jer. 50, 15. Theophyl. very well paraphrases thus: διὸ καὶ δεξιὰς ἔδωκα, τουτέστι, συνεθάντων, καὶ κοινωνός ἡμᾶς ἐποίησαντο, καὶ ἐδείξαν ὦτι ἀρέσκονται τῷ κυρίῳ μου, ἀν ἤπειρον διαφέροντι τῷ λόγῳ αὐτῶν.

The Philological Commentators, especially Wets. and Borger, adduce a vast number of Classical pas-

* Among the numerous illustrations in Wets. the following are the most opposite. Ignat. ad Philipp. οἱ στολοι τοῦ κύρους, οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Vita Sabin. 65. ἤσαν δὲ ἀληθῶς—ἀνθρωποι τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πιστοὶ θεράσαντες, στόλοι δευτερεύεστης καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. Eurip. Iphig. in Tauris 57. Maimonid. More Nevochim 2, 23. Accipe a propheticis, qui sunt columnae generis humani in rectâ fide et... Magnum Synedrium Hierosolymitanum fuisset legis non scriptæ fundamentum, columnamque instructionis: hinc decreta ad omnes Israelitas prodibant. And so Philo ap. Stobæum., cited by Borger: "Ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθοὶ στολὲς εἶσι, δῆμον δὲν ὄρετον ὑπερεῖδοντες. I add Pind. Olymp. 2, 145. ὅς ἔστιν ὕπολευ, Τροίας Ἀμαχὼν ἀπεραβηκόντα; (like the ἔρεισμα at ver. 12.)
sages illustrative of this antient symbol of friendship and union (and, I think, society, as here,) among both civilized and barbarous nations.

10. μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἢα μνημονεύσωμεν. As in the case of τὸ ἐναρθήν at ver 7., so here there is much meaning contained in μόνον, which has been best seen by Koppe. It signifies: (They did not wish to impede or circumscribe my liberty of action as an Apostle by any rules or directions of their's, but) they only desired that we would be mindful of the poor." It is rightly observed by Koppe, that before ἢα there is in St. Paul's writings often (as here) an ellipsis of αἰτεῖν, βέλειν, or παρακαλεῖν; as in 2 Cor. 8, 7. Eph. 5, 83. Borger refers for a similar construction to 1 Cor. 7, 39. Gal. 5, 13. Μνημονεύειν is here used, like the Heb. רֶשׁ in Ps. 8, 4. 106, 4.; in the sense remember to relieve. So also μνημονεύειν μον in Luke 23, 42. See Grot. and Gomar. I consider this as one of those euphemisms which, on this subject, are so often used by the delicacy of the sacred writer.

By the τῶν πτωχῶν are meant, not poor Christians in general, but (as all the best Commentators are agreed) those of Judæa. For though charity to the poor forms a distinguishing characteristic of the Christian religion, yet it also held a very high place in the Jewish faith, and therefore there would have been no need to urge that duty on Paul. But charity is chiefly understood to be exercised towards the poor of one's own neighbourhood, or country, and not to be extended to foreigners. By which rule the Gentile Christians would have held themselves not bound to relieve the poor Christians in Judæa; and, as while the necessity of circumcision and the other observances of the Jewish Law was retained, the

inhabitants of Judæa seemed to be placed on such a superiority over the Gentiles as would effectually secure that relief of poor Jews which other countries were accustomed to extend to the inhabitants from whom they derived their origin. So now that this ground of superiority was removed, and Judæa and its inhabitants brought down to the level of other nations, the Apostle might well fear lest this source of relief (which it seems had been opened, see Acts 11, 29 & 30.) would be dried up. And yet this would have been both detrimental to the welfare of the Church, and would have seemed peculiarly hard. For they bore the chief brunt of the hostility and persecution which the Gospel had to encounter, since most inveterate was the hostility and most violent was the persecution from Jews to Jewish Christians (even to the stripping them of all their property, and reducing them to beggary); and as the Gentiles might be said to reap the benefit of this strenuous testimony to the truth of the Gospel, so it was but right that they should relieve those who were suffering for the common cause.

10. ἐκαλ ἑσπερίδαςα αὐτῆς τοῦτο ρώσαι. Koppe remarks on the pleonasm in αὐτῆς τοῦτο after the relative, which he compares with the Hebrew idiom by which the demonstratives וַיְהִי and וַיִּהוּ are subjoined to the relative וַיְהִי. This may indeed be found in the popular phraseology of even modern languages. Here, however, it has an intensive force (see Wetstein’s Classical examples), and may be rendered which very same thing, πράγμα being understood. Ἐσπερίδαςα ρώσαι is not well rendered by Mackan. “I made haste to do.” For he had done it before. (See Acts 11, 29 & 30.) Preferable is the E. V. “I was forward to do.” But as the form αὐτῆς τοῦτo seems to carry with it an ellipsis of καὶ αὐτῶς, of

* Hence we find that collections had been for a long time made by the foreign Jews for the relief of their poor fellow-countrymen in Palestine.
himself, with the exhortation, I would render: "this very same thing I was of myself sufficiently studious of." So Theophyl. explains it: συνειοθήντας τοις εἰσόδου. The Apostle means that such was then his accustomed study. And we know that such it ever after continued to be.

11. ότε δὲ ζηλοῦν ἡμῶν Ἰωάννης—ἡ. The δὲ seems to be intensive and adverative. Yet the same scope is perceptible in this verse as in the former. For as Paul had just before shown that the Apostles Peter and James had taught him nothing, nor found any cause of reproach in him, so here shows, that on the contrary, he found cause for censuring and admonishing Peter: an undeniable proof of his equality with him in Apostolical dignity.

The time when Peter visited Antioch, and the epistostulation took place, cannot be exactly ascertained; but from the 14th verse (and indeed on many accounts,) it may be supposed to have been after the present interview, and not (as Semler thinks) before it. Koppe remarks, that Tatian. Chron. refers it to the fifth year of Claudius, Pears. Annal. Paul. and others, to the tenth year, i.e. A.D. 50. Koppe, with more probability, thinks that it took place not long after the time of Paul's visit, judging from Acts 15, 36., from a comparison of which passage with ver. 18. of this chapter, the causes of the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas may (he thinks) be understood and explained. The purpose of the journey, he conjectures, was personally to inspect the state of the Antiochian Church, and, by his authority and influence, to compose any yet remaining differences, and confirm by word of mouth the Apostolical decree which had been sent to them. All this seems very well imagined: but it proceeds merely on conjecture. And, indeed, no more than probability can be attained.

11. κατὰ πρόσωπον αυτῶν ἀντέτατην. This is compared by Grot. and Koppe with the Hebrew phrase "וַיַּלְכֶה in
1 Kings 1, 28. and ד"ע in Ps. 50, 21.* And though several examples of it are adduced by Raphel, Elsner, and Krebs. from the Classical writers, yet the Apostle may rather be supposed to have derived it from the Hebrew. Κατὰ πρόσωπον implies not doing it in an underhand way, and also not afraid of remonstrating with him, as not conscious of any Apostolical inferiority. Ἀντέστη signifies, I opposed and censured him. Ὅτι καταγγέλοντος ἦν. Koppe and Borger remark that this is an Hebrew idiom, by which past participles are used as verbs, of which the Hebrew language is destitute (see 1 Cor 4, 4. and the Interpreters); and is therefore for καταγγάλιον, i. e. καταγινώσκειν, "worthy of censure;" (καταγινώσκειν signifying ὄρθρον in Deut. 25, 1.) Borger compares Liban. T. 4. p. 377, Reisk. τὰς ὅπ παραπημένας ἦδονας όικ ἐτι ἐξωκερ.

12. πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἔλθεν τινα ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἑρωὺς συνήθειν, "For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles." Whether these were sent by James, or came of their own accord, is not clear. The latter opinion is the one usually adopted. It may signify "some of those who were intimate with James." By ἑρωὺς the best Commentators are agreed in understanding, not Gentiles, but Gentile Christians. And the συνήθει. is explained by many only of society. But I agree with Borger that it includes, and chiefly denotes, eating with; since that was especially forbidden with any Heathen person; and (as Borger adds) the determination of the dispute on the lawfulness of this required a speech from James and a decretory letter from the Apostles, Acts 15.

12. ὑπεστῆλε καὶ ἀφαίρετε. Some take the ὑπέστη for the middle ὑπεστηλατο, which indeed is more usual in the Classical writers. See Borger's examples. He, however, would subaud. πρόσωπον, and

* And Schoett. cites Hos. 5, 5. שערו נאץ לארץ יisos, Et spondedit superbia Israelis in faciem iepius.
'Haím, ἐαυτῷ, which seems preferable; but there is no necessity for it. The ἐαυτῷ after ἀφαίρεσιν (which seems to be exegetical of ὑπερ.) is meant for both. Τῶς ἐκ περιτομῆς. A periphrasis for Ἰουδαίως; as in Acts 10, 45. Borger compares οἱ ἐκ πιστεῶν, οἱ ἐξ ἔργων; and he cites Liban. 4, 804. οἱ ἐκ μεταβολῆς, for οἱ μεταβαλλόμενοι. Περιτομῆς, however, is not (as Koppe supposes) for περιτομῆς. There is rather a participle left to be supplied; and the sense is: "those who depend upon circumcision, and practise it."

Φοβοῦμενος, "fearing their censures." A similar timidity Peter also showed on another occasion. See Matt. 26, 69—75.

18. καὶ συναφεὶς ἦσαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποί Ἰουδαίοι, "dissembled with him." This is thought by the Critics an elegant term, of which they adduce examples from Polyb. and Plutarch. But they omit to notice that this dissimulation was partly implied in ὑπερτάλαλα, since ὑποτελέσθαι often signifies (by a natural metaphor) to practise reserve, and suppress one’s sentiments. So Plato Apol. Socr. E. 10. ὁτὲ ἀποκρυφάμενος—οὐδὲ ὑποτελάμενος. And it is not improbable that such is the sense intended by the Apostle.

By Ἰουδαίοι are meant Jewish Christians. Ὡστε καὶ Βαρνάβας, "so that even Barnabas." The καὶ implies, "though so good a man and so united in religious opinions with Paul." See Acts 9, 27, 11, 25. The phrase συναφεὶς αὐτῷ τῇ ὑπερτάλασσε elegantly develops the preceding συναφεῖς. This verb (as Borger remarks) signifies abripio, and the metaphor is taken from a torrent, which hurries any one away with it. The verb is somewhat rare; yet Elsner adduces some examples of it. The sentiment is illustrated by Schoettg. from Arrian, Epict. π, 9, τί ἑξαφανίστα τῶν τολμῶν; τί ὑπερτάλη Ἰουδαίως αὐτῷ Ἑλεήμονας; ωῷ ὀρᾶς, πας ἔκαστος λέγεται Ἰουδαῖος; πας Σοφος; πας Ἀγάπης; καὶ ὅταν ἐκαμφι- τερίζοντα λαμπρὸν, εἰσαμβαίνει λέγειν. οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαῖος.
14. ἄλλα τὰ ἐν τῇ τῇ ἱδρυμενοις ἡμῶν ἡμῖν παρατηρήσαντες, μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ὁμοῖαν, καὶ συνεδρίαν Ἰουδαίων ἔστιν καὶ ἡμῖν παρατηρήσαντες, ἐγγύς ἦς Ἰουδαίων, ἤρθος ἐν ἑλληνικῷ.

14. ἄλλα τὰ ἐν τῷ τῷ ὁσιωδότευον, "But when I perceived that they held not a right course, or did not (as we say) act with straightforwardness and integrity." For dissimulation, which runs into crooked and winding by-paths, is the reverse of this. The words τρεῖς ἡ τῷ ἱδρυμένων are (I think) added exegetically; and they seem to mean, "according to the true spirit and interest of the Gospel, which forbids singularity." Ὁσιωδότευον is said to occur no where but here, and with τρεῖς, Bover observes, it is synonymous with μικρόν στάχυς at 6, 16. The τρεῖς signifies according to.

14. έδοξὼν Ἡσυχίων τεμπείων, "I said unto Peter before them all." Agreeably to his own direction at 1 Tim. 5, 20. It is remarked by Dodd., that "had this been matter only of private offence, to be sure Paul would have known that duty required him to expostulate with Peter privately upon it, before he had brought it before such an assembly; but as it was a public affair, in which great numbers were so sensibly affected, this method was most proper."

The reprehension is this: Εἰ ών Ἰουδαῖος—Ἰουδαιζέων, which words are well paraphrased by Bover thus: "Si tu, Judæus natus, Judæorumque ritibus inutritus, nihil minus, religionem Christianam meliora edoctus, hase ceremonias deseruisti, atque adeo cum Ethnicis familiaritatem contrahere non dubitasti; quid demum est cause, cur quorundam adventu Judæorum perturbatus, denuo Judaicis ritibus magnum pretium statuere videri velia, teque Ethnicis corphæum præbeas, (noli enim, quantum valent doctoris exemplum,) ad eodem ritus Judaicos sequendos, ac peragendos?" I cannot, however, assent to that Commentator and Koppe, that ἔστι is to be taken for ἔστε; which is harsh and unnecessary;
since we have only to recur to that force of the present tense by which it denotes custom. The sense is: "If thou, though a Jew born, habitually live in the neglect of the Jewish observances," &c. To why. Many MSS. and some Fathers read πῶς, which makes no difference in the sense, but seems to be ex emendatione.

'Αμαρκάζειν must be here understood of moral compulsion, namely that of persuasion*, direct or indirect, as here; since this conduct tended indirectly to excite the Gentile converts to be circumcised. Ἰουδαίεσσι is for Ἰουδαίοις ἔγεμι, live in the observance of the Jewish rites and ceremonies. Theophyl. observes that Paul may very well be here supposed to loudly exclaim to all: "Imitate your teacher; for he, though a Jew, yet eats with heathens."

15. ἄγεις φίλεις Ἰουδαίου—έδοξες, &c. Before we proceed to the interpretation of this and the following verses, it is proper to advert to the question so long controverted, whether those verses are to be considered as forming part of the address of Paul to Peter, or as being directed to the Galatians. The former opinion is maintained by many modern Commentators, as Par., Fisc. Est., and Whitby, and most recent ones, as Hess, Rosenm., Bahrdt, Stroth, Titmann, and others mentioned by Borger. Some steer a middle course, and regard the address to Peter as ceasing at the end of ver. 17. As to the first opinion, it is recommended (as Borger remarks,) by an apparent facility, there being no plain vestige of any transfer of the address to the Galatians, and the words καταλύειν and εἰκοδομεῖν at ver. 18. seem more applicable to Peter's case than theirs. Yet facility is not always in St. Paul's writings always a characteristic of truth, but sometimes the contrary, since the Apostle often changes his address without distinctly showing it. Besides, as Borgher remarks,

* Borger aptly cites Liban. 455. τί ἡμᾶς ἀναγέλειν τοῖς θεοῖς Ἀδηναίων ἄνολοχοίν.
the Apostle is occupied in a confirmation of the opinion of those who thought the Mosaic rites necessary to justification, of which opinion was not Peter though he might sometimes assent, but some among the Galatians were. To them therefore the address could alone be useful, and not to Peter; and the words of ver. 18 may apply to their case as well as Peter's. To this I would add, that Paul was only concerned to point out and rebuke the dissimulation in Peter, and that would not have justified him giving the Apostle so long a lecture, and so little necessary. Besides, there is no appearance of any direct address in the greater part of this portion, inasmuch that some modern Commentators have endeavoured to remove that difficulty by supposing the address to Peter to be extended to ver. 17 or or 18. But the particles εἰ δὲ and εἶ γὰρ, which plainly refer to what precedes, entirely forbid this. Upon the whole, therefore, I cannot but consider the second opinion as the best founded.

Hυιὸς Ισραήλ eisires are Nominatives absolute. The sense is: "For we born Jews (and not Gentiles) well know." Εξ εἰσὶν εἰσαγωγῆς is (I think) a common periphrasis for εἰσαγομαι. See Grot. and Koppe. Thus, as Est. says, there is a latent recessus a Petro et ingressus ad materiam principalem. Borger rightly observes that this triling disagreement does not at all affect the question of inspiration, since it relates to facts, not doctrines. Nor does it seem that Paul so much disapproved of this accommodation to the opinions of weak Christians (since, by his own example, he recommends it) as that he took it amiss that Peter should in this place act the Jew, where he had himself preached directly contrary doctrines; for this seeming dissent of two principal teachers could not but be detrimental to the religion in general. On this account, then, and because by this sort of trimming, Peter favoured the notion that the rites of the Law were necessary to justification, he deserved this reprehension.
18. οὐ δικαιώτατα ἄνθρωπος εἰς ἔργαν νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διακατέστησα Ἰ. Χ. Here εἴναι μη is for ἀλλα; as in 1, 7; Rom. 14, 14, 1 Cor. 7, 17. As to the sense of δικαιώτατα, on that important term Borger has a long and elaborate annotation, in which he is much indebted to Koppe and Wittman. The conclusion he draws from the whole discussion of the sense of the term is this (p. 146.): "Liceat verbi δικαιώ-θαι significationem ita definire, ut non tantum sit, paenit eripi, quas Deus legis contemptoribus comminatus est; sed etiam, ut Wittman utar verbis, Opusc. p. 371. omnem omnino gratiam salutarem adipiscit, beari, salvare, bonorum omnium participem fieri, quorum demum per Christum et fidem in ejus Evangelium, in hoc et futurum vitæ participes fieri possimus. Deus itgitur δικαιών dicitur, cūm tale beneficium in homines confert; homines autem δικαιώταται, cūm tale beneficium adipsiscuntur."

'Εξ is for δια, by, as Rom. 3, 20. εἰς ἔργαν νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ: and so indeed sometimes our from. A similar sentiment is found in Rom. 3, 28. λογιζόμεθα γὰρ πίστει δικαιωθήναι ἄνθρωπον χωρίς ἔργαν νόμου.

The words καὶ ημεῖς εἰς Χ. Ἰ. ἐπιστεύκαμεν, οὐκ—νόμου may be rendered: "And the reason why we have embraced this belief is, that we might thereby attain that justification by the faith of Christ which we could not attain by the works of the Law. And then the Apostle adds: διότι οὐ δικαιωθήσεται εἰς ἔργαν νόμου πᾶσα σάρξ, which words occur in a similar passage of Rom. 3, 20. They have plainly the air of a citation, or accommodation of a passage of Scripture. There is at least an allusion to Ps. 143, 2. See the note on the passage of Romans.

17. εἰ δὲ χητοῦντες—ἀμαρτωλοί. The sentiment is expressed somewhat obscurely; but the sense is well explained by Theodoret (from Chrys.) thus: εἰ δὲ δι’ τὸν νόμον καταλείπουν τὸν Χριστὸν προσεληφθο-βάμεν, διὰ τῆς ἐπ’ auton πιστευτι τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἀπο-
...the author or producer of sin." It is remarked by Rosenm., that this is the objection of a Jew, supposing that where the Law of Moses is not, there there is no rule of life, not considering that there may be another rule in morals, although the ritual law is not observed. He thinks that the Apostle means this: "Whosoever reproaches us for neglecting the Mosaic Law, reproaches Christ himself, who abrogated this Law." Theophyl. observes that there is here a reductio ad absurdum, which is followed by μη γένοιτο; as is often the case when no other proof is necessary, but only an ἀπαγόρευσι is needed.

18. εἰ γάρ ἐν κατέλυσα—συνιστήμ. I assent to Rosenm. and Borger, that though the Apostle here uses the first person (through delicacy, and to lessen the reprehension,) yet he intends the words to be taken generally. So the French on. It is here well remarked by Theodoret, that he skilfully retorts and inverts the accusation: for as they had called the non observance of the Law a breach of it, so he calls the observance of the Law a transgression. See also Theophyl. Γὰρ, enimvero. Borger offers the following connexion and paraphrase: "Secundum, Petri-nam agendi rationem omnino sumus peccatores:" sive, "Petrus omnino pravè egit: si quis enim (γὰρ) iis rebus, quæ antea contempererit (κατέλυσε), nunc multum tribuit (αἰκόνει), is, malè se antea egisse hac ipsa animi inconstantià, confitetur, (παρα-

* Theophyl. paraphrases thus: 'Εδηνήειεν, φησι, διεκαθίζοντας ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀφέσει τῶν χώμων· διέ γέγένη ἦσαν ἀμαρτίας τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ τῶν χώμων· εἰς γαίτην λοιπὸν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ὁ Χριστὸς ἤμας συνύβησε· δι' ἑκείνον γὰρ ἀφέσειν τὰς νομικὰς παντὰ· οὕτως οὖν μόνον οὐκ ἔδικαλωσαν ἡμᾶς, ὡς φατε, ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείωνος παντελῶν αἷμας ἦμιν γέγονεν, ἐκ τοῦ ποιεῖται ἡμᾶς ἀφέναι τῶν χώμων.
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'étη εισερήν σωικτάσει:) itaque, ai legem Mosaicam, ut abrogatam, quis ante a migraverit, nunc vero huic legi, ut magnâ munitæ auctoritate, pareat, eo ipso ostendit ac confitetur, suam agendi rationem perver-
sam suisse anteà et temporarium, legisque se suisse violatorem, atque adeo se peccavisse graviter." Thus the γάρ, as referring to a sentence omitted, will retain its usual force. It is plain that in κατέλυσα and σινκέμον is an architectural metaphor, such as is frequent with our Apostle.

18. παραβάτην είμαις πωιστήμι, declare myself, approve and show myself to be a transgressor (and not an observer of the Gospel, as a teacher of it should be); namely, by setting up what God hath destroyed. This sense of σωικτήμι occurs in Rom 5, 8. 2 Cor. 7, 15, and in the Classical writers, from whom examples are adduced by Munth and the other Philological Commentators.

19. εγὼ γάρ διὰ νόμου νομίμοις απέθανας, ἦν Θεός Ἰησός. Here we have a somewhat enigmatical sentence, which certain antient and early modern Commentators very injudiciously torture. By νόμιμοι is evidently meant (as all are agreed) the law of Moses: but on the sense of νόμου there is a difference of opinion. Some antient and modern Commentators think it donotes the New Covenant; which interpretation may be defended; but I prefer to understand it (with many modern Commentators) of the Christian religion. So Rosenm. and Borger, who refer for examples of this use to Rom. 8, 2. compared with 3, 27. 6, 11. 7, 4. It is strange that he should have omitted 6, 2. "fulfil the law of Christ." By being dead to a law is plainly meant, no longer observing it. Rosenm. very well renders thus: "by one law (or doctrine) I am dead to another," i.e. the Christian doctrine has occasioned me to cast aside that Mosaic religion. ἦν Θεός Ἰησός. Here the Apostle indicates the intent with which he had rejected the law. The consequence, or result of it (he says) was, that he "lived unto God;" which
signifies, lived to the honour of God, and this by the observance of his religion. So ver. 20. ὅποι οὖν ἐξ ὑπακούσα τῷ τὸν Θεόν. Now the Jews lived not unto God in this sense, but unto themselves, by persisting in the observance of a law by which they gratified themselves rather than pleased God; a law, too, which far less promoted the glory of God. Here Borges aptly compares Dionys. Hal. L. 3, 17. ἐὰν εὑρίσκης παν, ἔπειτα προς τοὺς, ἐφ' ἐκείνη τοῦ τετρα ἱματίαν, καὶ προς ὅπου τῆς ἑαυτῆς ὑποτασσόμενον.

20. Χριστός σωτήρ ἡμῶν. The Apostle here (as Borges observes) compares the death just mentioned with that of Christ on the cross; a comparison frequent in St. Paul; as Rom. 6, 6, 7, 4. Gal. 5, 24. It is remarked by Rosenm.: “Repetit, se mortuum esse legi, sed alio verbo utitur, quia per omnia Christo, in cruce mortuo, similis esse capit. Homo tropice moritur, quando desinit esse talis, qualis antea fuerat. Ergo Paulus dicere vult: Non sum amplius Judeus, et contemptor religionis Christiana. Mea pristina vitae ratio desit.”

20. ἦν ἢ, οὐ ἦ τοι ἑταίρῳ. ἦν ἢ ἦν ἦ τοι ἑρίτος. Borges very well renders thus: “This life which I now live, freed from the power of the law and sin, is not properly to be called my own, but is entirely owing to Christ, who worketh in me and, as it were, liveth (is in me the vital principle):” or, as the Apostle elsewhere expresses himself, ἐγενήθην ἐτέρω, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγενήθην, ἵνα καρποφορήσω τῷ Θεῷ, Rom. 7, 4. The whole passage is thus elegantly paraphrased by Tittmann, Praefat. Opusc. p. 13. “Christ, his love, life, death, doctrine, example, salvation, glory, is to me, as it were, the vital principle, which animates me to do what I do; I am entirely occupied with the religion of Christ, I spend my whole life in preaching the Christian doctrine.”

At δ’ must be supplied καθ’, quatenus. Ἔν τισιν ἦν ἢ, &c. These words, Borges observes, may signify: “I am occupied in the Christian religion, by pro-
fessing and by teaching it." Yet he thinks τοῦ νοῦ may be put for ἐν τῷ νῷ, or εἰς τὴν νοῦν, a genitive of object; as Matt. 10, 1. ἐκωσία πνευμάτων. The sense, he says, will then be as follows: "as long as I continue on this earth, I mind not the Mosaic laws and ceremonial observances, but my very life itself consists in faith in Jesus Christ; to this faith I entirely give myself." Finally, he observes, that the phrase ἡν ἐν τῷ, denotes to be devoted to any thing and the pursuit of it; as Cicero says: "an imposs vivere, nisi in literis viverem?"

In τοῦ ἀγαθήσαντος με, καὶ παραδόντος ἐαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμῶν there is (I think with Koppe and Borger) a sort of hendiadís for: "who so loved me as to yield himself to death for me." Koppe remarks that the Hebrew copula ò is often so used.

21. ὅπι ἄδειε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, "So far from despising this divine goodness, as shown ἐν τῷ δίκαιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκ πίστεως, I rather highly value it." Such is the force of the negation in Hebrew as to indicate the very opposite, as Ps. 84, 12. Zach. 8, 17. Hebr. 13, 2. Apoc. 12, 11. (Borger.)

I cannot see why Koppe should take ἄδειε in a future sense, "I will not, cannot bring myself to;" which is very harsh. He is, however, right in supposing that in the next sentence there is a clause omitted, to which γὰρ refers, as ἄδειε δὲ δοσις ἐκ νόμου θέλει ἐτι δικαιοῦθαι; or thus: "which I should do, if I were to aim at obtaining the favour of God by the observance of the Mosaic law." The sense of the passage is thus expressed by Borger: "if, by obeying the Mosaic law, and celebrating the Jewish rites, we can obtain justification from God (See ver. 16.), it follows, that Christ died in vain." He then notices, with approbation, the following remark of Chrys. on this passage: Εἰ γὰρ ἀπεθάνατο ὁ Χριστὸς, εὐθείᾳ δι' αὐτοῦ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἴσχύειν τῶν νόμων ἡμᾶς δικαιοῦν εἰ δὲ ὁ νόμος δικαιοὶ, περιττῶς ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θάνατος.
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Διακρατον, causelessly, in vain. So the Hebr. בְּמִין in Job. 1, 9. Ez. 6, 10, which is sometimes by the Sept. rendered μάτην.

CHAP. III.

VER. 1. οἱ ἄνωτοι Γαλάται, τῆς θυμὸς ἐθάοκαν. Theophyl. remarks, that having shown in the preceding chapter that he was not an Apostle of men, or by men, and having established himself as ἀξιότατος, he now proceeds to speak μέτα πλεονεκριῶν απερριών. Borger observes, that the Apostle proceeds to prove what he had himself asserted at 2, 6.; and this he does by arguing, 1st. from the example of the Galatians, 1—5.; 2dly, from that of Abraham, 6. seqq. “Now (continues he) in order to rouse the attention of the Galatians, and show them the high moment of what he is going to urge on their attention, he addresses them by name.” And this he does with the addition of the epithet ἄνωτοι.* Yet the rebuke it conveys was merited, and not unaffectionate, as partaking of paternal plainness of speech. They had, it appears, with the levity and inconstancy of their nation (descended as they were from the Galli), suffered themselves to be shaken from the doctrines which Paul had inculcated, by the seductions of some false teachers.

There is great energy and pathos in the interrogation τῆς θυμὸς ἐθάοκαν; which literally signified bewitched, fascinated, or rather in a metaphorical

* The word does not (I think) denote simply folly, or stupidity. Though Callim. in Delum. 184. (cited by Wets.) says, ἀσπίδας, αἱ Γαλάται κακὴν ὄθεν ἄφροι φύλοι Σχέσονται. Yet I know of no good authority for supposing them to have been such; and (as Wets. observes) unless Themist. 299. α. be speaking ironically, he calls them οἰκεῖ καὶ ἀγγείον, characteristics of their ancestors, the ancient French, which was transmitted to their latest posterity. Perhaps the Apostle only calls them ἄνωτοι, as respects the present case, in having suffered themselves to be deceived.
sense, seduced; deceived. This verb is a somewhat rare one,* occurring no where else in the New Testament, and seldom in the Classical writers (indeed and hardly ever in this sense), who use for it γητεύω and καταγητεύω. Plutarch, however, 2, 680. has καταβασκαίνει in this sense.

1. ἀλλ' ἐφανέντας Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη, εἰν οὖν ἐσταιροφένεις. The sense seems to be this: "to whom Jesus Christ hath been represented before your minds eyes (as in a picture) crucified." The phrase κατ' ἐφανέντας, is equivalent to πρὸ ἐφανέντας, or εἰν ἐφανέντι, all which occur in the Classical writers. The πρὸ is explained by Grot. and others before; better by others publicly; as in προκηρύσσει. The sense is: "You to whom the truths of the Gospel, especially that of the great doctrine of the atonement by the blood of Jesus, and not by that of bulls and goats, or any other of the Mosaic rites." This great truth was set forth, partly in the preaching of Paul (who at 1 Cor. 1, 23: says: "we preach Christ crucified," and at 1 Cor. 2, 2. "to know Jesus Christ and him crucified"), and partly in the lively representation of the death of Christ in the Eucha-

* It is derived by the Greek Commentators from φανεῖ and καίνειν. See Schol. on Arist. Plut. 571. and Gall. N. A. 13, 6. referred to by Schleusen. It should seem then that they thought the evil was communicated through the eyes; as serpents are said to fascinate birds, so that they fall down to the earth, and become their prey. So Hes. Hymnus, cited by Borger. "Fascinare proprius dicuntur, qui sic impetunt humanis sensibus, et praecipue oculis, ut aed formâ res apparent, quàm re verâ se habeant." He also refers to A. Morus ad h. l., and thinks that this may be explained by the words which follow, ὥς κατ' ἐφανέντας Χ. προεγράφη. But I think this exceedingly precarious; and Koppe rejects the derivation on which this interpretation is founded as visionary, deducing it from διάκειν (for διακεῖν), equivalent to κακολογεῖν, to calumniate, eny. (See his annotation.) But the subject is too extensive a one, and too little connected with the real sense of the Apostle to be treated of in this place. The Apostle (I apprehend) only means it in the sense seduce, deceive, literally talk you over; as conjurors or mountebanks do.
rist.* Some would take ἐν ὑμῖν for ἐνερ ὑμῖν. But this seems very harsh, nay, unauthorized: and though the words ἐν ὑμῖν may not seem necessary with ἀλά (whence it is easy to account for their omission in a few MSS.; for as to versions, they are in such a case as this of no authority), yet nothing is more frequent in identical and popular phraseology than this use both of the relative and the nominative for which it stands. See 1 Pet. 2, 24.

The clause τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι (where it is necessary to subauda ὡστε), though rejected by most recent critics, is ably defended by Matthæi.

It is very well observed by Doddr., that there is no room to object, that this is merely an argument to the passions; for in proportion to the affecting sense they had of the love of Christ in submitting to crucifixion for them, would be the rational sense of the obligations they were under to him to preserve his Gospel pure, and his church free and happy."

2. τοῦτο μένον βέλω—πίστεως; Suam stabiliturum sententiam Paulus, testem laudat ipsum Galatarum experientiam quâ certâ scirent edocti, se omnem illim mentis mutationem, et, quæ cum hac erat conjuncta, miraculorum efficiendorum vim et facultatem soli πίστει debere. (Borger.)

Τοῦτο βέλω μαθεῖν ἀρ’ ὑμῶν. This seems to be a common formula (of which Wets. adduces many examples), signifying, "in short, to omit other considerations." On the meaning of the next words there has been no little difference of opinion. In determining this, it is proper to enquire what is meant by ἐλάβετε τὸ πνεύμα. The antient and the early modern Commentators, as Est., Menoch.,

Vorst., Tirinus, Grot., Gomar, Doddr., and, of the recent ones, Borger and Schoettg., understand it of the Holy Spirit, and its various gifts and graces, both internal and external, ordinary and extraordinary, such as were then found in many believers. So Theophyl.: τὸ ἔλαβετε Πνεῦμα ἁγιον, καὶ το- σοῦτον δύναμιν καὶ σημεία ἐποίησατο; and Chrys. 787, 15. εἰργάσασθε δυνάμεις πολλὰς, ἐπετελέσατε σημεῖα, νεκρῶς ἐγείρωστε, λεπρῶς καθαίρωστε, προφητεύουστε, γλαύσσαις λαλῶντες. Most recent Commentators, however, as Koppe and Rosenm., interpret it: “nobilior, perfectior sentiendi agendique ratio et con- suetudo quae est effectus doctrinæ Christianæ;” Rom. 8, 4. Thus Morus renders: “scientiam religionis interna spectantis, cum effectis et commodis suis.” And so Slade explains: “became ye Christians? were ye admitted into covenant with God, of which the gifts of the spirit were a sure testimony?” This last interpretation is indeed very specious (as is also that of Mackn., who has here a long discussion, though little to the purpose); but I see no reason to desert the first mentioned and far more common acceptation, which is (I think) placed beyond a doubt by the words of ver. 5, with which the present are closely connected, ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν. Koppe indeed objects, that it cannot be admitted, unless all the Galatians, without any one exception, be supposed to have received these gifts. But the learned Commentator exaggerates the difficulty unnecessarily. Nothing is more common than to pronounce that in general terms (as if of all) which is confined only to a part. By ye need only be understood the Galatian church. Yet it is not quite clear to me whether it might not be understood of the Christian church in general, i. e. ye Christians; though it might be true chiefly of some members of the churches of Jerusalem and Corinth, and perhaps a few other congregations. The Apostle’s argument would hold good equally on that ground. For if only a com-
paratively few well authenticated instances of the efficacy of the Holy Spirit in the communication of such extraordinary and miraculous gifts as were never imparted, would be as satisfactory a proof of the divine origin of the religion they supported, as if every member of every congregation had received them.

The words ἐγὼ ἁκοφὶς πίστεως are variously explained. But if we consider them as antithetical to ἐγὼ ἐργῶν νῦν, we shall have no reason to stumble at them. The antients evidently took ἁκοφὶς πίστεως for τὴν πίστεως, the Gospel. It is not necessary to render "doctrina religionis," as Glass, Tittman, Koppe, and many modern Commentators; still less to take ἁκοφὶς for ὑσσαργὸς. It is plain that πίστεως, being opposed to νῦν, must mean the Gospel, the Christian religion: and as to the words added, ἐργῶν, and ἁκοφὶς, they are of great force, but chiefly serve to ornament the idea. The expression works of the law, is elsewhere used for the law; as in Rom. 9, 32. where, in like manner, faith is opposed to the works of the law. The addition is made, to hint at the nature of the law, which related wholly to works. So also ἁκοφὶς is added to πίστεως because, as the Apostle says, Rom. 10, 17., faith cometh by hearing, i. e. (as he then explains) by the hearing of the word of God preached. The same expressions are repeated at ver. 5.

3. οὕτως ἁκοφὶς εῦτε; There is great δεσμός in this clause, and especially in thus suspending the two members of the sentence each on an interrogation. As to the next words, the antient Commentators have, without reason, taken ἐκπαθεῖν in a passive sense. Its being opposed to ἐναρξάμενος shows that it must be taken (as is done by Grot. and most modern Commentators since his time) in an active sense, i. e. as a deponent. And this is countenanced by a parallel passage of Phil. 1, 6., ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑπὲρ ἐργῶν ὡγάνθε ἐκπαθεῖν. It is plain that ἐναρξάμενος ἐκπαθεῖν is for ἐργάσειν ἐν ἐκπαθεῖν; and ἐκ must be,
repeated after ἁμαρτ. The verb ἀμαρτ. is sometimes used in the Old Testament, but very rarely in the Classical writers.

It is not difficult to see what is meant by the two other opposites πνευματικός and ἁμαρτ., the former of which must refer to the powerful gifts of the Spirit, ordinary and extraordinary, which followed baptism and the sincere profession of the Christian faith. By "concluding in the flesh" is meant, taking up with those external and fleshly ordinances of the law which were mere forms, and only typical of the internal and spiritual gifts of the Gospel. In reference to the double opposition of members in this sentence, Borger notices an observation of Koppe, namely, that St. Paul, when he puts two verbs or nouns in opposition to each other, often ascribes a notion to one of the opposites which it has not of itself, except in the opposition; and thus he accommodates the signification of one to that of the other. Launæus, Moldenhauer, and Ernesti, here take πνευματικός to mean the Gospel; and ἁμαρτ., the Law of Moses. But this is going too far; since we cannot suppose that any had gone over to the Jewish faith. Some antient and modern Commentators think that there is here a metaphor taken from the race course; which is probably true; though Synesius seems to have thought it an architectural metaphor, as far as one may judge from a passage cited from him by Wets., τοῖς ἐνθρυμένοις πρέσβεις ἐκουσώμεθα, in which he appears to have had the present passage in mind.

4. ταύτα ἐκάβετε εἰς; ἐγε καὶ εἰς. On the interpretation of these words the Commentators are divided in opinion. The question hinges entirely on the signification to be affixed to ἐκάβετε, which all the antient, and all modern Interpreters up to the eighteenth century, take in a bad sense, understanding it of the persecutions and difficulties they had suffered in entering on the course of their Christian profession. On the contrary, the more modern
Commentators, as Homberg, Adam, and Starek, and almost all the recent ones, as Kypke, Rosenm., Zacharias, Koppe, Borger, Schleusner, and others, maintain that it is to be taken in a good sense, and understood of what immediately precedes, namely, the spiritual blessings they had received. And these Commentators have proved that πάντα is used by the Greek Classical writers in a good sense as well as a bad one. But this is almost always with the addition of some particle: as εἰ, ἀγαθόν, or the like: and they only adduce one instance of this (and that doubtful), from the Classical writers, and not one from the Scriptural ones. Whereas instances of πάντα in a bad sense, and without the addition of καθὼς, κακῶς, or the like, very often occur both in the Classical and the Scriptural writers. So Demosth. c. Conon. ὑβρισθέλα, ὑ ἄνδρες δικασταῖ, καὶ πάντως ὑπὸ κόσμου τούτου τοιαύτα: and Lucian de Gymn. 13. μάτη τοιαύτα πάντοτε. See more in Elsner, Bos, and Wolf. And so Mark 5, 26. τολλᾶ παθῶσαι. Matt. 16, 21. τολλὰ παθεῖν ὧδε τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. 27, 19. τολλὰ γὰρ ἐκαθὼς δι' αὐτῶ. Luke 13, 2. τοιαύτα πεπόθησιν, and elsewhere. In Matt. 16, 21., 1 Pet. 4, 19., it is used of suffering persecution. In a bad sense the word perpetually occurs in St. Paul’s writings, never in a good one. Thus the new interpretation is refuted both by positive and by negative arguments, and the common one is undoubtedly to be retained, especially as it yields manifestly a better sense, and is more agreeable to the style of St. Paul. The Apostle diversifies the argument, first by asking whether, after possessing such high and distinguished spiritual graces, and solid benefits, they will take up with mere external rites, only typical of them; q. d. “shall the benefits ye have received by the Gospel be changed into empty ceremonies?” Then he aptly subjoins: “And shall the difficulties and persecutions ye have undergone in order to attain these blessings have been undergone in vain?” Besides, the words following, εἶγε καὶ έκι, are infinitely more
apposite on the common interpretation than on the new one. The brevity of the expression εἰς καὶ εἰκῇ was caused by the delicacy of the Apostle. The words necessary to complete the sense are easily supplied from the context, and the nature of the subject, i.e. "if indeed ye will act so as to have suffered them in vain." As to the difficulties and evils alluded to, what, I would ask, is so probable as that they should have suffered them? Were they to be exempt from the trials which invariably attended the profession of the Gospel everywhere, and of which we have such frequent mention or allusion in the New Testament?

Indeed, the new interpretation is so far-fetched and frigid that not all the learning and ingenuity which have been expended to the establishment of it by Kypke, Koppe, Borger, and others (whose matter I must omit), can make it even tolerable.

5. ὅσον εἰκχορηθῶν ὑμῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα—πίστεως; The Apostle now proceeds to resume the subject of ver. 2. The ὅσον is not merely transitive (as Koppe treats it), but (I think) serves to an epanalepsis; as in Eph. 4.1. 1 Cor. 8.4., and often; verses 3 & 4 being parenthetical. Εἰκχορηθῶν is, by some Commentators, as Koppe and Borger, regarded as a participle put for a finite verb, with the ellipsis of τοῦ. But it seems more regular, and agreeable to the style of the Apostle, to regard the sentence as highly elliptical, something in the latter member εἰς εἰργῶν—πίστεως being to be supplied from the former one, namely, εἰκχορηθῆσαι from εἰκχορηθῶν, which is the participle imperfect, not present, and εἰργῆσαι from εἰργῶν. The term εἰκχορηγεῖν is not (as Borger considers it) the same with the simple, but the εἰκ. has an intensive force. It is of more importance, however, to attend to the sense of εἰργῶν δυνάμεως ἐν ὑμῖν, which all the ancient Commentators rightly understand of the supernatural and miraculous gifts of the Apostolic age. Nor do the modern Commentators deny this. Some recent ones, however, as Koppe and
Rosenm. ascribe to the & the sense inter, rendering "qui patravit miracula;" which would remove the miracles from the Galatians to Paul himself, or other Apostles. But (as Borger, who was half inclined to adopt that interpretation, acknowledges,) it is by no means agreeable to the context. "The Apostle (says he) is speaking of the spirit received by the Galatians, conjoined with the power of working miracles, or (which is more probable) the pneuma must be here taken in the same sense as at ver. 2.; though the force of the pneuma here St. Paul further develops, when he makes mention of its principal charisma, namely, the working of miracles." I would suggest another proof, deduced from the usus loquendi, of the futility of the above interpretation. It may safely be asserted that ἐνεργεῖν ἐν never means patrare inter, either in the New Testament or the Classical writers: whereas, though it often occurs in Scripture, yet it is always in the sense of to work or produce effects in anyone, and almost always miraculous ones. So Matt. 14, 2. ἀν δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ: and Mark 6, 19. supra 2, 8. (where see the note.) 1 Cor. 12, 6. of the supernatural gifts. See also 1 Thess. 2, 13. 2 Thess. 2, 7. And numerous are the passages where ἐν following ἐνεργεῖν signifies in, not inter. It is truly remarked by Borger, that this, and other such passages, in which the Apostles make mention of miracles, of which those to whom they wrote were witnesses, are calculated to powerfully establish and confirm the divine origin of the Christian religion. (Compare 2 Cor. 12, 12. 1. Thess. 1, 5. al.) But if this be the case, what must we think of the judgment or the intentions of those who (as most recent foreign Commentators) have the temerity to adopt modes of interpretation destructive of this glorious evidence of the truth of the Gospel?

6. καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιστευεται τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐξεγέρθη αὐτῷ ἐς δικαιοσύνην. The Apostle now adduces a new argument, derived from the faith of Abraham, ver. 6—19., such as was calculated to produce much
effect on the Jews and Judaizers, since Abraham was the author of their nation, and celebrated for the illustrious proofs he gave of his faith; as is found both from the New Testament and the Rabbinical writers. See Rom. 4, 3. James 2, 23., and the notes there.* The passage here adduced by Paul is from Gen. 15, 6. (according to the Sept.), from which it only deviates in the transposition of the words Ἀβραὰμ and ἐλευθερία. The Hebrew is as follows: בַּרְצָה וְיָדָעַת וּלְתַח עַל. The Sept. seem to have used the passive for the middle ἐλευθερία, which the Apostle adopts. And so they have rendered the passive יָדָעַת in Ps. 106, 31. by the passive ἐλευθερία. See Surenh. βιβλ. κατ. p. 448.

Now the correspondence and agreement of the faith of Abraham with that of Christians consists in this, that each is shown by confidence in the Divine promises. Abraham gave a double and illustrious proof of faith; 1st, in reposing entire confidence in the promise of God that he should have offspring in extreme old age. (Genes. 15, 5 & 6.) 2dly, in not hesitating to sacrifice the child of his age, and source of his hopes. (Gen. 22. James 2, 21—23.) Hence the expressions of St. Paul and St. James are easy to be reconciled. St. Paul speaks of the former evidence of Abraham's faith; St. James, of the latter, inasmuch as this was shown in deeds. Of the Christian faith we treated supra 2, 16. We grant that the force of the phrase λαοίς εἰς δικαιοσύνη is not to be formed from the common doctrinal works; since this phrase, used of Abraham and Pinæaus (Gen. supra, Num. 23, 11 & 12. Ps. 106, 31.) cannot, without great harshness, be interpreted of what in the Schools is called justification. Yet it must not be

* "In order to feel the weight of St. Paul's argument, we must bear in mind that Abraham was justified by faith even before his circumcision; so that that was of no moment to procure him the favour of God; as the Apostle fully shows at Rom. 4. And the same thing is observed in Just. Martyr's Dial. cum Tryph. p. 340. Thirlby." (Borger.)
concluded, that as the δικαιοσύνη of Abraham and
Pinehas is not to be understood of the remission of
sins, and the consequent bestowal of benefits, nei-
ther does the Christian justification consist in for-
giveness of sins, and consequent acceptance and fel-
licity with God. For as the faith of Abraham is
very different from that of Christians, so also must be
the justification proceeding from thence be different.
With the Apostle the force of the word has greater
extent than with Moses. (Borger.)

The phrase λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην is of the same
signification as δικαιοσύνη. See Rom. 4, 2. compared
with 3. So also they are interchanged by James 2,
21 & 23. For neither from this term is the notion
of divine favour and consequent benefits to be ex-
cluded. Thus James (supra) conjoins the phrases
ἐλογίζῃ αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην and φίλος Θεου ἐκλείπῃ,
of which one is explanatory of the other; and at
ver. 25. he adds: 'Ραδα η πόρνη ὡς εξ ἐργῶν ἐδικαιώθη'
which words are, doubtless, to be explained of the
benefits which accrued to Rahab. See Jos. 2, 6.
Again, when at Rom. 4, 3. the Apostle had said
ἐπιστευσε—δικαιοσύνη, he subjoins, at ver. 4. τῷ δὲ
ἐργαζόμενῳ—χάριν, a metaphor taken from a work-
man’s wages, which is applied to the advantages and
benefits consequent on the faith of Abraham. So
Heb. 11, 7. κατεσκέασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου
αὐτοῦ—καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονό-
μος, where σωτηρία and δικαιοσύνη denote the same
thing. (Borger.)

7. The Apostle (as Chrys. observes) now proves
this from the testimony of the Old Covenant. Γι-
ώσκετε ἀρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, αὐτοὶ εἰσὶν ὁι Ἀβραὰμ.
"Know ye, therefore, that those who are of faith
are the genuine sons of Abraham." Οἱ ἐκ πίστεως
(on which see the note on 2, 12.) is equivalent to οἱ
πιστεόνετε, as opposed to the οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι. It is
well remarked by Theophyl. and CEcumen.: "Since
they had feared lest by letting go the law they should,
fall from their spiritual affinity to the Patriarch (on which they so much prided themselves), the Apostle shows them that, on the contrary, the faith makes them rather sons of Abraham who possess it.

The expression μιαν Ἀβραὰμ is used agreeably to that idiom of the Hebrew and Hebrew Greek, by which the term is applied to any near affinity, and strong resemblance of disposition and manners. See Rom. 4, 11 & 12, and Joh. 8, 39, and the notes. This idiom is sometimes found in the early Greek writers. Thus Borger cites Hom. II. 5. 800 & 812.

8. προϊδώσας δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι πίστεως δικαίως τὰ ἔθνη ἢ Θεος, "not only are believers sons of Abraham (i.e. like unto him, see ver. 7.) in faith, but also in justification." Hence the particle δὲ may be aptly rendered enim. See Mark 16, 8. Luke 12, 2. Joh. 6, 40. 1 Cor. 10, 11. (Borger).

By the Scripture, which has here, by metaphor, an action ascribed to it, we are to understand the author of Scripture, God, who gave the Law (see Chrysost. and Theoph.) or the Holy Spirit. Borger here refers to Glass's canon 22. de verbis. Η γραφή is for αἱ γραφαὶ. Δικαίως is said by Kypke to be the present for the future, "would justify, save, and bless." Εκ πίστεως is for διὰ πίστεως.

8. προεκχειλισσατο, prænuntiavit, promisit. Of this signification an example is adduced by Wolf from Philo. The term, as Theophyl. remarks, implies desire on the part of Abraham.

8. οὖτε εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοί πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. A promise repeatedly made; as Gen. 12, 3. 18, 18. 22, 18. 26, 4. 28, 14. From a comparison of the Hebr. and Sept. Borger thinks it will appear, that the Apostle has closely adhered to neither, but formed his sentence out of two different passages, i.e. εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ is from the former part of Gen. 12, 3. and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς from the latter part of Gen. 22, 18. The construction, of a plural verb with a neuter plural noun is very rare in the Classical writers; yet it occasionally occurs in the later ones.
8. ἐν σοι, τῷ, by, through thee, because of thee.* Abraham, it must be remembered, attained this justification before the promulgation of the law; an evident proof that the law was not necessary thereto. It is well observed by Chrysost., that this is meant to serve an important purpose: for since it was a difficulty with them, that the law is the more antient, and the faith subsequent to the law, the Apostle destroys this fancy also, by showing that the faith is (as is plain from the case of Abraham) in reality more antient than the law.

9. ἄντε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογώνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. To repress this fear of being accursed, if they kept not to the law, the Apostle shows them that, on the contrary, they shall be blessed by leaving it, and coming to the faith, as faithful Abraham was blessed. (Theophyl.) The sense is: from all this, then, it is made out, that as Abraham obtained felicity by believing and trusting, so also those who have faith, are to enjoy felicity. (Borger.)

10. δόν γαρ ἐξ ἔργων νομοῦ, &c. The Apostle now proceeds to further draw out the thread of the argumentation, and makes it out clearly, that those who contended that salvation might be obtained by the observance of the law, and wished so to obtain it, were liable to divine punishment. Now as brevity and abruptness of expression are frequent with St. Paul, so also here there seems to be something left to be supplied from the context, by a kind of enthymema; &c. Those who think their salvation depends on the law, must observe the law, because God threatens

punishment to those who transgress it: but all transgress; it follows therefore, that they are all justly punished. (Borger.)

The sense is admirably illustrated by Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) as follows: "Iac μετις ἐκτετέθη λέγον, ὅτι εἰκάτω ὁ Ἀβραάμ ἀπὸ πίστεως ἠλογισθη καὶ ἐδικαιάθη, διότι οὐκ ἐνόμος ἦν. οὐ δὲ δειξὼν μοι ὅτι μεθ’ ὧ δὲ καὶ τὸν κύριον, η δικαιομένου ποιεῖ δεικνύον ὁ ἄρσιτος τοῦ, ὥσ τινι εἰς τὴν δικαιίαν καὶ εἰλογίαν, ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ τὸ νόμος ἀμαρτίας καὶ κατάρας αὐτίς γίνεται: οὐδές γὰρ ποιεῖν δύναται τὸ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὦ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ἐτικαταρατος." Ουτε τῆς πιστεως ἐστι τὸ εὐλογεῖν, καὶ μάτην ὑμῖν φοβεῖσθι μήπωτε ἐτικαταρατοι γίνονται εἰκοσάτετε τοῦ νόμου μᾶλλον γὰρ χρισμοι αὐτῶν ἢ κατάρας, ἐστε, ὦσ μὴ δυνάμεις πληρωσίν αὐτῶν.

In the words following the Apostle is supposed not to have followed either the Hebrew or Greek. But it should be remembered, that until the Text of the Sept. be regularly formed, we cannot fully ascertain how far the Apostle followed or deserted that version.

Borger observes, that ἐμέκεν εἰν νόμῳ is good Greek: and he cites Lucian 1, 606, to which I add Soph. Aj. 350. ἐμέκενατε ὁθεῖ. So also Thucyd. 5, 56. ἐμέκενατε τοῖς ὄρκοις and often elsewhere.

11. ἄτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ αἰδεῖς—ς, γίνεταί. The δὲ is continuous, and may be rendered and again. ''Εν νόμῳ, "by the observance of the law." Παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, apud Deum, q. d. "however it may be with men." There is, Theophyl. thinks, an allusion to the Pharisees, who approved themselves unto men, rather than unto God.

On the scope and sense of this verse it is remarked by Theoph., that having shown that the law maketh accurred, but the faith blesseth, he now shows also that the faith alone justifieth, and not the law: and he brings in the Prophet Habakkuk, saying, That by faith shall the just live, and not from the law: for the law requires not faith only, but works: since, then, the law, because of its difficulty of being accomplished, could not justify, but put men under the
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curse, grace came showing an easy way, named faith, by which being justified we are blessed." On the sense of the passage of Habakkuk see more in the note on Rom. 1, 17.

11. οὐ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως γίνεται. The interpretation of Mackn. and others, "The just by faith shall live," is very properly rejected by Bp. Middleton, who observes that thus we should have had οὗ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως, or else οὐ ἐκ πίστεως δίκαιος. "Besides (continues he), to say that he who is just, or justified by faith, shall live, amounts to very little; but to affirm that the good man, he whose obedience, though imperfect, is sincere, shall reap life everlasting from faith (as opposed to a law of works,) and from faith alone, is a most important declaration; and it agrees exactly with the context: That no man, says the Apostle, is justified under the law, is evident; for one of the prophets hath said, 'The just shall live by faith.'"

12. ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ πίστεως, "As therefore no one can attain justification except by faith, and faith has nothing common with the law, it follows (as was said at ver. 11.) οὐδένα δικαιώματι ἐν νόμῳ. Such is the connexion, which ought not to have been broken by the distinction of the verses. 'Ο δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ πίστεως, "the law requires not faith (but works.)"

So Theodoret well paraphrases: ὁ νόμος οὐ πίστις ἔγειται, ἀλλὰ πράξεων ἄγαντες, καὶ τοὺς φυλαττοὺς τὴν ἐν σώζει ἐπαγγέλλεται. (Borger.)

12. οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ, i.e. literally, "does not depend upon."

13, 14. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν—κατάρας, i.e. literally, "Christ hath bought us off from the curse of the law, by becoming a curse for us." This seems to be a sort of hypallage for ἐξηγόρασεν τὴν κάταραν. Ἐξαγ. signifies to liberate a captive by the payment of a ransom. But in laying down the general sense of the passage it is necessary to determine who are the subjects of this assertion, and what is the nature of the curse from which they are said to be delivered,
Now the antient and many modern Commentators, especially Crellius, and almost all the recent ones, understand the subject to be the Jews; and the law mentioned, to be the law of Moses. And this seems to be confirmed by what precedes. But many modern Commentators, as Grot., Whitby, Dodd., and Mackn., maintain that the ἰμας has respect to both Jews and Gentiles; and by the law, Dodd., Mackn., and Whitby say, is meant the law of nature as well as the law of Moses. This is ably supported by the two last mentioned Commentators.*

* The former of whom (inter alia) observes, that to restrict the words He redeemed us from the curse of the Law, to the Jews only, is in effect to say, Christ only suffered for the Jews, since he only suffered by hanging on the cross, the tree on which he expired. The Gentiles were not indeed subject to the particular maledictions contained in the Law of Moses, because that Law was not given to them, but only to the Jews. But they were subject to that death which was the general punishment threatened to the violators of the law, and was the curse denounced against Adam and his seed. And since it was by virtue of Christ's hanging on the cross, that the blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles, he must have been thus made a curse for them also, and not for the Jews only. And the latter remarks: "That the persons here said to be bought off from the curse of the law, are the Gentiles as well as the Jews, is evident from ver. 10, where the Apostle tells us, 'As many as are of the works of the law,' that is, as many as are bound to perform works of law, and seek to be justified thereby, are under the curse. For the proposition being general, it implies, that the Gentiles as well as the Jews are under the curse, and need to be bought off. This appears, likewise, from the purpose for which Christ is said, ver. 14, to have bought us off, namely, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the nations, that is, on both Jews and Gentiles. Next, the curse of the law, from which all are bought off by Christ, is not a curse peculiar to the law of Moses. For as the Gentiles were never under that law, they could have no concern with its curse. But it is the curse of that more antient law of works under which Adam and Eve fell, and which through their fall came on all their posterity. And it is the curse of the law of nature under which all mankind, as the subjects of God's universal moral government, are lying, for having broken that law. These curses are called by the general name of the curse of the law, not as being peculiar to the law of Moses, but because they were published in the law of Moses. See ver. 10, note 2. From this curse of the law of works Christ hath bought us off, by becoming a curse for us. For in the view of his death to be accomplished in due time, God allowed...
which ought to be preferred is no easy matter. The words preceding, and also γέγραψαν, &c. somewhat confirm the latter: for the ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, &c. is closely connected with Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς—κατάρα. This Borger would unite with ver. 12., making ver. 13. parenthetical: which, however, seems harsh. Perhaps the former interpretation may deserve the preference, and the construction is ably traced by Theophr. (from Chrysost.) as follows: ἵνα μὴς ἄντειξῃ, λέγων, ὅτι ἀληθῶς μὲν ὃ μὴ ποιήσων τὸν νόμον ἐπικαταρατότως, καὶ ὅτι ἡ κατάρα ἐκεῖνη ἀνήρτησαι; δεδοίκαμεν γὰρ μήπως ἦν ὑπὸ τὸν ἄθικον τὸν νόμον ἄπαξ γενόμενι, ἵνα τὴν κατάραν ἐτί αἰμε καὶ αὐτοὶ. Δείκνυσιν οὖν ὅτι λέλυται ἡ κατάρα διὰ Χριστοῦ· δοὺς γὰρ τιμῆν, τὰ, αὐτὸς γενέσθαι κατάρα, ἐξηγορασθεὶς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς τὸν νόμον κατάρας, ὅποι εὐθὺς ἔξεφυγεν, ἄτε τὸν νόμον πληρώσας. He also excellently explains the words ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία—'Ησοῦν thus: Διὰ τοῦτο φησὶ, κατάρα γέγονεν εἰκίως, ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, τούτεστι, τοὺς μὴ τῷ νόμῳ χρωμένους, ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Αβραάμ, τούτεστι, ἢ ἐκ πίστεως, γένεται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, τούτεστι, τῷ σκέπματι τοῦ Αβραάμ. καὶ ὅτι γέγραφαι, ὅτι ἐν τῷ σπέρματι του εὐλογηθοῦσαι, τούτεστι, ἐν Χριστῶ, τῷ ἐκ σου γενομένῳ κατά σάρκα, πιστεύοντες δηλαδή εἰς αὐτῶν. And on these words Crel. well annotates: “There is here indicated an ulterior end of this redemption of the Jews from the curse of the law, in which is contained the abrogation of the law. For as long as the law retained its strength, and kept the Jews under the curse, so long the Gentiles could not be partakers of Adam and his posterity a short life on earth, and resolved to raise them all from the dead, that every one may receive reward or punishment, according to the deeds done by him in the body. Further, being bought off by Christ from death, the curse of the law of works, mankind at the fall were bought off from law itself, not indeed as a rule of life, but as a rule of justification, and had a trial appointed to them under a more gracious dispensation, in which not a perfect obedience to law, but the obedience of faith is required, in order to their obtaining eternal life."
the blessing of Abraham, or the felicity destined to Abraham and his posterity, in which (as we before observed) is contained justification; and therefore neither could they obtain the Holy Spirit, the pledge of it. For it neither could nor ought to have come to the Gentiles before the Jews, to whom these things were really and properly promised. But first, the law was to be abolished, which stood in the way of the blessing both of the Jews and the Gentiles.” It must be remembered, that until the abrogation of the law of Moses the promised blessing of the Messiah was withheld from the Gentiles.

The next words ἐνα τῷ ἐπαγγελίαν—ψήτεως seem meant to show the end or result of the blessing, namely, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit, imparted together with the Gospel. See 2 Cor. 1, 22. Eph. 2, 22. It is plain that κατάρα in the verse preceding is for κατάρατος, by a sort of Hebraism. It is, however, a much stronger term. In ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πυθόματος there is an idiom common both to the Scriptural and Classical writers, by which the former of two substantives is taken as an adjectival. See Glass. Phil. Sacr.

15. ἀδελφόι, κατὰ ἀνθρωπον λέγον. Theophyl. ably traces the scope and connexion thus: Τοῦτο βούλεται δεῖξαι, ὅτι η ἐπίστασις, διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἄρχωντερα τοῦ νόμου, καὶ ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἐν δίκαιον ἐν προσιμμονίαν αὐτής τοῦ νόμου διό καὶ τὸ ὑπόδειγμα τέθεικεν. Ἐδώ γὰρ ἀνθρωπος, φησί, διαβάσται, μη τολμᾷ τις μετὰ ταύτα ἐλθών ἀνατρέψαι ἡ ἐπιδιατάξεωσθαι, τούτεστι, προσεκάνει συ; Borger observes: “It is the intent of the Apostle to show that this covenant, or promise, was in no respect made void, and that the law then promulgated has by no means taken away its force; as is shown by an example derived from human affairs.” So Theophyl.: ἀνθρώπων ὑπόδειγμα μέλλων ὄμων παραγαγεῖν. See also the note on Rom. 3, 5.

The δρομὸς is highly elliptical, and carries with it much meaning, which is thus expressed by Borger: “Though the faith of a man, weak as it is, is not to
be compared with that of God, as evinced in promises and covenants, yet not even in a man's covenant,” &c. See H. Tooke’s Ex. Pr. vol. I. p. 135 and 184.* Thus it appears that there is no occasion to resort to the conjecture of Alberti, Bowyer, and others, διαβηκη. It is rightly remarked by Borger, that the ellipsis of quamvis before tamen is by no means rare: and he refers to Ernesti’s Clav. Cic. in tamen, and Gronov. on Liv. 88, 19. Rosenm. (from Koppe) annotates thus: “Jam Paulus occurrit objectioni: talia quidem de Abrahamo valere; sed successisse publicam legislationem, quae omnino praeferenda sit, et respondet, per serius datam legem Mosaicam non tolli, sed firmam ratamque manere promissionem Abrahamo factam.” See Loeser’s examples, and the note on Rom. 6.19. and 1 Cor. 9.8.

With respect to the sense of διαβηκη Koppe (after Grot.) in his first Edition renders it promise and testament; but in his second he (rightly, I think,) adopts the common signification covenant, which is supported by the authority of many antient, and most of the modern Commentators. See Chrysost., Theophyl., &c. And so our English Translators. On this important term it is rightly observed by Borger, that the Divine διαβηκη can have no similitude to a human testament. He adds: “Omnino autem cavendum, ne nimiä anxietate omnia, quae διαβηκη humanae insunt, ad divinam illum transferamus, iterumque hujus propria humano instituto adjungamus. Putem igitur, hancce vocem in nostro commate solitam fideis pactiœ significationem esse accipiedam, ubi autem vs. 17. de divina agitur διαβηκη, huic vocabulo vim promissionis, divinitatis factœ, esse tribuendum. Neque tamen existimandum, hoc interpretatione omnem διαβηκη divinae cum humanæ convenientiam tolli aut minui, Paulumque ludere in

* Where he has shown that our word though is derived from the Ang. Sax. thaffian, to grant, (whence we may account for its being written and pronounced by the vulgar thaff.)
voce: scilicet in humana æquè ac divina pacta sanc-
cientes nil aliud agunt, nisi quod sibi invicem duo
pluresve aliquid promittunt, adhibito forte ritu, tam-
quam fœderis fulcro. Est igitur convenientia in eo,
quo utraque διαβήκη continetur promissis, hoc tan-
tum discrimine intercedente, quod in humana plures
sibi promittunt invicem, Deus autem solus sit δια-
τιθέμενος. Conf. Luc. 22, 29.” Wets. annotates
thus: “Sicut testamentum ratum est morte testa-
toris: ita etiam fœsus, altero contrahente mortuo,
hœredibus ejus præstandum est, neque ab eo resilire
licet.”

Kękroμένη, authorized, proved, attested. I would
compare Isæus, p. 7. init. Bekker. ei γὰρ δὲ—τῶν
δωρεῶν.

‘Abetei is for ἄκοροί at ver. 17., annuls, sets at
nought. Schleus. compares 1 Macc. 11, 36.

The words ἡ ἐπίδιατάσσεται may (I think) be ren-
dered, “or (even) makes any addition to it, by al-
tering any of the dispositions therein contained.”
Koppe would render ἐπίδιατάσσεται “rem promis-
ioni contrariam instituit.” But Borger justly ob-
jects to this version, and truly remarks, that the
Apostle does not here account the law as a new part
superadded to the promises, but rather intends to
show that the law afterwards promulgated did not
make void the Divine promises. And this observa-
tion is confirmed by Chrys. and the other Greek
Commentators.

16. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐφέβησαν αἰ ἐπαγγελια, καὶ τῷ
σπέρματι αὐτῷ.

Koppe observes that the above example is applied to the promises
of God made to Abraham.

The δὲ may be rendered now (in like manner). The plural in
ἐπαγγελια, which is for the singular, is rightly thought by Grot.,
Storr, and Borger, to regard the repetition of the promise or en-
gagement. ἐπέβησαν, uttered, pronounced, made. But it is of
more importance to turn to the consideration of the disputed expres-
sion καὶ τῷ σπέρματι—σπέρματι, &c., on the interpretation of
which there has been no little discussion among the modern Com-
mentators. The reader may consult Beza, Crit. Sacr., Pole’s Syn.,
Wolf, Whitby, and Mackn. Most of the recent foreign Commenta-
tors, as Nosselt and Rosema, venture to assert that by στέφω is here meant, not the Messiah, but the children or posterity of Abraham, namely, Christians in general. But this is in direct contradiction to the interpretation of the Apostle, who, (as Koppe observes,) to say nothing of his inspiration, might be supposed to be better qualified to decide on a point of this kind than any modern Philologist. We cannot surely be justified in deserting such an authority, especially as the interpretation involves no contradiction or absurdity. This will especially appear on consulting the masterly remarks of Chrys. on this passage and the context. See also Theophyl., Theodoret, and Óeumenius. Indeed, the credit of the Apostle is so much at stake in a case like this, where the Commentators in question (say even some who ought to have known better) lay to his charge bad Greek, erroneous interpretation, may, even designed perversion of the sense of the prophecy, thereby imposing on the simplicity of the Galatians, that I may be excused for entering somewhat more into particulars than the nature of my plan will usually permit me to do. I must therefore content myself with referring to the remarks of Beza, Whitby, Wolf, and other writers in the hands of almost every student, in order to introduce a very masterly defence of the common interpretation from the pen of the learned Borger, which I am the rather induced to do, since his work is exceedingly scarce.

"Sententia eorum interpretum, qui ipsum Jesum Christum hic intelligendum esse existimant, ab Hieronymi inde stato crebrò impugnata fuit, multis argumentum Pauli e singularis numeri voce στέφων ductum, nullius prorsus pretii, imo Apostolo indignum, opinantibus. Negandum non est, ex usu numeri singularis efficac nequaquam posse, voce στέφων Christum significari, quom ipse Apostolus, Rom. 4, 6, hoc vocabulum aliciae ratione exponat, neque usquam in S. S. vox plur. num. στέφει de prole usurpatur. Sed tenendum est:

1st, Paulum hanc distinctionem singularum inter et pluralum numerum instituisse non eo consilio, ut demonstraret, στέφω Abrahami esse Jesum Christum, neque verba: έστι Χριστός, continere veluti conclusionem, quam Apostolus e numero singulari duxerit, sed hoc unum Paulum sibi velle concedi, promissiones Abrahami exhibitas omnino ad Messiam spectare, neque eo esse explicandas; cujus tamen interpretationis vanitatem certissimè dicit esse apparitam, si non στέφων, sed στέφου mentio fuisse facta in locis Gen. ad vs. 8. laud. Itaque numerum cum hac explicatione non pugnare.


3dly. Quidni licuerit Apostolo, Jesum esse Messiam probaturum hominibus, Judaica studia admantibus, Judaicam demonstrandi rationem usurpare? Novimus enim, Judeos e vocum numeris aepius argumenta petisse, ad rem aliquam demonstrandum: sic
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v. g. e loco, Levit. 19, 24. ubi exstat nomen plur. דּוֹלֵק efficium, Den quibus esse celebratione laudandum, ante cibum captum et post eum, Berachot. pag. 35. forma plur. vocis יָהּ, Ps. 63, 6. probare canuntur, Deum, in virtute presenti et futuri, precibus et laudationes esse honorandum, Berac. bag. 16. Plura vid. apud Surenhus. l. l., pag. 84, 85.


Cum igitur promissio divina non ad universam gentem Israëlicam spectat, recte eam ad unum aliquem retulisse videtur Paulus; si vero, ut vidimus, unus est intelligendus, Apostolus, hæ promissione Jesum Christum significari, rectissimè contendit. Ad quam enim normam omne vaticanum Messianum, quot vocant, exige debet, eandem locum Gen. laud. interpretandum est: scil. si vates talia alicui attribuant, quia præter Jesum Christum nemini attribui possint, de Messia lili loqui existimandi sunt: hane igitur interpretandi legem si teneamus, manifestum est, promissionem divinam neque ad Isacum aut Jacobum spectare, quippe quibus eadem postea quoque exhibita sit, Gen. 26, 4, 28, 14; neque Mosen, Josuam, Judæum aliquem, Davidem, tane exitisse omnibus gentibus, felicitatis fontes, quorum scil. auspicia multi putant populi interneciones ferme deleti, armisque subacti; neque post Davidem, cui itidem
illustrius promissus est ἐγγονος, 2 Sam. 7, 13, 14. aliquem fuisse naturum, ἐν θ', ἐκλόγηται παιντα ἢ ἐθνη, si a Jesu Christo diesseris, quis ut multis Jam gentibus summae est letitiae ac beatitatis dator, ita eximias hujus felicitatis, promittente Deo, omnes omnino populos, qua potet orbis, aliquando es redditurus participes.

I am compelled to omit many further able proofs and illustrations of the same learned writer, as also those of Koppe. I will conclude with making one or two observations on this use of the plural σέρματα. It has been denied that the word γνη is ever used in the plural, except to denote the seeds of vegetables. And the same assertion has been made respecting σέρμα. But the former position merely extends to the Old Testament, which only contains a fragment and small part of the Hebrew language. So that it cannot be proved that γνη was never used in the plural to denote sons, races. As to the latter assertion, it is unfounded; for though σέρμα is used in the singular as a noun of multitude, to denote several children, yet it is sometimes used in the plural to signify several sons of the same family; as in Soph. ΟEd. Col. 599. γης ερημη ἀπελάθην Προς τον ἐμαυτος στρατιών. Other passages are also cited by Elmsley on Eurip. Med. 798. But there the word is only used in the plural dignitatis gratid, and in a singular sense.

It is truly observed by Mr. Slade, that though there is no authority for the word, in the plural number, as applied to different families, yet there can be no objection to such an application of the word in its figurative sense, than to its being literally used for the seeds of different vegetables, or for different portions of such seeds.' And he remarks that σέρμα is nearly analogous to the English word progeny (or offspring,) which denotes, even in the singular number, all the descendants of one man, however numerous; but if we had occasion to speak of the descendants of different men, we should use the plural." He also a little before remarks, that in the case of Abraham, there was such a remarkable difference between the two lines of descendants which sprang from him, that, if the divine promise had extended to both, it would, as the Apostle seems to intimate, have been more expressly affirmed by the use of σέρματα.

17. τούτο δὲ νέγα. This is considered by Koppe as a formula equivalent to μνι δ, jam vero; as in 1 Cor. 12, 18. and elsewhere. But this seems wrapping up matters too briefly. It should seem to signify, "My meaning is this:" and it has generally a resumptive and continuative force. So here the Apostle resumes the thread of the discourse at ver. 16., and continues* it thus. Δια-

* So Borger: "Verba, το δ λαμ οο—αβτο, vs. 16. initium continere putem sententiae, quam ex illa humane διαδηνη et divinae comparatione efficere voluit Paulus, quam vero sententiam,
That here διαβήκη signifies promise, Borger thinks is manifest, not only because it is interchanged with ἐπαγγελία just before occurring, but because ὁ οὖν νῦμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελίων at ver. 21. is the same as ὁ λόγος οὶκ. ἀκυροὶ τὴν διαβήκην.

Προκεκυκραμένη. Borger thinks the πρὸ is to be referred to the law afterwards promulgated; and he renders εἰς usque ad. He then assigns the following sense: “promissis, quæ rata esse debebat usque ad tempora Christi, quod scilicet est illud promissum σπέρμα.” And he remarks, that this was therefore no longer a promise, when the thing promised was come; and thus it follows that the law promulgated 430 years after, (and therefore long before the Divine promise had its fulfilment,) could not by any means make void this law (διαβήκη) of God, and take away its force, unless it can be supposed that God was inconsistent with himself, a mutability, which as it is disgraceful in men (ver. 15.), so it is utterly unworthy of the Deity."

17. νῦμος οὐκ ἀκυροὶ εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὸ ἐπαγγελίαν. A sort of Hebrew mode of expression for "cannot annul, or abrogate." The εἰς is for ἀπετε. Borger compares a similar use of the Hebr. ל with an Infinitive. He also, in conjunction with Loesner, ad-duces some Classical passages. The verb καταργεῖν is often used by St. Paul; though it occurs so rarely in the Classical writers, that it is reckoned by Michaelis amongst the Cilicisms of the Apostle. It should rather seem to have been a word of the Macedonian and Alexandrian dialect.

As to the chronological disputes raised on the number 430., on which the reader may consult Whitby, Dodd, and Macknight. I can see no reasonable objection to the mode of settling the interjecta parentesi (οὐ λέγει—Χριστός), non ad finem per ductam, hoc commate Apostolus instauret, quales repetitiones in scriptis Pauli haud raro reperiri, in ep. ad Rom. passim monet Koppius."
question as adopted by most of our English Interpreters, namely, by supposing that the Apostle computes not from the ratification, but from the original institution of the covenant mentioned in Gen. 12, 3 & 4., when Abraham was seventy-five years old, from which period to the birth of Isaac there were the twenty-five years which are required to make up the number 480.*

18. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου—ο Θεὸς. Here we have the ground on which the Apostle, in the preceding verse, maintained that the Divine promise was not made void by the Law afterwards promulgated; namely, that God cannot reasonably be supposed to have altered his own sayings, so that, after having first held out a promise to Abraham, with a condition annexed, he should then have caused the obtaining of it to be conjoined with the very difficult observance of the Law. It is to be remembered, 1st, that the promise was made to Abraham before the promulgation of the Law (ver. 17.): εἰδι, that in the argumentation of St. Paul the promise and the things promised are closely conjoined; separated indeed by the Law, as by something ἐτρεπθεὶς, or intermediate (see the note on 2, 21.), yet so united as not to be disjoined in thought; and St. Paul considers the Law so closely connected as to make, as it were, one chain. (Borger.)

At κανονοὺς Koppe and Borger would supply διδοται; as in Acts 7, 5. 2, 32. But the real ellipsis seems to be that of the verb substantive, which will

* Borger, however, declines the discussion of the question, with the following remark: "Ceterum, ctm adlectus annorum numerus hic nihil valeat, ad argumenti perspicuitatem gravitatem verendumque sit, ne post operosissima difficilesque computationes, omnis res ad conjecturæ vanitatem redeat, cùmque nostrum non sit tantas honi num doctorum componere lites, nec denique Pauli sit consilium, ad normam exacti temporis longitudinem, accurate docere, quod ipsis a prima inde facta Abrahami promissione, sive a nativitate Isaei, sive a Jacobi in Egyptum migratione, ad latam usque legem Mosaicam fuerit præterlapsam; hsec igitur ctm lta sint, intuiti prorsus ad causam nostram questione supersedere nobis liceat."
admit of being taken in the sense, come, or be given. Κληρονομία answers to the Heb. יִתְנָה. It must be observed, that there are two inheritances spoken of; 1st, the temporal one, that of the land of Canaan: Edly, the spiritual one (which was typified in this), namely, the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom. See Ps. 37, 18. Is. 54, 17. Hence it was applied, in the sacred writers, to denote all the blessings of Christ destined for men, both in this world and the next. See Acts 20, 38. Eph. 1, 14 & 18. Col. 3, 24. 1 Pet. 1, 4. It is, therefore, the same as εὐλογία supra ver. 4. Thus the words are conjoined in 1 Pet. 3, 9. ἐκλήθητε ἵνα εὐλογήσητε. It is judiciously observed by Theophyl. that we must not press the example too far; for that very reason the Apostle said, I speak after the manner of men, i.e. I bring forward an example derived from human affairs; therefore no wonder that it cannot be adequate to divine things.”

Borger thinks that κληρονομία ἐκ νόμου is synonymous with δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου, i.e. the felicity proceeding from justification. Compare Rom. 8, 17. Koppe takes the ἐκ to have respect to the times posterior to the law of Moses.

Κεχάρισται, “graciously gave it by promise,” i.e. graciously promised to give it. Borger takes it for εὐπαγελλάν κεχάρισται. Of course τὴν κληρονομίαν must be repeated from the clause preceding. Χαρίσθηκαί is often used as a deponent; but rarely in this tense.

19. τί ων ὁ νόμος; Τῶν παραδόσεων, &c. Here we have an answer to an objection, of what use, then, was the Law, and why was it promulgated.” To which it is replied, that the Law was by no means useless, but that its use was of another kind, and only temporary. (Rosenm.) It was not unproductive of good; though it had no effect in procuring justification. It was of great service in restraining and governing a people prone to wickedness of every kind.
But this (as was seen by Chrys.*) pertained to the Jews only. Some eminent modern Commentators, however, have thought that this is not the full sense intended by the Apostle. See Grot., Beza, Doddr., Whitby, and Mackn. The Law was added (say they) also to convince the Israelites of sin, by showing them in what they were offensive to God. See Rom. 3, 20. "Thus (says Dodd.) their transgressions, not only of the ceremonial but of the moral precepts, would appear more exceedingly sinful and dangerous, in proportion to the perspicuity of those precepts, and

* For he explains τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν thus: τούτους ἵνα μὴ εἰς Ιουδαίοις ἄνωτες εἶναι, καὶ εἰς ἑκάστον ἐξολοθρεύειν κακίας, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ χαλινοῦ οὐ νόμος αὐτοῖς ἐπικείμενος ἢ, παιδειῶν ἰδικεῖαι, κυρίων παραβαινεῖ. So also Theophyl.: ἵνα ἀντὶ χαλινοῦ εἰς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, κυρίων παραβαινεῖν τινὰς γοῦν τῶν ἐντολῶν, εἰ μὴ καὶ πάσας. Rosenm. explains: "Addita est delictorum coeterorum causae: non eo fine, ut pacto, quod Deus cum Abrahamo inierat, aliiquid contrarium institueretur, sed ut Israelitae, ad idolatriam, et omnem vitae improbitatem proni, coerereatur."

† In this limited sense the same may be said of human laws; in which view Alberti and Borger adduce several Classical passages, as does also Gataker on M. A. 3, 5. It is of more consequence, however, to observe, that the Mosaic Law, like all other severe codes, tended as much to produce sin as to check it. Thus of the Law of Moses, St. Paul says it worked wrath (Rom. 4, 15.), "and continued, that sin might abound." (Rom. 5, 20., where see the note.) Of such severe laws, as of Draco and others, promulgated about the time of the Peloponnesian War, we have the opinion of the Prince of Historians in the following profound and eloquent remarks, L. 3, 45. τεφθασί τις ἀκαντει καὶ ιδία καὶ δημοσία ἀμαρτάνει, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι νόμως διηνῆ ἀνεφέρει τοιοῦτον, ἐπει διεξεληφθῇ γε διὰ παιδών τῶν Ἱημών οἱ ἀνθρώποι προσεπείτες, εἰ πάσος Ἀδωνίς ἄνωτρον ὑπὸ τῶν κακόργων καὶ εἰς τὸ πᾶλαι τῶν μεγίστων αἴδευματων μαλακοτέρας κεῖσθαι αὕτα, παραβαινομένων δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ, εἰ τὸν θάνατον αἰ πολλαὶ ἁνήκουσι· καὶ τοῦτο ὅμως παραβαῖνεται ἤ, τοῖνοι δεινὸτέρον τι, τοῦτον δεῖ εὑρεῖν ἔστιν, ἢ τόδε γε οὕδεν ἔπληξε. And a little further on: ἀπλως τε ἄδυναν καὶ πολλῆς εὐθείας, διότι οἰεῖται, τῆς ἀνθρωπείας φύσεις οἰκείων προθέμενοι τι πράξει, ἀκτόρητον τινὰ ἢ παραπλήκτες τῆς νόμων ὕπατι ή ἄλλῃ τῷ δειρῇ. And so Porphyry de Abstin. L. 1. p. 7. οὐκ ἂν ἐτέρῳ χρήθαι φαρμακῷ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ συμφεροντος ἀρετήν ἢ τῷ φάσμα τῆς ἀφορισμένης ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἑνδίδονται. Plato, however, seems wiser than all the Legislators, who thought (as we are told by Aristid. 3, 509.) τὸ συμμέτρον (moderate) τις τιμωρίας ποιεῖσθαι πολιτικῶν.
the awful solemnity with which they were delivered.”
“So that (to use the words of Mack.) becoming sensi-
sible of their transgressions, and of God’s displeasure
with them for their transgressions, and of the punish-
ment to which they were liable, they might be con-
strained to have recourse to the covenant with Abra-
ham, in which justification was promised through faith,
as it is now promised in the Gospel.” Finally (as Whit-
by observes) it is here shown that the Law was intend-
ed to discover transgressions and their punishment,
that the Scripture hath concluded all men under sin,
viz. by virtue of the Law, that as many as are under
the Law are under the curse, ver. 10., and that upon
these accounts the Law is our schoolmaster to bring
us unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith in
him, who are condemned by the Law, ver. 24., Christ
being “the end of the Law for justification to every
one that believeth.” Rom. 10, 3.

Here I cannot but notice the var. lect. ετέθη for
προστέθη, which, though only found in five MSS.
and some Versions and Fathers, has been preferred
by many Critics, and received into the text by
Griesbach; but (I think) on insufficient grounds.
Supposing that it had been the original reading, what
could have occasioned προστέθη to have been intro-
duced into nearly all the MSS? That would be
quite unaccountable. Whereas ετέθη, as being some-
what more elegant than προστέθη, was therefore in-
troduced by the correctors of the Cod. D. F. G., and
especially the first mentioned interpolated and altered
MS. It appears that those early Critics thought the
προς useless, or worse. But they forgot that there
had been before the Law of Moses a law of nature,
under which the Gentiles continued to be afterwards,
“who were a law unto themselves.” To the Jews,
however, the Law of Moses might be said to be
added to the previous law of nature. This use of
προσετ. is rare in the Classical writers; but it some-
times occurs. So I would understand Thucyd. 2;
85. επαινοῦσι τῶν προσθέντα τῷ νόμῳ τῶν λόγων τόπῳ.
So also Herodot. 2, 186, 10. (which Pericles, ubi
supra, seems to have had in mind) προσέχειν δὲ ἔτει τεύτω τὸ νόμος τῶν. Now every fresh law may be said to be an addition to the law, or body of law. So in Thucyd. 3. 45. καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ νόμος ὅσις ἀπείρητο τέωτο, ἐπεὶ διεξελλώθησα διὰ πασῶν τῶν ζημιῶν ὃι ἀνθρώποι προσεδέντες, where I would supply, not ζημιῶν, with the Commentators, but νόμους from νόμων preceding.

It is plain that the common reading is, on these and other accounts, to be retained.

19. ἄχρις οὐ ἔλθῃ τὸ στέρμα ὡς ἐπηγγέλται. In ἄχρις there is, as Koppe observes, an ellipsis of ὅσις διαμένειν. So Theophyl.: ἀλλ' ἄρας οὐκ εἰς ἀπέραντον ἐκάθη νόμος, ἀλλ' ἄχρις οὐ ἔλθη ἐν Χριστῷ, ὡς ἐπηγγέλται τὸ εὐλογεῖσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ ἔθη. By the τὸ στέρμα, agreeably to the interpretation adopted at ver. 16., is meant Christ. Ὅτι ἐπηγγέλται, This seems to be taken impersonally: or ἐπηγγελία may be supplied from ἐπηγγελλάς a little before.

19. διαταγεῖς depends upon προσέχειν, the words ἄχρις οὐ—ἐπηγγέλται being parenthetical. I cannot see why Koppe should consider it as redundant. It may be expressed in the participle in preference to the verb, to show the connexion. The term διαταγήσι is very appropriate, signifying to ordain, promulgate, &c.; and it is joined with νόμων in Hesiod, Opp. & Dies vs. 274. (cited by Borger) Τώδε γὰρ ἀνθρώποις νόμων διέταξε Κρονίων.

19. δ' ἄγγελων. This is supposed to have been said in accommodation to the universal opinion of the Jews. I need not enter into any further explanation, having fully treated on the subject at Acts 7. 53. I would, however, observe, that perhaps δ' may be taken for εἰς; as in Rom. 2. 27. 4. 11. 8. 25. Heb. 12. 1. Rom. 14. 20. 1 Cor. 16. 3. Ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. By the μεσίτιος is meant, not Christ (as some antient Commentators suppose), but, as Theodoret and the best modern Commentators are agreed, Moses. So Theodoret: ἔτειθη δ' νόμος δ' ἄγγελων ὑποργοῦντων καὶ τῇ τεύτων βοήθει Μαωσέως. διακοινότας· αὐτὸν γὰρ μεσίτην ἐκάλεσε. It may be rendered me-
diator, interpreter, internuncio. And so, indeed, Moses, is called both in the works of Philo and the Rabbins. See Wets.

20. ο δὲ μεισιμης ἐνὸς εἰκ ἐστιν ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἐστιν.

There is, unquestionably, no passage in the New Testament that has so much, and to so little purpose, exercised the learning and ingenuity of Commentators, as the present, which seems to defy all attempts to elicit any satisfactory sense, except by methods so violent as to be almost the same thing as writing the passage afresh. It is impossible for me to detail, much less review, a tenth part of the interpretations that have been proposed. For the following sketch of the various opinions, I am indebted to Borger. 1st. Some understand the μεσιμην of any Internunciun; and of these there are some who at ἐνὸς and εἰς supply μέρος; others at ἐνὸς supply μέρους, and understand εἰς of number, whereas others take it for ὁ ἄνδρος. Some, again, there are who at ἐνὸς supply λαός, and take εἰς for ὁ ἄνδρος; while others take ἐνὸς substantively; others take ἐνὸς and εἰς for ὁ ἄνδρος.

II. Others interpret μεσιμήν of some certain internunciun, of whom many understand Moses; others, Christ. These again supply μέρους, σπέρματος, νόμου, παράγαμος, τόπου, γένους, ἐθνῶν: εἰς they take for a numeral, or for ὁ ἄνδρος. Yet those who so supply, for the most part pursue a different mode of interpretation; whence has arisen a host of discordant opinions. The most diligent investigators of the sense have been Koppe in his Excurs 7. to this Epistle, Antonius, and Bonitz, each in an elaborate dissertation, published in 1800, and, above all, Borger, in his long and admirable annotation, or rather dissertation, on this passage, in which he proposes three different modes of interpretation, all most ingeniously and learnedly supported; yet no one of them (I apprehend) so certain as to remove all doubt and objection. I can only find room for the third, which I insert, because it is thought by himself, on account of its comparative facility, to deserve the preference. For greater certainty, I will give his own words verbatim: ‘Paulus scilicet non tantum universè religionem Christianam Mosaicæ opponit, sed specialiæ hoc etiam ait ut, promissiones divinas Abrahamo exhibebat leges postea latè non irritas fuisse factas, demonstrat: hinc frequenter est ἐπαγγελία, seu διαθήκη et νόμου oppositio, 15—17, 18, 19, 21. Legem ergo curn promissione, divinæ quicquam habere communè negat, cum illa tantum παραβάσεων χαίρω lata sit, vs. 19. hujus verò longè aliud consilium, conf. ad vs. 21. Obiunct Judæi, (hoc enim a superiori disputazione sumimus,) legislationis splendorem, quem habuerit, cum ab Angelorum præsentia, tum ab interpretes ministerio: respondet Paulus ita, ut μεσιμήν breviter tantum commemoret, Angelos ne verbo quidem tangat, quod quomodo fieri potuerit supera diximus. Si ergo poét ἐνὸς intellegamur παράγαμος (vid. L. Bos. de Ellips. Gr. v. παράγαμα, et Schleus. la v.); i. e. ἐπαγγελίας s. ἐπαγγελίων (s.), omnia erunt, opinor, explicata faciliter. Quo tandem pacto, inquit Judæi, contentas promissiones
divinas vim suam non amississe per legem; sed hanc tantum parabasew χάριν esse latam, cum potius hac lex Angelorum et interpretis auctoritate munita, omnia, quae ante eam fuerunt instituta, divinas, adeoque etiam promissiones tanto splendore non exhibitas, nisi sed vi privisse videatur? Concedo, ait Paulus vs. 20. minum illud ἐπάγγελμα (scil. promissionem), non habuisse suum interpretem, ut habuit alterum illud (scil. lex.) (t.) : neque hoc quicquam demit promissioni; unus enim idemque Deus auctor est legis Mosaicæ et promissionis Abrahæo facta: jam vero, dignitas et divina alcuju instituti auctoritas, non est a legati, qualis est μεσίτης, auxilio repetenda, sed salis est, illud Deum habere auctorem; unde patet, legem Mosaicam non potuisse tollere promissiones divinas hanc ob causam, quod his non, ut illi, adefuerit, quamque quae tantum fuerit, adjuncta quedam ἔπαφος. Hac assumat interpretatione, ut in superiori, ita et hic intelligendus est μεσίτης in universum. Neque tamen repugnem, si quis cum alii bene multis verba, δὲ Θεός εἰς ἐστιν, vertere velit: Deus sibi constat, manetque idem, i. e. semper stat promissio; preser-tim, cùm ipse Paulus, vs. 18. e constantid et fide Dei mutati nescia efficere videatur, non δὲ νόμον esse κηρονομιὰν, sed δὲ ἐπαγγελίαν, vid. ibid. notata: ut sensus sit etsi promissio divina non exhibita est ope interpretis, id tamen ejus fidem non labefactare potest: Deus enim semper sibi constat. Quiquid statueris, articuli τοῦ ante ἔνος omissionem nobis ne objecteris, cujus ellipsis multa sunt cùm in libris sacris, tum in aliis aliorum scriptis exempla, vid. Glæ-sus, Phil. S. pag. 136—8. Fischerus ad Plat. Phed. cap. 37. not. 17. Si post ἔνος intelligendum putes ἐπάγγελμα, i. e. ἐπαγγελία, alia in mentem venit interpretatio, quæ ab orationis serie insignem habere commendationem nobis videtur. Nimimum, ut ad vs. sq. copioeis demonstrabimur, Paulus imprimit in eo est, ut longe aliud fuuisse promissionis consilium atque legis ostendat: promissionem enim spectasse ad Christum et κηρονομιὰν, vs. 16, 18. legem verò latam esse parabasew χάριν, vs. 19. Diversum hoc utriusque consilium apparece dicti ἐπιχριστάους, quse alteri adferunt, alteri non iten: legis enim consilium manifestum esse ex eo, quod sit διαγγελὶς δὲ ἄγγελων, εν χειρὶ μεσιτου, quæ solemnitias non posset non insignem habere, ad reprehendum ferociam, vim, et efficaciam; (vid l. 1. pag. 291. Act. et Ep. ad Hebr.) longe aliud fuuisse promissionis consilium, appare, cùm non tanta cùm pompa fuerit exhibita, neque habuerit suum μεσίτης (cur Angelorum mentionem Paulus, vs. 30. non fecerit, supra, pag. 299. digimis),igitur δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς εἰς ἐστι, neque tamen hoc in promissionis contentum trahendum est, sequì enim firma est et divina ac lex, cùm eundem Deum habeat auctorem (δὲ Θεός εἰς ἐστι). Hanc interpretationem si probaveris, facile intelligitur, verbis διαγγελὶς μεσιτου, non continere Judæorum aliquam objectionem, sed Paulum iis demonstrare velle, verum esse quod dixerat, legem esse latam parabasew χάριν, voculam verò δε ἐν δὲ μεσίτης obtinere solitam vic adversat-tem: interpret contra cet."

Wets. offers the following annotation: "As when we speak of an umpire, or mediator, we understand that it belongs to his office,
not to favour one party only, but show himself the same to both; so also when we speak of God, we view him as the Father not of the Jews only, but of all men. Whence it immediately follows, that Moses, who was mediator between the Jews only and God, was not a mediator, properly so called; but that from the goodness of God is to be expected another who shall be the mediator of the whole human race, even Christ. See Rom. 3, 30. 4, 16."

21. οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελμάτων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ: Μὴ γένοιτο. This passage, it should seem, is to be closely connected with the words τί οὖν οὖν νόμος;—ἐπαγγελται, ver. 19., the others, διαταγεῖς—εἰς ἑστιν, ver. 20., being thrown into a parenthesis: indeed ver. 19 and 21. are united by the help of the particle οὖν, as is usual after a parenthesis, or a somewhat long digression. In order to comprehend the meaning of the Apostle, it is necessary to attend to the context. Now it has been shown, that far different had been the intent of the law, and the promise; for that the former had been promulgated παραθέτασιν χαίρων, to repress sin (ver. 19.); the latter had respect to Christ (ver. 16.): that the law could to no one be the cause δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ζωῆς, of justification and life (ver. 11 & 12.), but that Christ, promised to Abraham, had by his death conferred this benefit on men (ver. 13 & 14.); therefore the law, he says, was only a παραδογγυς, till Christ should come (ver. 24.), who would take away all its authority (ver. 25. 4, 3—7.). As, then, the divine promise has nothing in common with the law, the Apostle justly asks: οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελμάτων τοῦ Θεοῦ; "is the law, then, at variance with the divine promises," so that the justification or inheritance (ver. 18.) which God had before awarded to us by promise, is now to be obtained by the observance of the law? To which the Apostle answers by the strong negative, μὴ γένοιτο, by no means! "For if (continues he) such a law had been promulgated, as could have procured us felicity, then indeed justification would depend on the observance of a law, not on divine promise, and therefore it would follow that the law is at variance with the promise, and that
it has rendered it void: but (as was said before, and will appear from what follows, ver. 22. seqq.) this is not the force of the law, nor was this its intent.” (Borger.)

The words are thus explained by Theophyl.: εἰ αἱ μὲν ἐπαγγελίας ἐντέλεοι, ὁ δὲ νόμος κατάραν εἰσάγει, προδηλών ὅτι εἰναὶ παραδεξαμένα αὐτῶν, ὅσ τὸ κύρος ἔχειν, λοις τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς τῆς εὐλογίας διδόσθης: ἀλλὰ μὴ γένοιτο ἄκουε δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐξην. Τότε, φησιν, ὁ νόμος ἐπικρατέστερος ἂν ἦν τῆς πίστεως, καὶ εὐλογεί, καὶ ἐδίκαιον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, εἰ γιοσοὶ γαίται ἕνων καὶ σῶσαι τὸν δὲ μᾶλλον ἄποκτινόν τε, καθ' ὅ ὦ δύναται ἄμαρτον ἐλευθερώσαι. Πῶς οὖν ἐπικρατήσῃ τῆς πίστεως τῆς δυναμένης γιοσοῖν διὰ τοῦ βασιλεύσατος, καὶ εὐλογοῦσις καὶ δικαιούσις;

In the phraseology there is no difficulty. See the note on 2, 16. 3, 6.

22. ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσι. This is to be closely connected with the latter part of the preceding verse. The sense is:

“But so far is it from being the case, that such a law (a law able γιοσοῖν, and from which should issue justification) has been promulgated, that the Scripture teaches us that all men are sinners, (and therefore worthy of punishment).” Ἡ γραφὴ is for ὁ Θεὸς. See the note on ver. 18. and Rom. 11, 32. Συνέκλεισε, teaches, shows, accounts that all are συνεκλειμένοι, &c. On this idiom see Glass. Phil. Sacr. L. 1. Tr. 3. Can. 15. Alberti and Loesner on Acts 10, 15. and Storr on Hebr. 7, 3. The aorist is here for the preterite: or it may denote, by a very frequent idiom both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, what is done passim, or habitually. The sentiment is by no means unusual in Scripture. See 1 Kings 8, 46. Ps. 14 & 53. compared with Rom. 3. Here, as in Rom. 7., sin is compared to a tyrant, who holds men captive, and to whose domination all are subject. Τὰ πάντα is for τῶν πάντας, neuter for masculine, by a common idiom, on which consult Glass. and Matth. Gr. Gr.
However, τὰ πάντα may have an emphasis, so as to signify that all men of all ages and nations. See a similar passage at Rom. 5, 20. (Borger.)

'Ek πίστεως I. X. is supposed by Koppe and Borger to be for εἰς I. X.; there being, they think, a pleonasm in πίστεως. But this seems somewhat precarious. I should rather take εἰκ πίστεως to be put elliptically for η' εἰκ πίστεως ὅσα, "which is suspended on, depends on faith in Jesus Christ."

Συνεκλεισεν, "considers all (whether Jews or Gentiles) as included ὑπὸ ἀμαρτίαν, under the same subject-ion to sin, and consequent punishment."

23. πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν. Having refuted the former objection, the Apostle again goes on to show the use and intent of the law. Πρὸ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, "but before the faith in Christ was introduced." For ἐλθεῖν is used populariter. By πίστις is denoted the Christian religion, from its distinguishing characteristic; since it enjoins, and enables us to live by faith, not by sight. See Rom. 3, 27. 11, 8. The words ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν πίστιν, are not (I think) to be too much pressed upon. There seems to be in them a continuation of the metaphor begun in the preceding verse, by which sin is considered as a jilior holding the whole human race in durance. 'Εφρουρούμεθα merely serves to dress up the metaphor; though it suggests an idea of the strictness with which the Jews were bound to the observance of the law. For the we can only refer to Jews. Eis signifies usque ad, until: and in τὴν μελλούσαν πίστιν there is (as Borger observes) a trajectio for τὴν πίστιν τὴν μελλούσαν, "until the (establishment of) the faith which was to be revealed and manifested."

24. ἀντὶ τοῦ νόμος ταῖδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν. Here there is a continuation of the same metaphorical language respecting the Law and the Gospel compared; and as before, the law was likened unto a jilior, so here it is to a pedagogus: and thus the Apostle concludes what he has to say on the use
and duration of the law by a very apt similitude. Most modern Commentators, however, seem to have formed a wrong notion of the idea meant to be conveyed, by interpreting παιδαγωγὸς a schoolmaster, or tutor; whereas many eminent Commentators have rightly seen that it only signifies a παιδαγός, a very different sort of person, namely, one (often a freedman, and sometimes a slave,) who conducted children to and from school, and superintended their moral conduct out of school hours, and, as I conjecture (though it has not been touched on by any of the Commentators,) superintended the studying of their lessons, and assisted them in preparing for the master.* This is confirmed by Chrysost. 742, 29. ὁ δὲ παιδαγωγὸς οὐκ ἐναντίον τι τι διδασκάλω, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπράττει, πάσης κακίας ἀκαθάρτω ὑπὸ νέον, καὶ μετὰ πάσης σχολῆς τὰ μαθήματα παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου δέχεσθαι παιδαγωγόν ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐν ἔξει γένηται, ἀφίηται λοιπὸν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς. Borger refers to Wesseling on Herodot. L. 8. p. 654. J. N. Antonii Commentat. de Pædagog. Vet. Rom. J. C. Messerschmid. de Pædag. Lacedæm. in Actis Societ. Lat. Jenensis, vol. 5, p. 72. seq. Several Rabbinical passages are adduced by Wets. and Schoettg. in which there are allusions to the office of the παιδαγός. The latter Commentator illustrates the sense thus: “The law,

* Dr. Parr in his notes on four Sermons of Taylor, Lowth, &c. p. 27. says: “The pedagogue attended his pupils at public spectacles.” And the learned Critic might have proved and illustrated this from Philostrat. Vit. Soph. L. 8, 21. where, speaking of a public lecture-room for declamations, he says: ἀφροὶ εἰςεκαλομεθα, καὶ ἑκαθήμεθα, ἑικληθέντες, οἱ μὲν παίδες καὶ οἱ παιδαγοὶ μέσοι, τὰ μειράκια δὲ αὐτοὶ, and Theophr. Char. 9, καὶ ἔνως δὲ αὐτοῦ θεαν ἀγοράσας, μὴ δοῦσ τὸ μέρος, θεωρεῖν, ἅγειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς νείς εἰς τὴν ὑπεραλαῖαν καὶ τὸν παιδαγόν. That the παιδαγοὶ were, if not slaves, yet regarded as domestic servants, appears from Soph. Electr. 23, where, addressing his antient παιδαγῶγος, he says: ὃ φιλτραν ἀνδρῶν προσόλων, domesticorum. So also Phœn. 93. Μὴ τι πολιτῶν ἐν τρίβῳ φανταξητοί, Κάρμοι μὲν ἕλθαν φαύλος, ὃς δοῦλος, φύγας, Σοὶ δὲ, ὃς ἕκκλησα. Those who are conversant with the Greek Dramatists will remember, that the persons in question are usually represented as of servile condition.
then, is a sort of pædagogus who brings unto our great Master, even Christ. Boys would seldom of their own accord go to the master, unless they were urged by the pædagogus. Nor should we many of us come to Christ, did not the law, our pædagogus, urge us by compulsory methods.” See also Grot. and Elsner, Borger remarks, that the office of the pædagogus, the oeconomus, and the ἔσπιρος were indeed very different (referring to Plut. de Lib. educat. p. 4.); but we must not be too nice in laying down the distinction; and he refers to his note on 4, 2. All this is very true: but if the conjoint duties of the pædagogus be attended to, which I have above suggested (from Chrysost.), there will be no occasion. The general allusion seems to be to the introductory nature of the pedagogial office, and the retrain and, as it were, bondage under which the boys were thus held. It also represents the condition of persons under the law, as that of νέπτω, compared to that of those under the Gospel, who are τέλειοι. So Chryst. says, πιστίν τὴν εἰς τὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα ἀγουσαν. The metaphor is often used by the Apostle; as in Rom. 10, 6. A combination of this with other metaphors on the subject is found in the following beautiful passage of Isidor. Pelus. L. 1. Ep. 257. (cited by Borger) : Ἀνατέλλοντος φωτός, ο ὄρθος υποχαρεί γιλιον αὐνιγχοντος λαμπρῶς, τὰ τῶν ἀντέρω ἀμαρωταὶ χαρεύματα: δέν ἄθροις ἑμέρα εἰκῆ, τὰ τῆς ἐω ἀπολύγει σκιάσματα: ἄρα ἴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σοφία ἔξελαμψε, ἵ του νόμου παιδαγωγία ἐσχάλασε.

26. Πάντες γὰρ ὦν Ὁσοῦ ἔστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Since they are said to be ὦν Ὁσοῦ in tacit opposition to the state of δώλοι, slaves of the law, it is plain that ὦν must have the adjunct notion of liberty: yet there is no occasion to press on that of slavery* under the law, which was only compara-tive, and chiefly meant with reference to the re-

* As when at 4, 1. ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου δεδουλώμενοι. See also 4, 1 & 4, 5.
strains of the law. Γὰρ has here the sense of scilicet; the connection with the foregoing being very close.

This sonship is supposed not to be complete till they arrive at maturity, and be liberated from the restraints of tutors and governors of every kind.

27. οὐκ ἐστι κατὰ νόμον Χριστοῦ ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸς ἐνδονομασθείς. The passage is thus rendered by Koppe and Borger: “for as many of you as, having received baptism, profess the Christian doctrine (whether circumcised or uncircumcised), are united with Christ by the closest bond.” Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) annotates thus: κατασκευάξει τῶν ζωλ ἕρμεν Θεοῦ, καὶ Φησιν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος. Οὐκ εἰσε οὖς ἐστιν ἐβαπτίσθητε, οὐλ Θεοῦ γεγονότε, ὡστε καὶ ἡ ἄκολουθον ἀπήγει ἀλλὰ τὸ πολϋ φροντίδάστερον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐνδονομασθείς. Εἰ γὰρ Χριστὸν τὸν ζωλ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνδείκνυμεν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφαρμοιώθηνε εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἔθεν ἡχόμεν, χάριτι γεγονότες ὅσπερ ἐκεῖνος ἐστὶς φύσει. It is rightly observed by Borger, that ἐνδονομασθεὶς τι, or των, signifies to contract familiarity with any person or thing: and so the Hebr. וְלָּו is often used of any close connection.* This (I would add) may be paralleled by our vulgar idiom, to be hand and glove.

28. οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαῖος—θῆλα. This is (as Borger observes) partly a repetition of what was said at ver. 26. πάντες γὰρ ἐστε οὐα̈ το Θεοῦ. It is (I conceive) a further development of the idea; q. d. “there is under the Gospel no distinction of nation (οὐκ ἐν Ἰουδαῖος, ὦδε Ἐλλήν. See the note on Rom. 1, 14 & 16.), nor of condition (οὐκ ἐν δοῦλος, οὐδε ἐλεύθερος), nor of sex (οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλα).” Such, Borger observes, is the general sentiment, which is not to be too much pressed upon. That is (I think) especially to be observed on the words οὐκ ἐν ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλα: for, notwithstanding what Grot. says, the

* So Chrysost. (cited by Borger): οὐσι φαι ἐπι φιλον λέγοτε, ἡ χείρα τον χείρα ἐνδονομασθα, τὴν πολλὴν ἄγαν χένοις, καὶ τὴν ἀεικελειτον συνωσται.
females under the law were nearly on the same foot-
ing with the males.* The points of inferiority which
some fancy being only such as respected political,
not religious, matters.

The ἐν is by some taken for ἐστι. Which use,
Koppe observes, cannot be proved. Not, perhaps, by
the examples of Raphel and the earlier Philologists:
yet it has been established beyond doubt by Borger's
examples; though the learned Commentator is in-
clined (and, I think, with reason,) to prefer the com-
mon interpretation, by which the word is taken in its
usual sense, Χριστῷ being supplied, and by Χριστῷ
is understood Christ's religion.

28. πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This
clause is explanatory of the preceding; and the
sense is clear; though there is no little diversity of
reading, which has (I imagine) arisen from certain
Critics who fancied they saw a solecmism, and were
more anxious to remove it than careful about the
means. In F. C. the εἰς is altered to ἐν. In A. it is
cancelled. But these are all MSS. that have been
much tampered with by Correctors. And as to
Versions, they are here of no authority. The com-
mon reading is undoubtedly to be retained; since
from it the others may be easily accounted for, and
the seeming solemism (which has the appearance of
Hebraism) is not to be heeded. Wets. compares
Lucian Tox. 46. εἰς ἄνδρας ὄντες οὕτω βιοῦμεν, οῖς,
ἀφ' οὗ συνεληφθαμεν, εἰς ἄνδρας ὄντες, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀνυ-
Ambo idem sumus; nam haec dici a me patitur ille,
qui melior est. The sense is: "Ye are all one and
the same in your Christian profession."

29. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἃρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστε.
The connection is well traced by Theophyl. thus:
"Having before said that the seed of Abraham, in
whom the nations are blessed, is Christ, to whom the

* So Rosenm. (from Koppe) remarks: "Hoc exprimit partiendo,
i.e. nonnullis generibus, in quae solebant homines omni tempore
dispesci, sigillatim enumeratis."
promises were given, and having proved that they have the form of Christianity, he now draws the conclusion: If, then, ye be Christ's, ye are therefore the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promised blessing; q. d. 'How then do ye hanker after the law, who have been blessed by Christ so as to put him on, or be likened unto him, and have thence become the seed of Abraham.'

It is observed by Koppe and Borger, that the phrase εἵνα τινος imports conjunction with any one; and the latter adduces examples, which, however, are needless. The phrase is plainly equivalent to ἐνδούσθαι at ver. 27. Borger renders it: "if you are so closely connected with Christ, it is apparent that you are the seed of Abraham." The nature of the connection appears from ver. 16.

29. καὶ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι. Borger renders: "and are therefore by Divine promise partakers of felicity." And he compares Rom. 8, 17. Eph. 3, 6. and Rom. 9, 7.

CHAP. IV.

Here, Borger thinks, the division was improperly made; since the same argumentation is continued, and there is a close connection with the preceding.

VERSE 1. λέγεται δὲ. On this phrase see supra 3, 17. Koppe observes, that from the word κληρονόμοι supra 3, 29. (a name of which the Jews were fond), the Apostle takes occasion, from the different terms κληρονόμοι νήπιοι and κληρονόμοι υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολαβοῦντας, to metaphorically represent Jews and Christians: And Borger remarks, that at 3, 26. the υἱοὶ and δούλοι are opposed. The Apostle mentions the sonship of Christians, hinting, that before they embraced the Gospel they were, if Jews, in the condition of servants: then, to soften what must appear harsh to those who were accustomed to claim the title of Ἰσραήλ Ἰς, sons of the Lord (Deut. 14, 1.) he shows
how he would be understood. He admits that they were in some sense sons, but yet that their condition was servile, since as the servant or slave is under the governance of his master, so were the Jews bound to obey the precepts of the law, as the orders of a pædagogus." The word νίπτος here means, not infans, but, in a general way, a boy, one who is not yet adult, a minor: a signification often occurring both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, as Hom. II. 

1. οὐδὲν διαφέρει δουλῶ, "is in no respect different from a slave," i. e. in having no disposal of his own property, being entirely under government and restraint, and subject to castigation. Yet the expression must not be pressed too far. The sense is thus laid down by Borger: "Quamvis omnium paternarum opum dominus sit atque possessor filius, tamen, quamdiu tutorum reique familiaris dispensatorum est curæ commissus, iis ut ipsi non licet, opesque illæ nil ipsi prosunt; eodem prorsus modo vestra filiorum dignitas nullam vobis utilitatem praestabat, neque vestra vobis jura usurpare licebat, quamdiu legis imperio parere cogebramini."

2. ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐπιτροπὸς ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμος ἅξιος τῆς προβεβημίας τῶν πατρῶν. These words are explanatory of the preceding. On the sense of the terms ἐπιτροπὸς and οἰκονόμος, the Commentators differ in opinion. Some take them to denote what we call guardians. If there be a difference, it is thought to be that the ἐπιτροποὶ were guardians by law; the οἰκονόμοι, those appointed by the parent. Most recent Commentators however regard the ἐπιτροπὸς as synonymous with παῖδαγωγὸς, as denoting literally those who are set over the care of the children. By the οἰκονόμοι, they understand those aged servants to whom was committed, together with the care of the domestic affairs, the superintendence of the education of the children. It is perhaps unnecessary to press on the exact sense of these terms, and their difference. The sole meaning of the Apostle is, that the minor is
under government and restraint, and even his own property is administered by others.

At προθεσμίας must be understood ἡμέρας. Theophyl. explains it νομίμου ἡλικίας. Krebs, Wets,, and Loeusner, adduce numerous examples of the word from the Classical writers, of which I need insert none. It meant the day or time previously fixed for the execution of any thing. Thus the period for the succession to property might be, and was, fixed by a testator: for I cannot think, with some, that τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς means the time appointed by the laws at which any one might succeed to the property of a parent: but I would regard τοῦ πατρὸς as put for ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, which depends on some participle understood, which may be the better tolerated, since προθεσμία carries in itself the nature of a participle. I assent to Borger, that it is not probable the Apostle had in view the regulations of the Roman law, considering in what low estimation the law of the Heathens was to Jews, and especially as in the very history of the Israelites mention is made of these ἐπιτρέπων and οἰκονόμων (as Gen. 24, 1. seq. compared with 15, 2.) to whose office, equally with that of the Romans, it is probable some certain προθεσμία was appointed by the parent. See the Interpreters on Hebr. 3, 2.

3. οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς—δεδουλωμένοι. The example is here brought into application, "As a boy is subject to the governance of the παιδαγογός, so were we Jews and Heathens (for to both the word ἡμεῖς belongs, v. 8, 9.) subjected τοῖς στουχεῖοις τοῦ κόσμου, by which is meant the elements of religion, especially fitted to the capacities of ignorant and uncivilized persons, such as are usually delighted with external rites and ceremonies. See Hebr. 5, 2. Col. 2, 8 & 20. Κόσμ. denotes the whole multitude of those who had not embraced the Christian religion, whether Jews or Heathens. See Joh. 15, 18, 12, 31. Col. 2, 20. In what sense δεδουλ. is to be understood
appears from the note on § 26. Compare Hebr. 9, 9 & 10. (Borger.)

Koppe also is of opinion, that the ἡμεῖς refers to both Jews and Gentiles. It is well remarked by Theophyl. : Μανθάνομεν δὲ, διὰ ο μὲν θεὸς τῆς υιοθεσίας (αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ κληρονομία) ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡ θεόλετο δοῦναι, ἀλλ’ ἡ νηπιότης ἡμῶν ἐκάλει. The interpretation of στοιχεῖα, adopted by most recent Commentators, is supported by the authority of some antient ones, who (as Theophyl. remarks) explained it by τὸν στοιχειώδη καὶ εἰσαγωγικὸν νόμον.

4, 5. Here the Apostle carries further the comparison drawn from the pædagogus, the οἰκουμένος, and the ἐκτρέφος; q. d. "For as the son, for a time, is subject to the government of these, but when the προδεσία is accomplished, is, as it were, liberated, and becomes his own master; so we, so long attached τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, are liberated from them, on the Son of God being sent into the world for the purpose of delivering us." Πλήσαμα τοῦ χρόνου also occurs in Gen. 25, 24. 29, 21. Acts 2, 2. Eph. 1, 10. Ez. 5, 2. (Sep.) The phrase πληροῦν τοῦ χρόνου, and similar ones in the Old Testament, are supposed to be derived from a similar use of the Hebr. נָעַם. But they also occur in the Classical writers. Thus Plut. 1, 516 c. επιμαρτυρόμενοι πεπληρώσθαι τοῦ χρόνου. [To which may be added Pindar fragm. 95. ἐν χρόνῳ δὲ γίνετ' Ἀπόλλων. Edit.] So also Eph. 1, 10. Πλήσαμα τῶν καίρων. (Borger.)

Ἐξαποστέλλειν is thought by Borger to be the same with ἀποστέλλειν. But it almost always is somewhat more significant, and especially when, as here, and in the next verse, and also in Exod. 3, 10 & 18. 1 Sam. 2, 5. Acts 22, 21., it is used of legates sent out with a divine commission.

4. γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς, "descended from a woman." Of this sense of the word many examples are adduced by Borger, as Herodot. L. 9. ήμέρα τῇ ἐγένετο βασίλεια, on his birth-day. Dionys. Hal. p. 136. ἦ ἐγένετο Ἀ. M. Ἀλιαν. V. H. 3, 36. ἐς ἴλυρίδος γυναικὸς γενομένη. The words following ἤνα
tods ὑπὸ νόμον ἔξωγοράς, state the purpose (or rather the purposes) for which Christ was sent, namely, to buy off and liberate those who were under the law. At τῶν must be supplied δεσδουλαμένους from the preceding. This sense of ὑπὸ has, in the Classical writers, almost always the dative; but in St. Paul, always the accusative; which may be reckoned among the Cilicisms occasionally found in the Apostle.

5. ἵνα τὴν ζωοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. The ἵνα denotes end, or effect. On the sense of ἀπόλ. τὴν ζωοθεσίαν see the note supra 3, 26. Ζωοθεσία is explained by Borger "ea hominis Christiani conditio, quà ab omni metu liber colit fidenter, amatque Deum ut Patrem, ut ab eo nihil quicquam mali timeat, immo vero optima quæque in hac et futurâ vitâ exspectet."

6. ὅτι δὲ ἔστε ιολ, ἐξαπεστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ ζωοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. It is here demonstrated, by a sure proof, that the Galatians are partakers of that ζωοθεσία, or sonship.

Theophyl. well explains: "Whence is it not plain that we were presented with this sonship?" Now the Apostle (says he) had before manifested this; when he shewed that we had put on Christ, who is the son of God: but he shows it now, also, from our having received the Spirit, which prepares us to call God our Father, having touched our hearts in a new and distinctive manner. Yet this would not have been the case, had we not been favoured with the adoption." He then paraphrases: "So that, since we are sons and heirs, not of ordinary things, but of those that pertain to God, and are partakers of the only begotten, why are we then become servants, and neglect the faith which gave us our worship, by hankering after the Law?"

Borger thinks that, from the context and the course of the argument, it appears that before ὅτι there is an ellipsis of ἵνα δῆλον ἦ; as in Demosth. C. Pant. p. 628. ὅτι ταύτ' ἐλήφθη λέγει, καλεῖ μοι τοῦτον τῶν μαρτυρῶν, i.e. ἵνα δῆλον ἦ ὅτι, &c. But this ellipsis is (I
think) no where else to be found in the Apostle. I therefore prefer the other mode proposed by Borger (and which had also occurred to myself), namely, to supply δῆλον after υἱόν. It is plain that the Apostle means to assert the having received the Spirit as a proof of their sonship. The same argument of proving it (Mr. Locke observes), from their having the Spirit, St. Paul uses to the Romans, Rom. 8, 16. And on reading 2 Cor. 4, 17—ver. 6., and Eph. 1, 11—14., it will be found that the Spirit is looked upon as the seal and assurance of the inheritance of life to those who have received the adoption of sons, as St. Paul speaks here, ver. 5.” The force of the argument (continues he) seems to lie in this, that as he that has the spirit of a man in him has an evidence that he is the son of a man, so he that hath the Spirit of God has thereby an assurance that he is the son of God.”

The πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ is explained, by almost all the recent Foreign Commentators, sensus Christianus, those pious feelings which become us as Christians.* But this, however specious, seems to be a precarious, not to say an unsound, interpretation. I cannot but think that the sense of the expression was better seen by the antients. Thus ÓEcumen. 784: ἤρα ἐκφανὴς τῆς αὐτῆς τριάδος ὁ θεὸν ἡφέστειλεν, ἀ υφες ἑσαρκίσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συνήργησεν, ὃ καὶ εἰς τὰς καρδιὰς ἐγῶν ἐπεισελθὼν, διὰδεκα λέγειν, ἀββά ὁ θεός ἡ φήσιν. And so Bp. Pearson: “Here the Son is distinguished from the Father, as first sent by Him; and the Spirit of the Son is distinguished both from the Father, and from the Son, as sent by the Father, after He had sent the

* Borger makes the best of this interpretation by paraphrasing thus: “Deus ergo, cum Filii sui spiritum mittit, id efficit, ut idem animi sensus in Christianis excitentur atque alantur, qui sunt in C.J. utique illi, quoad ejus fieri potest; id velint, cogitent, agant, quod velle, cogitare, atque agere eos decent.” He, however, shows his orthodoxy by observing: “Haec vocis πνεῦμα significatio repetenda est a notione Spiritus Sancti, eximie ita dicti, quem borum sensuum piorum auctorem et effectorem esse, constanter docent Apostoli.”
Son. And this our Saviour hath taught us several times, Joh. 14, 26. 15, 26. Hence we conclude that the Holy Ghost, although He be truly and properly God, is neither God the Father, nor God the Son." And so also Mr. Locke ap. Doyley. "He could not be called the Spirit of the Son any otherwise than as proceeding from the Son; so that it is evident He proceeds from both Father and Son." This is, I conceive, the truth: yet not perhaps the whole truth; for there seems some allusion to those supernatural gifts which some of the Galatians had to boast of as well as the Corinthians. So supra 8, 5. οὐν ἐπιχορηγῶν ύμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν υμῖν.

The words κραξέω, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατὴρ, are excellently explained by Oecumen. thus: ὅπερ κατακεφοίτηκε παρασκευάζων ὑμᾶς καὶ διδασκόν πατέρα τὸν Θεόν καὶ καλεῖν.* As to ὁ πατὴρ, it is plainly the Nominative for the Vocative; as in Matt. 1, 20. Mark 14, 36. Eph. 6, 1.

7. ἐστε οὖν ἐίς εἶ δοῦλος, ἀλλ' υἱὸς εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ. Borger observes that there is no difficulty in this verse, if it be compared with Rom. 8, 17. and 3, 29. and the notes. Εἶ is for ἐστε, by a very frequent idiom.

8, 9. The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that in these two verses, by a sudden conversio sermonis, the persons addressed are Gentile Christians. And this seems to be denoted by the ἀλλά. The two verses are also opposed to each other by the use of the apodotic particles μὲν and δὲ. The first treats of the pristine condition of the Galatians, when enslaved to a wretched idolatry

* According to the interpretation of the recent Commentators just noticed, κραξέω must be interpreted "give us a right to exclaim," which is very harsh. Far preferable is the one just given.

Selden (De Succ. in Bonâ Def. C. 4.) adduces a quotation from the Babylonian Gemara, to prove that it was not allowed to slaves to use the title of Abba in addressing the master of the family to which they belonged, or the correspondent title Imma, (or mother,) when speaking to the mistress of it.
(which is meant by ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὕσι Θεοῖς); and this the Apostle attributes (in the words οὐκ εἰδότες τὸν Θεόν) to their ignorance of the nature of God. The second describes the opposite state, as knowing and being known of God, and is made to serve as a ground of wonder how they should wish to slide back into their former bondage to superstition. Such is the general sentiment. We will now proceed to consider the phraseology in detail.

It is manifest that ἀλλὰ μὲν is not (as Koppe thought) a mere form of transition. Nor was there any reason for Noesselt and Rosenm. to think that τὸτε refers to the time when the Jewish part of the congregation had been under the law. The τὸτε and νῦν are added to the μὲν and δὲ, to more clearly express the meaning; the former designating the time when they were Heathens; the latter, that during which they had been Christians. The phrase οὐκ εἰδότες τὸν Θεόν is a periphrasis for ἀθεόν (as in Eph. 2, 11 & 12). See 1 Thess. 4, 5. 2 Thess. 1, 8. The sense is: "because ye were ignorant of God," i.e. the true God, Jehovah.* Εἰδουλεύσατε is thought by most Commentators to designate the slavery of idolatry. But it is objected by Borger, that δουλεύον, like the Heb. תוע in 1 Chron. 28, 9., and often elsewhere, sometimes merely signifies to worship and serve God. And so Paræus, Tir., our English Translators, and Schleus. And this would be preferable, were it not for the phrase δουλεύον στοιχείων at ver. 9., which (I think) plainly proves that δουλ. is here to be taken in sensu deteriori.

The τοῖς μὴ φύσει οὕσι Θεοῖς is also a periphrasis for "false gods." Thus Grot. compares Deut. 32, 21. γνωτε τοὺς Θεοὺς, εἰς τοὺς φύσεις τοῦτο καὶ θερ. It is strange that some eminent Critics, as S. Clarke,
Koppe, and Semler, should have regarded φύσει as a gloss, merely because its place is not quite the same in different MSS. It is not omitted in one Greek MS.; and though some MSS., as A, C, D, E, F, and G., and some Fathers read τοῖς φύσει μὴ δοθῆ, yet that is only a more elegant mode of position, such as we often find in MSS. where the text has passed through the hands of a corrector, which may be said of most of those here cited. As to the Versions, they are, in such a case as this, no evidence. Hence it is clear that φύσει must be retained; and its present position is defended by a similar trajectio in Eph. 2, 3. As to the sense of φύσει, most Commentators, as Menoch., Par., Beza, Pisc., Koppe, &c., think that the word is meant to be opposed to the δόξα, or opinion of men, or human laws and ordinances.* But this seems scarcely to reach far enough. I should think, with the antient Commentators, and some modern ones, as Wolf and Elsner, that it has a reference to the essence and nature of the Supreme Being, as opposed to those who were only fictitious and made gods.† This, Elsner observes, supplies a strong argument against the Socinians: for if Christ is not a φύσει Θεός, he can in no respect be a true God, nor worthy of religious worship.

The formula μᾶλλον δὲ, Koppe says, is one non angendi sed corrigendi superiora. But to this I cannot assent. It should seem to be a formula corrigendi ideoque et angendi. Examples are adduced by Raphel from Polymb. Such, indeed, are also to

---

* So Wets.: "φύσει opponitur νόμῳ πόλεως sive θεσει.
† To which purpose Elsner cites Hierocl. (addressing wise and good men after death): ἔσσει τοίν μάλλον θεός, οὐ φύσει (scil. ἦν) τοίν μάλλον θεός. Idem p. 170. (of Pythagoras): ὃς οὖν τῶν ἄνθρωπων θεόν, ὅπερ τῶν φύσει Ἰρων, ἀλλ' ἄνθρωποι θεοὶ κοιμήθησι. Αἰλιαν. L. 3. Var. Hist. C. 18. He also cites from Philostr. οἱ μὴ φύσει παίδεις and Julian, οἱ φύσει γονεῖς. It is strange that the learned Commentator did not notice the very frequent, I had almost said perpetual, use of Θεός in Philostratus in a lower sense, as it was applied to demi-gods, i.e. heroes, deified men.
be found in Thucyd. and almost every good writer. And so Justin Martyr p. 64 d. (cited by Borger) πιστεύοντες, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πεπεισμένοι.

The γνώντες Θεώ has the very same sense as εἰδότες Θεώ just before: but it is used to introduce a paronomasia, as well as an antithesis in γνωσθέντες υπὸ Θεοῦ.

9. γνωσθέντες υπὸ Θεοῦ. This is, by Beza, Koppe, Noesselt, and Schleus, taken to mean "brought by God to a knowledge of him (as in 1 Cor. 8, 3.)," according to the Heb. Conj. Hiphil. And this is confirmed by the authority of the antient Commentators. So Theophyl.: αὐτὸς ύμᾶς ἐν σκότῳ βαθεὶ διάγνως ἐξήτησε καὶ προσελάβησε, τὸ γὰρ, γνωσθέντες, ἀντὶ τοῦ, προσελθάντες υπὸ Θεοῦ. Borger and Paræus, however, would interpret the γνωσθ. of the love of God. So God is said γινόμενος τοὺς ἄντρας αὐτοῦ, 2 Tim. 2, 19. And Borger has much of learned observation in proof of this sense, adducing several Classical examples. But I confess that I think the interpretation very precarious. Grotius has, I think, alone seized the true interpretation, who explains it, "being recognized as God's own sons, and approved by the spiritual gifts he had imparted to some of them." See supra 3, 5. This mode of taking the expression had also occurred to myself.

The πῶς carries with it a mixture of indignation and interrogation. ἐπιστρέφετε is rendered, by Koppe and Borger, "would you turn." But the present sense may be retained, namely, "how is it that you are turning back." The epithets ἄσθενη and πτωχὰ are nearly synonymous, and little needed the laboured explanation Koppe has given them. They both designate inefficiency for the purpose in view: but the latter is a more bold and figurative expression, and answers to our wretched, je-june. It is rightly observed by Doddre., that the ceremonies of the law were weak, as they had no sufficient power to cleanse the soul from sin, and justify the sinner in the sight of God; and poor, as they
could not confer the spiritual riches of the Gospel, pardon, and peace, and the assurance of enjoying life and happiness. See also Crellius.

In πάλιν ἀναθέτει Koppe recognizes a redundancy. But, in fact, there is none, any more than in our phrase back again. As to the passage of Galen (taken from Wets.), it is nothing to the purpose; since though πάλιν and ἀναθέτει are conjoined, yet there each is significant. So also Aristoph. in Plato, v. 121. ἂν γε πλουτάσωσιν ἐξ ἀρχής. It is true that πάλιν αὖ and πάλιν αὖθις are common in the best writers; as Thucyd. But I cannot think this is of the same kind. The sense is: “again (as), at the first.”

Of στοιχεῖα the general sense has been explained supra ver. 8.: but the question is, to what it refers here? Grot., Whitby, and Pyle, think that “the Gentiles of Galatia, in embracing Judaical doctrines, are said to turn again to the elements of the Mosaic Law, because the rites and ordinances of that law resembled, in so many particulars, their former idolatrous ceremonies.” But this seems very harsh. Of the early modern Commentators most interpret the words of the Mosaic rites and ceremonies; others, of the Heathen ones. But both opinions lie open to objection. The best founded one is (I think) that of Koppe, Storr, Schleus., Mackn., and Borger, that the word relates to the rites and ceremonies both of Judaism, and of Paganism. It is well remarked by Koppe: “In ritibus externis magnam fuisse omni tempore Judaismi et Gentilismi similitudinem, et eam quidem ex ingenii humani, quod inter omnes gentes, dummodo temporibus, coelo, reipublice institutione, cultu denique omni non sint planè dissimiles, prorsus eodem modo se exserere paulatinque efformare solet, natura facile intelligendam et explicandam, inter omnes constat.”

10. ἦμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε, καὶ μέρας, κ. κ. This verse, Borger observes, is meant to be explanatory of what the Apostle just before called ἀναθέτει στοι- χεῖα. When the Apostle says ἦμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε,
he may be thought to have reference to the Jewish festivals. By ἡμέρας is supposed to be meant the Sabbaths; by μῆνας, the novilunial feasts; and by καλής, certain festivals recurring at stated times, as Passover, Pentecost, &c. The ἐναρτίον has been thought by some to denote the Sabbatical or Jubilean year; but by others, with far more probability, the feast of the new year, called in Num. 29, 1. וַיְהִי. It is, however, not necessary to minutely scrutinize the force of each term, as the Apostle only intends a general description of attachment to rites and ceremonies. Almost all the Commentators seem agreed that the words are meant of the Jewish ceremonies only. Yet, I see not why they may not be also understood (with Koppe, and formerly Hilary) of the Heathen ones, which bore a strong resemblance to the Jewish. Indeed, if στοιχεῖα, in the verse preceding, have that extended sense which many eminent Commentators ascribe to it, they must be so understood. And this seems to be confirmed by the words following.

Παρατηρεῖται signifies properly to "keep the eye fixed upon, (παρά) any thing, and thence to mind, observe, keep," &c., as men do a feast day. Koppe explains the term here of superstitious inquiry whether certain days are lucky, or unlucky, feast days, or not, and what should be done on every day. Wets. compares Jamblich. 8, 4. (speaking of the Egyptians) μητε ἐλλο τι προσπαραλαμβάνοτε ἢ μόνον καὶ ρου παρατήσῃσιν. Chandler and Battier take the sentence interrogatively; which seems preferable.

11. φασθῶμαι ὑμᾶς, μῆτως εἰκῇ κεκατάκα eis ὑμᾶς. There is here a very common idiom, by which (as Borger expresses it) a noun in the accusative is united with a preceding verb, which properly ought to have been joined with a following one, whether in the nominative, or accusative. So Mark 1, 24. οἴδα σε τις εἶ, for οἴδι τις συ εἰ and Luke 4, 34. Gal. 6, 1. And sometimes this noun is pleonastic; as here. Classical examples may be seen in Wets. and Borger.
This, it must be observed, is especially found with verbs of fearing.

Κοπιάω is elsewhere used by St. Paul of labour in evangelizing; as 1 Cor. 15, 10. Col. 1, 29. 1 Tim. 4, 10. Εἰς υμᾶς, is taken by Koppe for ὑπέρ υμῶν or υμῶν ἐνεκα. But the εἰς may have its usual sense, and denote the end of action; and there will be no difficulty, if we translate thus: “I fear lest I have bestowed labour upon you in vain.” The same construction is found in Rom. 16, 6. ἦτες πολλὰ ἐκπιάσεν εἰς υμᾶς.

12. γίνεσθε αἰς ἐγὼ, &c. This is one of those passages in which, from the extreme brevity of the Apostle, the sense is exceedingly doubtful. Hence the variety of opinions. It is evident that the sense will depend on the verb to be supplied in κἀγας αἰς υμεῖς. Now the most regular ellipsis is γίνομαι, from the preceding γίνεσθε. And so our English translators and most recent Commentators, as Koppe, Roem., and Borger. But they are not agreed on the sense. Some, as Morus, Mackn., Grot., Wolf, and Whitby, think there is here a description of mutual love; since the beloved object is another self. So Terent. Eunuch. 1, 2, 116. Meus fac sis postremo animus, quando ego sum tuus. But I assent to Koppe and Borger, that this sense cannot be elicited from the words. Koppe explains thus: “Imitate my example; for I, though a Jew by birth, care no more for Jewish rites than you.” But as this Epistle is chiefly addressed to the Judaizers, that would be contrary to fact; and if the Apostle be supposed to address himself to Gentile Christians only, it is difficult to imagine in what he would have them follow his example, or what force the ἐτι κἀγας αἰς υμεῖς can thus have. Upon the whole, no interpretation seems so little exceptionable as that of the antient Commentators (including the Syr. and Arab. Versions), and some moderns, as Hamm., Starck, Zeltner, Beausobre, Wells, Dodd., Wets., Rosenm., Semler, and Schleus., who understand ἐγενώμην, and assign the following sense: “Follow my example in
renouncing the law for the Gospel. I was once as zealous for the law as you are; but now I live as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews; do you who are not Jews, but Gentiles, live in like manner as men released from the law.* So Theophyl. (from Chrys.): μιμήσασθέ με, καὶ γὰρ ἔγα τὸ νόμον περιεκιαίμην, αὐτοὶ όμοιοι ἀρχὴν τοῦτον, καὶ αὐτῶν τό Ἑρώτητο καὶ τῆς πίστεως ὑπὲρμαχώ· τοιούτοι καὶ ύμεῖς γίνεσθε. Καλῶς δὲ τούτο ὑστερον τεθείκεν· οἱ γὰρ ἄνδροι τοῖς μᾶλλον αὐτὸ τῶν ὑποδειγμάτων ἐλκυσταί, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν λογίσμων. It is truly observed by Slade, that this is the more natural interpretation. And he compares Acts 26, 29. It has indeed been objected that thus ἤτι will not be suitable; nor the following words ὑπὸν με ἡδικήσθε, be to the purpose. But that depends on the mode in which they are explained. The ἤτι may mean ἅττορε; as in 2 Cor. 5, 14. Rom. 10, 9. Phil. 1, 27. 2, 22. Col. 1, 19. 1 Thess. 1, 5. 2, 14. In which case ἤτι has an highly elliptical force, and refers, as here, to several words omitted. As to the ὑπὸν με ἡδικήσατε, it must be explained in conformity to the view taken of the preceding words. According to the interpretation above adopted, the words may be thus explained: "I have not to complain of being aggrieved by you; ye have never been ill affected to me (and therefore I may expect you to attend to my entreaty in this case)."

13, 14. It is well remarked by Borger, that the Apostle commences a new subject; reminding the Galatians of past times. Yet there seems to be a connection with the preceding. Thus Koppe, after observing that ver. 13 & 14. are closely conjoined, gives the following as the general sense: "On the contrary, ye yourselves remember under what infirmities of body I taught you the Gospel, at my first sojourn among you; and yet you did not despise," &c.

* The passage has been imitated by Justin Martyr, ap. Wets.: γίνεσθε ὡς ἔγα ἤτι καὶ γὰρ ἦμεν ὡς ύμεῖς. It is manifest how high an authority this must give the interpretation in question, considering the high antiquity of this Father.
18. So ἀσθενεῖα, is for ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ; which use Koppe says is rare. He refers, however, to Joh. 6, 57. Phil. 1, 15. The ἀσθεν. τῆς σαρκὸς is explained by most antient and modern Commentators, of the persecutions and afflictions which the Apostle underwent. And if those words only were to be considered, that interpretation might have place; but viewed in conjunction with the words following, καὶ τῶν πειρασμῶν—ἐξεπτύσατε, which seem intended to explain the preceding, it cannot be admitted. For (as Whitby and Doddr. observe) these persecutions could be no cause why the Galatians should despise him, and were so far from making him contemptible, that they must rather be an inducement to their receiving him with more respect, when he could bear such sufferings in vindication of the doctrine he delivered. Besides, as Mr. Slade (from Whitby) observes, though the words ἀσθενεῖα and πειρασμὸς, when put absolutely, do sometimes signify afflictions and persecutions, yet we do not find ἀσθενεῖα τῆς σαρκὸς, or ὦ πειρασμὸς ὦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί, ever used in such sense. "The Apostle (says Doddr.) speaks of it as an infirmity and temptation seated in his flesh, which, by the effect it had upon him, might render both his person and his speech obnoxious to contempt, and have a tendency to make him despicable in the eyes of others; agreeably to which he elsewhere mentions it as objected to him, that his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible (2 Cor. 10, 10)." Indeed there seems so striking a resemblance between his representing temptation as in his flesh, and what he says (at 2 Cor. 12, 7) of the thorn in his flesh, that I cannot but consider it, (with Whitby, Doddr., Wells, Mackn., Slade, Borger, and Jaspis,) as the same; for a full detail of which see the note on that passage.

On the πρόερεπόν it is well observed by Jaspis (after Borger), that it would seem frigid, unless we suppose Paul to have been twice, at least, in Galatia before this epistle was written. And thus (he adds)
may be better illustrated all that we know of the adversaries of the Apostle, and their calumnies.

As to the terms ἐβουλένσατε and ἐξετύσατε, they are merely synonymous; though the latter (which answers to the Latin repsiure) is the stronger term; and the union of both terms strengthens the sense. The force of each of the words Koppe has illustrated with examples, the most apposite of which is from Ἀeschin.: Δημοσθένης δυσχεραίνει καὶ καταπτύει δωροδοκιας.

14. ἀλλ' ἂς ἄγγελος Θεοῦ ἔδεξασθέ με, ἂς Χ. 'Ι. The ἀλλά signifies immo vero, and refers to a clause omitted, q. d.: "Nay, so far from despising me for my infirmity, ye received me as an angel of God (nay) as Jesus Christ himself." By ἔδεξασθέ, I think, meant not merely personal respect and reverence (though Koppe confines it to this; referring to 2 Sam. 19, 27.), but also obedient admission of his doctrines, as if promulgated by an angel, nay, even Jesus Christ himself in person, and not by deputy. Borger understands it solely of the reception of his doctrines; which is harsh and unnecessary. The passage of 2 Sam. is not quite apposite; since there the King is (agreeably to Oriental notions) considered as God’s vicegerent on earth.

15. τίς οὖν ἡν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; These words are by the antient, and some modern Commentators, taken to signify, "where is all that mutual congratulation at having me for your teacher? What are all your praises come to?" But this sense cannot be elicited from the words; neither would it be agreeable to those that follow. I therefore prefer, with some modern and most recent Commentators, as Locke, Doddr., Rosenm., Koppe, Borger, and Jaspis, to consider the; as a note of exclamation rather than interrogation; q. d. "how great was the happiness and blessedness which you felt!" namely, (as Jaspis supplies) at having such a teacher. And this latter interpretation is supported by the authority of ὍEcumen. 751. τίς ἡν, οὐκ ἐρωτῶντος ἔστιν, ἀλλ’
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ὅπον θαυμάζοντος καὶ ἐπαιροῦντος τὴν πότε πίστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐκ ταύτης μακαρισμῶν. Τις ἄν Ἰλίκης ἄν, φησι, θαυμαστῶς Ἰλίκου μακαρισμοῦ ἔξεσάτε. Thus the words following yield a very apt sense.

15. μαρτυροῦ γὰρ ὑμῖν—μοι. “Nay, so great was your gratitude and affection that (I bear you witness) ye would, if possible, have torn out your eyes, and given them to them.” Ἐξορύξατεν ὁφθαλμὸς is to denote tearing out the eyes: and ὁφθαλμὸς ὑμῶν ἔξορύξατε ἃν ἐδοκίμασε μοι, is an hyperbolical and proverbial saying, of which Wets. adduces numerous examples.*

16. οὕτε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα—ἄλλα ἐκκλείσαí ὑμᾶς. There is here an appearance of some abruptness; but, in reality, there is none. The Apostle means to deprecate the ill will they had harboured, or might harbour, against him for his free expostulation; drawing a strong contrast between their former unbounded admiration of, and respect for him, and their present reserve and distrust.† So that this expostulation began to at ὠδὴν μὲ ἀφίκησατε, and, after the interposition of ver. 13 & 14, is continued at ver. 15.; q. d. “I had thus no reason to complain of any want of affection, or unkind treatment, and there is no reason why I should experience it now, except that I have told you the truth, unwelcome as it may be, and have given you wholesome counsel, though perhaps unacceptable.” This view of the connexion, and plan of the context, is in


† So Paley well observes, that it was very natural to contrast with this conduct, the zeal with which they had once received him; and it was not less so to mention, as a proof of their former disposition towards him, the indulgence which, whilst he was among them, they had shewn to his infirmity.”
some degree confirmed by the Greek Commentators. So Theophil. (from Chrys.) 474, τι οὖν γέγονεν ὑμιᾷ καὶ αὐτῷ ἐχθρὸν με νῦν ὑποτεύετε; ἄτοσον γὰρ τὸν οὕτω παρ᾿ ὑμᾶς τιμηθέντα, ἐχθρὰ γνώμῃ ταῦτα λέγειν ὑμῖν. And again: "Ἀλλὰν, φησίν, οὐκ οἶδα ἐχθρὸς αὐτῶν, ἢ ὅτι τὰ ἀληθῆ ὑμῖν εἶπον, καὶ ἡ λεγέσα διαφθειρόμενα περὶ τὰ δόγματα. Hence it is clear that ἐχθρόν, though it is susceptible of two senses, to hate another, and to be hated by another, must here be taken in the latter (as is done by Est., Par., Schleus., Koppe, and Rosenn.) and not the former, as many Commentators, including Grot. and Borger. And it is in vain that Borger urges that the ὑμῖν demands that sense: for the Apostle is not so exact as to attend to such niceties. Besides, as ὑμῖν occurs just after, it would have occasioned a tautology: and, moreover, ἐχθρός may be considered as a noun; q. d. "can I become your enemy, the object of your hatred?"

"Ὥστε is here used in the very rare sense of So then? "Ὥστε signifying therefore, out of interrogation, is common.

16. ἀληθευῶν ὑμῖν, "by speaking the plain truth to you." 'Ὑμῖν is for πρὸς ὑμᾶς. The Apostle seems to have had in view some adage, such as that of Ter. Andr. 1, 41. Sapienter vitam institut: namque hoc tempore obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit. Various other similar passages are adduced by Wets.; as Sophocl. Ajax. 1545. ἔξεστιν οὖν ἐπινεύτοι τὸ ἀληθῆ φίλῳ. Σοι μηδὲν ἦσον ἡ πάρος ξυνηρμευείν; εἰπ᾿ ἡ γὰρ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἂν εἶδο φρονῶν. Herodot. 7, 101. ὁ βασίλευς, κάτερα ἀληθής χρηστοί πέσας σε ἡ ἱδονή; see also Herodian 4, 9. and Dio Cass. p. 290. cited by Borger. To which I add a saying of Agatho, ap. Athen. 15. p. 211 ε. εἰ μὲν φράσω τάληθες, οὐχὶ σ᾿ εὐφρανῶ, εἰ δ᾿ εὐφρανῶ τι σ᾿; οὐχὶ τ᾿ ἀληθὲς φράσω. Eurip. Phoen. 586. ἀπόλωλεν ἀλήθεια, ἐπεὶ σὺ διστυχεῖς; Æschyl. Agam. 603. οὐκ ἐσθ᾿ ὧτις λέξαι μι τά μενιν καλά, Εἰς τὸν πολὺν φίλοισι καρπούσαι χρόνον. Liv. L. 22, 38. concio fuit verior, quam gratior populó. Æschin. 71, 38, πόσερ τ᾿ ἀληθὲς εἰπώ, ἢ τὸ ἡδίστον ἀκούσαί; τ᾿
On the face of it, the verse reads...

17. ἔκκλείσαι υμᾶς οὐ καλῶς—ἐκκλείσατε. The interpretation of this and the next verse is embarrassed with difficulties. The obscurity seems to have arisen partly from the extreme delicacy of the Apostle on a subject connected with his own private feelings. Before we can hope to determine the sense, we must fix the reading; and the state of the case is strangely misstated by Dodd. and Mackn. Now the common editions have ἔκκλείσαις ἡμᾶς. But all the MSS., Versions, Fathers, and Editions before Beza’s third edition, have ὑμᾶς, which has been approved by the best critics, and received by Bengel, Koppe, and Griesbach; and rightly; for ἡμᾶς was merely a conjecture of Beza; though it seems to have place in some MSS. But what sense is to be assigned to ἔκκλεισαν? Most modern Commentators, as Grot., Elsner, Alberti, Dodd., &c. render: “ut amorem vestrum captant.” But it is justly objected by Koppe and Borger, that there is not sufficient authority for such a signification. Koppe’s interpretation, however, (which see) is too far-fetched to be admitted. Upon the whole, I see none so little liable to objection as that of Chrys. and the other Greek Commentators, as also the Vulg., Wells, Koppe, and Borger, who take ἔκκλεισαν to mean imitatur et aemulatur; a sense of ἡμ. very common. (See Borger.) The words may, then, be rendered: “they imitate and copy your zeal for the Gospel οὐ καλῶς, with dissimulation, with evil intention.” Then the words following show the nature of that evil intention.

17. ἔκκλείσας ὑμᾶς. Here again no little difficulty involves the interpretation, owing to extreme brevity. Something is left to be supplied, and what that is the context alone can show us. Borger, who has, of all the modern Commentators, most diligently examined the context, would supply ἔκκλησιάς, βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, &c. But if so, the turbu-
were not *Judaizing Christians*, but *Jews*; which does not seem to have been the case. There is every reason to think that they were persons who wished to unite the Law with the Gospel. I cannot but think that the antient Commentators have here, as on most other occasions, best discerned the sense. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrys.) explains: ἄκκλεισαι ὑμᾶς, τουτέστιν ἐκβάλλειν τῆς τελειωτάτης ἐν Χριστῷ καταστάσεως καὶ γνώσεως, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἀτελεστέραν ἐκβάλλειν, ινα αὐτῶς τιμᾶτε ὡς διδασκάλους, καὶ γηλούτε καὶ μιμήσθε, ὡς μαθηταί. And he adds: 'Ἐγὼ δὲ τούναντιν ἡβουλόμην ὑμᾶς αὐτῶς καὶ πάσιν καθηγτάς εἶναι πρὸς τὰ τελείωτα ἡ δὴ καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἡμῖν. Διέπτεται δὲ ταύτα ἐξής. And so Ὑεκumen. and Theodoret. This interpretation is, I think, strongly confirmed by what is found in the preceding chapter. The difficulty, it may be observed, has been partly occasioned by a union of point, and antithesis.

The words ἵνα αὐτῶς γηλούτε have certainly the sense assigned to them by Chrys., namely, "that ye may be imitators and disciples of them (rather than of me.)" So 1 Cor. 11, 1. it is said ἰμιηταὶ μου γίνεσθε.

18. καλὸν δὲ τὸ γηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε—ὑμᾶς. Here again the sense is rather hinted at than expressed, and is rather to be guessed than proved. The difficulty, as in the former verse, has been occasioned by the paromasia and antithesis in καλὸν—καλῷ. Borger, who has diligently discussed the sense of the whole of this difficult portion, offers the following interpretation: "Omnis ejusmodi imitatio, (qualem vs. 17. significaverat Apostolus) inutilis est atque perniciosa: mutua vero virtutis semulatio vos, Christiani! decet, sincera illa, omnemque simulationem sernens, non tantum me praesente, sed quovis tempore." This is very well conceived; but the chief scope of the passage seems to be overlooked, which was acutely pointed out by Chrys., who, in addition to his annotation on the preceding, here subjoins: 'Εν
taútha aivístetai, ósti ἡ ἀποστολαί αὐτῶ ταὐτά εἰργάσατο, καὶ óti τὸ μὲν μακάριον, τὸτε ἔστι, μὴ παρόντος τοῦ ὄντας Μᾶς τῶν μαθητάς τὴν διάσωσαν ἔχει γνώμην, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπόντος· ἐκείνῃ δὲ ἐκείνου οὐδέτερον ἄλλως τὸν τελείωτον ἀφιγμένοι, ταύτα τοιεῖται, οὕτε εἰς τὸτέ αὐτῶς ἐμβιβάσαι.

19. τεκνία μου, οὐς τὰλιν ἀδίνων, ἀγριεὶς οὐ μαρφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. This verse is by Wesseling transposed and placed after ver. 15. But that is wholly unsupported by any external evidence, and in so abrupt and irregular a writer as St. Paul such transpositions might be adopted frequently; though it is evident how precarious they will be. At the same time, it is possible that the Apostle had the words of ver. 15. still in mind, and that ver. 15—18. are, to a certain degree, parenthetical. At all events I would, with Bos. Semler, and Borger, closely connect the words τεκνία, &c. with ὑμᾶς preceding, and regard them as parenthetical. Though it may be more just to consider them as said per epanalepsin, the δὲ often having that force.

The metaphor in τεκνία — ἀδίνω is frequent in St. Paul (and also the Rabbinical writers; see Schoettg.) and though his more frequent term is γεννάω (as in Corinth. 4, 15. Philem. 10), by which he represents himself as a father begetting children. Here he represents himself as a mother conceiving and forming them in the womb: which is accurately expressed by the words following, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. So the Hebr. לוח in Ps. 7, 15. Cant. 8, 5. And so sometimes the Classical writers. See Loesner in loc., who aptly cites Philo 313 b. and 447 c. ἦ ἐπὶ πλέον ἄνεσις τὸ μεγίστον κακῶν ἀσέβειαν ἀδίνω. I cannot but think that in these passages he had in mind Ps. 7, 14. (Sept.) ἵδιον ἀδίνησεν ἀδίκιαν, σωμάτισθε τοὺν, καὶ ἐτεκνά ἀναμίαν.

Theophil. (from Chrys.) excellently illustrates the phraseology thus: Διεθείτε, φηλι, τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν ἐλγετέ ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτισματος, καὶ δέσθε πάλιν ἐτέρας ἀναγενήσεως καὶ ἀναπλά-
οσις, ινα παλιν εν ώμιν η μορφή του Χριστοῦ γένεται, οστε εξ αυτοῦ Χαρακτηρίζεται ύμας, παλιν γαρ ομος οδίνων, δια της διδακταλιας εν αυτης εκδηγησεστι ου γαρ απογνωσκα. And by Koppe as follows: Ο filioli mei; in quibus denuo efformandis matris, filium utero gestantis, cura et sollicitudine elaboro, nulli ærumne, nulli labori parcam, usque dum genuini et perfecti Christi sectatores efformemini.

It is scarely necessary to notice the use of ὁς for δ', by the figure προς το σημαινόμενον, on which see Viger. Idiot. and Matth. Gr. Gr.

20. ἡθελον δε παρείναι—ομι. Here we have a re-sumption of what was said at ver. 18; as is clear from the repetition of the word παρείναι and the δε, which has in this, as in many other cases, an epa-naleptic force. The sense is: "I could wish, I say, to be present with you."

The meaning of the words και ἀλλάξαι την φανήν μου is somewhat obscure and dubious; yet by the aid of the context, and by attention to the circumstances of the case it may be ascertained. Chrys. Theophyl., Cyrill., and others explain: "change my tone into lamentation and wailing." But this seems harsh and far-fetched. Preferable is that of Pisc., Wolf, Wets. Doddr., and Rosenm., who render: "I would gladly change my tone, namely, to praise instead of cen-suring you; as I first commended and now re-prove you." But this seems to be somewhat stiff and unnatural, and seems little agreeable to the words following, unless δε be rendered for at present, with a strong emphasis on at present: which, however, would be too violent. I would therefore adopt the interpretation of ΟEcumen. and Theodoret, the latter of whom excellently paraphrases thus: Περιπολούμενος ύπο του πάθους γενέσθαι υπόπτερος ἡθελον, και των μεν την ἐκτροπην θεψαμαι, των δε το βέβαιον θεωράτηκαν γαρ, Φησιν, απογα τη τι επι τι φθέγομαι, τι οὔδομαι.—So Grot. explains: change my tone, i. e. speak some-
times with severity, sometimes with lenity, according as I should find you affected, which is easier for those who are present, and in personal intercourse. And so Est., Menoch., Tirin., Hamm., Whitby, Locke, Koppe, Wells, Mackn. Schleus., Jaspius, and Borger, which last Commentator paraphrases thus: “I am quite at a loss with respect to you; perhaps I accuse you too severely: would that I were present with you! For then could I, according to circumstances, adapt my language both to mild remonstrance, and severe reproof.” No Commentator, however, has better expressed the sense than Crellius, as follows: “O quam vellem nunc præsens adesse vobis, ut orationem meam vobis passim attempere, et prout res, necessitas, occasio exigerat, ita vobiscum loqui: quod nunc absens ita commodè facere nequeo. Cùm enim absentes sumus, non possimus tam commodè pro cujusque captu et ingenio, pro rei necessitate, variarum circumstantiarum ignari, disserere, quàm si præsentes essetem.”

This last interpretation is unquestionably the true one: for thus the words ἀποφημαι ἐν ὑμῖν are very apposite. Ἐν ὑμῖν is for ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, super vos, respecting you.

Of ἀλλάσσω φωνῇ in a physical sense, Wets. has given examples from Artemid.

21. λέγετε μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμου θέλουτε εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οἰκ ἀκοιτε; The Apostle now, leaving off from soothing expressions, applies himself to refute the Judaizers, who had wrought such disturbances. In doing this he, in some measure, resumes the thread of his former argument (which had been interrupted by the vehemence of his impassioned feelings), and the principal subject of the Epistle; and proves, by a peculiar and allegorical interpretation of a passage of the Old Testament respecting the two sons of Abraham, that Christians, whom he compares to Isaac (not Ishmael, whom he likens to the Jews in bondage to the law) are liberated and exempted from the
dominion of the law; nor has the law any power to obtain justification. So Crell., Koppe, and Borger. The scope of the passage is very well traced by Theophyl. as follows: Ἐπειδὴ ἰκανὸς αὐτῶς ἐμάλαξε καὶ ἐπετάσατο, τάλιν εἰς ἁγίων ἐμβαίνει, δεικνύον ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος οὐ βούλεται ἔστων φυλαττεσθαι.

Borger regards λέγετε μοι as a formula epanalepsis. And so Pisc.: "ἀνακαίνωσις est." But I rather think it is one of affectionate remonstrance and earnest reasoning; as in Luke 7, 42. "Now tell me which will love him most?" &c. and Is. 1, 18. "Come now, and let us reason together!" The Romans used Dic mihi in a not dissimilar manner.

In τὸν νόμον there is (as is usual with St. Paul) a Dilogia and paronomasia on the two senses of νόμος; the word being used, 1st, to denote the ceremonial law of Moses, as contained in the Old Testament; 2dly, to denote the Scripture itself; or the injunctions of Scripture; which latter sense is here so much the more admissible, as Genesis, from which the passage is taken, is one of the Books of the Law properly so called.

The βέλωτες well represents the proneness and strong inclination of the persons who had been tampered with by the Judaizers to subject themselves to the dominion of the Law as well as the Gospel. So Theophyl.: καλῶς δὲ εἶπε το βέλωτες' οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολουθίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀκαίρων φιλοσοφικέας ἱν τὸ πράγμα.

The phrase ώτο τὸν νόμον εἶναι, to be subject to the Law, is frequent in St. Paul.

'Ακούεστε signifies not so much hear, as mind, attend to, know; a sense frequent in Scripture. Borger refers to Lampe on Joh. 5, 24 & 37., and adduces Porphyr. de Abstin. L. 3, 4. 'Αράβες μὲν κάρων ακούσας τυγρῆνις τὸ ἀνέτοιμον. And he paraphrases thus: "Ye who think to obtain justification by obedience to the Law, do not even know what the Law is, or
consider its mystical sense.” See Grot. and Hyper. in loc.

22. γέγραται γὰρ, ὅτι Ἅβραμ δύο νυών ἐσχέν ἑνα ἑκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἑνα ἑκ τῆς ἑλέυθερας. The story is so well known as to need no illustration. One or two things, however, in the phraseology may deserve attention. Παιδίσκη is here used to denote a bond maid. So the Heb. רבים, and indeed our maid, girl. And so Hagar is called in Gen. 17. The use of the article here has nothing corresponding to it in our language; though its force may be discerned if we change the terms into those which probably the Apostle would have employed, but for delicacy; namely, “one from the concubine, and one from the wife.”

The connection is well traced by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) thus: “He had before said, ‘Ye are sons of Abraham; but, since the sons of the Patriarch were not of the same dignity, one being by the bond maid, the other by the free woman, he now means to say: ‘ye are not only sons, but such as was the free and well born one.’”

23. ἀλλ’ ἵ μὲν ἑκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγένηται: ὁ δὲ ἑκ τῆς ἑλευθέρας, διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. This is meant to show the dissimilarity in nativity of the two brothers; one being born κατὰ σάρκα, i.e. κατὰ φύσιν, in the regular course of nature, and in the carnal mode. Now in the opposed member we should have expected κατὰ πνεύμα, as at ver. 29., instead of which we have διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας: but we may best discern the correspondence of the opposites, if we consider κατὰ σάρκα as carrying with it the secondary sense of κατ’ ἄνθρωπον; and then in the apodosis supply τοῦ Θεοῦ. Yet something further seems to have been meant by the Apostle; and this is (I think) well expressed by Theophyl. “It was intended (says he) to verify the somewhat impossible assertion he had before made, that they (the Galatians) were sons of Abraham; q.d. “Ye are such, though not
after the flesh; just as Isaac was the more genuine son of Abraham, though himself not born after the flesh, but formed by the Spirit, according to the Divine promise: whereas Ishmael was born in the common course of nature; and yet he that was after the flesh was a slave, and had no participation in the inheritance; but he that was after the Spirit was the master and heir. What then is to hinder you from being Abraham’s genuine sons, since you have become such by regeneration in baptism.” So also Chrys. 747, 37. μὴ θερομένων τοιν πρῶ το μὴ κατὰ σάρκα γεγενηθὰν ὃ τοῦτο μάλιστα αὐτῶν συγγενεῖς ὑμεῖς, ὅτι ὅτα σάρκα ἐγενέθητε ὅ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ἄλλα καὶ ἀτιμωτέρους τὸ ὅ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, καὶ πνεύματι εὐαγγελισεν. 24. ἀτιμά ἐστιν ἀλληγοροῦμεν.

Here it is quaintly remarked by Borger: “Pervenimus ad locum, qui vexavit interpretem, vehementer, vexatus ab iis et ipsis.” On the mode of interpreting this passage, both Koppe and Borger have, especially the latter, much valuable matter, but far too copious for me to insert at large. I shall, however, endeavor, by way of careful selection and abridgment, to put the reader into possession of the most important information to be therein found.

Koppe observes that there are two modes of understanding this passage, each of which has its advocates; namely, 1st, that of some Commentators, who suppose that when these things concerning Sarah and Hagar were written by Moses, God intended the religion of Christ, and the accession thereto of the Jews and Heathens, to be obscurely prophesied; 2dly, that of others, who suppose that the narration in question was merely historical, but seemed to the Apostle worthy of being accommodated to the case of Christians, which bore some resemblance thereto. Of these modes of viewing the passage, he regards the second as the more probable, for the following reasons: 1. ut in mythico et parabolico dicendi genere ejusmodi allegoricæ orationis usus in optimis scriptoribus et frequenter occurrat, et a nemine improbatur, its vicissim in narrationibus mere historicis, qualem esse nostram Moseaciam nemo negat, similis ἀλληγορίας exemplum, clarum illud quidem et ab omni dubitatione alienum, e scriptoribus divinis humanisque affertir vix potest: II. contra vero, omni tempore, inter omnes populos paullum cultos, exatitisse acimis viros sapientes, qui in scriptoribus sua gentis celebroribus interpretandis hanc allegoricae rationem sequentur, etiamque etiam ad ipsas historicas narrationes accommodarent cf. Philosophorum Graecorum, Platonis, Plutarchi interpretationes Homerics, maximæ verò inter hos Heraclidem in Alleg. Homericis; III. eandem rationem
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Judeos imprimis, in libris suis divinis interpretandis, inde ab anti-
quissimis tempore tenerè solitos fuisse, testis est, ipse hoc studium
suoe exemplo confirmans, quin adeo ipsam hanc de Sarà et Hagare
historiam allegoricè, etsi allo modo, quo Paulus, interpretatus Philo
in Allegorìis, 3, p. 135.

Idemque tradunt, et in suis ἀποδιδότα εἰμιταντισμεν recensores Judei
omnes, vid. Maimonidein in More Neveochim 3, c. 43. Aben Esram
ad loc. nostrum, cf. etiam Vitringa de Synag. Vet. 50, 3, P. 1, c. 5.
p. 673—678. Similiter igitur Paulus, Judeos ipses, in hoc inter-
pretandi generis exercitatus, scribens tempore eo, quo hoc litterarum
ss. allegoricè interpretandarum studium et vulgarè erat et omnibus
probabatur, scribens denique ad homines, partim Judeos ipsos, par-
tim Judaicarum litterarum peritos, cur non similis locum historicum
allegoricè interpretandi ratione ad rem suam, non quidem confir-
mandam, at confirmaturn καρ' ἔσθερων illustrandum, salvè et sa-
pientè et animi integritate et auctoritate denique divina, uti potuisse
existimandus sit mihi non apparat.

Thus far Koppe. Borger has here a very long and learned Dis-
sertation, in which he first strenuously opposes the opinion of those
who contend for a double sense in Scripture. And he thus pro-
ceeds: "Unum tantum sensum esse querendum, et res ipsa loqui-
tur, et dudum monuerunt viri docti; quod tantum habet vim, ut ne
in enigmaticibus quidem duplex, isque verus, sensus lateat. Tenen-
dus quoque est sensus unus in historiis interpretatione, etiam si sta-
tuere velis, 

procreatione 
quodam 
dividum 
accidisse, ut historia illius
V. T. cum N. T. oeconomiav evidens erat et magna simulitudi.
Fac enim Hagare et Ismaelis res, vitam, fortunam, ita fuisse moderatum
Deum, ut ipsis, tamquam tabulis, impressum esset religionis Judæae
meliori cessure simulacrum et adumbratio; hæc igitur fac ita
esse, tunc propertrea negare sustineas, hunc unum esse narrationis
Mosaicæ sensum: Hagare, peperit filium, quem cum mater e familiæ
expulit Abrahæmus: fuit illo servus, cet.? Neque igitur Paulus, cum
historiam Mosaicam cum utriusque fatis religionis contendit, sensum
duplicem in eam narrationem importasse existimandus est, quando-
quidem, ut dein videbimus, utriusque rei simulitudinem tantum cogi-
tasse videtur.

Cum vero Paulus Hagaram et Saram fuisse docet duarum διαβη-
των τουτου, id non ita interpretandum est, quasi illarum historia
mulierum religiosam Christianæ, Judaicam illam aliquando ever-
sure, significationem jam habuerit; cum id tantum contendere
videatur Apostolus, narrationem Mosaicam insigne simulitudine cum
religionis permutatione esse conjunctum, adeoque aptissimè hanc
cum illâ comparari posse. Hanc convenientiam Paulum tantum-
modo indicare voluisse, nemo, credo, negaverit, lectis egregiis
Koppiti observationibus, quibus hoc unum addere nobis liceat. S
Paulus ex historia Mosaicæ argumentum petere voluisset, quo reli-
gionem Judaicam meritori a Christianæ fractam et veluti exturbatam
esse, efficerat, non tantum perquam frigidum fuisse hoc argumentum,
secedisset etiam, opinor, Apostolus causà."
GALATIANS, CHAP. IV.

Borger then removes the objection deduced from the inspiration of the Apostle, and proves that inspiration is equally applicable to comparison as to argument; and he proceeds, at large, to show that St. Paul could not intend here to adopt the course of argument.* I need not, however, introduce any of his matter, since that had been admitted by some of the most eminent Interpreters, as Beza, Calvin, Hyperius, and others cited by Borger.†


Ab hac igitur ratione, etsi Paulum non longe obesse vidimus, eventum tamen sedulub est, ne pro iisdem habemus similibusve, quae multum inter se differant. Judaici enim Doctores, quibus locis haec interpretandi et philosophandi tormenta adhiberent, iisdem duplicem sensum re vera inesse, existimabant, Paulus vero nil nisi historiae Mosaicae conventionali cum utriusque fatis religionis indi-

* See the dialogue which he supposes between a Jew and Paul, in which the former certainly appears to have the best of the argument.

† And so, of our English Commentators, Drs. Chandler, Sykes, and Dodd., which last mentioned Interpreter writes thus: "I would chuse to explain this passage in St. Paul as an allusion, rather than an argument: which frees it from many objections and embarrassments to which it would otherwise have appeared liable. If any should urge, that such glosses are of little importance, it may be sufficient to reply, that they were much in the Jewish taste, and that we may assure ourselves that the Apostles were preserved from any thing in them which was not perfectly agreeable to the mind of the Spirit. On the whole, I entirely agree with Mr. Chandler, that this part of the Epistle was not intended to prove Christianity, but to illustrate the different genius of that and Judaism, and to show that not all the carnal descendants of Abraham, but the spiritual offspring only, were heirs, even according to the principles which the Jews themselves really admitted." So also Dr. Owen: "This allegorical reasoning was not used by the Apostle particularly with a view to convince the Galatians, who, as Gentiles, could be little moved by such a mode of argumentation; but rather to confute those Judaizing zealots who endeavoured to pervert them, and with whom this way of reasoning was familiar and conclusive."
et. Habitum Ignor loci nostri externum, Judaicum dixerim, internum, Christianum et Paulo dignum.

Cum vero in eiusmodi interpretazione trina in primis cogerntari debeant, nimimum:

1. Et contineri duarum rerum similitudinem;
2. Eam similitudinem tantum ex parte spectandum esse;
3. Ex rebus adjunctis (συνεργοις) intelligendum esse, quenas pars potissimum sit spectanda;
Hac igitur trina, in allegoria interpreteratione tenenda, paucis explicemus,

Et quidem, quarum rerum similitudine hic sit observanda, non est difficile dictu, ipso Paulo id evidenter significante. Cum religionem scilicet Mosaicam, admodum molesta illa, conferunt servilis mulier conditionem Hagara. Hac igitur est comparationis vis, ut, sicuti e servo illa Abrahami nascebantur servi, igitur religio Mosaicam ad Simum montem instituto, veluti mater servorum sit habenda, i.e. sibi addictis molestorum observationem ritum injungat ingenua vero Abrahami uxor Sora cum religionem contenditur Christiana sui cultores ab hoc tanquam legis servitio in libertatem vindicante: quae comparatio ita instituitur: sicuti ingenua ingenuorum erat mater Sara, ita liberorum hominum veluti genitrix est Christiana religio, i.e. hujus religionis beneficio nil valet apud Christianos lex Mosaicam.

Secunda, quam ex Mori dissertatione posuimus, regula, duarum rerum similitudinem in allegoria tantum ex parte spectandum esse; illa igitur regula hac potissimum causarit nittitur, quod dux res, secum collatae, nuncquam fere sibi invicem igitur sint similis, ut nihil omnino discrepantiae differentiaeque intersit, quodque auctor, illas res conferens, omnes earum partes contendere secum invicem volesse, haud sit existimandus.

Quod tertia lex praepicit, ex rebus adjunctis intelligendum esse, quenas allegoria pars in interpretazione potissimum sit spectanda; id igitur cum alibi, tum nostro etiam loco, habet aliquam cautionem: potest enim pars hujus allegoriae præcipua bifarium constituti, rebus adjunctis nihil definentibus, utra harum duarum sit utri preferenda.

Altera ratio eam habet vim, ut Paulus docet, Saram simulàm fuisse religionis Christianae, Judaicae vero Hagaram, quatum hujus proles servilis esset conditionis, illius autem libera. Hanc comparationem partem, quae ad libertatis notionem referuntur, commendant dicta, vs. 22. Abrahamo duo fuerint filii, alter lex ψαλικέας, δε ἔλευθερας alter; vs. 24. ubi religio Judaica, ad montem Sinaicun instituta, eis δουλων γεννας dicitur, acque ac Hagara; item verbum δουλεια, vs. 25. addde vs. 26, ἢ ἕλευθερα δοτι μην ἡμῶν, (Christianorum); vs. 30. ubi ἢ ψαλικέας (religionis Judaice imago), iterum oppositum ἢ ἕλευθερα, (religionem Christianam significanti); Christiani preterea dicitunt, vs. 31. ἢ ψαλικέας τὲκνα, ἀλλὰ ἢ ἕλευθεραι; hic porro referendum est, cap. 5. exordium; vide denique notata ad cap. 3, 26.

Ratio altera convenientia terminum, (tertium comparationis), ita constituit, ut haec Pauli sit sententia: sicuti Ἰσαήλ κατὰ σέρκα,
procreatus est, Issacus autem dixit ephagnelas, ita Judaei filii tantum sunt kata sarka. Christiani vero dixit ephagnelas, Hanc compositionis partem, quas sarka et ephagnelas sibi invicem opponuntur, in hujus allegoriae explicacione minime esse neglegendum, dicerta docet illarum notionum mentio, quae et frequentius sit, et majore cum emphasi, quam ut obiter eam et abeque omni necessitate, factam esse, existimandum sit.

Cum igitur in hac allegoria convenientiae terminus bifariam constituit quest, ut, vel ad servitutis et libertatis, vel ad sarkos et ephagnelas vocabula, universum allegoriam interpretemur, caven- dum tamen, ne nimium distinguendi libidini hic indulgeamus, cum utriusque rationis conjunctionem universum commendet epistola argumentum."

Finally, the learned Commentator gives the following συνοικία, or scheme of the correspondence. "A. The Jews are ser- ville, as the offspring of Hagar was servile. B. The Jews are sons kata sarka, as Ishmael was kata sarka. A. Christians are free; as the offspring of Sarah was free. B. Christians are sons dixi ephagellas, as Isaac was dixi ephagnelas." Or, with a reference to the image of a mother, thus. A. The Jewish religion is, like Hagar, the mother of slaves. A. The Christian religion, like Sarah, is the mother of a free posterity.

"Ανυπότοσα εστιν ἀλληγορία: Borger renders: "these things may be excellently accommodated to our cause." And he compares the phrases ὥσπερ τούτος τοῦ μελλόντος, Rom. 5, 14. ἡ εστι γεία τῶν μελλόντων, Col. 2, 17.

Whether the aυται be referred to the two mothers (with Chrys. and most Commentators), or to the two covenants, it comes to the same thing.

24. εἰς δουλείαν γενώσα. This is only an accom-modation to the metaphor by which the covenant is considered under the image of a mother. The sense is sufficiently clear, from the above annotation.

25. τὸ γαρ Ἁγαφ. Σινά ὅρα ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβία. These words, which have not a little exercised the earlier Commentators, are by Bentley (Ep. to Mill. 96.), Kuster, and Valckn. (Schol. 1, 967.) proposed to be cancelled, as a mere gloss: and they would read τῇ δὲ Ἁγαφ συνοικεῖ ἵ νῦν Ἰερωσολήμ. But this is too much in the slashing manner of the first-mentioned Critic to please any sober-minded Scholar, or serious Theologian. It is sufficient, with Wolf, Capelli., Schmidt, Koppe, and Borger, to throw these words into a parenthesis: and then the common reading will yield a sense not essentially different from that produced by Bentley's conjecture. With respect to
the *interpretation* of the words, there is little doubt but that the true one is that which was first pro-
pounded by Chrys., Theophyl. Æcumen. Theodoret, and others of the antient Commentators, also, of
the moderns, by Erasm., Capell., Crell., Constant.,
Le Clerc, Hæseus, Grabe, Olear., Le Moyne, Bo-
chart, Koppe, Schleus., Rosenm., Borger, and Jas-
pis, who understand τὸ Ἀγαρ as not the name of
the bond-woman Hagar, but the Arabic word Ha-
gar, which signifies a rock, or *rocky mountain*, by
which name Mount Sinai was called κατ' Ἐξωτερικῆν, as
Athens was called ἀρτέο: Rome, urbs; and Constan-
tinople Stamboul, (i. e. εἰς τῆν πόλιν. And that
Sinai is a very rocky and stony mountain is testified
by Borger) cūm ad montis verticem pervenissetemus,
durissimum saxum comprehendimus ferrei coloris.
The sense will therefore be this: "Now (for such,
I think, is the force of γὰρ) Hagar in Arabia (in
the Arabic language) *signifies Sinai*," i. e. is the
name given to Mount Sinai. That it really bore
that name Borger thinks is not *proved*; though he
admits that it is highly probable. Yet such is *at-
tested* by all the antient Commentators, and espe-
cially Chrys., himself a native of the East. And
it is confirmed by many modern Travellers, as
also El-hagar is the name given to the capital of
Arabia Petraea.

The γὰρ, it must be observed, does not signify
*for*, but *now*: for the Apostle intended no *argu-
ment*, but only an *illustration*.

The next word, συντοιχεῖ ἐς τῇ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ,
δουλεῖς ἐς μετὰ τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῆς are explained by
the best Interpreters; "But this Hagar corresponds
to, is similar to Jerusalem, as it now is, which, with
her children (i. e. her inhabitants) is in bondage." This
sense of συντοιχεῖ has been proved by Raphel
Obs. Pol. Thus Polyb. 1402. καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἦν τῶν τυφῶν
δυνα καὶ σύντοιχα. By the τεκνῶν most Commentators
understand (and, I think, rightly) its **inhabitants**. And they notice a similar use of the Hebr. דּ in Gen. 23. 11. 2 Chron. 25, 13. Ps. 149, 2. But they might better have adduced Luke 19, 43. where it is also said of Jerusalem, ἐδαφίωσι σε, καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί, which passage indeed the Apostle may have had in mind.

26. ἦ δὲ ἀνε Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἐλεύθερα ἐστὶν, ἢ τις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν. On the sense of these words Commentators are divided in opinion. The chief interpretations, which are **four** in number, I shall thus detail from Borger. 1. "Some Commentators understand the words of Mount Sinai, a part of Jerusalem situated higher than the rest, and erected on the mount of that name. So L. Vitringa, Mill, Elsner, and others. 2. Some, as Oder, Teeneck, and Michaelis take this of old Jerusalem in the time of Melchizedec. 3. Others, as Schoetg. Witsius, Offerhaus, Meuschen, Teller, &c., take it of the Christian Church, the economy of the New Testament. The fourth and most common opinion is, that it signifies the heavenly Jerusalem. The first interpretation, as Koppe and Borger observe, is utterly untenable: for the Arx Sinaitica cannot be opposed to the νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ, since the inhabitants of the lower town were equally citizens with those of the upper. The second, though it may seem to be defended by the prophecy of Is. 54. cited at ver. 27., yet is proved by Borger to be utterly unfounded, and especially as it is at variance with the context, in which not the antient Jerusalem, but the economy of the New Covenant is opposed to the Mosaic Law. Thus far Borger, who of the two last interpretations prefers the former, for two reasons; 1. because the heavenly Jerusalem can scarcely be thought a suitable opposite to the Mosaic oeconomy; since the purpose of the Apostle is, to show the superior excellence of

* Borger, with far less probability, thinks it may refer to the smaller and dependent towns.
the Christian religion as compared with the Jewish; 2. the prophecy of Isaiah has nothing respecting the heavenly Jerusalem; on the contrary there is no difficulty, if we understand it of the economy of the New Covenant. I cannot but assent to the opinion of the learned Commentator, especially as it is supported by the authority of Chrys. and the other Greek Commentators* (to whom, however, it is strange Borger makes no reference). Yet the third and fourth may, I think, be united: for I see not how we can understand the heavenly Jerusalem otherwise than of the Gospel Dispensation, as the earthly Jerusalem represented the old.

Borger here takes occasion to inculcate an Hermeneutical canon (above all applicable in St. Paul's writings), if especially attending to the force of opposite terms, i.e. accommodating the interpretation of one opposite to that of the other, since when we have ascertained the sense one, we may be sure of the other. "Thus (continues he) the Apostle had said that Hagar corresponds to and is like the present Jerusalem, namely, the Jewish economy, or Jewish state subject to the Mosaic Law. He had opposed Sarah, the free wife of Abraham, to Hagar, and for this reason, that he might show that the fortunes of either woman were, so to speak, the images of things opposite. Therefore the expression

* Hence it would appear that in the present case, as well as in a thousand others, learning and acuteness have been expended to little purpose, since, at last of all, we are compelled to embrace the most antient opinion. We may rest assured, that the sagacity and erudition exercised in support of these false hypotheses (among which is that of the early moderns, which refers it to the heavenly Jerusalem) might, if the opinion of the Fathers had been known, have all been spared, and probably would. But what can place in a stronger light the propriety (I had almost said necessity) of first consulting these venerable, intelligent, and generally safe guides, previously to the broaching of novel hypotheses, devised only to be in the end destroyed, and thus "wasting our strength for nought, and for that which cannot profit," nay, which tends to evil, as it too much countenances the accusation of our Roman Catholic opponents, that no stability of interpretation is to be expected from Protestants.
Galatians, Chap. IV.

η ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, with which he compares Sarah, can here denote no other than the Christian oeconomy, not subject to the Law of Moses. And even though it might be difficult to prove that the words themselves have elsewhere that sense, yet the proof arising from the opposition is sufficient."

With respect to the construction of the sentence, it is thus laid down by Koppe:  η δὲ ἑτερα (διαθήκη) εἰς ἑλευθερίαν γεννώσα, ἦτις, ἕστιν Σάρα—συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ, ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ, τῇ ἑλευθερᾷ, ἦτις. But this is rather a paraphrase than a construction; though it well represents the sense, and is expressed with truly Dutch, or German, exactness.

27. γέγραπται—τὸν ἄνδρα. Chrysost., Theophyl., Theodoret, and other antient Interpreters understand the στείρα η οὐ τίκτουσα of the Gentile Church; and the τῆς ἐγνωσης ἄνδρα, of the Jewish Church. Thus Chrysost. 748, 23. τίς οὐν ἡ στείρα, καὶ τίς ἡ ἐρήμος πρὸ τοῦ τοῦτου; οὐκ εὐθύλην ὅτι ἡ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐκκλησία, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώσεως ἀπεστερημένη; τίς δὲ ἡ τῶν ἄνδρα ἐγνώσα; οὐκ εὐθύλην ὅτι ἡ συναγωγή; ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐνίκησεν αὐτὴν τῇ πολυπαιδίᾳ η στείρα; ἐκεῖνη μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἔθνος ἔχει τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, τὴν βαρβάραν, τὴν γῆν, τὴν θάλατταν, τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀκασάν ἐνέκλησεν. And Theophyl.: Οὐκ ἀρκεῖται τοῖς τύποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν Ἑσαίαν πάραγε μάρτυρα, στείραν μὲν λέγοντα καὶ ἐρήμον τὴν ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐκκλησίαν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐρήμος ἢ θείας γνώσεως, καὶ ἀπεκπροφύτησεν τὸν Ἰουδαίαν συναγωγήν, ἢ ὅτι τὸν νόμον ἔχει διοικοῦντα τὰ νόμιμα, ἢ ὅτι τὸν Θεὸν αὐτὸν. Ρήξον οὖν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, φανεὶ εὐφρόνης ἐκλάλησον, ὅτι νῦν ἐκπληρώθη σοι τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην πάσαν σὺ ἐγέννησας, οὐκ ἐν ἔθνος, ἢ τὸν Ἰουδαίαν συναγωγήν. And so Whitby and Valpy. C Ecumen., however, explains it of the Christian Church in general, whether composed of Jews or Gentiles, though chiefly the latter. And such is the interpretation adopted by some eminent recent Commentators, as Morus, Rosenm., and Borger. Upon the whole, the difficulty is rather in appearance than in reality, since of the
Christian society the greater number were Gentiles. It is observed by Rosenm., that we must not press upon each particular term; for we have here merely a poetical description, expressing the happiness of the Messiah's kingdom under the image of a woman who, from being before barren, is now fruitful; and the meaning is this, that the number of citizens of this kingdom will be great, and much greater than before. Borger admits, with the best Interpreters, that the fifty-fourth chapter of Isaiah upon the whole treats of the times of the Gospel. And this indeed is clear from its close connection with the celebrated fifty-third chapter, which is obviously predictive of the Gospel times.

The ἡ τικτωσα, Koppe and Borger observe, is simply a synonyme of the former term. And indeed this kind of pleonasm is inherent in the genius of Oriental style. But here it could not have been well avoided, considering the beautiful parallelism by which the idea of the Prophet is evolved.

At ἰδεια must be supplied φωνη. The phrase ἰδεσειν φωνη occurs both in the Old Testament, and frequently in the best Classical writers of every age, from whom numerous examples are adduced by Wets. and Loesner. Koppe thinks that the word εὐφρασωνη has been lost after ἰδεια. But ἰδεια and βόσου suggest the idea of exultation, and shouting for joy, especially as being antithetical to εὐφρανητη.

The term ἐρημού, as opposed to τῆς ἐχουσης τον ἄνδρα, may mean either an unmarried woman, or a widow. It must here have the former sense. Borger, however, thinks that both this and the τῆς ἐχουσης ἄνδρα are not to be too much pressed upon, but merely serve for ornament, and are here inserted, to complete the passage of the Prophet. And so Koppe. But this is despatching matters somewhat too hastily. The literal sense is plain, and the allegorical sense scarcely less so. By the τῆς ἐχουσης ἄνδρα I would understand, with the antients, the Jewish Church in covenant with God. Thus ἐρημού
will very well designate the Pagans, who were desti-
tute of any covenant with God.

28. ἥμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ, ἔπαγγελιας τέκνα ἐσμέν. This verse is, as Borger remarks, closely
connected with the preceding one, in which the
Apostle makes mention of the promise itself of off-
spring held out to the heavenly Jerusalem, which
offspring is here clearly shown to be the Christian
Church; q. d. “If you would know who are signi-
fied by Isaiah, we Christians,” &c.

28. τέκνα ἔπαγγελιας is for τέκνα ἔπαγγελλόμενα.
See the note on 8, 14. Κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ, “like Isaac, after
the similitude of Isaac;” a signification of κατὰ oc-
curring in Eph. 4, 24. Job. 1, 8. and in the Classical
writers, from whom examples are adduced by Raphel
and Wets. in loc. So that it is unnecessary, with
Koppe, to compare the use of the Hebr. ἐ.

Theophyl. well explains thus: ἡ ἐκκλησία στεῖρα ὁσα, ὡσπερ ή Σάφρα, οὐ μόνον πολύτασις ἐγένετο ὁς ἔκειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἐγένησεν ὁς ἔκειν; Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνη μητέρα οὐχ ἡ φως, ἀλλ' ἡ ἔπαγγελια ἐποίησεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν, &c.

29. It is remarked by Koppe and Borger, that the
Apostle, dwelling on the same similitude, adds, that
as Ishmael vexed Isaac, so do the Jews injure and
maltreat the Christians.

In discussing the phraseology, Borger rightly ob-
served, that ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα (scil. γενεθλεὶς) is the same
with the διὰ τῆς ἔπαγγελιας preceding; as appears
by the opposite κατὰ σάρκα: but here the πνεῦμα is
used for the sake of greater clearness. Διακων ex-
presses injurious treatment of every kind, both by
words as well as deeds; as in Gen. 21, 9. See also
the Rabbinical writers in Wets. The correspond-
ence of this with the facts recorded in the Acts of
the Apostles is ably pointed out by Paley in his Hor.
Paul.

Theophyl. (from Chrys.) traces the scope of the
passage thus: “Be not surprised that you suffer per-
secution from the Jews; for so Ishmael persecuted Isaac; yet that did not hinder him the persecuted from being the free born son of Abraham and the Lord of the persecutor; so that this very circumstance shews their resemblance to Ishmael, and our's to Isaac.*

30. ἄλλα τι λέγει τῇ γραφῇ; ἐκβαλε—ἐλευθέρας. Theophyl. well traces the connection thus: “Lest any one should say, “What then, is it any consolation to those now persecuted, that Isaac also was then persecuted,” the Apostle bids them hear the Scripture and be comforted; for that as a retribution for that temporary persecution with which he persecuted Isaac, he was wholly cast out, and not only so, but disinherited, and that by God himself.

By τῇ γραφῇ is meant the words of Scripture, and of God. For the words here referred to are (with a slight accommodation necessary for the purpose in view) those of Sarah to Abraham, requiring him to expel Hagar and her son, and were approved by God; and therefore might, in a certain sense, be called the Scripture, or the Word of God.

The particles ὅ τι strengthen the negation, and are used in sentences strongly prohibitive.

Koppe seems to think that that the ἐκβαλε may be understood of violent expulsion. But in Luke 8, 54. it is said of Jesus, ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας, where no force can be imagined. And Borger adduces many passages from the Greek Classical writers where the term signifies to put away, repudiate a wife. And so Sirach, 7, 26. And this seems to be the sense here. For a man may be said to put away a concubine as well as a wife.

* In this passage it is only said that Ishmael mocked Isaac; but from the tenth and following verses it appears, that he claimed a share of the inheritance with him, which (as he had no just title to it, and derided the pretensions of the lawful heir,) was a persecution, and thus typified the contempt and violence with which the Jews, the natural seed of Abraham, urged their claim to a spiritual inheritance, deriding and excluding those who expected justification by faith. See also Mackn.
Borger observes, that it seems to have been the general intent of the Apostle, in citing these words, to set forth in this light also the great superiority of the Christian liberty to the servile condition of the Jews. Yet by the term ἐκβαλλεῖν, he thinks, the Apostle meant also to indicate, that as Ishmael was expelled from Abraham's house, so also those Jewish teachers, whom he so often glances at in this Epistle, would be excluded from the Society of Christians. See 5, 12. and the note there. See also Mackn. and Locke.

31. ἅρα—ἐλευθερα. Now follows the conclusion the Apostle meant to draw from the above allegory: "Since, then, the Christian religion is so greatly superior to the Jewish; since the Mosaic Law has no authority with Christians, while, on the other hand, the Jews are subject to it; since Christians, by the efficacy of the Divine promise, have attained the right of sons, while the Jews are only sons κατὰ σάρκα; and finally, since the latter are excluded from the hope of inheritance; whereas the former justly nourish it. It is therefore manifest that I have not wrongly compared the œconomy of the Old Covenant with the bond-woman Hagar, but that of the New, with Sarah, the free wife of Abraham; the Jews with Ishmael, but the Christians with Isaac." (Borger.) See also Mackn.

CHAP. V.

Having taught them by an example derived from the Old Testament, that Christians are free, the Apostle now exHORTS them not to suffer this liberty to be wrested from them, but manfully to defend it.

So Borger, who observes, with Koppe, that it is plain this verse ought not to have been dissevered from the preceding chapter, since it forms the con-
clusion to be thence deduced. Yet Chrys. here commences another Homily.

1. Στήκετε ἐν τῇ ἑλευθερίᾳ, "stand fast, persist, continue steadfastly in the liberty with which Christ has freed us;" as 1 Cor. 16, 13. and often. And so Rom. 11, 20. ἐστηκέναι ἐν τῇ πίστει, where see the note. The ἑλευθερία is well explained by Theodoret τῇ ἔξω τοῦ νόμου πολιτείᾳ. See 1 Cor. 20, 29. Borger thinks it does not differ from νοθεσία in 4, 5. and elsewhere. But this seems a not well founded opinion. Koppe and Borger notice the common Hellenism in ἑλευθερία ἑλευθέρωσε, by which a substantive is joined with its cognate verb.

Verse 1. καὶ μὴ τὰλιν ἄνγοι δουλειὰς ἐνέχεσθε, "Do not again subject yourselves to the yoke of the law." This sense of ἄνγοι, by which it is metaphorically used to express servitude, constraint, &c. is illustrated by Kypke, Wets., Koppe, Borger, and others. But this is so trite, in all languages, that to heap examples were unnecessary. On ἐνέχεσθε Borger refers to Hesych. ἐνέχεσθε, κρατεῖσθε, συνέχεσθε. But this gloss is not quite apposite. The term is indeed often used with words denoting restraint, as yoke, chain, &c., of which examples are adduced by Wets. But the Philologists do not attend to the sense of ἐνέχ., which seems properly to refer to the insertion of the neck: and ἐνέχεσθε must be here taken in the middle voice. The sense seems to be this: "do not again thrust your neck into the yoke of bondage (to the law)." See 2 Cor. 11, 4.

2, 3. In order to the understanding of this verse it is to be remembered, that the Jewish teachers in question maintained, and wished to persuade others, that the Christian religion might and ought to be conjoined with the observance of the law of Moses; and they especially urged and enjoined circumcision as the most evident token of Judaism. To these innovations Paul opposes his own doctrines, and bids the Galatians contemn their petty reasonings;
q. d. They contend that nothing hinders you from adding the Mosaic rites to the Christian religion: but "I Paul say, and would have you to be convinced, that you will derive no benefit from Christ and his doctrines if you follow their directions and admonitions. Nay, I maintain that every one who undergoes circumcision is not even to be called a Christian, but rather numbered with Jews, because by this rite he is bound to the Mosaic laws in general, and must observe them." He teaches them therefore that circumcision (which is of such a force that, once undertaken, there follows a host of rites) destroys that liberty and immunity from the law obtained for us by Christ, and which (as he shows at ver. 1.) is to be maintained. (Borger.)

Koppe observes, that the Apostle says this only in opposition to the false teachers; and that he not unfrequently says things with somewhat of harshness and vehemence, of which at another time, and when dealing only with weak brethren, he utters and writes with more lenity and indulgence. See Acts 16, 8. 1 Cor. 9. seqq. Rom. 9. 14. seqq. But I can scarcely agree with the learned Commentator. The indulgence he speaks of was to Jews who still continued in an observance of the Mosaic law, not, as here, to Gentiles. Now it is clear, that if they underwent circumcision, it was quite another thing. Besides, the indulgence shown to weak brethren could not be extended to factious and violent partizans. And though the Apostle does say that circumcision would exclude a man from the benefit of Christ, it is not at variance with his position at 8, 28. and 6, 15., that circumcision is a thing indifferent; since, though circumcision, of itself, could do neither harm nor good, yet when considered in conjunction with all the other rites of the law which it drew after it,* and as implying a trust in it as

* So Theophyl.: "For circumcision demands sacrifices, and observes days; sacrifice requires place, and mode, and purifications."
necessary to justification, it could not but do harm, nay, exclude from salvation by grace, since the two modes of salvation in the law and the Gospel are inconsistent with each other. This point is admirably illustrated by Chrys., Theophyl., Æcum., &c. Thus Theophyl. : αὐτοὶ αἰθελεῖ ἐκ Χριστοῦ τῶν περιτεμνόμενων, διότι ὁ τεκνὸς τὴς χάριν αθετεί, καὶ τῷ νόμῳ μὲν, αὐτὸ εὐεργετή, προστέχει Χριστῷ ἐκ ἀπίστει παίτας, αὐτῷ μὴ εὐεργετήσωσιν αυτῶν ὁ ἐκ ἀπίστων, σωθὲν κερδανεὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀπίστωμένου. See also Whitby, who has excellently treated this matter; * though he is

Purification again, requires other observances, all having a necessary connection; so that if you undertake a little of the law, you submit to the burden of the whole."

* Its most important observations are as follows: "The J udaizing Christians, who held that the law of Moses was an everlasting covenant, thought that the believing Gentiles were to be dealt with as their proselytes; that is, that unless they were circumcised, and observed the law, they could not be saved, Acts, 15, 1. But still it remains a great enquiry, whether the words contained in the second, third, and fourth verses, are to be taken generally, so as to exclude all believing Jews from any benefit by Christ, or by the covenant of grace, who sought for justification by the works of the law? or whether they are to be restrained only to the believing Gentiles? Now, in answer to this question, let it be noted that the law of Moses being given to the Jews, and some of its precepts being stiled everlasting covenants and commandments, and they having all engaged to observe it, might think themselves obliged still to be circumcised, and observe the law by virtue of God's precept, till it was more solemnly by God declared to be abrogated, though they expected not to be justified by it, for so we find it was with the believing Jews, they all continued zealous of the law, Acts 21, 20., and thought all Jews obliged to observe it, v. 24.; but then they thought to be saved not by the law but by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, Acts 15, 11., as the believing Gentiles were, and they believed in Christ that they might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law, Gal. 2, 16. But now the Gentiles being not under the obligation of the law of Moses, they having first believed in Christ, and received upon that faith the Holy Ghost, they could not afterwards submit to the observance of the law, but by so doing they must testify they thought not faith in Christ sufficient to justification, or acceptance with God, without the observation of the law, and therefore must submit to it for these ends, and so must, in effect, deny that faith in Christ would justify them; or that the giving of the Holy Ghost was a sufficient evidence of their acceptance with God, which was a tempting, or distracting of God after
indebted for the substance of what he says to the Greek Commentators, of whom, however, he deigns not to make any mention.

Thus the Apostle does not forbid circumcision to the Jews as a national rite, but as a rite necessary to salvation. But the Galatians, having no such political obligation, could only use it as necessary to justification and salvation; which would make void faith and grace, and is therefore forbidden. See Grot. and Michaelis.

3. πάλιν is ill rendered by our English translators and Doddr. again. It seems to signify contra, vicissim, (as it is rendered by Koppe,) or rather (as it rendered by Whitby and Borger), and again, furthermore, in Matt. 5, 33. 13, 44. and sometimes in the Classical writers. (See Borger.) Περιτέμνεσθαι must here be taken in a reciprocal sense, namely, undertake the rite of circumcision. Οφειλεντις εστι: is for ὕφειλε; as in Rom. 8, 12. 15, 27., where see the notes. Now both circumcision and baptism, and indeed every initiatory rite introducing any one into any religious society is symbolical of obligation to follow its rules and perform its injunctions.

3. ποίησαι, to perform, keep, observe. So the Hebr. יָשָׂע, which I am surprised the etymologists should not have perceived is the radix of ἀρκέω; had they been aware of this, they would not have proposed such absurdities as are enough to bring etymology so full a demonstration of grace and favour to them, Acts 15, 8, 9, 10.

I therefore think these words concern as well those Jews as Gentiles who sought for justification still, not by their faith in Christ, but through the works of the law, Rom. 9, 31, 32., and held circumcision necessary to all, not by way of precept only, but as a necessary means of salvation; for by these things, saith the Apostle, they in effect declared that Christ was dead in vain, and frustrated the grace of Christ, Gal. 2, 31., and so fell from it. Nor is it easy to perceive how they should have justification and salvation from him, from whom, after the revelation of him, they did not expect it, or have faith in him to justification, by whom they thought not that they should be justified."
into disgrace. The above derivation is confirmed by the vowel point. It may be observed that the termination \textit{κεω} denotes \textit{habit}. So \textit{ἀσκείν ἀφετήριον}.

4, 5, 6. In these verses the Apostle explains \textit{why} circumcision so undergone must exclude from the salvation by Christ.

\textit{Καταργεῖσθαι, or καταργηθήσεαι ἀπὸ τινός, signifies properly "to be freed from, to be no longer bound to;" as in Rom. 7, 2 & 6, καταργ. ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου. It must here simply denote separation from. Thus the sense is: "ye are separated from all community with, and consequently all benefit from," &c. So Theophyl.: οὐδεμιᾶν κοινωνίαν ἔχετε μετὰ Χριστοῦ. By δικαίωσθε is meant, "ye seek to be justified, seek justification and redemption." So OEcumen.: δικαιώσθαι ἤτειτε, or συναθάξετε.

The words following τὴν χάριν are added by way of explanation, and the sense is: "ye miss of justifying grace," (see Wetstein's examples,) or, as Borger explains (with a reference to ver. 5 & 6), "ye no longer profess the Christian religion, and therefore are not to be accounted Christians at all." It is shrewdly remarked by Wets., that "if it had been altogether impossible for any one to fall from grace, this would have been perfectly incongruous."

5. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐπίδεικνυσα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. The Apostle here shows that those are aiming at an absurdity who think that \textit{both} religions may be conjoined, and wish to be accounted Christians, even though they seek to attain justification by an obedience to the law.

The sense is: "For we (Christians) do not expect or hope for salvation by any external rites, but by the internal feelings," i. e. by faith. (Borger.) And so Rosenm. and indeed long ago Paræus and Grot. But this seems a very frigid, feeble, and forced sense. Far preferable is the interpretation of Wolf, who understands the \textit{πνεύματι} of the doctrine of the Gospel, or the economy of the new covenant, as opposed to τὸ σαρκῶν, just called τὸ νόμον. And to
this Koppe inclina. "It will thus (says he) be equivalent to εν χάριτι; as at 4, 29. κατὰ πνεῦμα is equivalent to κατ' ἐπιγγελίαν." But, after all, I see no reason to desert the antient and common opinion, that πνεῦμα here signifies the Holy Spirit. So Theophyl. : ημεῖς οἱ πιστοὶ, οἱ νόμιμοι, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι ἀγίῳ ἐλπίζομεν δικαιωθῆναι πᾶς; ἐκ πίστεως. Δεῖ γὰρ πραγματεύειν τὴν πίστιν, εἰτα τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἁφεσον τῶν ἁμαρτίων λαμβάνειν, καὶ δικαιωθῆναι ἐν τῷ βαστίσματι. And Theodoret. : τὸν γὰρ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀργαθανα δεξάμενοι, καὶ ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις πιστεύοντες, τὸν προσδοκώμενον βιον προσμένωμεν, δο ἁπαντία κοσμώμενος τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἔχει τὴν προσβολήν. See also Chrys. and ΟΕcumen.*

The modern Commentators have not noticed the elliptical use of the γὰρ. There is, as often, a clause omitted; which Chrys. seems to have been aware of; for he remarks, that "having shown them the shipwreck of faith and salvation they must sustain by Judaizing, he now points out to them the port of grace, and teaches them the ready and safe course by which salvation may be attained."

5. ἀπεκδεχόμεθα ἐλπίδα δικ. is treated by Koppe as a mere periphrasis for δικαιώμενον ἀπεκδέχεται: and he refers to Polyb. 746, γεφυρόμενη ἀφελεία τοῖς Καρχηδονίσι ἀγίας τῶν προσδοκομένων ἐλπίδας. "For ἐλπίς (says he) is the thing hoped for; as in 1 Cor. 9, 10. and elsewhere." It is, however, neither a periphrasis, nor a pleonasm, but rather a very energetic expression denoting anxious longing and earnest

* So Whitby paraphrases: "We expect the hope of justification and glory; for being justified by faith we have peace with God, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God; it is through this spirit that we wait for, and expect this glory; for he is the pledge and earnest of it; by him we are sealed up to the day of redemption, and wrought up to the expectation of it, and therefore are not ashamed of our hope, because the love of God is shed abroad into our hearts by the spirit which he hath given us; and thus do we, who have the first fruits of the spirit, wait for the redemption of our bodies, or the glorious liberty of the sons of God, Rom. 8, 21 & 23." See Bp. Hall ap. Mant, also Est., Beza, Gomar, and Mackn.
hoping for any thing. Thus in Rom. 8, 19. it is
united with ἀποκάλυψιν; and in 1 Cor. 1, 7. ἀποκά-
λυψιν τοῦ Κυρίου. The Apostle (which I am sur-
pried no Commentator should have noticed) seems
to have had in mind a very beautiful passage of
Deut. 28, 32. "Thy sons and daughters shall be
given unto another people, and thine eyes shall look
for them and fail, grow dim (or, as the Sept. renders,
grow sore), with longing for them." Indeed έκθε-
χομαι, like ἀποκαραδοκέω, seems properly to mean
thrust and stretch forward the head and neck, as in
anxious expectation. And so the Apostle himself
appears to have thought, by what we find in Rom.
8, 19. τῇ ἀποκαραδοκίᾳ τῆς κτίσεως τῆν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν
ωτῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. It is plain that δικαιοσύνης
must be rendered, not righteousness (as in the
E. V.), but justification.

6. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ—ἐνεργουμένη. In this verse
there is nearly the same sentiment repeated, yet so
as to show that Christians do right in rejecting every
use of the Mosaic Law; and resting solely upon
the internal feelings of the heart. (Borger.)

Koppe renders: "Christi judicio, sive circum-
cisus fueris, sive non circumeisis, nihil interest, modo
confidas ejus benignitati, et benevolentia complec-
taris alios." And so Rosenmuller. But in these
interpretations I cannot acquiesce: nor do I see
why ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is to be rendered Christi judi-
cio. And as to animi sensus, I can see nothing
of the kind in the words. The antient Commenta-
tors appear to have taken a far more correct view
of the scope and sense of the passage. ἐν Χριστῷ
is explained by them, and also by Whitby, "in the
economy of Christ, in the Christian religion." The
exposition of Chrysost. is so excellent, that, though
somewhat long, I cannot suppress it: p. 751, 7. ὁ
γὰρ τῶν Χριστῶν ἐνδυσάμενος, μικρὶ τοιαύτα περιεργαζόμενος,
φησὶ καὶ μὴν ἐλεγέν, ὅτι βλαβερὸν ἡ περιτομὴ τῶν ὁμοίων
ἀδίαιρον αὐτῷ τίθησιν; ἀδίαιρον ἐξαίτων ἔνας ἢ πρὸ τῆς
πίστεως ἐν χρήσει, οὐκ ἔπι τῶν μετὰ τὴν πλεῖν περιτομῆς
νομέων ὁρὰ δὲ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἐξέβαλε, μετὰ ἀκρωθυνίας
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οτις εις το γαρ τοιοον την διαφοραν, η πιστις εστιν
αστερ ων δν αδελθιας τις καταλεγη, δν τε γρυπως, δν τε
συμων, δν τε μελανας, δν τε λευκως, ωδεν διαφερει προς
tην δοκιμασιαν ταυτα, αλλα ινα ισχυως και ευιστομονες
ωσι μονον τουτο δει εκτειν ευτω και των μελλοντα άπο-
γραφονται εις την καινην διαθηκην, ωδεν βλαπτει τα
σωματικα ταυτα προστατα, αστερ ευτω εωτε ονυνησιν, δν
προση. So also Theophyl., Ecumen., and Theodoret. And this is, upon the whole, I think, a just
view of the sense.

6. ιης κυίη, “avails any thing to salvation.” It is
not, however, necessary to suppose that this is only
said of the circumcised before they became Chris-
tians. For circumcision, even after Christian bap-
tism, would avail nothing to salvation. Yet it would
not injure, unless relied on as a means of obtaining
justification.

5. αλλα πις δι’ αγαθης ενεργουμενη. On the
sense of these words Commentators are little agreed.
The antient Interpreters take the αγαθης of love to
Christ, of which, Chrysost. says, the Apostle means
to hint those were devoid who listened to the seduc-
tions of false teachers, as must also be the false
teachers themselves. Others think that αγαθης refers
to charity towards the Heathens. But this can still
less be tolerated. I, however, am so far inclined to
agree with Chrys., that I think the Apostle meant
to strike a home blow at one of their greatest faults,
namely, the want of this αγαθη, notwithstanding all
the pretensions to great scrupulosity as to the Law
and the Gospel. I think, therefore, that Grot., and
most recent Commentators, rightly render: “that
which shows itself, exerts its force in charity, or be-
nevolence.” That disputes and uncharitable brawl-
ings had taken place, is clear from ver. 18, 15 & 26.
It is agreed by the most eminent Commentators
(see especially Cameron., Grot., and Borger), that
εφερ. must have the sense above assigned, and not
that which some, as Whitby, attribute to it, namely,
is made active by, is wrought, perfected by (see Schl.
Lex.) ; though the two significations in some degree merge into each other.

Nay, if any one will choose to interpret ἡγάσης both of love towards God and towards man for God’s sake, he may possibly be right.

7. ἐτρέχετε καλῶς τὴν ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; Here we have an agonistical metaphor. See the note on 2, 2. Ἐγκόπτω signifies to cut off and intercept any one’s course. The common reading here is ἀνέκοψε. But there is reason to think that ἐνέκοψε is the true one. The former may, indeed, be defended by some examples adduced by Elsner, Krebs, and Loesner (to which I add Onosand. 68, 1. ἀναβαλλόμενοι καὶ δυσπρόοντοι, καὶ τοῖς ὑπηρέταις τοῖς προσίντας ἀνακόπτειν κελεύοντες), yet that is unnecessary, as the other is so superior both in external and internal evidence. Indeed, in the few MSS. in which ἀνεκ. is found, it arose probably by mere chance, since α and ε are perpetually confounded.

In the next words τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι there are variations in the MSS. But, as the best Critics admit, there is no reason to alter the common text, in which the πείθεσθαι is governed of ὡστε, and the μὴ is thought to be redundant; as is the case with several other verbs of peculiar kinds, on which see Matth. Gr. Gr. Though it is, with reason, questioned by Hoogev. whether these can be really accounted pleonasmis. Indeed, a word is often thought pleonastic, when it would not be used according to the idiom of some other language, in respect of which it is called pleonastic.

By ἀληθεία is meant the true doctrine of Christ. See 3, 1. and 2, 5 & 14. It might be paralleled by our modern word orthodoxy, as opposed to the heterodoxy of the Judaizers.

The interrogation is, as Theophyl. observes, ἐλεφορομένου. So Chrys. ταύτα ἀποροῦντος ἐστὶ καὶ θενόντος μᾶλλον, ὡσπερ καὶ ἐμπροσθεν ἔλεγε, τίς υμᾶς ἐβάλκηνιν.

8. ἦ πεισμοὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. It is ob-
served by Borger, that the difficulty here hinges on the sense of the rare word πεισμονή, only found elsewhere in Eustath. and in Hesych. : πείδα, πεισμονή πίστις. It may signify either εὐπείδεια, pliability, obedience, (as the antient Commentators and most moderns take it), or craftiness in persuading others, deceivableness, (to use the expression of the E. V. in 2 Thess. 2, 10.), as referred to the false teachers. And so Par., Menoch., Erasm., Est., Zeger, and Pisc. As to authority, the passage in Eustath. is in favour of the latter interpretation. But the context is, I think, clearly in favour of the former and more common interpretation: for there is evidently a paronomasia, and an allusion to πείδασθαι just before; q. d. “this facility and readiness to hearken,” &c. That πεισμονή will bear this sense, is apparent from Hesych.; and the authority of so very modern a writer as Eustath. is of little weight. Upon the whole, though the former interpretation seems to deserve the preference, yet Theophyl. well explains thus: Τὸ πείδασθαι τοῖς ἀπατώσειν, οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν υμᾶς ἐκείνος ἵνα πείδησθε τοῖς συμβολεύοντι Ιουδαίοι.

The ἦ is for αὐτῇ ἦ, this. The τοῦ καλοῦντος may be interpreted either of God, or, with some modern Commentators, as Locke, Doddr., and Mackn., of Paul. But I prefer the former, which is supported by the authority of the antients.

9. μικρὰ δὲ ὀμὴ ὧλον τὸ φύεμα ὃμοι. Chrys. and Theophyl. ably trace the connexion thus: “That they might not say, “Why so severe upon us for obeying one precept of the Law (namely, circumcision)? why exaggerate our blame.”

In the interpretation of this expression, which is evidently a proverbial one (occurring also in 1 Cor. 5, 6., and on which see Schotttg. Adag. S. N. T. p. 108.), the modern Commentators hesitate, as it seems to me, very needlessly. Many moderns, as Grot., Hamm., Locke, Mackn., and Borger, refer it to the false teachers; q. d. “a few false teachers may, by
their doctrines, corrupt the whole congregation." The antients, however, and many moderns, as Est., Whitby, Wells, Rosenm., Jaspis, and (as it seems) Koppe, refer it to circumcision and such other limited observances of the Law as those Judaizers might be content, at first, to enjoin. So Theophyl.: ἀστερ γὰρ ἡ ἤγιος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἵπποι καὶ μετατιθεὶς τὸ ὅλον φύραμα, καὶ τοι μικρὰ οὕσα: οὕτω καὶ ἡ περιτομή, μία οὕσα ἐντολή, εἰς τέλειον Ιουδαῖομον ὁμοσ μετακαλεί. And Koppe: "Tell me not that circumcision, and other such rites, are immaterial and indifferent, and that in them you may accommodate yourselves to the counsels and wishes of those persons, without compromising your Christian profession; for, I fear, this strong inclination which you have for those things, though very immaterial, would so corrupt you, as to entirely destroy your Christian principles."

I cannot but think that this latter interpretation deserves the preference, since it seems to be confirmed by the verse preceding, and also ver. 31., where see the note. ὁν φύραμα Borger has much needless discussion; for on either interpretation, and especially the latter, the import is plain.

10. ἐγὼ πέτοιμα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, δτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε. It is remarked by Koppe and Borger, that lest the reproofs before thrown out should too much depress and consequently alienate them, the Apostle here softens that harshness by expressions indicative of confidence in their docility, and readiness to return to the right course."

Here one would have expected some introductory particle, as δὲ, which, indeed, is found in three ancient MSS; but it seems to have arisen from the margin. Koppe would subaud δὲ, or ἀλλὰ. But such an ellipsis is not usual. The fact is, the Apostle here, as occasionally elsewhere, adopts the figure asyndeton, (which, as the Prince of Critics long ago observed,) has, when properly employed, great energy. The sense may be thus expressed: "I for my part, place confidence in you:" for εἰς ὑμᾶς is not (as
Borger regards it) redundant: nor was there any reason for the recent Commentators, as (Koppe and Borger,) to have stumbled at the sense of Κυρίω. Nothing can be more harsh and frigid than the interpretation they propose. The true sense is, undoubtedly, that assigned by the antient Commentators, and, of the moderns, by Grot. and Koppe, namely: “Deo adjuvante,” “by God’s help and blessing.” So we familiarly say, “I trust, or I hope in God he will not go.” We may regard this as one of the many phrases scattered up and down in the Apostle’s writings, indicative of a mind thoroughly imbued with a sense of man’s dependence upon God for every blessing, both temporal and spiritual. Such as these it were unwarrantable to fritter away into unwmeaning generalities.

In the words ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε there is an ellipsis, which may (I think) be attributed (as often) to the modesty of the Apostle. Had this been attended to, no one would ever have thought of supplying, (with Jerome) “than as I do,” or (with Whitby) “than as I exhort you to be,” or (with Borger) interpreting, “agree with me on the truth of the above proverb.” The true mode of supplying the ellipsis is undoubtedly that of Beza, Menoch., Est., Tir., and Koppe, τάρ 

10. οὐ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμῶς βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα. The δὲ is rendered by Koppe, ceterum, however, be that as it may. οὐ δὲ ταράσσων—ἡ. Wets. illustrates the force of ταράσσῃ from Galen. ταράττοντες μόνον τοὺς μαθα- 

νοντας, διδάκτοντες δ’ οὐδὲν. And Schleus. compares a similar use of the Heb. תִּשָּׁא in Mic. 7, 9. Since it appears from ver. 12. and supra 1, 7. 4, 7. 6, 17. that these disturbors were many in number, it may be supposed (with the best Commentators) that the Apostle here, as often, uses the singular collectively. The sense, then, seems to be: “whoever may be the troubleurs.” Wolf and Dodd. infer from the phrase ὅτις ἀν Ἰ, in conjunction with the use of the
plural elsewhere, that the Apostle was not informed of any particular false teacher. But this seems not a correct inference. It should rather appear that though his remarks were applicable to, and glanced at many, he meant to particularly level his rebukes against some individual. Koppe conjectures that the δοτις ἄν ὅ hints that the persons in question were persons of dignity and authority, such (I would add) as we have reason to think were some of the Corinthian false teachers. Who these persons were we know not for certain; and conjectures will not be worth detailing. See Jerome in loc.


11. ἔγα τε, ἀδελφοι, εἰ περιτομήν ἔτι κηρύσσω τι ἔτι, &c. The Apostle here adverts to a calumnious charge brought against him by the Judaizers above mentioned, namely, inconsistency—restraining them from the observance of the Law, though to some other Churches he had permitted, nay enjoined it.

By these words being introduced just after mention of the disturbers, it plainly appears that they were the promulgators of this calumny. We may therefore thus paraphrase: "Now as to the calumny propagated by such persons, that I preach circumcision, it is sufficient to reply: "If I (indeed) now (that I am become a Christian) preach it, why am I yet persecuted by the Jews and Judaizers? Surely the disgust and offence they took would have ceased."

Κηρύσσω is for διδάσκω. The περιτομή is, as Koppe says, for ὅτι ἡ περιτομή ἱσχύει τι; as at ver. 6. And ἡρα signifies profecto, tandem.

11. ἡρα κατηργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. Some recent Commentators, (as Noesselt,) have proposed a strange interpretation of the σταυροῦ, namely, calamity. But, as Borger acknowledges, there is no reason to desert the antient and common interpreta-
tion, namely, the doctrine of the crucifixion of Christ. And Borger aptly compares 1 Cor. 1, 17. seq., where the cross is said καταργεῖται (as here καταργεῖται). And at ver. 18. it is called ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ: and further on, at ver. 23., it is said: ἦρες κυρίσσουμεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαῖοι σκάνδαλον. Borger observes, that the words are susceptible of two modes of interpretation. 1st. “There is thus taken away the stumbling-block which hinders the Jews from embracing the doctrine of Jesus Christ crucified.” 2dly. τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ being put per oppositionem for σταυρὸς δὴ ἐστὶ σκάνδαλον (on which sort of apposition see Grot. on this passage and on Rom. 4, 11.), the sense may be this: “For thus is taken away all that doctrine which is so odious to the Jews, and which proves such a stumbling-block to them.” The latter interpretation is adopted by Grot., Rosenm., and Borger, which last mentioned Commentator remarks that σταυρὸς may be interpreted either of the whole doctrine of the Gospel, whose primary dogma was the death of Christ, or the doctrine of the death of Christ; and that, on either interpretation, the Apostle’s argument will hold good. But surely the latter is by far the more apt, namely, “the doctrine of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and his laying down his life by a violent and ignominious death as a ransom for many.” Now as by this death deliverance from the curse of the Law, and from its burthensome ceremonies was purchased, and also that justification which, by the Mosaic Law, could never have been obtained, so, by making the law void and of none effect, (nay even being inconsistent with any use of its ordinances as available to justification,) it is no wonder that this fundamental doctrine of the cross of Christ should have been to the Jews a stumbling-block. This view of the subject is entirely supported by the Greek Commentators. (See Chrys.) Theophyl. paraphrases thus: Εἴ περιτικὴν κυριττδ, πέταυται τὸ σκάνδαλον ὁ σκάνδαλον τὸ σκάνδαλον ὁ σκάνδαλον εἶ τῷ σταυρῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ εὐθὺν γὰρ ἔτερον σκάνδαλον ὁ σκάνδαλον εἴ τῷ
There are few passages which have more perplexed the Commentators, or given rise to greater variety of opinions, than the present. The antients take ἀπόκοφαν as a physical sense, and think there is a paronomasia on the preceding περιτομὴν; q. d. "I would that they who are so forward to enjoin circumcision would cut off the membra genitalia." So Chrys. renders: εἰ βοᾶλνται, μὴ περιτομέσθωσαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ περικοπτέσθωσαν (or, as is read in some MSS., ἀποκοπέσθωσαν). And so (Ecumen. 760 c. perī ὑμῶν μοι μέλει, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀναστατοῦντων υμᾶς, ὡς ἄνιστροφοι, οὕτως τοὐ- γαρῶν μὴ μόνον περιτομέσθωσαν, ἀλλ’ ἐδέι καὶ ἀποκόποις ἐναυς ἐποίησαν. And Theophyl.: εἴδε μὴ μόνον περιετέμοντο, ἀλλά καὶ τελείεις ἄνεκτον τῷ ἑαυτῷ μορίᾳ. This, Wets. thinks, is meant as a bitter sarcasm on their lasciviousness.

The above interpretation is also supported by not a few modern Commentators, as Beza, Grot., Raphel, Kypke, Rosenn, Schleus., and most recent ones. But to this it has been objected by Doddr., that "it by no means agrees with the mild genius of Christianity to suppose that the Apostle (who understood it so well, and cultivated it so much) should mean by the expression in question to intimate that he wished them dead, or wished that any bodily evil were inflicted upon them by human violence." It must, however, be remembered, that the word does not suppose it to have been inflicted by human violence, but by themselves, and voluntarily. At the same time, I cannot but think, (with Erasm., Crell., Le Clerc, Elsnar, Whitby, and others,) that the sentiment arising out of that interpretation has far too much of levity, and is too bitter, imprecatory, and scurrilous a sarcasm to be supposed to come from the Apostle. And it is in vain for Koppe and Borger to urge the change of manners and different ideas in ages so far distant; since we find nothing like it in any other part of the Apostle's writings, even when we might have sooner expected bitterness and scurrility, namely, in speaking of the Corinthian false Apostles. And though it may be urged that the paronomasia requires this interpretation, yet that figure, though frequently used by the Apostle, is not to be introduced unnecessarily, as, I think, is sometimes done by recent Commentators. As to the passage of Phil. 3, 2, it is nothing to the present purpose, since there is only a paronomasia between καταραμὴν and περιτομὴν, but no aim at a jest.

I cannot, however, approve of other interpretations which have been substituted in the room of the antient one. That of Elsnar is destitute of all support from the tuss loquendi; and that of Koppe and others, "may they be punished and suffer perdition from God (as βαστάσει τὸ κρίμα at ver. 10.)" is liable to much more serious
objection, and is equally at variance with the norma loquendi. Upon the whole, I see no interpretation so little liable to objection as that of Gomar, Pisc., Menoch., Par., Est., Crell., Whitby, Mackn., Dodd., and most Commentators for the last century, who take the expression to signify either, “I would that they would cut themselves off from the society, and so Jortin, Dresig., and Jaaspis, or, supposing the future middle to be used in a passive sense (as often), “I would that they were cut off from the society (by excommunication).” As to what Kypke urges in objection to this, it is frivolous. For, in the first place, nothing is more frequent than this change of the future middle into the future passive, and of the future passive into the future middle; on which Borger marshals a host of critical references. The same learned Commentator has ably defended this interpretation against all the objections of Koppe. As to the ellipsis of ἀφίμων, it is no more harsh than most others in the Apostle’s writings, and is defended by a similar one in ἐκκλαίειν supra 4, 17, where see the note, and also that on 4, 30.

Finally (to use the words of Whitby) this seems agreeable to a similar passage of 1 Cor. 5, 6 & 7, where having said, as here, a little leaven leavens the whole lump, he adds, purge out therefore the old leaven, i.e. put away from yourselves the wicked person, which he himself here would not do alone, because he saw his authority among them was impaired, and he feared this rather might exasperate than cure their distemper. And when (as Dodd. says) we consider the particular circumstances in which these seducing teachers opposed the Apostle, it will appear they very well deserved that ecclesiastical censure which, it seems, the Apostle here wishes to be pronounced against them.

The ἀναστούντες, it may be observed, are the same with the of ἀναπάντητος at 1, 7, and supra 10. And so Acts 17, 6. εἰ τῆς ἀνακομίας ἀναστοῦντες. The term signifies properly to turn upside down, and metaphorically to unsettle, disturb.

13. ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐν ᾗ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί. It is observed by Borger, that the interpretation of these words will depend upon that of the former ones. But upon the first interpretation there can be no connection imagined here, without great violence; and scarcely less so on the second; q. d. “Well, be that as it may, do you enjoy the liberty they seek to destroy, for you were called,” &c. I therefore cannot agree with Borger, that “whichever be adopted, the words must be closely connected with the preceding;” (though I see they are so taken by Koppe). It should rather appear that there is no connection at all, and that the γὰρ refers to ver. 8 & 9. ἧ πεισμονή—
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μαθὼν ἄλλα φρονήσεις; the words of ver. 11 & 12. being in some degree parenthetical; q. d. "Do so, I say, for ye were called to the Christian faith for freedom," i. e. to be free. 'Ελευθερία is not (as some suppose) put for ἑλευθερία. The ἐν ἐκεῖ has, (Rosenm. and Borger think) a sense frequent in the best writers, namely, hac lege et conditione ut; as in Thucyd. 7, 83. εἰ τις βουλεταί ἐν εὐεργείᾳ ἀσ σφαίρας ἀπέγνω. Diodor. Sic. 2, 24. ἔπειτε τοὺς Πέρας ἐν ἑλευθερίᾳ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας. And I would add, that this signification is frequent in Thucyd. Here, however, the use of ἐν differs from the Classical, and the sense is: "to the intent that ye should be free (from the Law of Moses)." So Theophyl., who well paraphrases: οὐχ ἦν δουλεύομεν τῷ νόμῳ, ἐκλήθημεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἅλλ' ἦν δουλευόμεθα ἀπὸ δικαίως τῆς νομικῆς δουλείας. On καλείσθαι see 1, 6. and the note there.

13. µόνον µὴ τὴν ἑλευθερίαν εἰς ἄφορμην τῇ σαρκί. It is evident that there is here an ellipsis of ὡς τα ἡμεῖς; and that τὴν is for ταυτὴν τὴν. Wets. illustrates the ellipsis from Arrian Epict. 3, 24. ἀπὸ βασιλέως τις ἡκεί, µόνον µὴ τι κακῶ. It is well observed by Borger, that having made mention of liberty, the Apostle gives them a seasonable admonition on its right use; on which subject he continues to treat up to 6, 10.* A striking proof that the Apostle, though he maintained that all force was taken away from the Mosaic Law, yet was the farthest from the temerity of those who abuse the doctrine of justification and Christian

* Thus Theoph.: "As possibly they might say, 'Since, then, we are free, we may do as we please,' the Apostle rectifies this misconception, and shows that we have not this εἰς ἀδικίαν ταῖς σαμαίαις ἐκτὸς τοῦ νόμου, that we should rush headlong, but that, without the law, we should walk εὐθείας, as being better instructed: and we were only set free from the ceremonial, not from the moral precepts of the law." By the way, I would observe, that this, if a correct interpretation, would prove the marriage of Henry the Eighth with Catharine of Arragon to have been at variance with the Word of God, and, in that sense, unlawful. Whether Abp. Cranmer employed the passage in his Treatise on that subject, I know not.
liberty into sluggish indifference to the moral duties, or absolute violation of them. See Rom. 6, 9, seqq. supra 2, 10. 1 Cor. 7, 39.

Borger observes, that ἀφομία not only signifies an occasion, but a cause, also a help, and furtherance in doing any thing. And he refers to Munth in loc. and Wets. on Rom. 7, 8.; and adds, that in general it is used of the abuse of what is in itself good; as in Demosth. p. 16. τὸ εὖ πράττειν παρὰ τὴν ἄξιαν ἀφομία τοῦ κακῶς φρονεῖν τοῖς ἀνόητοις γίνεται.

Oecumen. well expounds thus, 761 l. μὴ ἀποχέψησθε τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ, εἰς τὸ δουλεύειν καὶ ταῖς τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμίαις. Compare 1 Pet. 2, 16. 2 Pet. 2, 19. Among the many Classical passages adduced by Wets. the most apposite are the following. Aristid. p. 372. λαυτελεστέραμεν μὲν εἶναι δουλεύειν, ἢ κακῶς ἐφοδιασμὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἤχειν. Liv. 34, 49. libertate modicè utantur, temperatam eam salubrem et singulis et civitatibus esse; nimiam, et alis gravem, et ipsis, qui habeant, effrenatam et præcipitem esse. Hor. A. p. 282. in vitium libertas excidit ac vim, lege regi dignam.

Koppe observes, that δουλεύειν ἢ ἀγάπης is for ἀγαπάν, and is used as being more suitable to τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ. But the Apostle meant (I think) to express more than simply love each other, namely, inservire commodis mutuis.* It is well noticed by Oecumen. and Chrysost., that δουλεύειν denotes the τὸ ἐκπεταμένω τῆς ἀγάπης. For the Apostle, though he has taken away the yoke of the law, yet lays upon them another yoke, which, though light, is yet stronger, namely, that of love. What is meant here by ἀγάπη is clear from 6, 2. The antient Commentators (and, of the modern ones, Rosenm.,) observe that the Apostle hints at the πολιτεία of the deceivers, and the disputes and enmities of the rest. It is here truly

* And so δουλεύειν is used in Plato de Legg. L. 10. (cited by Bulkley) Ὅσι ἐστι (βίος scil.) τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πρασούντα ἐὰν τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ μὴ δουλευόντα ἐφέροι ταύτα νόμον. I add Eurip. Phoen. 556. ἡμιος μὲν νῦν τε δουλεύει βροτεῖς.
remarked by Theophyl., that φιλαρχία is the mother of heresy and schism.

14. ο γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐν λόγῳ πληροῦται, ἐν τῷ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου σὺς ἑαυτόν. Theoph. observes, that the Apostle here, with admirable address, turns the discourse from doctrinal to moral subjects. He here gives an important moral maxim, the primary precept of the law, called in James 2, 8. βασιλικὸς νόμος. In this, as Koppe, Pott, and Borger observe, we are not to seek refinements, but take it in its plain and obvious sense. In order, however, to determine what is the exact sense, it is necessary to ascertain that of πληροῦται. Some explain: “the whole law is completed,” i.e. he who obeys this precept, may be thought to obey the whole law. (See Borger.) And so our English Translators, who render fulfilled. This interpretation is in some degree countenanced by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) εἰ διὰς πληροῦν θέλετε τὸν νόμον, μη ἐν τῷ περιτέμνεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ ἁγάπῃ πληροῦτε, αὐτή γὰρ τοῦ νόμου πλήρεσμα. See also Œcumen, and Theodoret. And Grot. annotates thus: “Sicuti rudimenta implentur per doctrinam perfectiorem. Lex Israelitas tantum inter se jungit, Evangelium homines omnes; idque non quovis modo, sed propter Deum.” All this may be very true; but it does not seem to have been in the Apostle’s view. I confess I see no reason to desert the more common interpretation, originally propounded by Vorst., and since his time supported by most eminent Commentators down to Koppe, Borger, Rosenm., and Jaspis, who take πληροῦται as equivalent to ἀνακεφάλαιοιναι in a very similar passage of Rom. 13, 9. (where see the note), and also Matt. 22, 37. seqq. and 7, 12. Borger paraphrases thus: “Of the whole law (both the Jewish, the moral, and the Christian; see 2, 19.) the argumentum, as it were, amounts to this, comes to this,” &c. And he here compares a beautiful sentiment of Isidor. Pel. 4, 15. τὰ γὰρ κατ’ εἰδος ἐπε-
The passage of the Old Testament alluded to is Levit. 19, 8; a sentiment (as Burger observes) very often inculcated in the New Testament, and which seems to have become proverbial. It is remarked by Koppe and Borg., that in enquiring into the import of the terms αἰς σεαυτὸν, we are not to seek metaphysical refinements, or too much press on the sense. And the latter, after premising that the Apostle means not to say how much we are to love our neighbour, but gives an example of love, paraphrases: "As it would be absurd and irrational for you not to love yourself, so love others;" or, "You love yourself, love others also." And so many other of the modern school of German Theologians explain: "Not only love yourself, but likewise your neighbour." But this mode of interpretation lies open to objections, especially one which occurred to the acute Koppe, namely, that it is manifestly "made for the nonce," and to avoid a doctrinal difficulty, which after all, however, is none: for, as Koppe remarks, "after throwing aside all metaphysical subtilties, and considering the words only in their plain and popular import, they merely refer to the kind, not the degree, of love and good-will; q. d. "Love your neighbour in the same manner as you love yourself, though not to the same degree," which would have been unnatural and impracticable, and therefore could not have been commanded. So that it comes to the same thing with the golden rule at Matt. 7, 12., to do unto others as we would they should do unto us. If I am not mistaken, the same exposition is somewhere to be found in the writings of Dr. Paley. And, indeed, after all, the elaborate, but needless, disquisitions of Storr, Burger, and others, nearly come to this interpretation, though in a far less regular way.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that by the ὅπερ vol. vii. 2
πλησίον is meant τὸν ἄτερον, every one with whom we have any connection.

15. εἰ δὲ ἀλληλοὺς δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλληλοὺς ἀναλωθῆτε. The Apostle urges the necessity of this duty from human motives, and from the evils which would result to them, as a society, from the opposite conduct. It is observed by Chrys. with his usual taste, that he expresses this by an _if_; though he knew it was too much the case.

The δὲ may be rendered "on the contrary." The terms δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε are metaphors common to all languages, to denote scandals, envyings, disputes, broils, altercations, and calumnies: for to _all_ these they are applicable; as will appear from the numerous Classical passages cited by the Philological Commentators, to which I add Max. Tyr. Diss. 35, 5. περίπτωτοις ἀλληλοις καὶ διαδάκνοντες. Philodem. ap. Brunck. Analect. 11, 88. γνωστοὶ φιλεῖν πάντα τὸν φιλέοντα, καὶ τὸν μὲ δακόντα δακεῖν. I must here observe, that _κατεσθίετε_ is _not_ (as Koppe and Borger suppose) synonymous with _δάκνετε_, but is a far stronger term: though I cannot think with Chrysost, that the former designates the effects of sudden anger or ill will, and the latter those of deliberate malignity. It is, however, not necessary to refine on such a passage as this. Though it is proper to advert to the sense contained in the concluding words, which is expressed in a brief and popular way: "Take care lest ye be (all) consumed one of another, and (as a society) brought to ruin." This, I find, has been anticipated by Jaspis, Schleus., and Borger.

It is, with great probability, conjectured by Theodore, that these disputes arose chiefly between those who were zealous for the law, and those who maintained the doctrine of salvation by grace: for which reason the Apostle first introduces this precept of love. And Whitby observes, that as the zeal of the Jews would not suffer an uncircumcised person to live among them, so might it be also with these zealous Judaizers.
16. λέγω δὲ· Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ επιθυμίαν σαρκός οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. The λέγω δὲ is a formula of earnest exhortation. So Koppe renders it: "omnino verò rogo et hortor vos." Or it may be rendered, with Borger, "hoc autem mihi volo." And he refers to 3, 17. 4, 1. Since, however, δὲ has often a resumptive force, it may, with Rosenm., be referred to the preceding, where he had taught them that liberty was not to be carried into licentiousness. But the antient Commentators (more properly, I think,) refer it to what immediately precedes.*

It is remarked by Borger, that this verse contains, as it were, the sum of the precepts which the Apostle wished the Galatians to observe: and thus the verses following seem to explain and illustrate it.

16. περιπατεῖτε, live, act, &c.; like the Hebrew בָּלָה. A metaphor, as Koppe observes, well adapted to denote habit and manner of life. Πνεῦματι. I can by no means approve of the interpretation of Morus, namely, "the human mind," which is an unwarrantable lowering of the sense. And Rosenm., though he does not adopt Morus's gloss, yet too much lowers the sense by interpreting it, "lead a life conformable to the precepts of the Christian religion." This is certainly not the full import of the phrase, which, as Koppe and Borger observe, has the same import as πνεύματι ἀγαθῷ at ver. 18., namely (as he renders) "yield yourselves to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, who worketh in you." And he truly observes, that the Apostle every where represents the Holy Spirit as the first principle and author of all that is good in men. Yet the exposition of Mr. Locke (ap. Slade) may be admitted, especially with the qualification of it by Macknight,*

* So Theophyl. (from Chrysost.): "After having said, that to bite and worry each other will tend to the destruction of all, he suggests the remedy for it, which both preserves love, and is preserved by it, namely, the being spiritual. For "if we be spiritual, we love the more, and if we have this love, we become spiritual, and do not fulfil the lusts of the flesh."
who explains, men’s spiritual part, their reason and conscience enlightened by the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel revealed by the Spirit of God.”

16. καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσῃ. The καὶ is rendered by Koppe, contra vero. But it should rather seem to signify “and thus.” The words καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσῃ are explained by some, “and by no means fulfil the lusts,” &c. Others take τελέσῃ for the future τέλειται, and καὶ for ἣν, with this sense: “and so ye will not fulfil,” &c. The latter, which is the more common interpretation, seems to be preferable: and certainly it is more significant. It is also adopted by Wets., who cites from Ach. Tat. τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τέλεσαι.

17. ἥ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς. The γὰρ appears to have reference to a clause omitted, q. d. “(And need have ye to strive to follow the motions of the Spirit, if ye would not fulfil the lusts of the flesh;) for the flesh,” &c. Ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Borger observes, that ἐπιθ. is for ἐπιθυμίας ἔχει. By σὰρξ is meant the animal principle of man’s nature, which inclines him to gratify the desires of the flesh; and the πνεῦμα is to be understood in the same way as in the last verse. See also the notes on 4, 6. and supra ver. 13. Now the desires and motions of these, it is said, are κατὰ, at variance with each other, or, as the Apostle further adds, Ἀντίκειται ἀλλήλοις, i. e. (as Koppe explains) ἐνάντια εἰσὶ. * See the excellent annotation of Dr. Doddr.

* Wets. compares Sext. Emp. Hypoth. 2, 14. ἀντίκειται δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ἐστὶν ἀπόδειξις, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπόδειξις. Nedarim 2. Fomes boni pugnat cum formite mali, and several other passages from the Rabbins. See on this subject a learned Dissertation of Schoett., annexed to his Hor. Hebr. “De Luctu carnis et spiritus ad mentem priscorum Hebræorum.” Borger also compares Porphyry. de Abstin. L. 1, § 56. Εἰ καὶ μὲν ἀγγέλῳ κοινωνιάς τᾶς ὑπομονᾶς ἐχρῆν, καὶ οἴδατον τοῖς νόμισι τοῦ σώματος ἤπεσαι, βιαίους οὖσας, καὶ ἀντικείμενοι τοῖς τοῦ νοῦ νόμισαι καὶ τάς ὀδης τᾶς συνεργεῖ, ὑπακοόμεν. And he adduces other beautiful passages from the Classical writers, to which I can only refer my readers, namely, Xen. Cyr. 6, 21. Cic.
GALATIANS, CHAP. V.

17. ἰνα μὴ, καὶ δὲν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιήτε. This is one of those passages in which a fancied doctrinal difficulty has led to interpretations evidently devised for the purpose of avoiding it. The obvious sense is that expressed in our Common Version, "so that ye cannot do the things which ye would." Now as the Apostle could not mean to admonish the Galatians not to fulfil the lusts of the flesh because they could never do the things which reason, conscience, and the Holy Spirit enjoined, so Commentators have devised various methods of interpretation. Grot. would closely unite the words with the preceding, and render, "ne ea faciatis quæ alioqui velletis." But this is too violent a method to bear being adopted. Very specious is the one pursued by Hamm., Pisc., Locke, Doddr., Slade, and Valpy, who render, "so that ye do not the things which ye would." But I am inclined to think that ἰνα, when thus used for ἀστε, will not admit the subjunctive, but requires the indicative. I am surprised that Mr. Locke should think our Common Version is singular in the sense it assigns. The Latin Versions are indeed dubious; but most of the early Commentators were inclined to adopt the sense "cannot do;" and so almost all eminent Biblical Critics for the last century (and formerly Paræus), who regard the ἰνα as having the eventual sense, and think the assertion is to be understood not of what is always, but often the case. Thus Borger renders: "quo fieri solet, ut saepius, quæ velitis efficere nequeatis." And he compares Eurip. Hippol. 380. and the Antiope cited by Valckn. in loc. So also Mackn., whose note may be consulted, together with an able annotation of

Whitby and Chrysost. It is, however, I fear, true that we shall _seldom_ be found to do the good things we would, and the resistance and opposition of evil inclinations are _almost always_ perceptible, and for this perpetual malady the only remedy is that suggested by the Apostle both here and after, namely, to seek the assistance of the Holy Spirit to strengthen the weakness of the flesh.*

18. _ei ἐν Πνεύματι ἄγαθον, οὐκ ἔσται ὑπὸ νομῶν._ Koppe regards this as an _insertion_ rather connected with the _scope_ of the _Epistle_ than with the _context_. But to this I cannot assent. It should seem that the Apostle means to suggest the _remedy_ for the deporable frailty of our corrupt nature. See the note on the verse preceding.†

* So Doddr. annotates: “By the Spirit, which is here set in opposition to the flesh, and is elsewhere expressed by the _new man_ that is put on by such as are _renewed in the spirit of their mind_ (Eph. 4, 23 & 24.), we are to understand that no supernatural principle of grace which is imparted from above to the renewed soul, to overcome the passions of the carnal mind, to set us free from the dominion of our lusts, and to inspire us with a love to holiness; which divine and heavenly principle being communicated to us by the Holy Spirit, has frequently the title of the Spirit given to it, as it is plainly the effect and fruit of it; for _that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit_. (John 3, 6.) And there is such a contrariety in these two principles, that they are continually opposing one another in their desires and tendency, so that (as the Apostle adds) _ye do not the things that ye would, ye do them not without doing violence to the opposite principle that would be drawing you another way_; which is agreeable to what the Apostle says (Rom. 7, 19.) _For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do._

† This, I find, was not unperceived by the great Chrysostom, who excellently traces the connexion, and illustrates the scope of the passage thus: _ποία ἀργός ἀκολουθία; μεγίστη μὲν καὶ σαφῆς ὁ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἔχων ὡς χρή, σβέννυσι διὰ τούτου πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν ἀπασάν ὡς τοῦτων ἀπάλαγεσι, οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου βοηθείας, ἔνθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου παραγγελίας γενόμενος ὁ γὰρ μὴ ὀργιζόμενος, τῶν δεῖται ἀκούειν οὐ φονεύεισι;_— _τὸ γὰρ διαλέγεται περὶ τοῦ καρποῦ τῆς κακίας τῇ τῆς βίας αὐτῆς ἀνασπάσαντι;_— _τότε μὲν εἰκότως ὡς τοῦ νόμου ἦμεν, ἔνα τῇ δει κολάζωμεν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ὡς τοῦ πνεύματος φανέρως τῶν δὲ τῆς χάριτος δεδομένης τῆς οὐ κελευόντος μόνον αὐτῶν ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρανόησις αὐτῶς, καὶ πρὸς μείζον πολιτείαν ἀναγούσης τίς χρεία νόμου; τῷ γὰρ οὐκοθέν καταρθοῦντι τὰ μείζω, τοῦ χρεία παιδαγωγοῦ;_
GALATIANS, CHAP. V.

By the law must be understood both the Mosaic Law and the law of nature. Thus it will embrace both the Jewish and Gentile Christians, both of whom the ye comprehends.

19, 20, and 21. Koppe and Borger remark, that in considering this list of the vices generated by the flesh we are not too minutely to scrutinize each, and anxiously determine the difference of one from another, nor seek reasons why this and no other order was adopted; since that varies in different passages, (see Mat. 15, 19. Mark 7, 21. 1 Cor. 6, 9 and 10. 8, 8, Eph. 5, 3—5. Col. 3, 5. James 3, 14.), and the Apostle means no more than by an accumulation of vices, such as were prevalent in that age, to show how fruitful of crime is viciositas. But against this way of wrapping up matters of this kind I have on former occasions entered my strong protest; and I must here repeat it. Whatever may be the case with the other sacred writers, St. Paul almost always digests these lists of vices into regular order, and throws them into groups; so he does here, as I shall show in discussing the terms in detail. As to the question, why should not some other vices as nefarious have been inserted, it may be answered, that this list is not meant to be complete, since it concludes with καὶ τὰ δόμων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and such like, and includes all the other vices to which our corrupt nature is prone.

19. φασερὰ δὲ εστὶ τὰ ἐργα τῆς σαρκὸς. ἄτινα ἐστὶ, κ.&c. Some Commentators here recognize a synchysis for φασεροῦ δὲ εστὶ, ἄτινα, κ.&c. But the common construction is the more natural. Here it is objected by Whitby,* that some of these vices seem not pro-

* He seems to have derived the difficulty from the Greek Commentators, who, however, remove it in a more ingenious manner. Thus, speaking of the strifes, jealousies, heresies, &c., Chrys. maintains that by σὰρξ the Apostle here means the γεωδή λογισμόν, καὶ χάμα αὐθέντον. And he adds: εἰ δὲ φύσεως ταύτα τοιηθῆσαι, καὶ οὐ προαρέσεσις μοιχηρᾶς, περιττώς εἰπε, πράσονειν, ἀλλὰ τὰς πάροικον τίνος δὲ ἐνεκεν καὶ βασίλεια ἔκκειτοναι; οὐδὲ γὰρ τῶν ἐν φύσει, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐν προαρέσει καὶ οἱ στέφανοι καὶ οἱ κολάσεις.
perly works of the flesh, some being errors of the mind, and others evil dispositions of the spirit. And he offers some illustrations of the subject, which however seem somewhat sophistical. I am rather inclined to agree with Doddre., that σάρξ may here, as often, be taken to denote our corrupt nature, that natural corruption which is said to have infected all the faculties of man, and so extends to all the powers of the mind, as well as to the appetites of the body; and thus (as he observes) there is no difficulty in ascribing each of the particulars here enumerated to the flesh, as it is evident they all proceed from that corruption by means of which even the mind and conscience is defiled. Tit. 1, 15.

19. μορφία, πορνεία, ἅκαθορσία, ἄσελγεια. These four terms form a group descriptive of illicit venery; as adultery, fornication, lasciviousness, and impurity of every kind, including sodomy and other abominations, the evidence for whose existence justice to the Apostle compelled me to introduce at Rom 1.

20. εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία. Some, as Schleus., explain εἰδωλ. of covetousness or an excessive attachment to the world. But (as Borger remarks) that signification seems unsupported by authority; and as to the passages adduced by Schoettg. and Wets. at Eph. 5, 5., nothing can be from thence proved, than that there is a similarity between covetousness, or worldly-mindedness, and idolatry (since the covetous person makes as it were Mammon his God), or that this vice is so criminal as to be instar omnium reliquorum." It is clear that the common signification must be retained.* Koppe supposes that this vice is

* Idolatry, it may be observed, is rightly numbered among the works of the flesh, since it originates in a grovelling and sensual mind, which cannot worship God in spirit, but brings him down to the senses, and represents him to corporeal eyes by images. Thus idolatry originally arose from sensuality, and tended ever to produce and perpetuate it. Too true a description of the natural man is that of the Christian Poet of our age. (Taske, L. 5.)

"Propense man's heart to idols, he is held
In silly dotage on created thing,
put after fornication, since that was called spiritual idolatry. And he refers to Num. 14, 33. and Apoc. 14, 8. Borger compares Jalkut Rubeni, f. 10, 3. Idolatræ non vocantur homines, quia animæ eorum sunt a spiritu impuro, sed Israelitarum animæ sunt a spiritu sancto.

Φάρμακα. Some, as Erasm., Beza, Pisc., Est., Menoch., Whitby, and Wets. understand this of poisoning; a crime by no means unexampled among the Greeks, Romans, and Jews. Borger refers to Havercamp on Tertull. Apol. c. 45. But surely this could not be reckoned among the works of the flesh, or those things to which human nature is prone. There is no reason to deviate from the common interpretation, namely conjuration, enchantments, fascinations, and other sorts of what is called witchcraft, or the black art. Thus Koppe remarks, the Sept. render the Hebr. לָאָס or לָאָס אֶל by φαρμάκος at Exod. 7, 11 and 22. and Is. 47, 9 and 12. See also Herodot. 7, 94. He observes, too, that this term is used of Circe by Arist. Plut. 302., and that Justin Martyr Ap. 45, A. joins ἐπορκίστης, ἐπάστις and φαρμακέυτης. Certain it is (to use the words of Doddr.) that, "on account of the drugs made use of in some supposed magical compositions, this word is often used to express those practices in which combinations with invisible, malignant powers were believed and intended, to which it is well known the Gentiles, even in the most learned nations, were very much addicted." It is observed by Koppe, that as the association of ideas led to the Apostle’s mind

Careless of their Creator.
And that low and sordid gravitation of his pow’rs
To a vile clod do draws him, with such force,
Resistless from the centre he should seek,
That he at last forgets it.
All his hopes tend downward; 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."
from fornication and adultery to idolatry, so did it from thence to incantations.

30. 'Εχθραί. The word is used in the plural, like the Latin intimicitia. In the terms following the plural it is used (I think) dignitatis gratid. The same is found also in Soph. ΟEd. Col. 1228. (cited by Wets.) φόνοι, στάσεις, ἔρεις, μάχαι, καὶ φθόνοι. The ἔρεις and ἡλικίας are synonymous, and are joined at Rom. 13, 13. Θησεί, ἵρᾳ; as in Hebr. 11, 27. "Ερισί, ἐπιθεία, δικαιοσυνία, and αἱρετικὶς are nearly synonymous. See Rom. 16, 17. Acts 15, 5. 1 Cor. 11, 19. and the notes. Haresy, Whitby observes, according to the Scripture notion, being not a pure mistake of judgment, but an espousing a false doctrine out of disgust, pride, or envy, or from worldly principles, or to avoid persecution or trouble in the flesh, may well be ranked among carnal lusts." And Doddre. remarks that heresies, in the ecclesiastical sense, as distinguished from what appears to be the Scriptural, may generally be said to be works of the flesh; as bad inclinations of mind naturally lead to bad opinions, and to a haughty and factious manner of obtruding them upon others.

In φθόνοι and φόνοι there is thought to be a para nomasia. Some eminent Critics would cancel the φόνοι, which is omitted in six MSS., and some Latin Fathers. And even Koppe, though he admits that we may easily account for the omission in so few MSS. (namely, by the homoeoteleuton) yet stumbles at mention being here made of a crime which is usually coerced and punished not so much by religion, as by the civil magistrate. But the same observation might apply to some other vices of this lust. In fact, the objection is of no force, since the Apostle here intends (without reference to what may or may not be forbidden, and punished by the civil magistrate) to mention the chief vices engendered by our corrupt nature: and if he inserts φόνοι, he is fully justified, since several of the above vices tend to produce it. Perhaps, however, it may
be a more satisfactory answer to Koppe's objection, to say that the Apostle here by placing φῶνοι after ἐρεισ, ὕμωλ, φόνων, &c. had especially in view that kind of φῶνοι produced by disputes, strife, and anger, namely, what is called homicide, not deliberate murder for purposes of robbery.

The last group is μὲθαυ, καίμωι. See Luke 21, 34. Rom. 13, 13., and the notes there. Borger compares Liban. 4, 158. ἐκεῖ μὲθαι καὶ πλησιμωναι, καὶ καίμωι. The καίμωι, it may be observed, is put last, as produced by the other; for revellings (as Mr. Locke remarks) were, amongst the Greeks, disorderly spending the night in feasting, with a licentious indulgence of wine, good cheer, music, dancing, &c.

At ἀ προελέγω ὑμῖν, κ. κ. π., ἃτι, &c. there is, as Borger observes, a synchysis of particles, on which see the note on 1, 11. Koppe says that this is for, "which those who do, will not (I forewarn) enter into," &c. Perhaps, however, it would be better to suppose an ellipsis of κατὰ, quod attinet ad. Προελέγω signifies, "I thus publicly warn and admonish you:" which (I conceive) is the sense of πρὸ (as in some other cases), and not beforehand. Borger compares the Dutch waar-schouwen. And he thinks that both προελέγω and προείπτων are emphatical.

By τὰ των υἱα τράπων, is meant "commit any of those, and such like vices, one or more."

The expression βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομεῖν has been explained more than once before; and is too much refined upon by the recent Commentators.

22,23. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἁγιωσύνη, πίστις, πρεσβεία, ἔγκρατεία. The ὁ δὲ is adversative, and may be rendered on the contrary. Καρπὸς, i.e. as Grot. and Koppe explain, fruits, effects, works,* as in Matt. 7,

* I must, however, object to their being called works, since the Apostle seems to have studiously avoided the word: which did not escape the observation of Chrys. See his masterly annotation,
16. Eph. 5, 9. Thus it answers the τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, a little before. The τῶν must be explained as at ver. 16, 17, & 18.

Borger thinks that in explaining this list of virtues, the same caution must be used as in that of the vices of ver. 19. "For the list (says he) is not meant to be quite complete. Nor are we to seek curious distinctions of signification, or anxiously enquire why the Apostle adopted this order in preference to any other; for he elsewhere deviates from it; as at Eph. 5, 9. Col. 3, 12." This is, upon the whole, a judicious observation; but care must be taken lest we run into the other extreme (so prevalent in the present age), namely, of supposing these lists confused assemblages of virtues and vices, thus huddling all up in bare generalities, which is a slovenly, uncritical, and above all, an irreverent procedure.

With respect to the ἄγαθον, it is not difficult to account for its being placed first, as being chief of all the rest, the queen of virtues (elsewhere extolled by the Apostle; as at Rom. 13, 10. 1 Cor. 13, 4. Col. 3, 14), and (as Koppe remarks) comprehending in itself many special virtues subjoined by the Apostle.

22. χαρὰ. This is thought by some, as Koppe and Schleusn, to be put in opposition to φθορά, at ver. 21. And they interpret it, "pleasure derived from the happiness of others;" which seems to be supported by the context. Otherwise, Borger thinks, it might

which is thus abridged by Theophyl.: "Evil works come from ourselves alone; therefore they are called the works of the flesh: but virtuous ones require not our own exertions alone, but the co-operating aids from above; therefore the Apostle calls them the fruits of the Spirit, the seed (namely, the intention) being from ourselves, but the fruit resting with God." Another, and scarcely less beautiful metaphor, is used by our Christian Poet on this same subject:

"But oars alone can ne'er prevail
To reach the distant coast;
The breath of heaven must swell the sail,
Or all the labour's lost."
be interpreted *joy of the spirit*; as in 1 Thess. 1, 6
See, however, Macknight.

22. *εὐπρήσια*. This is closely connected with the for-
mer virtue, and opposed to hatred, variance, &c.,
and is united with it at Rom. 14. 17.

23. *μακροθυμία*, *χρηστότης*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, and *πράξης*,
are considered by Borger as synonymous, and all
contained in *ἀγάπη*. Yet, I think, some well founded
distinctions may be made. Thus *μακροθυμία* denotes
a slowness to anger, and lenity towards those who
offend us. *Χρηστότης* is explained by Koppe and
Schleus., *suavitas in convictu*; and by Crel.,
"comitas, humanitas, seu suavitas quaedam, morum,
quæ elucet in verbis, in vultu, alisque rebus exter-
nis, ob quam fiat, ut sis amabilis omnibus." *Ἀγα-
θωσύνη* is rendered by Koppe *integritas*; and he
considers it as synonymous with *πιστις* following.
But it rather seems to mean *benignity, kind-hearted-
ess*, which delights in doing good to others. See
Eph. 5. 9. Both these last virtues are closely con-
ected, and are much promoted by that almost con-
stitutional good-nature and sweetness of temper with
which some are blessed, and the *seeds* of which are
sown, more or less, in most persons.

*Πιστις* is variously explained. By the antient
Commentators it is taken to denote *faith of the
highest sort*; by Grot., the *profession of the true
faith*, in opposition to the *heresies* before mentioned;
in which sense (as Mr. Slade observes) "it may in-
clude a teachableness of disposition in matters of
religion; and a readiness to acquiesce in divine
doctrines and dispensations; in opposition to that
sceptical and rebellious spirit, which engenders he-
resy; thus being similar to the *faith of Abraham*."
By most recent Commentators it is thought to sig-
nify *probity and integrity, fidelity in performing our
covenants*; as in 1 Tim. 4, 11 & 12, and often. And
as it is here associated with other moral virtues, I
cannot but prefer this last mentioned interpretation,
which may be illustrated from Plut. Erotic. Op. Mo-
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23. ἐγκρατεία signifies temperance in the gratification of all the natural appetites, as opposed to any intemperate, and still more illicit, gratification of them, as in the vices of fornication, adultery, drunkenness, &c. with which these virtues are contrasted.

30. κατὰ τὰν τοιούταν οὐκ ἔστι νόμος. Many early modern Commentators, and also Koppe, take τοιούταν in the masculine gender, i. e. “against persons who practise such virtues.” And Koppe cites the Greek adage δίκαιος ἐὰν ἦν ὢν, τῶ τρόπον χρῆσθη νόμαρ. But this seems needlessly harsh. It is far more natural to take it, with the antient Commentators, and many eminent modern ones, in the neuter, “against such things,” i. e., such dispositions. At any rate it seems to be a resumption of what was said at ver. 18. “If ye are led by the spirit, ye are not under the law.”

Borger well explains thus: “Against such virtues no law (whether the Mosaic, or any other) is directed, but against the words of the flesh,” mentioned at 19—21. The sentiment (he thinks) when connected, is this: “From the spirit proceeds virtue. To those therefore who are led by this spirit the dominion of the law has no reference. How? Because law is not promuligated against virtue, but vice.” So elsewhere: “The law was not made for the righteous, but for sinners.” Theophyl. well
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explains thus: Ψυχὴ γὰρ κατορθώσα ταῖτα ἀπὸ πνεύματος, οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου νοεθείας, ύπηλοτέρα αὐτῆς ὁποία ὁσπερ καὶ οἱ φύσει ἐξεῖρ ἤπει οὐ δεῖσαν μάστιγος. Ὡθὲ ὅσ ποιηθοῦ δὲ τοῦ νόμου ἐκβάλλει οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ' ὅσ ἐλάττωνα τῆς παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος διδομένης φιλοσοφίας.

24. οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. The connexion has here not been well traced either by the antient or the modern Commentators. The former think this is meant to show who are those that practice such virtues. And Koppe closely connects this with the preceding. And it is remarked by Borger, that mention is here made of those who are closely united with Christ, inasmuch as they do not fall into the vices generated by the flesh (ἐσταύρωσαν τὴν σάρκα), and are adorned with all those virtues of which the author and producer is the spirit.” But the scope of the passage is best traced out by Crellius thus: “After having enumerated the various effects both of the flesh and the spirit, the Apostle now proceeds to show, that Christians may and ought to avoid the works of the flesh, and follow the works of the spirit. To which he afterwards subjoins an exhortation to shun those works of the flesh to which the Galatians were especially prone, namely, strifes and contentions, and the vices from which they spring; and thus he, as it were, returns to the beginning of this whole exhortation.” With respect to the present verse, he recognises in it a tacit meeting of an objection; q. d. “How can we, encompassed with the frailties of the flesh, forsake the works thereof, and follow the motions of the spirit.” To which the answer is, that we can, and must, otherwise we are not Christ’s, and are not to expect the inheritance with him.” To me it seems that the Apostle means to still further enforce what he had said at ver. 21. “they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God;” q. d. “No! I repeat, they shall not inherit the kingdom of God. For those
only are Christ's, and can attain that inheritance; who have crucified and do crucify and mortify those carnal lusts." It is not necessary to nicely discriminate (as some do) between παθήματα and ἐπιθυμίας, or define on the sense of ἐσταύρωσαν, as do some recent Commentators, especially Borger, who, besides, altogether omits to notice one thing which the antient Commentators might have taught him, namely, that the σάρκα is meant especially of the works of the flesh, namely, vicious actions; and παθήματα and ἐπιθυμίαι corrupt desires and incentives to evil actions. Now those who are really Christians crucify the latter as well as the former, and thus purge the fountain.

25. ἐι ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχάμεν. It is somewhat difficult to determine the sense of these words, since they are susceptible of more than one. The antient Commentators have not here had their usual success. Koppe and Borger think that the words ἐι ζῶμεν πνεύματι are connected with the concluding part of the verse preceding, at which may be understood ζῶσε δὲ πνεύματι. And Koppe renders: "As therefore it is no longer the flesh, but the spirit that operates in us, moves and bends us, it is necessary that we should obey the will and impulse of the spirit." But it is somewhat harsh to render εἰ cum. I am inclined to think that the Apostle meant to repeat the earnest admonition at 2, 16. "Now, I say, live by the spirit:" which, if they do, he tells them, they will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. At ver. 18. he sets forth the advantage of being led by the spirit, namely, that they are not ἀνὸν νόμον. He then draws a striking contrast between the works of the flesh, and of the spirit, to show them what it really is to live by the spirit, and be led by it: and points out the awful consequences of the former, and the glorious results of the latter, repeating that "against such there is no law." Then at ver. 24. he tells them that they only are Christ's who have thus crucified the flesh, i. e.
whether they profess to have the spirit, or not. Thus at ver. 25. the sense must be as follows: “If, then, we (or rather ye, ἡμεῖς being used by the usual delicacy of the Apostle) profess* to have the spirit, and live by it, let us show the evidence of it, let us walk† and act by it, show it in our actions, by the fruits above mentioned.” Thus it is a repetition of the πνεύματι πέριπτατείτε at ver. 16. This, Dr. Middleton observes, may be regarded as a caution against the mischievous consequences of trusting to the all-sufficiency of faith.

26. μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλοῦμενοι, αὐτῶν συνωνύμοις. In requiring of them the above proof of the indwelling of the spirit, the Apostle especially adverts to some vices to which, it seems, the Galatian Christians, like the Corinthian ones, were too prone, namely, pride, vain-glory, and the accompanying vices of ostentation and envy. Here Bulkley compares Epict. L. 3. C. 24. p. 384. Νόμος θείος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς—τι γὰρ λέγει; Ο προσποιούμενος τὰ μηδὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔστω ἀλάνων, ἔστω κενόδοξος.

The Commentators dilate much on the words. The κενόδοξοι they explain, proud and vain of empty advantages, as birth, wealth, learning, eloquence. The προκαλ. has reference to the paltry competitions which such vain-glory produces, and the consequent envy of those who fail. Much more might be said; but it may suffice to refer to the Commentators, who, however, omit what to any one who has attentively studied the Epistles to the Corinthians (who were not very differently situated) would immediately occur, namely, that the Apostle adverts to vain-glory, competition, and envy in general, not in temporal matters only, but in spiritual ones also. And if we remember that some of the Galatians

* So Whitby and Wells.
† This is not a mere Hebraism, since examples of the sense are adduced by Web. from Philo, Polyb., and Sext. Emp. as C. Eth. 59, στοιχεῖν τοῖς φιλόσοφοις.
enjoyed spiritual \( \chiαρίσματα \), like those of the Corinthians (see supra 3, 5.), the admonition would be seasonable: and this view of the sense seems confirmed by the words following \( ύμεις οἱ πνευματικοὶ. \)

CHAP. VI.

Ver. 1. ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληψί—ἐν πνεύματι προφήτων. There is here the same complaint made by the critics as at the preceding chapters, namely, that the division of the chapter has been introduced at an improper place. Yet this division is sanctioned by the example of Chrys., who commences a new homily with this verse. Certain it is, that in a writer so desultory as St. Paul, it is extremely difficult to make any such divisions as shall be clear of objections.

Theophyl. introduces the words thus: Ἐστι, τὰ τέλος παρὰ αὐτῶν δεικνύεις ἐπιτιμάς τοὺς ἁμαρτάνουσιν, τὰ δεικνύεις ἔξοδόν ταῦτα, ἀπὸ φιλαρχίας εἰς τοῦτο ἐρχομένης: φησιν, &c.

The καὶ (which is passed over by most translators) signifies even. Προληψί is rendered by the early modern Commentators, and also Wolf, Elsner, and Kypke, “hurried away.” And they take προ to signify before he is aware. To which it is objected by Borger, that this would require ύπο τοῦ παραπτώματος. This, however, is but peddling criticism, and in a writer like St. Paul deserves little attention. Yet I remember no instance of such a use of προ; and therefore I cannot but prefer the interpretation of Grot. and others, and recently Ernasti and Koppe, overtaken in. Borger renders deprehensius; and Mackn. surprised into. But the former neither has, nor can have, any authority; and the latter is not English. The truth is, that there is here a confusion, or blending together of two phrases of different construction, though not dis-
similar in sense, namely, overtaken, and hurried away by any fault (i.e. the temptation to commit it. So Theophyl. σωρπαγα), so as, &c. and surprised and detected in any fault. Both of these the Apostle may be supposed to have had in view.

The ἄνθρωπος answers to the Hebr. וָפַן, and partakes of the simplicity of Oriental diction. Παράτομα, a fault. This is a sort of euphemism for ἁμάρτημα. Τιμεῖ, οἱ πνευματικοί. This is explained by Locke, Chandler, Doddr., Kypke, Rosenm., and Borger of the more advanced in Christian knowledge and virtue, since such are especially qualified to recall others to the right path, by reproof and admonition. And Borger refers to Rom. 15. 1. 4, 6. 5, 18. But this seems to too much lower the sense; and when we consider how πνεῦμα has been repeatedly used a little before, we can hardly fail to see that the sense must be that which the antient Commentators assign, namely, “such as have the holy spirit.” And when we bear in mind that some of the Galatians (see 3, 5. and elsewhere), like the Corinthians, were endued with spiritual gifts, it is not unreasonable to suppose that these are the persons here meant.* And even Koppe admits that gifts of the holy spirit are to be understood.

* So Whitby: “I have noted on 1 Cor. 14, 32. that in the beginning of Christianity, when churches were first converted, they had for a time no settled church governors, but all their church offices were performed by men who had spiritual gifts, and by them are said to prophesy in the church to their edification, exhortation, and comfort, v. 2. So I conceive it was when St. Paul writ to the Galatians; for here is no direction of this Epistle to any stated church governors, no salutation of any in the close, no charge against any for suffering these great miscarriages in the church; no exhortation to them to take heed to their ministry, and to oppose themselves to these deceivers; and then the spiritual men here mentioned, must be the prophets, who then performed all spiritual offices among them.”

And so Mackn., and other Commentators. Doddr. indeed makes objections to this; but his arguments seem not very forcible; though I admit that Whitby appears to have been too much carried away by fondness for hypothesis.
1. καταρτίζετε, i.e. literally, "set him right:" a metaphor, if I mistake not, derived from surgery, namely, bone-setting. This, it may be observed, is an euphemism for correct and reform. For καταρτίζετε a Classical writer would probably have used καθήμορσαϊθε, or ἐπανομῆσασθε, on which see Hemst. on Pollux 9, 139. Now this the Apostle directs to be done ἐν πνεύματι προφήτησι, which is, by the ancient Commentators, thought to refer to the Holy Spirit, and especially that which had conferred the spiritual gifts. And Koppe and Borger both acknowledge that the Holy Spirit is to be understood, since προφήτης has been a little before mentioned as one of its fruits. But I must confess this appears to me to be an insufficient proof. I cannot but think that ἐν πνεύματι προφήτησι signifies, "with a spirit and temper of meekness." Thus it is a stronger expression for ἐν προφήτης. And perhaps this may be a Hebraism.

1. σκοτῶν σεωρῶν, &c. Macknight has here fallen into a most grievous error, by regarding this as a change of address from the Galatians to the reader himself; q.d. "Do thou, reader, take a view," &c. This presumptuous deviation from the opinion of all other Commentators, antient and modern, and gross ignorance of one of the most common of figures (namely, an enallage, introduced for greater effect), and which is only one among a thousand other proofs of ignorance, may serve to convince students how little reliance is to be placed on the Doctor's judgment, and that when he is guided by his own opinion, it is scarcely to be expected that he should be in the right. The sense is; "each of you considering himself, lest thou also be tempted (and fall)."

This last, however, the Apostle, from delicacy, suppresses. Thus, as Theophyl. observes, he reminds him of the weakness of human nature. Compare 1 Cor. 10, 12 & 13. Of the Classical passages here adduced by Wets., the most apposite is Pliny, Ep. 8, 22. Eos etiam, qui non indigent clementiā, nihil
magis quam lenitas decet. Atque ego optimum et emendatissimum existimo qui caeteris ita ignoscit, tanquam ipse quotidiē peccet, ita peccatis abstinet, tanquam nemini ignoscat. Proinde hoc domi, hoc foris, hoc in omni vitē genere teneamus, ut nobis implacabiles simus, exorabiles istis etiam, qui dare veniam nisi sibi nesciunt; mandemusque memorie, quod vir mitissimus, et ob hoc quoque maximus Thrasea crebro dicere solebat: Qui vitia odit, homines odit.

2. ἄλληλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τῶν νόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is thought to be a proverbial expression, of which the sense is: “bear with each other, show Christian charity to each other.” Theophyl. (from Chrys.) elegantly explains thus: Ὁ ἑσειδὴ γὰρ ἀνθρώπων θυτα ὡς ἔστιν ἀναμάρτητον εἶναι, παραπεῖ μὴ ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι πρὸς τὰ τοῦ πληθοῦν ἀμαρτήματα, ἀλλὰ θέρει ταῦτα, ἵνα καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν πάλιν παρ’ ἄλλου βαστάζηται ἄμαρτήματα.

2. καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληράσατε ὑ. τ. Χ., and thus (i.e. by so doing) fulfil the injunctions and commands of Christ, who said, “My command is that ye love each other as I loved you.” See Joh. 13, 34. 15, 12. 1 Joh. 4, 21. It is rightly observed by Koppe, that ἀναπλ. is for τηρήσατε. And he addsuce many examples of a similar use of πληθῶ and ἀναπλ. from Herodot., Herodian, Liban., and Philo. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) well explains: “Obey Christ’s commands by bearing with each other.” And he thus excellently exemplifies it: οἷον ὁ ἄρχων τὸν πνεῦμα φερέται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σφοδρὰν ἐκείνου ὀρμήν· καὶ οὕτως οὕτως ἐκείνος ἀμαρτήσεται ὑπὸ τούτου βαστάζομεν, οὕτε οὕτως ἐκείνοι. Οὕτω δὲ ἄλληλοις χείρα ὑπὲρεντες, δι’ ἄλληλων πληράσατε τῶν νόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα λείτε τοῦ πληθοῦν ἀναπληρῶν ἐκαστος διὰ τοῦ βαστάζειν ἐκείνων. Thus Borgier, not amiss, explains βάρος here by παράτασμα, and renders: “bear with each other mutually,” &c. And he aptly cites Ignat. Polyc. C. 1. τῆς ἐνασκεως φρόντις, ἵνα οὐδὲν ἀμείνων. Πάντας βάσταζε αἰς καὶ σε ὁ Κύριος· πάντων ἄνέχων ἐν ἀγάπῃ.
διὸ ἡ τοιοῦτος. He also takes ἀνακληροφαστε as put for the future; and refers to Glass and Schroed. Synt. Heb. Here, too, he aptly cites Isidor. Pel. L. 3. Ep. 410. Οὐ διὰ μικρὸν ἐλάττωμα καὶ τὸ μεγίστον πλεονέκτημα ἐξστασίζωσι, οὗτε τὰ πάντα πιστικὸν σκοπὸν, οὗτε τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ πείθουσι Παῦλῳ παρακολουθείν, ἀλλὰ ἔν τοῖς βάρις βαστάζοντες καὶ οὗτος ἐν ἀνακληροφαστε τῶν νόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ γὰρ μὴ φέρει τὸ μικρὸν ἐλάττωμα, οὗτος τοῦ μεγίστου κατορθώματος ἀπολαυσθείς, οὗτος τῶν νόμων τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τουτέστι τῶν ἀγάθην κληροθεί.

3. εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι, μηδὲν ὁμ., εἰσυνέφεραντα. Theophyl. observes, that here again he represses their arrogance, showing that he who fancies himself to be somebody, when he is nobody, gives thus a convincing proof of his nothingness, and deceives no one else but himself.

The γὰρ is not (I conceive) a mere particle of transition (as it is considered by Koppe), but suggests another reason why they should bear with each other's faults, and that derived from the impossibility of deceiving others by self-conceit. The phrase εἶναι τι (in which μέγα is understood) is common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Examples in abundance are adduced by the philological Commentators.* See 1 Cor. 3. 7. 18. 2. 2 Cor. 10, 11., and the notes.

Φερακτάτα is said, by Koppe and Borger, to be the same with ἀνακτά. But it is surely a stronger term. Both that and φερακτάτης occur at Tit. 1, 10. Schoef. ap. St. Thes. refers to Valckn. Or. 411. I am not aware of any Classical authority; and it seems to be a Ciclicism, or perhaps a word of the Alexandrian or Macedonian dialect. This passage is alluded to by Hesych., who explains χλευάζει; and Cyril, δικαιοποιεῖ, which is not a bad explanation, and may be rendered, tests with himself.

4, 5. τὸ δὲ ἔργον εἰσωτερικὸν δικαιογίτων ἀκατοστὸς, καὶ τότε

eis ἑαυτὸν μόνον ὑπὸ καθημερινὰ ἔξει, καὶ ὴκ τῶν ἑτέρων.
On the exact sense of this and the next verse Commentators are not agreed. Upon the whole, none of them appear to have seen the true ratio of the construction and sense of the passage so well as the antient Commentators and Borger. Thus Theodorot: Εἰ δὲ καὶ σεμφώνεσθαι βέλεις, τὸν ἑαυτὸν περισκόπησον βίον, καὶ ἀξιάγαστον εύρης, κατὰ σεαυτὸν σεμφώνον, εἴπερ ἄρα τοῦτο σε δει ποιεῖν. So also Æcumen.: Εἰ δὲ καὶ σεμφωνεσθαι βελεις, φησί, τὸν σεαυτὸν περισκόπησον βιον, καὶ ἀκατάγαστον εύρης, κατὰ σεαυτὸν σεμφώνον, εἴπερ ἄρα τοῦτο σε δει ποιεῖν. Borger has excellently traced the connexion, and detailed the sense thus: “The Apostle is still occupied in lowering their arrogance and pride; and as at ver. 2. he shows them how empty is all vain-boasting, so here he tells them that not even when any one, on examination, has found any thing to authorize boasting, ought he to make a boast of it. Δοκιμαζέω is a metaphor taken from the working of metals. See Schleus. Lex. Ἐργον here signifies course of action; as in 1 Pet. 1, 17.: and thus the sense: “let him examine himself and his course of action.” Καὶ τότε, “and then,” &c. Here there is a clause omitted equivalent to, “if he find his life virtuous.” The same ellipsis (arising from the grata negligentia of the Scriptural style) is found in Matt. 6, 33. 1 Cor. 11, 28. Δοκιμαζέω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν, καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ᾿ἄρτου ἐσθίετο, &c. 1 Pet. 1, 7. Gen. 4, 8. 1 Chron. 14, 12., and sometimes in the Classical writers; as Plut. 1, 388 c. The ἔξει is for the Imperative ἔχει; as in Gen. 33, 10. Ps. 5, 12. Luke 3, 5. See Glass. Phil. Sacr. Εἰς ἑαυτὸν in se, apud se; q. d. “Let him keep his glorying to himself, and not boast of it,” &c. Εἰς τὸν ἑτέρον, “to another,” “to others.” Παρὰ τῷ ἑτέρῳ would have been more Classical; but the εἰς τ. ε. was adopted for the sake of the antithesis. Or εἰς τὸν ἑτέρον may be put for κατὰ τὸν ἑτέρον, Luke 12, 10. 15, 18., i. e. “to boast to their detriment,” namely, by boasting so as to carp at their failings.
[So - Theophyl. (from Chrys.), who excellently explains thus: Ἐκεῖθεν, φησί, μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὰς ἑαυτοῦ πράξεις (τὸν γὰρ τὸ, δοκιμαζέτων), εἰ μὴ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν ἐποίησεν, εἰ μὴ ἐν ἀσκρίσει, εἰ μὴ ἄλλη τυν ἀνθρωπίνη αἰτία, καὶ τότε μὴ καθ ἐτέρου καυχάσθω. Ἀλλ' εἰ ἀρα ἀκατασχέτως ἔχει, εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὸ καυχημα ἐχέτω, τοῦτοτιν, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ συγκειμένος, τὸ χαῖρε ἐγου τὸ σήμερον κρείττον νομίζεται, καὶ ἐναθυμένῳ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐργα.] Nor is the interpretation of Castel., Grotius, and others, unfounded, who explain οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἐτέρου "non deteriorum comparatione," i. e. let him not boast that he is better than others, q. d. "to the injury of another." (Borger.) Upon the whole, the second interpretation seems to be the most tenable, in support of which I have above subjoined the authority of Theophyl.; and might have added that of Óçumen. It is shrewdly remarked by Chrys. that this is said συγκαταβατικῶς, οἵ νομιθετικῶς, in order to withdraw them gradually from boasting at all: for he that is accustomed not to boast to, or against others, will cease to boast to himself.

The sentiment is illustrated by Wets. from Greg. Naz. Ἐξεωνα σαυτών πλέον ἢ τὰ τῶν πέλας, τὸ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶς κερδαίει αὐτῷ, οἷς τῶν πέλας, and Philo: ἐν ἑαυτῷ δὴ τὰς σοφός καὶ χαῖρει, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς ξέλαλα σαυτῶν τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ διανοίασ εἰσιν ἄρεται, ἐφ' αἰς δὲ ἀρέτων συμπιεσθαι.

5. ἑκαστὸς γὰρ τὸ ἰδίου φορτίον βαστάσει. Koppe renders: "for each has frailties enow of his own to wrestle with." But, as Borger observes, the future tense in βαστάσει is at variance with this interpretation; neither is the sense it yields agreeable to the context. There is (I think) no reason to desert the interpretation of the antients. Thus Theophyl.: τί γὰρ κατακαυχαὶ τῶν πλησίων; καὶ οὐ καίκειος τὸ ἰδία φορτία βαστάσετε, καὶ τότε δοκιμαζότεται ἑκάστου τὸ ἐργον. "Ὡστε ἐπει καὶ ὑπὸ φορτία ἔχεις καὶ βάρυς, μηδὲ καὶ ἐτέρου καυχώ, μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἐναβρύνου τῆς ἀγαθορρίας. And Theodoret: μὴ περιεργάζου τὰ
The text is a continuation of the discussion on the difficult text in Galatians 1:8. The author argues against the idea that the phrase "δίκαιον" in Greek signifies a legal sentence, as opposed to the judgment of a chant, and supports the traditional view that it refers to a chant. The author cites various biblical passages to support this view, including Galatians 1:9, 2 Corinthians 5:10, and Matthew 27:22, among others. The author also notes that the phrase "κατηχεῖν" is often used in the New Testament to refer to teaching, and that it is used in this way in Galatians 1:10, where the author says they have "κατηχώμεθα τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ" (we have taught the word of God). The author then goes on to explain that "κατηχεῖν" is a more suitable term for the activity of teaching, as opposed to the more legal term "δίκαιον."
Galatians, Chap. VI.

οἱ ἐν ἐνι τῶν ἐγκαθεστάτος, ἐμφάνισθης, ἐμφάνισθης, παντοθεν ἐμφάνισθης, καὶ ἐν τῶν ἐμφάνισθης ἐκκαθαιρέσετε τῶν ἐγκαθεστάτων. I apprehend, however, that the Apostle had only in view a comfortable maintenance, such as should relieve them from anxiety as to their subsistence, and that they should not, by poverty, be made objects of contempt and insult, nor by a failure in respect to them be degraded in the eyes of the people. It is rightly remarked by Koppe, that this last seems hinted at in the words of the next verse, Θεὸς ὁ μυκτηρίζεται.

7. μὴ πλανᾶσθε. This is a formula introductory of some weighty admonition on a point of duty which the persons addressed might be tempted to neglect (as 1 Cor. 6, 9, 15, 58, 1 Joh. 3, 7, James 1, 16), and thereby draw down punishment on themselves.

7. Θεὸς ὁ μυκτηρίζεται. It would appear that the present tense is here used, as in some other passages, like the Latin participle in das, i.e. "is not (to be) mocked." I would compare Pindar. Olymp. 1, 104. Εἰ δὲ θέω Ἄνθρωπος ἔλεγω ἡλικίαν ἔδραν, ἀμαρτάνει. Μυκτηρίζειν signifies properly "to turn up the nose at, and hence to mock, deride, scoff at, insult." Koppe thinks the expression has reference to contumely shown by the rich converts to the teachers, and a subjecting them to scorn by keeping them in poverty. Borger, however, thinks it also has a senso irridendi et fallendi, so that there is a mixture of fraud and derision. Dodd. takes a somewhat different view, and thinks that the Apostle exposes the evasions some would make use of to excuse themselves from acts of liberality; by which, however they might impose on others, they would egregiously deceive themselves, as every circumstance lies open to an all-seeing God, and they assuredly should reap, according as they sowed." This too is supported by the authority of Theodoret, who remarks: Ἐφορὼς πάντα τῶν ὅλων Θεὸς, μὴ νομίζητε καὶ τὰς ἀγνοεῖν τὰ γενόμενα.
Borger confesses that without better knowledge of the circumstances of the Galatian congregation, and their teachers, we cannot positively determine the sense; yet he thinks the context seems to show that they had deprived them of their stipend and allowances, and excused themselves for their avarice by various petty subterfuges, such (Dodd. observes) as men of that kind never want. So that, upon the whole, Borger thinks the Apostle intended to express the following sentiment: "it is the will of God that the Christian society should provide for its teachers; whosoever, under vain pretences, refuses to do this, may deceive men, but cannot deceive God, who does not suffer himself to be mocked with impunity."

The words following may be explained of the contributing of money for the support of teachers of the Gospel; though Koppe extends them ad omnem vitæ morumque rationem, which, however, he merely refers to the duties and offices towards teachers. Borger understands the words in a general way of the whole of one's conduct; and he regards this as a sententis universalis, though here applied particularly to contributing for the sustenance of teachers. And he urges that it is applied thus generally in the Classical writers, as Aristot. Rhet. 3, 3, 18. Cic. Or. 2, 65. and other passages cited by Wets. and Loesner (to which may be added Æschyl. Agam. 1645. See the passages there adduced by the learned Editor), and also Prov. 22, 8. This mode of interpretation, however, seems harsh, and not agreeable to the context. For the whole of ver. 6—18. is on the subject of contributing money for pious uses, whether for the support of teachers, or the relief of the poor; and therefore to interpret the συντείχει, as does Borger, would make it too general. And yet I cannot think, with Koppe, that the whole of this portion respects only duties towards teachers. To me it appears that ver. 8. is in some measure parenthetical, in which the Apostle ingeniously engrafts on the proverb which he had adduced, in order to excite them to pious
contributions, _another_ on the _use_ of _riches_, and by suggesting motives whereby the abuse thereof may be repressed, to leave more to be applied to pious purposes. The _δι_, which introduces ver. 8. may be rendered _scilicet_, and is well adapted to commence a parenthetical admonition; q. d. "For _mind_," &c.

8. _ὁ_ _σπείρων_ _εἰς_ _τὴν_ _σάρκα_ _ἐκ_ _τῆς_ _σάρκος_ _θερίσει_ _φθοράν_: _ὁ_ _δὲ_ _σπείρων_ _εἰς_ _τὸ_ _πνεῦμα_, _ἐκ_ _τοῦ_ _πνεύματος_ _θερίσει_ _ζωῆς_ _αἰῶνιον_. See the note on the preceding verse. It is rightly remarked by Borger, that the Apostle compares the flesh (i. e. corruption and sin in general) and the Spirit (i. e. virtue and religious knowledge and feelings) to fields in which seed is sown, and yields different crops, according to the nature of the seed. So that _sowing to the flesh_ is equivalent to _living_ to the flesh, the fruit of which will be corruption and mortality, namely, _spiritual death_, i. e. eternal punishment. On the contrary, he that _sows to the Spirit_, i. e. lives to the Spirit, will reap the fruits in eternal life, i. e. _eternal_ happiness. Borger briefly states the sense thus: "Qui malè vivit, malè peribit; qui verò rectè vivit, felix evadet ætternum." But this is too general: and he himself acknowledges that the words _may_ have reference to the use and abuse of riches.

Much more might be said; but it is unnecessary. See Koppe and Borger. Upon the whole, the sense has been very well expressed by Mr. Valpy thus: "He that lays out his substance, time, and thoughts, only for his own gratifications, for his own necessities and conveniences, shall at the harvest find the fruit and product of such husbandry to be corruption; but he who applies his capacities, abilities, and possessions to that which is spiritual, to promote the interests of religion, shall inherit eternal glory, and be fully recompensed at the resurrection of the just (Luke 14, 14.) when all the hope of the sinner is perished.*

The Apostle seems to have here had in view Job 4, 8. _οἱ_ _δὲ_ _σπελαυντες_ _αιτῶ_ _δύναν_ _θεριοῦσιν_ _καυροῖς_, "they that plan iniquity,
9. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακώμεν' καὶρᾶ γὰρ ἰδιὰρ
θερίζομεν, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. The Apostle now returns to
the duty he had somewhat obscurely hinted at ver.
7., namely, contributing money for pious purposes.
Here he is more explicit, and shows that he meant
what he had said of works of piety and benevolence
in general. He still continues the same metaphor,
and in making use of the terms ἐκκακῶμι and ἐκλυο-
σθαί, both of which imply tiring, giving up, neglecting,
&c., he has reference to what might be likely to
happen, from the very frequent calls which persons
of known benevolence ever have on their charity,
and (what is still more calculated to tire them out,
and even disgust them,) the being imposed upon,
and their charity abused, by the meeting with un-
grateful returns from those whom they have relieved.
Now the motive to continue in the practice of be-
nevolence is, that at a proper time we shall reap our
reward, and having sown to the Spirit, the harvest
will be that of eternal life and happiness.

It should seem that this verse has especial refer-
ence to the relief of the poor; yet it relates also to
the support of the teachers, in which pious work it
seems the Galatians had tired and fainted. On the
phraseology the Philological Commentators have
much dilated. It is only necessary to observe, that
all the terms are adapted to the metaphor of a har-
vest. Ἐκκακῶμι often occurs in the New Testament,
and signifies to tire, or to be tired out, to fail, to give
up. Ἐκλυσθαί signifies to be exhausted; unnerved,
saft, fail, give up.* For both terms are synonymous.

and sow wickedness, reap of the same." I would also compare
Aristoph. Pel. 188, ὕστερα αἰσχρῶς μὲν ἐσπείρας, κακῶς δὲ ἐθέ-
πειας.

* It is opposed to θερίζειν; as in Theocr. Idyl. 10, 7. Compare
5, 2, 7, 8, 11, 3. (cited by Kypke). See also Rom. 12, 11. 2 Cor.
4, 16. Heb. 12, 3, 5. (Borger.) I would compare a similar passage
of Eurip. Bell. frag. 28, 2. ένθειστ' ἐσπελείς, οὐδὲ ἐκαμνες εἰς φίλους.
In ἐκκακῶμι (I would observe) there seems to be a Lituote for
κακῶμεν; as in Athen. 276 c. οὐκ ἄν ἐκπίασε τὰ αὐτὰ παρασκεύα-
ζονα.
Hence is for ἐν τῷ τούτῳ. And in ὑπάνωσις there is that use of the participle by which it stands for a verb and a conditional participle, i.e. "if we faint not."

10. ἰδίᾳ ὑπ᾽ ὑπάνωσις—πίστεως. Now is included the whole passage concerning the right use of liberty, from which the Apostle meant to make it appear that it is by no means the nature of Christian liberty to cast aside the offices of humanity, (than which liberty nothing could be more pernicious). (Borger.)

In this view, however, of the connection I cannot acquiesce. To me it seems that we have here the Coda, or Epilologus, of the preceding portion on pious and charitable contributions; and I think the ἰδίᾳ (like ὑπάνωσις at 2 Cor. 5, 16.) may have the following sense: "Having therefore these strong motives to sow unto the Spirit, by making pious and charitable contributions, let us do good," &c. It seems to have been the especial care of the Apostle in this concluding admonition, to show that this duty was to be performed not only towards the ministry, but towards Christians in general, and not towards Christians only, but towards all their fellow-creatures. So Chrysost.: εἰς κοινὸν ἔξαγει τῷ λόγῳ. Such, then, is the general meaning: but it will be necessary to further develop the phraseology. "Ως κατὰ ἔχομεν is explained by the antient Commentators, and by some modern ones (as Grot.): "whilst we have time, the time of this life." Most modern ones, however, interpret it: "as we have opportunity," i.e. the means, and as occasions present themselves. And on this sense the best Critics are agreed; and Wetstein's numerous examples are supposed to fully establish it. Yet I see no reason why both senses may not be conjoined, thus: "While we have the opportunity of this life, and as ability and occasions present themselves," &c. Ἐργάζομαι ἀγαθὸν is for τούτῳ ἀγαθῷ, in which laborious and studious liberality is implied. So the Apostle elsewhere says,
"Your labour of love." See 1 Thess. 3, 6. Rom. 12, 21. And Borger refers to ἀγαθὸν ἐργάζεσθαι in Herod. p. 656. By the τῶς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως are meant fellow Christians. Οἰκείους (Koppe observes) signifies "one who belongs to any family," who is connected with it either by consanguinity or affinity, and also one who is closely connected with another; an acquaintance; of which sense Wets. adduces examples from Herodian, 3, 6, 11. ἔχθρος δὲ ἀντὶ φίλου, πολέμιος δὲ ἀντὶ οἰκείου. 4, 6, 1. εὑρίσκεις ἐφ' ὅντο οἱ οἰκεῖοι οἰκεῖοι τε καὶ φίλοι. Finally, the term was joined to abstract nouns in the genitive, as οἰκείους φιλοσοφίας, for φιλόσοφος. So Strabo 1. p. 13 B. ἄνδρες ἀξιολογοῦν, καὶ οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας. Diodor. Sic. 13, 91. οἰκείους ὅταν ὀλιγαρχίας. Plut. in Philop. p. 337 c. μᾶλλον ἐδικεῖ στρατιωτικῆς ἡ πολιτικῆς ἁγίης οἰκείος εἶναι. It is obvious to notice the superiority of the Gospel in liberality of spirit over the law; nor was the admonition here of the Apostle given in vain. Thus Julian (cited by Wets.) bears this testimony: * τρέφουσιν οἱ δυσσεβεῖς Γαλιλαῖοι πρὸς τοὺς ἐαυτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους. The rule of liberality here suggested, namely, to give especially, i.e. more liberally, to Christians, is illustrated by the Philological Commentators with many similar sentiments from the Classical writers.

* To perceive the value of this testimony we are to remember, that it is an admission of an apostate from the faith, and the most bitter and deliberate enemy it ever had. Yet though the apostate has mentioned the Christians by his usual opprobrious term, οἱ δυσσεβεῖς, yet he was not ashamed to steal from the sacred book, and appropriate one of its most sublime precepts. Thus in his Forag. ap. Op. p. 290, 291. edit. Spanheim (as here cited by Bulkley): he says, Κοινωνικῶν—Ἀπαθὸν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἐκπείεσιν ἐλευθερώτερον, &c. which Bulkley has translated "We ought to be communicative of our wealth to all men, though with greater liberality to those of worthy characters, to the poor and necessitous what shall be sufficient for their relief; and what may seem strange to some, to give clothing and aliment even to enemies, is a thing laudable and incumbent; for we give not to the manners, but to the men." Here he has evidently in view the sublime precept of our Lord, to do good unto our enemies and those who persecute us.
Here Borger gives the following able recapitulation of what the Apostle has said on the subject of Christian liberty, both as to its use and abuse.

"The Apostle had taught that those who are subject to the Mosaic Law, lead a life of servitude, and are themselves slaves, 3, 23—26, 4, 1—3, 7—9; that from this subjection to the law Christians indeed are freed, but still are in a state of servitude, though an easier and more gentle, inasmuch as we are by love to serve one another, 5, 13. He had declared that the force and efficacy of the Mosaic Law is broken and worn away, 3, 13, 24—27, 4, 4—6. And yet (he shows) it is not to be thence inferred that Christians, being exempted from this servitude (3, 13,) are to be no longer subject to any law, since the law of love and benevolence remains to be observed by them; ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νῦν ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πληροῦται, ἐν τῷ ἀγαπητεῖ, &c. 5, 14., this is the law of Christ, 6, 2. The Apostle had said, that by the works of the law can no flesh be justified, 2, 16. And yet (he warns them) it does not follow from thence that Christians may do what they please, and basely abuse their liberty; for as by the works of the law, so by the works of the flesh, shall no one attain felicity, 5, 19—21. But that it is necessary to follow after virtue; every one must prove his own work, 6, 4.; on Christians it is incumbent to do good, 6, 9 & 10. That salvation and felicity, indeed, do not depend on the Mosaic Law (2, 16, 21, 3, 11, 12, 18 & 24.); yet these err grievously who abuse this liberty into utter disregard of virtue, as if to the attainment of felicity nothing on our own part were necessary but to follow the usual routine of life; for that this present existence contains the commencement, and, as it were, seeds of a future one, which seed will produce fruits, either of joy or sorrow, to be gathered at the general harvest, 6, 7, 8, & 9. It is therefore rightly observed by Isidor. Pelus. L. 4. Eph. 65. Παῦλος πιστεύσαντας δικαιοσύνην ἀκροτήτην εἰκότως ἀκροτήσει, ὅτε παρὰ μὲν τὴν πρώτην, ἡ χάρις ἐκδίκαιως τούτῳ δε δικαιώσεις, ἐργανώσθη ἀμαρτάνθηται ἐδικαιώσεις, ὡς ὡς ἐνὸς ἀνὴρ πίστεως μόνον σωθήσεται χρῆ γὰρ τῇ πίστει κρίνεσθαι τὰς πράξεις, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτον αὐτὸν λυχνίσθησαι: νεκρὰ γὰρ ἤν τοῦτων χαρίς.

11. ἦδετε πτηλίκιοι τοῦτο γεάμασε ἐργανά τῇ ἐρήμῳ χερί. Having concluded these exhortations, which the Galatians seem to have much needed, to clear their minds from error, and their morals from impurity, the Apostle finally returns to the subject treated of throughout the Epistle; and having repeated his entreaties and admonitions that they should not suffer themselves to be carried away into doctrines contrary to those which he had delivered to them, he concludes the Epistle. (Koppe.)

The only difficulty in this verse is connected with the πτηλ., which the antient Commentators, taking it in
its usual sense, render: "with what great mis-shapen letters I have written this with my own hand." So Whitby and Doddr., the latter of whom observes, that he might not be well versed in the Greek characters, or this inaccuracy of his writing might perhaps be owing to the infirmity or weakness of his nerves, which he had hinted at before, Gal. 4, 14. And indeed there is reason to think that St. Paul, like many other persons of great mental endowments, was not an expert scribe; and the infirmity alluded to at Gal. 4. and elsewhere, might tend to produce this. Yet the sense above assigned seems very harsh, and what one should little expect. I cannot but prefer the interpretation of almost all the modern Commentators, who take πηλ. in a sense indeed unauthorised, yet probably sanctioned by common use, namely, for many; words (as Koppe and Börger remark) signifying magnitude, being, in all languages, used also of multitude, i. e. how great for how many. The γράφωνα is taken by the best modern Commentators to denote litterae, epistola; as in Acts 28, 21. γράφωνα ἐδεξάμεθα. And Schleus. here compares Xen. Hist. 1, 1, 15.: and Borger, Herodian 1, 6, 23. Lucian 2, 450 & 568. He renders: "quantas litteras, quantum (i. e. copiosam) epistolam scribo vobis." Yet there seems to be no necessity for adopting this sense. Γραφωνα may not only mean letters, but words. The sense will then be: "In how many words I have written," which is equivalent to, "how long a letter I have written to you."

11. τῆς ἐμῆς χειρ. So in Philem. 19. Borger compares the conclusion of an Epistle from Callirrhoe to Dionys.: ταῦτα σοι γέγραψα τῆς ἐμῆς χειρί. ἐγράφωσο, and also Charit. 8, 4. p. 134. It was very frequent among the antients to employ the pen of a scribe (indeed the same indisposition to write continues in the East at the present day); so that when the writer wrote with his own hand, it was deemed a thing worthy of being noted. And this was done on
important occasions; such as was the present. For (as Theophyl. remarks) the Apostle wrote with his own hand, not only to show his affection for them, but in order that he might stifle evil reports; for he was accused of preaching differently at different places. It was therefore proper for him to give a written testimony of his doctrine. So Grot.: "So-lebat suá manu Paulus scribere sententias quasdam insigniores ac perpetuò retinendas." Borgcr well paraphrases thus: "Nolite vos criminatoribus istis patefacere aures! De meá ipsius sententia hæc vos edoceat epistola; quá in re nullus est frandii locus, cùm eam manu ipse meà exaraverim, satis longam." The Commentators all refer to the usual custom of the Apostle to dictate his letter to a scribe. But whether such was his custom at this early period (this being the first of all his Epistles) may admit of some doubt.

12. ὅσοι θέλουσιν—διάκωνται. It is observed by Borgcr, that in order to rightly determine the sense of this and the following verses, we are to remember the criminations mentioned in the preceding verse; q. d. "It is not I who impel you to the observance of the Mosaic Law, but those who court the gale of popular applause, they instigate you to it." That some words are left to be supplied is evident; and this ellipsis Borgcr has (I think) skilfully filled up.

On the sense of εὐπροσωπήσασι Commentators are not agreed. Some interpret it, "to live luxuriously." But this is frigid, and destitute of all authority. Others "to make a show of religion and piety, though factitious and ostentatious." And so our English Translators. But thus εν σαρκι will have little or no meaning. I see no interpretation better founded than that of Chrysost. and the other antient Commentators, who explain it εὐδοκιμεῖν, and take εν σαρκι for εν (i. e. παρὰ) ἀνθρώπωι, namely, the Jews and Judaizers. So Theodoret well paraphrases the whole verse thus: "Τήν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων θυρωμένην ὀδηγον, καὶ τής ἁπασελείας προμηθεύμενοι τῆς οἰκείας, τήν ἀναγκασ-
Galatians, chap. vi.

12. oüti ànagykázousin ýmáis peri tétemeðíthai—diákounntai. It is evident that the ànagyk must be understood of the compulsion of earnest persuasion and solicitation, and strong injunction. See Schl. Lex. and also Theodoret, just before cited. At the words tò staurof tò òrístòu, some modern Commentators strangely blunder, explaining them (as for instance Koppe) of calamities like those which Christ suffered. A mode of interpretation harsh and unnecessary. The antient Commentators rightly understood by the expression the faith of Christ, the doc
trine of Christ crucified. The Dative, it must be observed, is here dependent on éxì understood, and may be expressed by ob, propter.* The sense, then, is: “to suffer persecution for preaching the doctrine of the crucifixion of Christ, as I do.” But why, it may be asked, did not Paul say, suffer persecution for professing the Christian religion? I answer that the expression doctrine of the Cross has great

* This signification, Borger observes, is rare. And to the example from Demosth. adduced by Hoog. ad Viger. p. 37. He adds others from Theophr. Pl. 1, 16. M. Anton, 3, 1. Perizon. ad Æl. V. H. 2, 20. 7, 8.
force. For it was the doctrine of the crucifixion of Christ, and the atonement thereby procured for the sons of men, that formed the main pillar of the Christian system, and made it utterly impossible to tolerate the use of circumcision, as of any avail to procure justification and salvation: and this the Jews well saw, and therefore persecuted those who preached the doctrine. So the Apostle at 5, 11. feelingly speaks of the offence of the cross (where see the note); which will make it unnecessary for me to here enlarge further.*

18. οτι τοι περιτέμνετε —καυχήσεται. There was surely no reason for some recent Commentators, as Semler and Borger, to raise difficulties as to who are meant by the οι περιτέμνετε, whether the Jews, or the Judaizers mentioned in the preceding verse. It is plain that the latter must be understood.

It is rightly remarked by Borger, that the γη has reference to something omitted, which he thus supplies: άλλα ου σπουδής περι τον νομον, scil. άναγκαζοντων μας περιτέμνεσθαι. See the note on 2, 18. He thinks that they did not urge circumcision with the intent of subjecting the converts to the whole Law, since they had themselves abandoned the Law, but in order

* Dodd. has the following masterly illustration of this subject of the fear of persecution in the persons here alluded to.

"This seems to open the main secret spring of that zeal for the Jewish ceremonies, in some who professed themselves Christians, which occasioned so much uneasiness in the Apostolic churches. The persecuting edicts of the Jewish sanhedrim, the influence of which extended to remote synagogues, had induced many who secretly believed in Christ, to decline an open acknowledgment of him (John 9, 32; 12, 49; 19, 38.), which yet our Lord himself had so expressly required, that their consciences, during this state of dissimulation, must be in great anxiety. (See Mark 8, 38.) But afterwards, when a scheme arose of extending Judaism with Christianity, it may be supposed that this would abate the edge of persecution against those who fell in with it, and especially against those who urged the Gentile converts to such complete proclivity, though it might sharpen it against other Christians: and this might perhaps weigh more with some than they themselves were aware, in concurrence with the desire of making disciples, and to the prejudices of education, which must naturally be supposed to have their share. Compare chap. 5, 11."
to conciliate the favour, or avoid the persecution of
the Jews, by showing that they were not ill affected
to the Jewish religion, and also have to boast of their
influence in procuring the reception of circumcision;
for that seems to be the sense of ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὁμετέρᾳ
σαρκὶ καυχῆσονται*. For they seem not to have fully
perceived the connection of circumcision with the
rest of the Law.

By φυλάσσειν νόμον is, I think, meant keep the
whole Law (which sense is inherent in the φυλασσ.).
The αὐτὸ is evidently emphatic. By σαρκὶ some
Commentators, (as Koppe) would understand the
very prepuce itself cut off; regarding this as a sen-
tentia aculeata! But this appears to deserve as lit-
tle attention as the sententia aculeata ascribed to
the Apostle in ἐφελον καὶ ἀποκόψωνται at 5, 15. (where
see the note.) Borger has rightly rejected this fancy.
It is strange that Commentators should ever have
stumbled at the expression, which, in order to be-
come plain, only requires περιτετμένη to be repeated
from περιτετμησθαι. We may therefore render "your
circumcised flesh, or body, i.e. your circumcision. With
respect to καυχ., it has been rightly explained by
Borger supra.

Bp. Middleton has here ventured to differ from
all Commentators in interpreting νόμον (as indeed he
was compelled to do by his canon on the presence or
absence of the article in νόμος) law, or moral obedience.
24. But in the latter passage the article is used, and
the ceremonial law is manifestly meant. And in the
former by νόμον πρᾶσσειν is meant practise the whole
of the Mosaic Law, including the moral as well as the
ceremonial: which is plainly the sense here. The

* So Theophyl.: οὐ μόνον, φησί, δι’ ἀνθρωπαρέσκειαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
dία φιλοδοξίαν ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν. Οὐ γὰρ κατὰ ἔχον τῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ
νόμου, οὐδὲ ἐνεει συνπαρέσκεια, φησί, τούτο ἐγραφόμεναι, ἀλλὰ διὰ
φιλοδοξίαν, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὁμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῆσωμετα τουτεστών, ἵνα
ἐν τῷ κατακόπτειν τὴν ὁμετέραν σάρκα καυχῆσομετα, ὦ διδάσκαλοι
υἱῶν, καὶ μαθητὰς ὑμᾶς ἔχοντες.
Apostle means to accuse them of **inconsistency** in enjoining circumcision, and not keeping, or wishing to be kept, the whole law. Bp. Middleton says they were **ostentatious** and **hypocritical**, attending to the ritual of the Law, but paying no attention to the spirit and design, namely, the moral law. But this, I think, is supposing more information than we possess. It does not appear that they did observe all the ritual, (for ** νόμος** must mean that). The Apostle imputes to them, 1. a **cowardly** spirit, in giving up the point of circumcision in deference to the Jews. 2. an **ostentatious** spirit, in boasting of their influence over their converts, in procuring this observance. 3. **inconsistency**, in maintaining circumcision unaccompanied with the other parts of the ritual law. For as to the moral law of Moses, there was no difference of opinion between St. Paul and the Judaizers themselves on that point; since the Apostle never meant to say that that was abrogated. Thus I do not see that the persons in question are chargeable with **hypocrisy**, and therefore unworthy of regard, as Bp. Middleton says. Whether they observed the moral law of Moses, or not, is not here the question. In fact (as I have before observed) that was incorporated into the Christian system. I am inclined, with Dodd. (whom see supra) to think far less unfavourably of those persons than did the learned Prelate, who appears not to have made sufficient allowance for the frailty of human nature, even in religious and well-meaning persons, and the prejudices of education and national vanity. See Chrys. and Theophyl. It should seem that those who maintained the use of circumcision as well as baptism by the Gentiles, intended to place their proselytes in a sort of mid-way between proselytes of the gate and proselytes of righteousness, and thus effectually secure the honour of the Law, by engrafting the Gospel upon the Law.

14. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο κακάσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡ., Ι. Χ. From the discussion on the sense of
the two preceding verses the meaning of this is clear. The καυχ. must be interpreted in conformity to the καυχήσωμαι at ver. 12.; and the σταυρός τοῦ Κυρίου, &c.; like the σταυρός τοῦ Χριστοῦ at ver. 12. where see the note. The words may be paraphrased thus: "But for my part I leave them to glory in an antiquated rite; such is not my course; God forbid that I should feel proud of the incultation of any doctrine (and least of all circumcision), except that of the crucifixion, the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and the other doctrines which depend upon it, and which exclude circumcision." The μὴ γένοιτο has great force, and implies the necessity of teaching and maintaining this fundamental doctrine. Now in the promulgation of this doctrine the Apostle might and did boast. And, as Theophyl. remarks, "Christians in general may be said to glory in the cross of Christ, as a striking proof of the love of the Lord, who thus laid down his life, to expiate and atone for their sins, and thus accomplish their justification and salvation."

On this sentiment the Apostle engrafst another, somewhat obscure, but which may be understood by attending to the context and parallel passages. On the κόσμος the modern Commentators treat copiously, but not (I think) successfully. Schoettg. takes it to mean the Jewish economy. Rosenm. understands it of that Jewish vanity in which his adversaries sought praise, but which he rejects. Koppe remarks: "κόσμος dicitur in N. T. quicquam cum religione Christi non est conjunctum, sive sint homines ipsi non Christiani, sive studia, cupiditates, agendi ratio a religionis Christianæ præceptis aliena." And Borger explains it of homines non Christiani. But it is surely more simple to understand it (with Chrys. and the other antient Commentators, as also some early moderns) of the affairs of the world in general, as human glory, wealth, honours, luxury, and all that the world (i.e. the men of this world) can give, including persons and things.
The δι’ εἰς may be referred either to Χριστῷ or to τῷ σταυρῷ (i.e. by means of which doctrine.) The latter mode seems preferable. ‘Εσταύρωσαι, “is crucified and dead.” Καίγω, “and I am (dead).” So both the antient and modern Commentators. Borger stumbles at the construction of ἐμόλ ἐσταύρωσαι and debates whether it may be rendered “mihi mortuum est,” or, “a me enectus est,” taking ἐμόλ for ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ. But the latter mode cannot be tolerated. The former yields the truer sense. So Chrys. νεκρὸς εἰμί. I am surprised Borger did not see that ἐμόλ is for εἰς ἐμε, quod attinet ad me. It is rightly remarked by Koppe, that there is here one sentiment expressed in two formulas. So Chrys. and Theophyl.: διπλῆς τῆς νεκρώσεως γενομένης οὕτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνα ἔλεϊ με δύναται νεκρᾶ γὰρ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς προσδραμείν ἐκεῖνος νεκρὸς γὰρ εἰμί. This is all that needs be said.*

15. καὶ ἡ κτίσις. It is not necessary to enter into the refinements of some recent Commentators on this formula, which denotes moral regeneration, such a renewal of the heart as shall produce a reformed conduct. See the note on 2 Cor. 5, 17. It is observed by Borger, that St. Paul frequently describes this moral regeneration, or the new man (see Eph. 2, 15. 4, 24.), as opposed to the natural corruption of man, called the old man, in Rom. 6, 6. Eph. 4, 22. Col. 3, 9. “This change of thinking and acting (continues he) is signified by the words ἀνακαινοοῦσθαι, Col. 3, 10. 2 Cor. 4, 16., and ἀνανεώσθαι Eph. 4. 23. He who is regenerated is said κτίζονται ἐν

*Yet I cannot but notice the extraordinary assertion of Bp. Middleton, that as κόψωs has not the article, it must be regarded as one of those words which partake of the nature of proper names. Such a position can need no refutation. Indeed the criticism is adapted rather to the ninth than the nineteenth century, and reminds me of the notable device respecting ἀνάστασις in Acts 6. 17, 18. The Bishop might have noticed that τῷ κόψῳ occurs in the apocryphal Acts, yet that is evidently ex emendatione. Indeed, most of these MSS. are such as have been tampered with.
And in Col. 3, 10. it answers to ἀνακαινώσθαι εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν. Since therefore in such phrases there is a permutation of the terms ἀνακαίνωσθαι, ἀνακαινοθείσαι and κτίζεσθαι, it is obvious that ἀνθρωπός καὶ ὑπὸ, or νέος, καὶ κατα κτίσις signify one and the same thing, namely, a mind conformed to the precepts of virtue, with the abandonment of vice. The Heb. יָדוֹ and κτίσις are used of any thing effected mirabili virtute, and applied to the renovation of the mind in Ps. 51, 12., where the Sept. has καθίαν καθαράν κτίσον ἐμοί ὁ Θεός, &c. Here κτίζεσθαι and ἐγκαινίζεσθαι are placed in parallelism. Finally, since κατα κτίσις supra 5, 6. is said to be πιστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνέργουμένη and the same thing is in 1 Cor. 7, 19. called the keeping of the commandment, it is clear that in κατα κτίσις there is a signification of a mind reformed so as to produce holiness of life." (Borger.)

16. καὶ ὅσιοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσωσιν, εἰρήνη ἐπὶ αὐτῶς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Θεοῦ. On the phrase στοιχεῖν τινι, see the note supra 5, 25., to which I add the following Classical examples. Muson. ap. Stob. 339. αἰτησε τούτῳ στοιχεῖν τοῖς λόγοις οὗ ἐπαινεῖς, and Polyb. 28, 5, 6. στοιχεῖν τῷ προδέσει τινι. On κανόνι, Borger observes, that the word properly signifies a perpendicular line, or plummet, by which builders work; as in Plato Τ. 2, 56 οἱ τεκτονικῇ κανόνι χρῆται, καὶ διαβυθῇ, καὶ στάθη. But it also signifies a carpenter's rectangular rule. Hence it came to denote a rule of life and action; as Joseph. p. 1072. οἶδεν ἐθνεὶς αὐτός καὶ κανόνα τὸν νόμον. And ὀρθοποιοῖς, ὀρθομεῖν, περιτειχεῖν, and στοιχεῖν, are used of those who profess the Christian religion, and adopt their actions to it, as architects and carpenters adjust their work to the plummet, or the rule. Theodoret well paraphrases thus: κανόνα ἐκάλεσε τῷ προκειμένῳ διδασκαλίᾳ, ὥς εἰσόδητι κοιμοθέτησθαι, καὶ μήτε ἐπιλείπω τί, μήτε περιτῶν ἔχωσθαι. With respect to the κανόνι, most modern Commentators refer it to what immediately preceded, namely, the doctrine of
kaimi ktiwm: others, to the doctrine of Christ crucified, at ver. 14. But I prefer to refer it, with the antients, to the whole of ver. 15, namely, the doctrine respecting the inutility of circumcision and the necessity of moral regeneration. So Mackn. renders: "seeking acceptance with God, not by circumcision but by becoming new creatures." The Apostle may have had reference to the preceding instructions, which were to be their rule; and as it comes at the conclusion of the Epistle, this seems probable enough.

The eirn thea autwos kai elios is, as Koppe says, equivalent to the Hebr. שָלומְךָ לְמֶשֶךְ. And he observes that elios, and charis are synonymous, and both equivalent to eirn, which often (as here) denotes felicity of every kind; as 1 Tim. 1, 2. 2 Tim. 1, 2. The Commentators might also have remarked, that it seems to be a formula of bidding, (as we say,) adieu, by benediction. It is probable that the Epistle originally ended here, and that the words tou loipw —amn were added afterwards. Thus the Epistle to the Eph. concludes with eirn tois adelphois. Though then there is added charis, &c. Here, therefore, the words tou loipw —bastazw seem to be parenthetical.

There is surely no occasion to render "shall be with you;" as do Locke and others.

16. kai ev tou Israeil tou Theou. The kai is ill rendered by our English translators, Whitby and Mackn., and. The best Commentators, as Calvin and Par., and almost all recent ones, are agreed that it is exegetical, and has the sense of even, i.e. such being, or who indeed are. And so the antients seem to have taken it. This signification occurs in 1 Cor. 15, 24. Eph. 4, 6. 5. 20. Col. 3. 17., and sometimes in the Classical writers. See Borger's references to the critics. By Israeil, it is plain we are to understand Israelites. The sense is: such Christians are the true Israelites, "beloved of God." It is observed by Borger, that the Apostle calls Christians by this
name (as in Rom. 9, 6. αὐτὸν πάντας αἱ ἐν Ἰσραήλ οὕτω Ἰσραήλ) because (as he had taught at 3, 14. seqq. 4, 21. sqq.) to them alone the divine promises had regard. And he refers to Just. Dial. C. Trypho. p. 159. Cyrill. c. Jul. p. 254. And he remarks: "Aculeum habet hæc Christianorum appellatio, quo vehementer punctosuisse Judæos necesse est, populi Dei nomine et honore superbientes."

17. τοῦ λοιποῦ, κόπτως μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω. Here τοῦ λοιποῦ χρόνος is for τὸ λοιπὸν. This has been thought by some bad Greek. But its correctness is proved by numerous Classical examples adduced by Wets. from Demosth., Herodot., Aristoph., and many other authors. Κόπτως παρεχεῖν is synonymous with the more Classical πράγματα παρέχειν (see Borger's examples), and the Latin negotium facessere. But it is of more consequence to determine what the Apostle meant by the expression. On this the moderns are little agreed. Many interpret: "Let me have no more trouble or persecution, as an enemy of the law." Others refer the words to the Judaizing teachers: q. d. "let them give me no more trouble by calumniating me as inconsistent on the subject of circumcision and the law." So Æcumen. (Other opinions may be seen detailed in Borger.) It seems, however, more natural to understand the words, with the antient Commentators and Jaspis, as importing his fixed determination. So Chrys. and Theophyl. observe, that the Apostle says this as intending to give them to understand that the rules he has laid down are immovable fixed, and that they need not expect any thing else from him, but receive this from him as an absolute determination once for all. Yet, I think, he means also to hint that he had had trouble and chagrin enough on this question already. And this seems required by the next words, which may be paraphrased: "For I have troubles enow: I bear in my body the marks of sufferings endured in the cause of Christ. I have suffered enough, and do suffer." Such seems to be
the most natural interpretation, and it is supported by the authority of all the antient and most modern Commentators, even though they differ on the sense of κόπως παρέχετε. See Chrys. and Theophyl.

These στίγματα, or ῥεαλς, we may suppose to have been left by the violence mentioned at 2 Cor. 11, 24 & 25., the scourgings, beatings, and stonings, all which were a sufficient refutation of the calumnies of his enemies as to the subject of the law. For these were inflicted by Jews. Βαστάζειν has (I think) no reference to a triumph, as the antients suppose; but merely signifies, "I carry about with me every where." So 2 Cor. 4, 10. πάντοτε τὴν νέκρασιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες. Though there περιφ. is used metaphorically. I cannot omit to notice (though it deserves little attention) the opinion of those modern Commentators, who, as Potter, Deyling, Wets., &c. think there is a reference to a custom of the antients, by which those who were dedicated to the service of any God, had a brand stamped upon them. See Wetstein's numerous illustrations.* But this interpretation is so evidently forced that I cannot think it worth while to dwell upon it.

18. ῥάρις—ἄμην. On the sense of these words antient and modern Commentators differ. The former recognise in πνεύματος an allusion to the influence of the holy spirit on their minds, and especially as shown in the gifts before mentioned. (See 8, 3., &c.) On the contrary, the recent Commentators, as Whitby, Koppe, Rosenm., Slade, and Valpy take πνεύμα to simply denote their minds, i. e. themselves. And thus the expression will be equivalent to μεθ' ἓμοι; as at the conclusion of Romans and 1 Cor. But considering that the Apostle has before said so

* And so Herodot. 2, 113. mentions a temple of Hercules to which if any slave took refuge, and ἐπιβάληται στίγματα ἱπτε, he thereby ἔκατον δίδον αἰς Θεόν, ἐξέστη τοῦτον ἤψωσθαι. The custom also extended to the slaves of any prince. So Herodot. 1. 7. ἔστιν στίγματα βασιλεία τούς πλένων τῷ Θεόβαιῳ.
much of their being πνευματικόν (so 3, 3. ἐναρξάμενος πνεύματι: 5, 5. ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι 3, 2. πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε: 5. ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δύναμεις ἐν ὑμῖν 5, 16. πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε: 8, 18. εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀγέσθη: 8, 25. εἰ ἦμεν πνεύματι: 6, 1. ἡμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοί). I am inclined to adopt the former opinion; at least I think that the Apostle did not add the τοῦ πνεύματος for nothing.
EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

CHAP. I.

This Dr. Goodwin considers as the richest and noblest of all the Epistles, and thinks it was peculiarly intended to be so, to reward the generous zeal of the Ephesians in burning their curious book, by a book of divine knowledge, incomparably more valuable than any or all of them. A thought, as Dodd says, most remarkable and ingenious: though, with a prudence which I cannot but commend, he declines instituting any comparison of the excellency of the Epistle, with that of the others.

Verse 1. ἰδὰν θελήματος Θεοῦ, "by the good-pleasure of God." Compare 1 Cor. 1, 1. 2 Cor. 1, 1. Gal. 1, 1. Τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐσίν εν Ἔφεσῳ, "to the Christians at Ephesus." In what sense these are so called I have shown at Rom. 1, 7., and elsewhere. With respect to the words τοῖς οὐσίν εν Ἔφεσῳ, their genuineness has been called in question by some critics; but (I think) successfully defended by many others, whom I need not particularize. See the Introduction to this Epistle by Koppe, Rosenm., Michaelis, Hug., or Mr. Horne's Introduction, and also the note of Mr. Slade.

1. καὶ πιστῶς ἐν Χ. 'I. Many Commentators take the καὶ as a simple copula, and such it may be; but it rather seems to have the exegetical sense, even; as in Gal. 6, 16. I cannot think with Locke and Wells, that it signifies those who kept the doctrine
of Christ free from the corrupt admixtures of Judaism, or (with Grot.) those who persevered in the profession of that doctrine. A criticism which Doddr. rightly rejects, observing that the Apostle uses the same title when addressing the Colossians (Col. 1, 2.), whom yet he reproves on this very account (Col. 2, 16 & 20.). It should rather seem to mean, as Whitby and Mackn. interpret, believers in general. (Examples may be seen in Schl. Lex.) Both this and the former term are simply a designation of Christians; since that appropriate term was then not yet come into use. See the Inscriptions of the other Epistles. Sometimes the Apostle simply says, ο Χριστῷ Ι. (scil. ημῶν.)

2. χάρις ημῶν καὶ εἰρήνη. This benedictory sentence intreats for them all blessings, both spiritual (χάρις) and temporal (εἰρήνη, ἕως).

3. εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ημῶν. Ι. Χ. See Rom. 15, 6., and the note there. In the use of εὐλογητὸς and εὐλογήσας, there is, as Koppe observes, a dilation (such as is frequent in St. Paul), since in the former case the term signifies to praise and give thanks; in the latter, effectively to benefit. Both these senses are to be found in Hebr. τῷ, and (I would add) our English bless. See the examples in Schl. Lex. Koppe refers the ημῶς solely to Paul, to whom (he observes) are, at ver. 14., opposed those to whom the Epistle was written, expressly comprehended under ημῶς. And he compares ver. 8—14. But this seems harsh and unfounded. I must agree with the antient and almost all modern Commentators, in referring the ημῶς to himself and the Ephesians, most of whom (to use the words of Doddr.) were Gentile converts, sharing with him and the Jewish Christians in their evangelical privileges; and by thus beginning his Epistle with ascribing thanks to God for his mercies to them, he at once declares his firm persuasion of the calling of the Gentiles, and his hearty joy in it. Mr. Locke,
who discusses this point at large, applies it to the Gentile converts in general.

One cannot but notice the accumulation of cognate terms in ἐὐλογητός, ἐὐλογήσας, and ἐὐλογία. This was in ancient times rather sought after as a beauty, than avoided as a blemish. It is inherent in the very genius of Oriental phraseology, and seems to have been thence introduced into the Greek language, since we find it in the earliest writers, as Homer, Pindar, Herodot., &c.

The ὑ is not (as Koppe treats it) redundant, but answers to the Hebr. י. The sense is “by bestowing upon us,” &c. Πάση ἐυλογία, “blessings of every kind.” Ἡν Χριστῷ is for διὰ Χριστοῦ. On the sense of πνευματικῇ the modern Commentators are not agreed. Many regard it as emphatical, and explain, “blessings of the mind and soul,” as opposed to those of the body, which alone were afforded by the Jewish and Pagan religions. (So also Theophyl. and other antients.) Thus they limit it solely to the ordinary blessings of the Christian religion, or, at most (to use the words of Doddr.), the sanctifying graces of the spirit, such as effectual calling, justification by grace, the adoption of children, the illumination of the spirit, and all the graces of the Christian life, which are common unto all believers, and are communicated to them in all their several branches. On the contrary, the ancient Commentators, and some modern ones, as Dr. Wells, understand it chiefly of the supernatural gifts, though not to the exclusion of the graces of the spirit, sanctification, and all other blessings of the Gospel. So Theodoret: ἐδοξόσατο γὰρ ἡμῖν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος τὰ χαρίσματα, ἔδωκε τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, τὰς τῆς ἀθανασίας ἐπαγγελίας, τὴν ἑπόσχεσιν τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, τὸ τῆς ὀιδοσίας ἀξίωμα. See also Theophyl., Chrys. and Phot., as also Dr. Whitby. And this seems to be the best founded interpretation. But something depends upon the sense to be ascribed to the
next words ἐν τοῖς ἐπαυρανίοις; which has long been a matter of debate, et adhuc sub judice lis est. The phrase is evidently elliptical; and the question is, what is the substantive to be supplied? That may be either τὰς κατὰ τούτοις (or μέρεσι), or κατὰ κάθισμα. The former is adopted by the Syr. translator, and by the earlier modern Commentators, as Grot., Beza, Pisc., Wolf, and Wells, and, of the recent ones, Koppe and Schleus. The sense they assign is this: "with all spiritual blessings, and that not only in reference to our present state here on earth, but also in reference to our future state in heavenly places," i. e. in heaven itself. And this is supported by the use of the phrase at 1, 20. 2, 6. and 3, 10. Yet it seems here not agreeable to the context, and proceeds very lamely. Preferable is the latter mode of interpretation, which is supported by the antient and many modern Commentators, as Vorst., Casaub., Dodd., Schoettg., Rosenm., Barrington., Jasps, and others, "in heavenly things, with heavenly hopes and rewards; things (to use the words of Doddr,) which have a manifest relation and respect to heaven, and have a tendency to fit us for it, and to lead us not to seek after the enjoyments of this present world but to be conversant about, and to be waiting for those of the heavenly state." See also Bp. Barrington ap. Bowyer. Schoettg. refers to his Diss. on the heavenly Jerusalem, 5, 2 & 3., and adds: "Here the Apostle opposes spiritual and celestial things to Paganism and Judaism. In the religion of the Heathens every thing was vain, and savouring only of external worship, could not promise reformation of mind, or spiritual blessings. In the Jewish economy there was certainly a great superiority, but still heavenly things were wanting, since that worship was chiefly typical." Upon the whole, the sense is much the same on either interpretation.

4. καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ὁμαίνειν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. From hence to ver. 14. are detailed those πνευματικά and ἐπαυρανία.

VOL. VII.
Kαθὼς is said to be for καὶ γὰρ. I would render “for so.” This use Koppe ascribes to the Apostle’s custom of uniting periods to periods, either by participles or the pronoun relative, or by ἀστερεῖ καθὼς, &c. Here, indeed, we have a remarkably long sentence, consisting of twelve or fourteen verses.

4. ἐξηλέξατο ἡμᾶς. Rosenm. observes that this term, like the Heb. שָׁלוֹחַ, “is often used of the gracious purpose by which God decreed to bring certain persons to the Christian religion; as in the Old Testament it is employed of the election of the Hebrews to be the peculiar people of God.” See Is. 44, 1. Ps. 105, 6. Thus Doddr. observes that the Apostle cannot be here understood to intimate the personal election to eternal life of every one of the individuals who composed the churches of the Ephesians (or elsewhere to other Christian societies), but seems to speak of whole societies in general, as consisting of saints and believers, because this was the predominant character, and he had reason, in the judgment of charity, to believe the greater part were such: in which view he says of them in general, that whether they were Jews or Gentiles, they were indiscriminately chosen, not only to those present privileges which they all, as professing Christians, enjoyed, but to real holiness and everlasting glory.” The remark, too, of Wells and Slade, may deserve attention, namely, that “as the Jews imagined that none were elect but themselves, and that for them alone the world was created (2 Esdr. 6, 55—59.), it was one of the Apostle’s main objects to remove these persuasions and prejudices of his Jewish brethren, and to effect their entire union with the Gentiles. Principally, therefore, with this view, he applies to the Gentile converts at large these terms and descriptions which the Jews, as a nation, arrogantly appropriated to themselves.” See the note on Rom. 11, 5.

4. ἐν αἰεί, i.e. Christ. The ἐν answers to the Heb. ב, and signifies by, through, or (as some ren-
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der) because of. Ἰη διὰ γνώσεως τοῦ κόσμου, "before the creation of the world." This metaphor, also found in some passages of the Old Testament, proceeds upon the primitive notion that the world is a plain surface. See the note on Matt. 18, 35. Loesner cites from Philo 1002. καταβολή γενέσεως 645 c. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and other passages less apt. It is observed by Koppe, that whatever is done in this system of things, is said by St. Paul, here and elsewhere, to have been planned from all eternity. And he might have added, that this has usually, as here, a peculiar propriety, since it served to rebut the charge brought against the Gospel by the Jewish zealots, as being a mere novelty, and therefore unworthy of notice. See Chrys. and Theophyl.

Before εἰσαγεῖ must be understood ἀπὸ εἰς τὸ, "to the end that we should be holy and blameless in his sight." Rosenm. paraphrases: "the purpose of calling, and the calling itself, by the Gospel, had this in view, that those who should obey the call might shine in the beauty of holiness and virtue." The ἄγ. and the ἀμωρ. Koppe compares to the Heb. יְהִי and וּיְהִי, as in Eph. 5, 27. Col. 1, 22. The antients, however, rightly (I think) understand the former of steadfastness and purity of faith; and the latter, of purity of morals. And Koppe acknowledges, that the passage is to be referred, not so much to the study of virtue, as to the dignity of Christians, as being persons whom God treats as innocent and dear to himself. So that it comes to the same thing as the being justified before God, an expression elsewhere used by the Apostle. Hence the addition κατεσκέφασεν αὐτοῦ, ἵνα, in his judgment. But this also carries with it a notion of genuineness and truth, as opposed to mere hypocritical and Pharisaical holiness.

4. ἐν ἀγάπῃ. These words are, by the antient Commentators, taken with the verse following. And this is approved by the most eminent modern Critics, who render: "pro suo in nos amore," Yet
there seems something awkward in uniting the word with προορίσας. Koppe acknowledges that it may be taken with ἑξελέγατο. And this seems to be a more natural construction. Indeed, there is not anything more frequent in St. Paul than transposition. Some, as Rosenm., not attending to this, assign as the sense: “out of love to God for his goodness, and hope of his rewards.”

5. προορίσας ἠμᾶς εἰς υιοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χ. εἰς αὐτῶ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτῶ. Koppe thinks προορίσας ἦ, e. u. εἰς αὐτῶ is equivalent to the Heb. הַנֶּחֶם: חֶשְׁבָּנָה, Gr. προορίσας εἰςπονήμασθαι ἦμᾶς τέκνα αὐτῶ. I should prefer προ. υιοθετεῖν ἦμᾶς αὐτῶ, since εἰς αὐτῶ is put for αὐτῶ (like the Heb. יְדָעָה); as in Col. 1, 20. Ἀδὰμ Ἰ. Χ., by means of; through. So Theophyl.; ὁ δὲ πατὴρ προορίσετεν ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς προσήγαγεν ἦμᾶς. See Rom. 11, 36. Heb. 2, 10.

This adoption of God was an expression commonly used by the Jews to denote their national privileges, as being especially united to God. (See Rom. 9, 7 & 8.) But it was with more propriety applied to denote that relation in which Christians stand to God. (See Rom. 8, 23.) For further information on this subject I must refer my readers to the excellent notes of Whitby, Locke, and Mackn.

On the προορίσας it is remarked by Grot. that there is in this, as in all others of the Divine decrees, a taking for granted that we do our part.

In the phrase κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος there is a sort of hendiadis for “according to his will and good pleasure.” Rosenm. renders: “pro benevolo suo consilio.” The expression is a very significant one, and is well paraphrased by Theophyl.; δέλων καὶ σφόδρα βουλόμενος, καὶ επιθυμών. And Æcumen. remarks: εὐδοκίαν γὰρ τὴν ἐπ' εὐεργεσία βουλήσων ἔδωκεν Θεία καλεῖν γραφῇ.

It is observed by Grot., that if it should be asked why God imparted such benefits to the men of that time, the answer is, because it pleased him. “Shall
he not do what he will with his own?" (See Matt. 20, 15., and Rom. 9, 15.) Thus ἔση is used by Abarbanel on Is. 58, 10. respecting those decrees of which we know not the cause. So Servius on Virg. Ἑν. L. 3. Quotiescunque ratio vel judicium non appareat, Sic visum interponitur.

6. εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, i.e. (by a Hebraism), "to the praise of his glorious grace, that his glorious grace should be praised." Thus, in Hebrew, the words הָבְרִי and רַחְמַנֶּה are joined to names of virtues to signify their value. See Glass Phil. Sacr. (Koppe.) Grot. remarks that εἰς here denotes, not end (at least not primary end), but merely something consequent, or what it is just we should return to God for such a benefit: nor, indeed, can we do any thing more suitable to our nature, and more pleasing to God."* It is beautifully observed by Theophyl.: ἓ γάρ τῆς ἐνεργείας ὑπερβολὴ καὶ τῶν ἀχαριστίαν τὰς γλώττας εἰς εὐχαρίστιαν κινεῖ.

6. ἐν η ἐχαριστώσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ. The verb χαριστῶ (from χάρις, a favour, or benefit) signifies "to bestow a favour, to benefit" (with which Koppe compares similar forms in ὁι). For this the Classical writers use τοιοῦτοι or παρέχεσθαι χάριν. At η must be understood χάριτι. Nothing is more frequent, both in Hebrew and Greek, than the union of a verb with its cognate noun. "Εν η, "qua ductus." Koppe compares a similar use of the Heb. יִה and ב to that of χάρις and χαριστῶ. "Εν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ. Rosenm. compares the Heb. יִהְיָה, by means of, and because of. The τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ Koppe considers as equivalent to "the only begotten son." And he (I

* For this thought Grot. seems to have been indebted to Chrys., who remarks: "Does God, then, aim at glory? By no means. The Supreme Being can want nothing: but He wishes to be glorified by us, that we may love him the more. For he who holds in admiration benefits done unto him, will be studious not to offend his benefactor, and as often as he remembers his benefits, the more will he love him that conferred them."
think rightly) supposes that the Apostle had regard to the words of the voice from heaven, recorded at Matt. 3. 17.

7. ἔν ὧν ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν—παραπτωμάτων, “through whom we possess,” or “to whom we owe, the redemption (procured) by his blood.” On ἀπολύτρωσιν see the note on Rom. 3, 24. It is, indeed, explained by what follows: τὴν ἀφεσίν τῶν ἀμαρτιμάτων. Koppe remarks that, by the mention of his blood, it is clear that the Apostle had reference to the expiation and atonement procured by the bloody death of Christ. Παραπτ. is a general term denoting offences of every kind, whether heinous, or venial. See Schleus. Lex. and Tromm.

7. κατὰ τῶν πλούτων τῆς χάριτος. Here, Koppe observes, is another Hebraism, as at ver. 6., for, “the most free and liberal grace.” Compare Rom. 2, 7, 9, 23. Col. 2, 2. This, however, is not confined to the Scriptural writers. Thus it occurs in Alciphr. Ep. 1, 1. πλούτων ἄγαθῶν ἔδειξεν.

8. Ἡς ἐπερίσσευσεν, for ἐς, or ἐν, by a common Greecism. If περίσσευσεν. be here taken in a neuter sense, we must construe thus: “in which God hath evinced his abundant goodness towards us;” if in an active, thus: “which he hath abundantly bestowed upon us;” in which case εἰς ἡμᾶς will be for ἡμῖν, like the Heb. ἡμῖν. (Koppe.) I prefer the latter mode, which is confirmed by the antients. So Chrys. and Theophyl.: ἔδειξεν ἄφθονος. Theodoret elegantly paraphrases thus: ἀναβλύξει γὰρ τῆς ἐλεούς πῆγας, καὶ τούτων ἡμᾶς περικλύσει τοῖς ῥέωμασιν. Perhaps he had in mind, Ps. 84, 6., in the spiritual, and (I think) true sense, in which it has been interpreted by the pious Bp. Horne.

8. ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ σοφιστήσει. It is not agreed whether these words are to be taken with the preceding (as ἐπερίσσευσεν), or with the following words, (as γνῶρισας.) In the former case, they are explained by Koppe and Rosenm.: “sapientissimo consilio;” with a reference to God; or, as referred
to men, "per omnigenam sapientiam." But this seems somewhat harsh; and I cannot but agree with Theophyl., Jerome, and some other antient Commentators, and, of the moderns, Griesb., who unite the words with the following. Theophyl. well expounds thus: τουτέστι, τὴν χάριν ἐξεχειν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡστε σοφίας καὶ φρονίμους ποιήσας, γνωρίζαι ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον, τὸ ἐν πάσῃ φρονίμῃ καὶ σοφίᾳ, τούτῃ, τὸ πάσης σοφίας γέμων καὶ φρονήσεως. Whitby has here a very masterly annotation, which deserves an attentive perusal.

9. μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος, "that will which had been hitherto laid up in the mind of God, and hidden from men (see Rom. 11, 25., and the note);" namely, that counsel of God for the salvation of men by Christ, which was impervious to human knowledge, as being unattainable by the compass of natural religion (compare Rom. 16, 25. Col. 1, 26.); nay, was even not perfectly known to the angels. See 1 Pet. 1, 12. (Koppe and Rosenm.) See Schl. Lex., or Wahl's Clav. in v. μυστήριον. Τηλήριες answers to the Hebr. יְתוּי. On ἀποκαλύπτειν see Tromm.

9. κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὑτοῦ, "of his good pleasure." Ἡν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ. In this, Koppe and Rosenm. remark, no more is intended than what is contained in the αὐτῷ. But this is a slovenly way of wrapping up matters. The force of the words has been better pointed out by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl.: ἐποιησε δὲ τῶν καθὼς ἦθελε, καὶ καθὼς προέθετο καὶ προειρίσειν ἐν αὐτῷ, τῷ Χριστῷ δηλαδή.

It is very doubtful whether there be, as Chandler and Mackn. think, any allusion to the Heathen mysteries.

10. εἰς εἰκονομίαν τοῦ παράγματος τῶν χαριῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χ. These words shew what was that good pleasure and purpose. Yet the phraseology is harsh, and perhaps Hebraic. Eis, which answers to ἐπί, denotes purpose. The sense, which is rendered somewhat obscure by too great
brevity, may be literally expressed thus: "And this was done unto the displaying of this plan of redemption, at the completion of time, at the appointed time." Oikonomia, plan, dispensation. Theophyl. explains, εἰς διοικήσιν, καὶ κατάστασιν τοῦ. τ. τ. κ. Grot. renders: "Ideo hoc Deus penēs se retinuerat, ut suo demum tempore id publicaret dispartiretque in Judaeos et Gentes. And he remarks: "Est similitudo sumpta a familiā, in quā pater familias, aut aliquis ejus loco, ex cellā deprompta dimensa dat singulis." Koppe cites a similar use of oikonomia from Ignat. ad Eph. 18. Ἡσυχώς ἐκωφορήθη ὑπὸ Μάριας, κατ' oikonomiāν Θεοῦ. And Raphael has adduced similar examples from Polyb. On πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου see the note on Gal. 4, 4.

10. ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χ. This verb depends upon εἰς, which must be repeated from the preceding clause. On the sense of ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι τὰ πάντα Commentators are not agreed. Certain it is that τὰ πάντα is put, by an idiom familiar to St. Paul and every good writer; for τοὺς πάντας Ἀνακεφαλ. signifies to bring again under one head (κεφ.); which implies their being brought into one society. The best Commentators are agreed that by τὰ πάντα are meant both Jews and Gentiles. So in a parallel passage of Col. 1, 20., Christ (who is here meant by the head) is said ἀνακαταλαβαίνει τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν. See also Chrys. But the Apostle adds something further, namely, that God hath not only thus united all nations on earth under one head, but also united with them the hosts of heaven, the angels in heaven (for so the best Commentators, antient and modern, explain the τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς),* who

* Some few, indeed, as Hammond, Locke, Schoettgen, Maenkn., Koppe, and Schleus., refer the ἐνοπ. to the Jewish nation; as in Luke 21, 16., by αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν are signified the Jewish rulers. And they also appeal to Heb. 12, 25—28. But those passages are (I think) of another nature. There is surely no occasion to derivate from the antient and common interpretation, which is far more natural, and equally implies the union of Jews and Gentiles.
are called the upper family, God's family in heaven. Compare infra ver. 21. and 8, 15. It is well observed by Theophyl. (from Chrys.), that the heavenly and the earthly had been split and separated, and had not one head. For though, in respect of creation, there was one God over all; yet in respect of union, there was not. The Father therefore determined to unite the heavenly and the earthly, i.e. to place one head over all; even Christ; namely, over the angels by his incorporeal, over men according to his incarnate nature. The ἀνασκεφ. Theophyl. well explains with a reference to the οἰκονομία just before, thus: ἀνεκεφαλαιασατο δ' Πατήρ, τουτέστι, συνέτειμε τὰ διὰ μακρὸν χρόνου οἰκονομούμενα, λόγων συντελών καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. See Doddr. This interpretation is ably defended and illustrated by Noesselt. Prol. p. 186 seqq.

11. εν ὧ καὶ ἐκληρωθησαν. This is (I think) a resumption of the construction at ver. 7. εν ὧ ἐχομεν, &c.; ver. 10 & 11. being, in some degree, parenthetical. The epanalepsis may be thus expressed: "By him (I say) through whom we have allotted to us this benefit, even the hope of eternal happiness." Such, I conceive, is the true sense of ἐκληρ., which verb, in the active or middle voice, signifies to confer, bestow upon; and in the passive, to have bestowed upon us, to have allotted to us. It is observed by Koppe, that κληροῦσαι εἰς τι is equivalent to ἀξιώσας ταυτα εἰς τι, and that the notion of lot is not to be dwelt upon. Thus (he adds) προσκληροῦσαι at 17, 4. is equivalent to προστυγθάνειν. If there be any emphasis, he thinks it is derived from the Heb. נְלֵלָה, which is used of happiness in general. See the note on Gal. 3, 18. And then ἐκληρωθησαν εἰς, he observes, would denote נִלְּלָה, "contigit mihi, adeo esse felici, ut," &c. But this seems too lax an interpretation. See Whitby.

By the "we have obtained," most Commentators seem agreed are meant the believing Jews, with whom, it appears, the Apostle now associated him-
self. And this he might well do, since there is great reason to suppose that not a few of the Christian converts at Ephesus were Hebrews. Yet the antients understood these words of the Gentiles.

In ἐπροσπέθεντες κατὰ πρόσεχι τοῦ, &c., there is thought, by Koppe, to be a redundancy. But it is only that kind of pleonasm which is meant to be strongly energetic; and it may be doubted whether to that the name of pleonasm be properly applied; since even a reiteration of the same word for such a purpose is not called a redundancy. The sense is: "having been pre-ordained to the reception of this benefit, by the deliberate counsel of him who accompliseth all his purposes and plans according to the counsel of his own will."

In the expression κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ the Commentators again recognize a pleonasm. But it is surely such an one as that just mentioned, namely, with a strongly intensive force: q. d. "according to his own most free and unfettered will."

By τὰ πάντα, as Grot. observes, we are to understand both the thing in question, and all others.

Here we have a description of the omnipotence and unchangeableness of the Deity. This, (Doddridge observes,) does indeed express God's taking such methods to answer his purposes as he knows will, in fact, be successful. But it does not prove anything like an overbearing impulse on men's minds to determine them in such a manner as to destroy the natural freedom of their volitions, and so to prevent their being justly accountable to God for such actions." See also Jaspius.

12. εἰς τὸ εἶλας ἡμᾶς—Χριστῷ. Now is described the effect of this allotted benefit. "We received it in order that we should be (an occasion) for the praise of his glory," &c. A Hebraism for "to his praise and glory;" as at ver. 6. The τῶν προσεκότων is to be explained according to the persons supposed to be meant. Some say, the Jewish Christians. Others, the Gentile Gentiles. And others again,
as Koppe, the *Apostle himself*. Those who interpret it of the Gentile Christians, maintain that the πρό has no force. But this is manifestly too hypothetical. It is better to suppose, with Chrys., Theophyl., and Koppe, that it signifies *præcipere spem*, “to hope for a thing before it comes to pass.” Of which signification Raphael adduces two examples from Polyb. Now in a certain sense this may be applicable both to the Jewish and Gentile Christians; on which I need not enlarge. But what follows seems to confine it to the former. See however Slade.

18. ἐν δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀκούσατε—ὑμῶν, “by, or through, whom ye (Gentiles) having heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, and having believed, were sealed with the spirit of the promise, (even) the Holy Spirit.” Such is the interpretation of Rosenm., and (as it seems) formerly Grot. They remark that ἐν αὐτῷ πιστεύσατε is for καὶ αὐτῷ πιστεύσατε. Thus even the Classical writers sometimes use the article post-positive instead of the demonstrative. The Apostles, Grot. observes, do not observe these minute rules of construction, and therefore change genders, cases, and constructions, *verborum incuriosi, dum tantæ res mentem ambiunt*. The above mode of taking the passage is supported by the authority of the antient Commentators, and seems, upon the whole, well founded. Most modern Interpreters, however, suppose some verb is wanting after καὶ ὑμεῖς; and some supply ἐλπίζατε from κατηκότας; others, ἐκληρώθη, from ver. 11. But these subaudiitions are too violent, and break up the whole construction.

By λόγων τῆς ἀληθείας is meant the true word, the truth, as it is in Jesus, without any mixture of Jewish tradition, or Gentile philosophy. And it is explained by the following words: ὁ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας: which are a Hebraism for “the Gospel by which ye are saved.” In the πνεῦμα. τῆς ἐπαγγελίας there is a Hebraism for πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελματίας. These gifts of the Holy Spirit are said by Rosenm. to be such as are common
to all true Christians, the blessings of religious knowledge, true virtue, hope, joy, concord, and the like. But the truth is, that the expression signifies far more even than what the antient Commentators and most modern ones assign to it, namely, the *gifts of the Holy Spirit, properly so called*, as being more or less supernatural: and when we consider the mode in which the Gospel was disseminated in the Apostolic age, so entirely different from what it is in our own, we shall see that this (as the strong expression ἐσφρ. requires, and the term ἐφαγγ. suggests: for, as the antients have remarked, there is an allusion to Joel 2, 28. and Acts 1, 8.) must be understood of the gifts of the Holy Spirit of every kind; though varying in different persons;* for what the Apostle pronounces generally, need not be extended to individuals. I however admit that the ordinary influences of the Spirit on the minds of believers are included in this sealing. For (to use the words of Mackn.) though the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, whereby the believing Jews and Gentiles in the first age were sealed as heirs of the promises, have long ago been withdrawn, the ordinary influences of the Spirit of God still remain; and if they produce in any man a new nature, he is thereby marked, or declared

* Nay, even Koppe seems to recognise this sense, since he thus annotates on the πνευμ. ἐφαγγ.: “Nobis ad singula in cariss Christianis varia, divina tamen et singularia omnia, respici videtur, cum, quomodocunque tandem homo Christianus ad recte et præclarè cogitandum, sentiendum, agendum, affectum se sentiat: sive ampliore rerum divinarum cognitione, sive elatiore animi virtute, sive denique res inauditas patrandi potestate, singula hæc ad ipsum Ap. solet.”

  Grot, has here rendered good service to the cause of Orthodoxy, by an able annotation, in which (inter alia) he remarks: “What is more astonishing than that those Heathens, alienated from God, despised by the Hebrews, should have been not only converted to piety, but also made equal to the Prophets, in the gifts of tongues, healings, prophecies, and such like? But it increases the magnitude of the thing, that this had been already predicted by the Prophets, as Joel 3, 1 & 2. and Christ had expressly promised it, Mark 16, 17. Luke 94, 49. Joh. 7, 38 & 39.”
to be God's Son; and that mark, or seal, is to him a stronger evidence of his title to the inheritance, than if he possessed the miraculous gifts; nay, than if an angel from heaven assured him of his title.

On the metaphor in ἐσφραγίζω, the Commentators have dilated with superfluous copiousness. See the note on Joh. 6, 27. Rom. 15, 28. and 2 Cor. 1, 22. Seals were used for security and confirmation of any thing being untouched; and hence the term in question often signifies simply to confirm and make one safe of any thing, as if it had been under seal; or as when a charter is given by a king to any one by a warrant under his seal. Here, then, the sense is: "we have been assured under seal of this salvation from the Gospel in which we believe, by the gifts of the Holy Spirit which were promised by the Lord to true believers." See infra 4, 80.

14. ὃς ἐστιν ἀρραβών τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν. Here ὃς is for ὁ, by a common idiom, and must denote the Holy Spirit, who is said (or rather his gifts) to be the earnest of our inheritance. On the above idiom, which is a synesis, the Commentators treat with unnecessary minuteness; but they omit to inquire why the Apostle here used it. If I am not mistaken, it was from his considering the Holy Spirit as one of the persons of the Godhead; and therefore, by association of ideas, he accommodated the gender accordingly. This, then, affords a strong, though indirect and undesigned proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit.*

On the word ἀρραβών, pledge (Germ. Handgeld), see the note on 2 Cor. 5, 5. I will here only add a very similar sentiment of Arbarbanel on 2 Kings 22,

* Here, as not unfrequently elsewhere, I may apply the Classical dict, "Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt." In the above remark, I find, I have been anticipated by Ecumen. 2, p. 7. Ἐποίησατο δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν τοῦ ἄρθρου, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς προφορᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐννοιας τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ εἶπεν πνεύματι, τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ θεός, ἐπάγει οἰκεῖως καὶ βαθύτερον συννάσασθαι, δε ἐστιν ἀρραβ-βών, καὶ ἔξις.
7 & 8. (cited by Wet.) Lex est arrhabo, quæ in manibus nostris est a Deo S. B. redemptione nostræ et animarum nostrarum liberatione.

The καταρασμία signifies the things to be inherited, i.e. possessed; (for the terms καταρασμία and καταρασμόν are perpetually used, to indicate certainty of attainment.)

In the words following, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιπτερυγίως, εἰς ἑκατὸν τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, the construction is very harsh, and quite Hebraic, and so contort and obscure, that I see not how it can be reconciled with the usus loquendi, or accounted for by the ordinary rules of construction. On the sense Commentators are exceedingly divided in opinion. Whitby takes the expression to mean the redemption of life.* Bos renders; "usque ad redemptionem salutis." But this mode of interpretation is obscure and unauthorized. Doddr. explains the περιπτερυγία the people whom Christ has purchased to be his peculiar property; which, he observes, is very agreeable to the signification of the word elsewhere. Slade would retain the common signification of περιπτερυγία, viz. "property acquired by any valuable consideration;" comparing the Heb. ἐπικολοί, peculium. And he renders: "for the final deliverance of the people whom he hath purchased (by his blood)." Thus Dr. Wells: "For the redemption of the purchased possession." But I confess I do not see here any thing that approaches even to probability: and further than that no interpretation can well rise. I will now subjoin two others which

* And he brings many texts out of the Septuagint, where περιπτερυγία signifies to save alive. To illustrate this, he observes there are two redemptions or grand deliveries; (for that is plainly his idea of redemption;) the one, that of justification, consequent upon believing: the other, that by which we are delivered from death and all the other penal consequences of sin, in the redemption of the body from corruption, that it may partake of eternal life. Compare Rom. 8, 23. This nearly coincides with Beza's interpretation, who would translate it, till the redemption of vindication, that is, till we are set entirely at liberty, and receive complete deliverance and salvation. (Doddr.)
seem most to approximate to the truth: 1. that of Rosenm. and Schleus., who take the ἀπολύτ. τῆς περιτοιχίσεως to mean liberation from this life and all its evils. The sense will then be, “with the complete liberation of Christians from all their miseries, until their departure from this earth, when they will receive the promised inheritance;” or, as Schleus. renders: “until the time when Christ shall deliver his worshippers (whom he purchased by his blood, Acts 20, 28.) from this body.” 2. that of Koppe, who regards the ἄπολυτος as the status constructus, Hebr. in the place of a participle joined to a noun substantive, put for ἀπολύτρωσις περιτοιχίσεως, which is purchased and obtained for.” And he compares 1 Thess. 5, 9. 2 Thess. 2, 14. Hebr. 20, 39.; and observes there is a similar construction at ver. 18. ἔλτερ ἡς κληρείως αὐτῶ, for eis ἴν ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, and 1 Pet. 2, 9. λαὸς εἰς περιτοιχίσμα ὦ Θεός. This mode of taking the passage is somewhat confirmed by the authority of the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) περιτοιχίσεως, τὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς σπουδὴν καὶ κηδεμονίαν λέγει τῷ Θεῷ. Φησὶ δὲ, ὅτι ὁ ἀρχαῖος αὐτος, εἰς τὴν τελείαν ἀπολύτρωσιν, καὶ τὴν καθαρὰν ὑμῶν περιτοιχίαν φέρει, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἐσθόθη. Upon the whole, the truth seems to rest with the interpretation of Theophyl. and Koppe.

15. διὰ τοῦτο, i.e. “because I know and feel how great is the felicity formerly obtained for Christians.” (Koppe.) I prefer, however, the exposition of Theophyl.: διὸ πιστεύσατε, οὕτως εἰσφάγητε τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἀρραβώνα ἔλαβετε τῶν μελλόντων ἁγίων, καὶ τὴν τελείαν ἀπολύτρωσιν, καὶ μέλλετε τούχειν τῶν ἀποκειμένων τοῖς ὅρισι πιστεύσατε καὶ μισθοῖς.

15. καὶ γεγένον ἂκούσας τῇ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν εἰς τὸ Κυρίο Ἰ., καὶ τὴν ἁγάπην τὴν εἰς τάντας τῶν ἁγίων, “having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ that is in you; (or, your being true believers).” Ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις is for ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; but it seems a more energetic expression. Ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ is for εἰς τὸν Κυρίον.
The τὸν ἀγάπην is explained by most Commentators of liberality; and they refer to Gal. 5, 6. 1 Thess. 1, 8. But, from the εἰς τοὺς πάντας ἄγιοι, it appears to signify, in a general way, affection and good-will, φιλαδελφία, 1 Thess. 4, 9.; though that might in some cases be evinced by liberality in relieving their necessities. It may be observed, that in thus noticing the union of ἀγάπη with their faith, the Apostle means to instruct all his future readers.

15. ἄγιοι, i. e. Christians; as often. It has been well observed by Rosenm., Mackn., and others, that the ἄκοιτας, &c. is a proof that the Apostle had never visited those whom he is addressing, as only denoting that the report of their steadfastness in the faith had reached his ears. (See Mackn.) So Doddridge: "As it was now five or six years since Paul quitted Ephesus, he might judge it proper thus to express his complacency, on hearing that they continued, in the midst of so many circumstances of temptation, to behave in a manner so worthy of what he had personally observed among them.—In this sense Mr. Locke understands these words; and it is illustrated by comparing Phil. 1, 3 & 27. and 1 Thess. 1, 5 & 6. 3, 6.”

16. οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστοῦν, "I do not cease to return thanks to God on account of you."* Koppe compares ἀδιαλείπτως εὐχομαι at 1 Thess. 1, 2 & 3. Ἡτὲρ ὑμῶν he rightly explains for ὑμῶν ἔνεκα, or τὸ καθ’ ὑμᾶς. Also μείναν ποιεῖσθαι τινὸς is treated by Koppe as if it were an idiotical phrase simply denoting pray for. But it is not idiotical,† and it is more energetic than simply pray for. Theophyl. has the following striking remark: πόσων ἐμὲμνητο ἐν ταῖς εὐχαίς; ἦμεις δὲ, οὐδὲ ἤμων αὐτῶν ὡς δεῖ.

17. ἦν ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. Koppe ob-

---

* The modern Commentators notice the height of affection implied in these words. For, as Theophyl. remarks, ἡτὲρ πάντων εὐχαριστεῖ, ὡς αὐτὸς εὐφερετοῦμενος.
† Thus I find it in that most refined of Greek Poets, Eurip. Bacch. 46. ὅθει μ', ἐν εὐχαίς τ' οὖδαμον μείαν ἐχει.
serves, that what is meant by this formula it is difficult to say. "When (continues he) it is used of men (as the God of Abraham), it denotes the object of worship and the source of benefit. And this may be suitable to the man Jesus (see Joh. 20, 17.); but since Jesus was Son of God, and, on that account, united to the Father in a peculiar manner, who will venture to say that some profounder sense is not intended by the Apostle. What that is I would not venture to define." Until this something further be ascertained, we must be content to consider the expression not as presenting any real difficulty, but only deserving notice for its rarity. It is sufficient, with the antient Commentators, and most judicious modern ones, to consider Christ as here spoken of in his human nature; as when he speaks of his God, Joh. 20, 17. 1 Cor. 11, 3. 3. 28. So that the Unitarians have here no argument at all against the Deity of Jesus Christ, since this passage will only prove that he had a human nature as well as a divine one; which we readily admit.

17. ὁ Πατήρ τῆς δόξης, Ὄπ. Koppe compares the forms βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, Πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, &c. and takes it to mean our Almighty Father. Rosenm., "our ever to be praised Father." But the τῆς δόξης does not (I think) merely stand in the place of an adjective, but requires a circumlocution, namely, "worthy to be praised and had in honour and glory," an epithet applied to the Lord in 2 Sam. 22, 4. and Ps. 18, 3.

On the phrase πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἁποκαλ. I cannot agree with Bishop Middleton and Mr. Valpy, that πνεῦμα σοφίας signifies a wise and well informed mind. For πνεῦμα ἁποκαλυπτόνως will not admit of that mode of interpretation; nor is ἁποκαλυπτόνως ever reckoned among the words in which this idiom is supposed to have place. The use of ἁποκαλυπτόνως and of πεφασμένως τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ ἐλεήμων necessarily suggests the idea of the Holy Spirit; as the antient and modern Commentators are.
agreed.* Nay, even the recent foreign Commentators acknowledge this: nor would the acute and learned Prelate have thought otherwise, had not his canon here been, as it were, a beam in his eye. It should seem, that in σεφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως there is a sort of hendiadis; or at least ἀποκαλ. is added, to show that the wisdom meant is such as could not have been attained by human powers, but required the aid of divine illumination; such being true of the doctrines of the Gospel; for we are not authorized to interpret the ἀποκαλ. of mysteries properly so called, prophecies, revelations, and the like; and still less must we limit it to that portion of spiritual assistance which is now dealt out to Christians, or apply to the Apostolical age, (even that of the especial outpouring of the Spirit,) what is only true of the present times, when such extraordinary aids are unnecessary, and therefore withheld.

17. ἐν ἐπιγνωκει αὐτοῦ ἵνα ἐπιγνωσι, εἰς ὃ ἐπιγνώσατο, i. e. “that ye may more and more know him, attain to a more and more perfect knowledge of his religion.”

18. κεφασμένος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς καρδίας ἤματι. This is explanatory of what preceded, and shows the kind of knowledge which he prayed they might attain. Πε. τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν are accusatives absolute, and the sense of these words, taken in conjunction with εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι, &c. (which denote the result), may be thus expressed: “The eyes of your understanding being so enlightened that ye may see what is,” &c. It is plain that καρδίας, which is supported by very numerous MSS. of various recensions, as also Versions, Fathers, and ancient Commentators, is the true reading, and the διανοιας arose from a marginal gloss.

* Thia Theophr. : χάριμα ὑμῖν ψάλσε, ἤστε διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος φωνεῖσθαι. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἀποκαλλυθη τὰ κεκρυμμένα μυστήρια, ἀδύνατον ἄλλως μάθειν.
the Classical writers.* Similar expressions occur in Acts 26, 18. 1 Pet. 1, 13. Sap. 5, 5. **Karδία** is used, like the Hebr. דָּרָשָׁ, to denote not only the seat of the will and affections, but also of the understanding.

18. τίς, for πόση, quanta, how precious. "Ελλείποντος κλήσεως αὐτοῦ, for εἰς ἐν ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς, "the hope to which he hath called and invited you by his doctrines and promises." The words following καὶ τίς οὖν πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς άγίοις are explanatory of the preceding; and the simple sense is: "and how rich and glorious is the fountain of blessings prepared for you and all Christians." It is well observed by Koppe, that full of the mighty thoughts of eternal felicity, the Apostle accumulates words on words, so as, if possible, to exhaust the subject, and attain to the magnitude of the divine benefits.

The fruition of the hope or the blessing and felicity itself is, as usual, designated by the term κληρονομία, by way of hinting at its certainty, οὐς οὕτως μελετάτα διδοθαί, to use the words of Theophyl. And the expressions πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης have the force of an adjective; q. d. "how gloriously rich." So Theoph.: ταῦτα καλεῖ ἀφατον δόξαν καὶ υπερβολικήν.

18. ἐν τοῖς άγίοις. These words Koppe refers, not to κληρ. αὐτοῦ, but to τίς ἐστιν; and renders: "quae proposita Christianis spes felicitatis." So Mackn.: "prepared for the saints." Thus ἐν τοῖς άγίοις will be for εἰς τοῖς άγίοις. So Est., Zanch, and others, take the ἐν in the sense inter; which will require the subaudition "to be distributed." Others think

* Thus Ovid. Met. 16, 63. (cited by Wets.) quae natura negabat visibus humanis, oculis ea pectoris hauit; and (what strongly confirms the reading καρδίας) Achmet Onirocr. 5, 2. εάν τις τοῦ διὸ ρηθαλμὸν ἔχει τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ βλέπει μὲν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὲν ἄτοι βασιλείας, γεννηθείς τέκνων, συμβουλευόμεν ἐρεβόδες αὐτῷ. So also Plato Symp. (cited by Koppe) ἢ τῇ διανοίᾳ ὡς ἀρχεῖ μὲν βλέπειν, οὐκ ἡ τῶν ὁμοίων ἄριστή λέγειν εἰπεῖλαρ, a sentiment of great truth and beauty. I add Themist. 2. p. 29 a. Διανοϊκεῖταί γὰρ μοι τὸ στήθος καὶ τὴν καρδίαν, καὶ διανοησεῖτα γενεῖται ἡ ψυχή, καὶ τὰ ὄμαρα ἔχεται τῇ διανοίᾳ.

2 M 2
that the ἐν denotes actual possession. But this seems frigid. The first interpretation appears to be the best founded, and is (I think) supported by the words following (which are explanatory of the present), where we have εἰς ἡμᾶς.

19. καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλων—αὐτοῖ. Rursus sententia eadem tantum alio modo expressa, et ad vim impri- mis divinam, qua potest Deus Christianis suis felici- tatem largiri, cogitandum et admirandam accommoda- data. Ut vero hanc vim divinam sensibus Christianorum eo clarius obliceret, exemplo utitur miraculi, simili quadam vi divinâ a Deo patrati, resurrectionis nempe J. C. e mortuis; haque semel commemorata, ipsam Christianorum felicitatem eidem resurrectionis miraculo comparat, eodemque nomine compellat, 2, 5, 6. Unde, qui jam sequuntur versus, usque ad cap. 2, 10. arctè invicem sunt conjungendi: etsi sententia primaria variis aliis tum de Jesu Christi majestate, tum de Christianorum pristinâ miseriâ, è quâ nunc per Christum emerserant, paullulum est interrupta. (Koppe.) Theophyl. traces the plan thus: τὰ μὲν προφητεύεται, περὶ μελλόντων πραγμάτων ἢςαν νῦν δὲ λέγει τὸ ἦδη γεγονὸς, ἵνα ἀπὸ τούτου κάκειν πιστεύονται.

19. τὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μ. τ. ὁ. is for τὴν ὑπερβολή. To ὑπερβάλλων, the exceeding, excellent. In this use there is supposed to be a metaphor taken from archery. Here τὶ has not the sense of τὸς, since the words following are expressive of greatness and power. By ἡμᾶς τῶν πιστεύοντας is meant, "we and all Christians."

19. κατὰ τὴν ἐνέγγειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ. The Commentators are not agreed to what to refer this clause, whether to πιστεύοντες just before, or to ὑπερβάλλων μέγεθος τ. ὁ. a little farther off. The for- mer is the more common mode of interpretation, and is supported by some antient Commentators; (though they by no means recognize in the words any thing from whence to conclude that man is passive in the work of conversion; understanding them of the
working of faith, as meant of the strengthening and supporting it). The latter mode is adopted by many eminent modern Commentators, as Whitby and Koppe, the former of whom remarks, that the above mode of interpretation is not agreeable to the words; for the Apostle speaks not of the power exercised on us to render us believers, but of the power which shall be exercised upon us who believe already, not of the power exercised upon our souls to raise them from a death in sin, but of the power to be exercised upon our bodies, to give them a glorious resurrection to eternal life. And the latter observes that the whole context treats, not of conversion to their religion, but of the happiness thence resulting to Christians; and moreover, the interpretation in question would require κατὰ to be taken in a very uncommon sense, namely for διὰ. And (I would add) it is impossible to suppose that the Apostle would introduce so important a doctrine as the Calvinists here recognise, in so oblique a manner. Koppe offers the following version: “ut vim insignem illam intelligatis, quam ad Christianos suos beandos impediat Deus; non minorem eā ipsā, quà Christum è mortuis resuscitavit.” The words may (I think) be thus paraphrased: “And what is the exceeding greatness of his power towards us believers? What exceeding greatness and power is, and will be, exerted by quickening us, who were dead in trespasses and sins, and raising us to the enjoyment of the inheritance of the saints in light, according to and similar to the power which he hath already exercised in Christ.”

Κράτος and ἰσχύς are synonymous; but when united in this manner, the genitive has the force of an adjective, and that is meant to raise the signification of the noun.

20. ἦν ἐνεργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, “which (energy) he hath exerted in (the case of) Christ;” ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ being for εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν, or τὸ κατὰ Χ. Koppe observes, that in καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ there is a change of construc-
tion for καθαρός. Yet the change did not arise from negligence, but from design; for the verbs have a far stronger effect in expressing the important truth couched in the next two verses than participles. Thus here, as on other occasions, the Apostle sacrifices the minuter accuracies and delicate proprieties of style, in order to more forcibly inculcate weighty sentiments, and important truths.

'Ενεπάντωσες has the active sense, hath set, placed; as appears from εγείρας before, and from ὑπέραξεν after. In sitting at the right hand there is, as usual, a figure equivalent to συμβασιλεύειν.

By the εν τοις επιφανείς is meant "in coelo ipso." This expression is perhaps used as being a more dignified one than εν τῷ οὐρανῷ.

21. οὑπέραντο τῶς ἀρχῆς—μέλλοντι. In this most beautiful passage (on which see Bp. Pearson,) the Apostle, as in the preceding verses, labours for words to express the mighty thoughts which filled his mind on so transcendently important a subject. Thus ὑπέραντα is used as being a stronger term than ἀρχή, or ὑπὲρ. Koppe compares the Hebr. לְשׁוֹנָם and ἰσχυράτον. Some verb seems wanting in this sense. Koppe would supply ὅστε βασιλεύειν. But perhaps ἐναίων (which is a more regular subaudition) may suffice. It is truly observed by Koppe, that the substantives ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, &c. are abstracts for concretes, namely, the persons who fill those dignities. They are, he adds, synonymous, and only import that no notion of power is excluded from the idea of Christ's supereminence and sovereignty. Yet (I think) some distinction may be supposed, at least that which Chandler suggested, namely, that ἀρχή denotes the highest, and κυριότης the lowest degree of power.

By παντὸς ἐνοματος (notwithstanding what Koppe may object) it is plain the Apostle meant to denote " every (other) name of authority and dignity;" as in Phil. 2, 9., where God is said to have given him a name which is above every name," &c.

21. οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ οἰκίντο τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντα
These words plainly indicate that the Apostle has reference to dignities and authorities in heaven as well as in earth (for what else can ἐν ταῖς αἰώνι ἀλλοτριοι mean): and such has ever been the unvaried mode of interpretation adopted by Commentators and Theologians from the earliest ages. It is strange, therefore, that the recent Foreign Commentators should dispute this. Not so, however, Koppe, who admits the reality of the doctrine both here and at Col. 1, 16: and he refers to 3, 14, 6, 12. 1 Cor. 15, 24. Rom. 8, 38. Jaspis, too, acknowledges this.

On the sense of αἰών, it is not necessary to refine. For whether we suppose the Apostle to mean world, or time, the general meaning will be the same.

22. καὶ πάντα ἐκάλησε—ἐκκλησία. This verse is partly the same in sentiment with the last. Thus πάντα—αὐτῶ. Though, as Koppe observes, by the change of image there is suggested the subjection under which even his adversaries must be to him, and the consequences of that opposition by feeling the weight of his power in their punishment. Compare 1 Cor. 15, 17. The πάντα must signify the πάνης ἐρχησ of the preceding verse.

The Apostle then engrafts upon the former image another and more energetic view, under which Christ’s power may be considered, namely, as being head over all to the Church; which suggests the idea of superiority exercised for the benefit of the inferiors. Such (I think) is the idea intended by the term κυβερνή. The κυβερνή is, as Koppe observes (by a Hebraism derived from יָד), put for τελεικον, ἔστησε. Τερ πάντα may, I think, be regarded as an idiomatic expression, signifying “over all persons and things.” By τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, I assent to Koppe, is meant the general assembly of believers, both in earth and in heaven, angels as well as men. He refers to 1, 10.

* In which view the following spirited remark of Schottel is very applicable: “Non solum tituli dignitatum.”
† So Theophyl: μα τῇ ἀγώνας οτι εκάθισεν ἑπεράνω, νομίζει αὑτὸν προτιμηθέναι μόνον, δεικνυσι οτι καὶ δεσπότην αὑτὸν ἐκκλησ πάντων.
and, for another example of this extended sense of ἐκκλησία, to Heb. 12, 23. ἐκκλησία πρωτόκοιν εὖ οὕρανοις ἀπογεγαμενέαν, καὶ τριτῆ Θεοῦ πάντων, καὶ πνεύμασι δικαιών τετελειωμένων, καὶ διαθήκης κέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ, an inexpressibly sublime passage.

23. ἦνε ἐστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα—πληρωμένου. The Apostle added these words for the reason suggested in the former verse. So Theophyl. 1.: “That it might not be supposed that by head be meant power, he says that what the head is to the body, so is Christ to the Church, and in the same manner is he related to, and united with it.” The words τὸ πλήρωμα—πληρωμένου are put in opposition with σῶμα, and signify: “and this is the numerous body of him (or belonging to him as head) who filleth all with every thing.” So Hesych. : πλήρωμα, πλήθος. The term πλήρωμα, Rosenm. observes, signifies an immense multitude, which, not confining itself to its own territory, spreads far and near, and thus fills various regions; as in Ps. 24, 1. πλήρωμα τῆς γῆς, for παντὰ ἐστι ἐν τῇ γῇ.

“Here (continues he) the Church is called πλήρωμα, as consisting of many parts, and being a numerous society. Πάντα is the neuter for the masculine, all men. Ἐν πάσι, with all blessings. 'Ο πληρωμένος, "who filleth all with blessings," or "distributes blessings to men," i. e. God, the fountain and author of all good. The middle πληρωμένου has an active sense." The passage is thus rendered by Wets.: “Christus est plenitudo, gloria Dei Patris, omnia in omnibus implentis.” And he compares Philo. T. 2. p. 171, 34. ο εὐμενῆς καὶ ἱλεώς, ο πάντα διὰ πάντων πε- πληρωκαὶ τῆς εὐεργετίδος ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεως. Jaspis paraphrases thus: “Quale autem et quantum est solatium, quod tantum imperium habet is, qui id in ecclesiæ utilitatem exercet, tam admiranda χαρίσ- ματα πνευματικὰ ei largitur, atque illi sic prospicit, ut caput corpori consulit.”

* So Αeschyl. Agam. 304. ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρω- μενὸν.
CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτίαις. There is here the same complaint made as on so many former occasions, namely, of the division of the Chapter having been made at an improper place. Yet that division is sanctioned by the authority of Chrys., who here commences a new Homily. In fact, the propriety or impropriety of the division will depend upon the construction of the words ὑμᾶς ἀμαρτίαις, which the antient Commentators, and almost all the modern ones, connect with ver. 5. (where there is, as Grot., Crel., and most Commentators think, a repetition, per epanalepsin)* συνεξωσκοιςε τῷ Χριστῷ. Thus what follows, up to ver. 4., and καὶ, which follows at ver. 5., must be taken as pleonastic, after the manner of the Hebrews, who often interpose their י (which signifies ד and καὶ), or the ד is to be rendered inquam, and the καὶ, etiam. And certainly anacolutha are not unfrequently to be found in St. Paul; as Gal. 2, 6. Yet the above method has been, by the recent Commentators, thought too harsh; and they generally adopt what is considered as the simpler construction; namely, that proposed by Cramer (and before him by Dr. Chandler. See Doddr. and Mackn.), who refers the ὑμᾶς to the παραπτώμαινοι in the last verse of the preceding Chapter, so uniting both together as only to place a comma after παραπτώμαινοι, with the following sense: "Numerous is the assembly of that God who, as he loads all others with benefits, so also does he you;" or (as Doddr. better expresses it), "He who filleth all his members with all gifts and virtues, hath also filled you among the

* And so Ecumen.: 'Ἡ ἀνατρόποις, μετὰ τολλὴν σύμφρασιν καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας, φησὶ, νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι εἰς τολλαίον περιβολιὰς μετατόσας τὸν λόγον, μετὰ εκπαληθεῖν τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρονοῦ, οὐς, καὶ ὑμᾶς ἔμας νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμαιν, ἀπέδωκε τὸ κατὰ τοῦς, συνεξωσκοιςε τῷ Χριστῷ.
rest." But this method, simple as it may seem, involves difficulties perhaps as great as the common one. It is far more natural to suppose a period at παραμένω. The very air of the sentence requires this, and, I may add, the length of it (for it has continued from ver. 15.) demands it. The Apostle would scarcely have thought of adding to a sentence, already too long, several more verses, and uniting them too by so slender a connection. Finally, παραμένω cannot well be repeated, nor πεπληγέειεκ taken from it, at 1. 1., without much harshness being involved. This method yields, too, a somewhat frigid sense. So that, upon the whole, I see no reason to desert the common construction, which is defended by so many similar instances of anacoluthon and synchysis, and especially since it agrees with Col. 2, 13. As to the other modes proposed, namely, of connecting the ἡμᾶς, &c. with ver. 18. or ver. 19. of the preceding Chapter, they are too harsh to deserve any attention.

1. νεκρὸς τῶν παραπτάματος is for νεκρ. ἐν τοῖς παραπτάματος, and that for διὰ τῶν παραπτ.; as in Col. 2, 13. Rosenm. compares the use of the Latin Ab- lative. The phrase "to be dead unto sin," as in Rom. 6, 2. Gal. 2, 19., is of another nature. So Koppe, who thinks the former phrase equivalent to sceleri infeliciissimi: and he is of opinion that the term νεκρ. is only used to designate the height of destruction and misery, of which death is a frequent image. And he refers to Rom. 8, 6. and James 5, 20. So the Philosophers called backsliders from philosophy, and those who again yielded themselves to the dominion of animal passions, dead. See the Classical illustrations of Wets., to which I add Jambl. V. Pyth. §. 78., and Joseph. 1840 & 1821. Ed. Huds. But it may be questioned whether the allusions are the same. To be dead in sin seems to mean to be totally subjected to it, as a corpse is to the power of death, and to be as incapable of rising from it as that is of being restored to life.
And in the same light (I find) Mr. Locke viewed the expression.

The ἐντα is rightly said by Koppe to be the participle imperfect, not present; as appears from the τότε and the Aorist περιπατήσατε. I have on several other occasions pointed out this use of the participle imperfect, which, though somewhat rare, it is strange should never have yet found a place in the Grammars. Between παρατιτ. and ἀμαρτ. it is not necessary to make distinctions.

2. ἐν αιῶν ἐν τότε περιπατήσατε κατά τῶν αἰώνα τοῦ κόσμου ταύτων. It is plain that the Apostle is here only addressing the Gentile part of the Ephesian congregation; though as they doubtless formed by far the most considerable part, he was justified in addressing them all as such. It is remarked by Koppe, that περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀμαρτίαις is a brief mode of expression for περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀθῷ ἀμαρτίαις: as in Prov. 3, 20. And doubtless the metaphor is more unfolded in the Old Testament than in the New. Περιπατ. simply signifies to live, act, &c. Κατὰ τῶν αἰώνα τοῦ κόσμου. Here αἰών denotes (as often), like the Latin ænum and seculum, the manner of life. Rosenm. compares genus seculi, the way of the world. He might more aptly have cited Tacit. Germ. C. 19. “corrumpere et corrumpi seculum vocatur.” Κατὰ signifies in conformity to, after the example of. Though in the next clause it denotes in conformity to the will of, impelled by. By κόσμου ταύτω is plainly meant the wicked of that time.

2. κατὰ τῶν ἀρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας.

Most recent Commentators explain this, “the powerful Prince of the air;” the Genitive ἐξουσίας having, they say, after the manner of the Hebrew, the force of an adjective. But this seems a harsh and unwarrantable limitation of the sense. I prefer, with the antient, and most modern Commentators, as Koppe, to consider ἐξουσίας as put for ἀρχήν, i.e. (as Chandler explains) power for those who exercise the power or rule, throughout the various degrees of subordinate agency. And so Koppe, who refers to 6, 12. Ps. 114, 2. 136, 8 & 9. And this is supported by the authority of Theophyll., who explains it: ἀρχήν τῶν ἐναρειῶν δυνάμεων καὶ ἐξουσιαστῖν πατρὸς ἐναρείαν πατρόμας. Now the air is supposed to be the seat of this rule, and the residence of the various orders of sub-
ordinate agents who composed the body. That spiritual beings should hold their residence in the air is to be expected. There is here, as Mede, Whitby, and others, observe, reference to the opinion both of the Jews and Heathens (especially the Pythagoreans) of the air being thickly peopled with Spirits called Demons.* Wets. remarks that St. Paul only speaks thus according to the principles of the Pythagorean philosophy, with which those to whom he wrote were imbued, but does not give it as a part of the doctrine revealed to him by Christ, and to be believed by all." Yet he not only expresses no disapprobation of it, but by the expression τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος, &c. seems to profess his belief of the reality of Satan's agency, and the term ἀρχαία implies others.† Yet it should be remembered that the other words τῆς ἑλπίδας τοῦ δικαίου, do not indicate how far the Apostle's belief on that subject extended. Nor are we to ascribe to him all the dreams of the Rabbins. On the other hand, to exclude, as many do, the influence of this demoniacal agency altogether, and to represent St. Paul himself as disbelieving it, and yet countenancing it for temporary purposes, is not only doing the greatest injustice to the Apostle, but is running counter to the positive testimony both of the Apostle and the other sacred writers. Indeed to suppose, because there is no appearance of demoniacal influence now, that there was none in the Apostolic age, is as irrational as to suppose, that because no miracles are now worked in proof of the

* Which is fully proved and illustrated by the copious Collectanea of Wets. Thus Philo, 431, 28. ἔστι δὲ καὶ καθ’ τὸν ἄρα ψυχήν ἀσωμάτων ἑσπέρας χόρος, et de Gigant. p. 363, 7., besides many other passages from the same author, who represents them as equal in number to the stars, i.e. innumerable. Manilius, 2, 18. immenso voltantia numina mundo. Diogen. Laert. 8, 32. εἶπεν τοῦ ἄρα ψυχήν ἐκπλεόν, καὶ τούτον διάμονας τε καὶ ἡμῶν νομίζεις. And the lusts of the flesh, are, by Porphyry. ap. Euseb. P. Ev. 4, 23., ascribed to these Demons. So also Plut. p. 2, 361 b. εἶπεν ψυχεῖς ἐν τῷ περιείχοντι μεγάλαις μέν καὶ λαγυμα, δυστρέψοντες δὲ καὶ συνδραπεῖς & 274. Apulej. de Deo Socratis. Mediorum divisorum ista sortitio est, qui in aeris plagiis terrae conterminis nec minus confinibus coeli perinde versantur. Lucan. 9, 6. quodque pater terras inter lunaeque meatus, Semidei manes habitant. And Koppe cites Pirke Aboth. fol. 83. p. 2. Sciemund, a terrâ usque ad expansum omnia plena esse turmis et praefectis, et infra plurimas esse creaturas ludentes et accusantes, omnesque stare ac volitare in ære, neque locum esse vacuum sed omnia plena praepositionis, quorum alii ad bonum, alii ad malum, alii ad vitam, alii ad mortem incitant. And so Ignat. ad Ephes. § 13. ἐν ἵ δὲ πάσας πολέμους καταργεῖται ἄφρων καὶ ἐνιγμων πνεύματων.

† For Koppe, I think, has rightly observed that τοῦ πνεύματος is for τὸ πνεῦμα: a slight lapse (So Rosenm. Videtur Paulus hic, ut alibi, excidisse a constructione), excusable in so sublime a passage, similar to such as we perpetually find in the Apocalypse. It is too harsh to suppose, with Grot. and others, that πνεύματος is for πνευμάτων: a mistake which could not be accounted for on any princi-
Gospel, none were then worked. That were to confound the ordinary and the extraordinary dispensations of Providence; which would be unphilosophical as well as presumptuous. It should seem that the Almighty permitted, and, as it were, let loose those demons to exercise their power to oppose the spread of the Gospel, in order thereby to put to the proof the obedience of his faithful servants, and evince the divine mission of the preachers of the Gospel, by enabling them to cure evils which heretofore had admitted of no remedy. And the νῦν may be thought to favour this opinion.

On the kinds of demons, see a curious note of Grot. He then is said to especially energize in the children of disobedience, by which expression I would not understand (with Koppe,) unbelievers in the Gospel, but the disobedient to the will of God (so Theophyl. τοι μὴ πειθομένους Ὁσὲ), and the moral law; which was the case with the great bulk of both Gentiles and Jews. The antient Commentators dilate much on the term ἐνεργοῦσα, which, they tell us, implies voluntary obedience on the part of those whom Satan actuates. Those therefore, as the Apostle says in 2 Tim. 2. 26., he leads captive at his will. And at Acts 26. 18., as Whitby observes, their conversion is stiled a recovery of them from the power of Satan.

"Hence (continues he) we may rationally conclude, that the good spirit doth also inwardly work in pious persons, enabling them to will, and to do, it being unreasonable to conceive the evil spirit should have more power over those wicked men in whom he dwells, than the good spirit hath in those pious persons in whose hearts he is said to dwell." I would observe that ἐνεργ. implies effectually working. For the Devil and his subordinate agents doubtless often energized in the good, but did not prevail with them, because they were not children of disobedience.

3. ἐν ὅλις καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστραφημένοι ποτέ. As the ἡμεῖς, at ver. 2., refers to the Gentiles, so does the ἡμεῖς καὶ here refer to the Jews. Oecumen. here notices the delicacy of the Apostle, who, to spare their feelings on being reminded of their former gross vices, admits the subjection to sin even of God's peculiar people.

Whether ἐν ὅλις ought to be referred to the nearer antecedent νῦν, or to the more remote παρακαταύρασιν at ver. 1., the Commentators are divided in opinion. The former method is adopted by most, as Erasm., Beza, Pisc., and Zanch. But they are not agreed on the exact sense of ἐν, or to whom the ὅλις refers. It can only (I think) on this mode of interpretation, signify (as Koppe suggests) like unto; which, however, is an unauthorized sense; and therefore I can-
not but prefer the latter mode, which is supported by Grot., Est. and others, and to which no objection should be made on the score of minute propriety; for though the Apostle commenced ver. 2 with εν οἷς, referred to ἀμαρτίας, and here resumes the construction (for so he does) with εν οἷς, yet as παρατάχμαι had been united with ἀμαρτίας, he was at liberty to take one as well as the other. Besides, ἀναστρέφεσθαι is nowhere in the Scriptural, and rarely, if ever, in the Classical writers used in conjunction with an εν and a noun of person, though of things very often; as in 2 Cor. 1, 12. 1 Tim. 3, 15. Prov. 20. 8. ἵνα ἀναστρέφεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Polyb. 1, 14. τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πένθιμοις ἀναστρ. (See more examples in Schleus. Lex.) It is often used of conduct. Finally, the above method seems to be confirmed by the words following, which seem added for the purpose of preventing mistake, as the antecedent was so distant. With respect to the sentiment, there is abundant evidence both from the Gospels and Joseph., that the morals of the Jews were then nearly as corrupt as those of the Gentiles.

It is observed by some Commentators, as Grot., that the Apostle here includes himself by the figure κοινωσίας, so frequent in the orators, and indeed all who address others. To this, however, Koppe thinks there is no occasion to resort, since the Apostle might be conscious of having been given up to the same vices. But this seems very improbable. (See Lennep ap. Pole.) His were those of the mind rather than of the morals, namely, spiritual pride and disobedience to the will of God so clearly revealed by Jesus. It were frivolous, however, to discuss the question here.

3. εν ταῖς ἐκκυσίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. The εν is said by Rosenm. and Koppe to be for κατὰ. But to this unauthorized signification it is not necessary to resort. The words are used to show the construction; and therefore ἀναστρέφεσθαι is to be repeated. The sense is: "in which lusts of the flesh
we (I say) were conversant." The words ποιησαι τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ διανοίας unfold the idea couched in ἀνεστρ. &c. θελήματα, desires. This plural use of θελήμα, which (I think) is never found in the Classical writers, seems to be Hellenistical, and derived from the Hebr. Thus in Acts 13, 22. it is said of David: ὃς ποιησει πάντα τὰ θελήματα μου. And so 2 Chron. 9, 12. ἔδωκε τῷ βασιλείῳ τὰ θελήματα, καὶ ἤγισεν.

3. καὶ τῶν διανοίων. With this Commentators have been somewhat perplexed. Vorst. takes it to denote "duplices cupiditates perversae, quorum aliae magis externæ, aliae internæ sunt." Grot. thinks the Apostle adverts "subtilioribus illis vitis, quæ sunt magis ἐν τῷ θυμωδействε, et propius ad virtutes videntur accedere." But this seems too refined and philosophical a distinction. Wets. paraphrases thus: "Non tantum faciebant, quæ impetus affectuum praeceps dictabat; sed etiam deliberato consilio, quod pejus erat, mala perpetrabant homines ingeniosè pequant." Rosenm. observes: "Διανοίας, ἡς h. l. non tam sunt cogitata intellectus, quam potius sensa, propensiones, studia. 'Η σαρκα καὶ αἱ διανοίαι conjunctim cogitata sunt propensiones pravæ." And so Schleus. But this is confusing what the Apostle evidently intends to keep separate. It is plain that the Apostle means corrupt and wicked thoughts. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) very well illustrates the force of the word thus; ὅτι καὶ τὰς διανοίας ἐρρυταινομεν λογίζουμεν τὰ κακὰ καὶ τὴν σάρκα, πάρα τούτους αὐτά. Δύνασαι δὲ σαρκὸς μὲν ἔργα, πορνείαν καὶ τὰ ταυτὰ νοεῖν διανοίας δὲ, φόνον καὶ μοσσηκικίαν, καὶ τὰ δροια. I see no interpretation so probable as this, and that of Grot.; and I think it has been rightly remarked by Theophyl. and Beza, that the Apostle intended to show the utter depravity of the natural man, οὐδὲν πνευματικὸν φρονούντος.

3. τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς. It is well observed by Theophyl., that τεκ. ὀργῆς, worthy of divine wrath; children of hell; children of perdition. Now ὀργῆ here,
as often (and always when applied to the Deity), implies punishment. See Rom. 9, 22. 'Ως καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, “as the rest of the human race,” “the Gentiles.”

The sense of φθεῖν, the recent Commentators to little purpose discuss. Rosenm. maintains that it has no relation to insane corruption. And Morus interprets it, “statum hominis, deditis soli appetitum, nullo ad regulam respectu, et talem appetitionem licenter sequentis, nondum moraliter correcti.” Chrys., Greg., Naz., Theodoret., Οἰκumen. interpret it veræ; and the Syr. and Jerome, omnino. But both these significations are devoid of authority, and indeed yield a very feeble sense. Others explain it by habère. Le Clerc and Wets., “by their natural character and disposition;” and this they support by Classical examples, to which I could add many others, especially from Thucyd. and Dio Cass., in all which I agree with Doddr. is signified a natural disposition, and not merely an acquired habit. To this signification Koppe makes many objections, which, however, seem not well founded. His chief reason for rejecting it appears to be this, because (as he confesses), this interpretation necessarily brings us to the common doctrine of the radical corruption of human nature! But as that doctrine is inculcated in Scripture, and is, alas! justified by experience, there can be no reason for rejecting an interpretation because it is connected with it, but the contrary. This is surely the plain and natural sense, and by this we must abide, referring the expression (to use the words of Doddr.) to “the original apostasy and corruption in consequence of which men do, according to the course of nature, fall early into personal guilt, and so become obnoxious to the divine displeasure.” Wets. here cites a curious passage from Ignat. ad Magn. έπεί δέ άπεβα οἱ άνθρωπος, τού διαβόλου, οὐκ άπε τῆς φύσεως, ἀλλ’ ἀπε τῆς κατού γνώμης, γνώμενοι, which, I would observe, was imitated by Tertullian de Anima. c. 16. p. 275. when he says, Puimus aliquando naturā filii irae, irrationale indignavirum suggitati, quod non sit ex a naturā, que a Deo est, sed ex illā qua diabolus induxit. This doctrine of the radical corruption of human nature, indeed, the Heathen writers themselves acknowledge. Thus Kurlp. Beller. frag. 'Ως ἐμφυτος μεν πάσιν ἀνθρώποις κάπη.

Dr. Whitby has here a very masterly annotation; in which though he fails of his purpose, and falls into not a few manifest errors, yet he, as usual, instructs his readers.

4. 5, 6. δε Θεος—Χριστός. The Apostle now returns from a somewhat long digression to the subject

* In which view Mr. Slade aptly cites the celebrated passage of Hooker, “I hold for a most infallible rule in expositions of sacred Scripture, that, where a literal construction will stand, the furthest from the letter is commonly the worst.
he was treating of at 1, 19.; and the sentiment which he there only obscurely touches on, he here clearly propounds: namely, that as God raised Christ from the dead, of his abundant mercy and goodness, so he will raise us up.

4. πλούσιος αὐτὸν ἐν ἐλέει answers to the Hebr. דָּבָר בַּי in Exod. 34, 6. "Η is for ἦν. And ημᾶς must here mean all men. Ἐλέει, "mercy and goodness." Καὶ is for κατέρ. Συνεκκοποίησε. The σὺν in these compounds signifies after the manner of. Or we may render: "as (he raised) Christ." (Koppe.) On the sense couched in these words there has been much debate. The antient Commentators, and many modern ones, take them in their literal acceptation, and regard the Aorists as used for Futurés, i. e. they suppose the thing in posse as being in esse. On the other hand, many recent Commentators, as Koppe and Rosenm., take the words in a metaphorical sense, as representing the felicity which Christians either now enjoy, or will enjoy; and they think the Apostle used a similitude derived from the resurrection of Christ (1, 20-), because in the future happiness of Christians that and the reigning with Christ will form a part; q. d. "as Christ, after an ignominious death, suffered for the expiation of our sins, was raised from the dead and glorified, so shall we, after the ignominious death brought on us by sin, obtain the glorious hope of immortality." This, however, seems a precarious interpretation. I prefer that of Whitby, which holds a middle course between the two preceding, namely: hath quickened us together with Christ, not only by giving us a new birth, or renovation of life, but an assurance also of eternal life: for because I live, saith Christ, you shall live also, Joh. 14, 19. we shall be saved by his life, Rom 5, 10." And he explains the συνεκκοπε and the συνεκκάθισεν thus: "hath raised us up together (not only by a spiritual conformity to his resurrection, Rom. 6, 5 & 11., but also by an assurance of a like resurrection, 1 Pet. 1, 3., he being risen as the first-
fruits, 1 Cor. 15, 20, and the first born from the dead, Col. 1, 18.), and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus (our Head thus raised and exalted, and thus ascended into heaven as our forerunner. Hebr. 6, 20. 10, 13 & 14.)."

Doddr. goes still further, and would understand the words as having reference to that union which there is between Christ and all true believers, by virtue of which they may look on his resurrection, ascension, and glory, as a pledge and security of something quite of a similar nature to be accomplished in due time in and upon them." But this seems fanciful.

To the reigning with Christ there is allusion in Matt. 19, 28. 20, 21. 1 Cor. 6, 2. 2 Tim. 2, 12., where see the notes. The τοῖς ἐπωραίοις is for τοῖς ψυχαῖς.

5. χάρις ἐστε σεσωσμένοι. In this parenthetical sentiment there is great spirit. Theophyl. remarks: Τούτω αὐτὸ ἐκπλήξεως ἐνιαύθες μέσων παρενέβαλε, θεομάλακα τὴν ἁφατον διαπέδω τοῦ Θεοῦ.

7. Ἰσα ἐνδείξει—ἐν Χ. 'Ι. The sense of these words will depend upon the construction, of which two modes have been proposed. Some recent Commentators refer ἐν χριστοτητι to what goes before, and take them for τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ καὶ χρηστοτητος; and at ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ, they subaud ὅντας. But this seems too violent. I see no reason to deviate from the more common construction, by which a comma is put after αὐτοῦ, and χρηστοτητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς are joined; ἐν Χριστῷ being taken as at ver. 6. The sense is thus elegantly expressed by Koppe: "ut, quàm sit benignus Deus, ipsis his per Christum paratis, nobisque oblatis beneficiis, aliquod insignie extaret."

By the αἰῶν ἐπερχομένων is meant, "all future ages, both in this world, and in the next." Irenæus p. 181. (cited by Bulkley) beautifully alludes to this passage thus: "Temporalia fecit (Deus) propter hominem, ut maturesscens in iis fructificet immorta-
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litate mi, et eterna superinducit propter suam benignitatem, ut ostendat seculis supervenientibus," &c.

8, 9. τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως. These verses contain a repetition and further development of the parenthetical sentence at ver. 5. χάριτι ἐστε σεσωμένοι. The ἐστε σεσωμένοι is in both places explained by the most judicious Commentators of the being put in the way, or into a state of salvation." See Bp. Tomline ap. D'Oyley.

Χάριτι, "by mere grace and favour." Διὰ τῆς πίστεως, "(obtained) by your reception of the faith in Jesus Christ." Καὶ τῶτο ὥστε ἔξ ὑμῶν. It has been much debated, both by antient and modern Commentators, whether the τῶτο should be referred to πίστεως or the σωθήναι διὰ τῆς πίστεως. The former mode is adopted by Beza, Pisc., Zanch., and indeed all the Calvinistic Commentators. And this is strenuously maintained by Doddr., who regards the clause as asserting the agency of divine grace in the production of faith, as well as in the constitution of the method of salvation by it. He urges that the neuter τῶτο may very well be referred to the preceding πίστις; and he appeals to several passages of Scripture and the Classical writers. But they are all of a different nature. Chrys. indeed took the τῶτο to relate to the πίστις; but he is very far from assigning the sense which Doddr. does. He observes, that as the Apostle used the διὰ τῆς πίστεως, to show the free agency of man, so he here points out that this very faith was produced by God, inasmuch as he supplied the occasion for it, by sending the Apostle to preach Christ to them. And so it has been explained by Hamm. and Mackn., the latter of whom refers to Phil. 1, 29. This, however, seems not very satisfactory. The τῶτο must rather mean (as many recent Commentators after Grot. explain) "that ye have this faith." And so Koppe and Rosenm. ; though they explain it of promptitude in receiving the doctrine of Christ. But this is wandering too far. Upon the whole, I see no
interpretation so little objectionable as that of Vorst., and of the recent Commentators, Dean Tucker and Bp. Trinum and D’Oyly and Slade, who refer the word to the whole of the preceding sentence, i.e. the being saved by the faith. So Tucker: “The assertion of the Apostle is plainly this, that salvation by grace is the gift of God: that it is not of ourselves, nor are we derived from any work of ours, lest any man should boast. This is the substance of the doctrine; and the original Greek can signify nothing else. But as it here is mentioned only as the means, or an instrument of obtaining the salvation here described.” As this interpretation has been by some rejected as a mere novelty, I am happy in being enabled to prove that it was adopted by some antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl. has the following explanation: ου γαρ εστιν λαγει δι' αυτον Θεου, αλλα σε αυτου τεσσαρεν, τοτε δοσιν εστι Θεος. “The grace of God is not given to men, that they might be justified by man; but if any man be justified, then is grace of God.”

The justification of the sinner was the sole object of pardon and reconciliation, in which he was to work out his final salvation, is entirely owing to the grace of God through faith. See Bp. Sherburne’s Sermon, Vol. 2. Disc. 6.

A chain of arguments. The best Commentators are agreed and so Theophyl. that God has here the same sense. Matthew’s readers: “so that no one may boast, is doing paraphrases Whitby) anything which might antecedently deserve, or make him meet to be accepted with, and made partaker of this saving grace.” See an excellent Sermon of Bp.
that," &c.; which, however, is little suitable. Doddridge's paraphrase is, as often, so proliss, and circuitous, that it might prove quidvis a quovis. It is rightly remarked by Theophyl. and Photius, that this was meant to check the opposite error, namely, of fancying that they could be saved by faith only. Thus there is a clause omitted, which may be supplied in the following manner: "Salvation (i.e. the being placed in a state of salvation) was the gift of God, not for any works that we had done, nor with a view to any that we might do. So that boasting is excluded. Do them, however, we must; for we are his workmanship," &c. The best antient and modern Commentators are agreed that by the ποίημα and the κτίσθα must be understood, not the natural and original creation, as men, but the figurative, spiritual creation, as Christians. And this indeed is apparent from what follows. The Commentators also notice a similar use of κτίσθα in Deut. 32, 6. Is. 43, 21. 44, 21., where the word is used of the favoured and elect people of God, the Israelites.

'Εσπερισμένον, as often in the Classical writers, with a dative denotes effect or purpose, as in ἐπὶ μεσθαὶ, ἐπὶ κέρδει, &c. The sense is: "we are regenerated in baptism, and are made Christians for the purpose of performing good works." So Theophyl.: ἐκτίσθης γὰς ἐν Χριστῷ Θεοῦ, καὶ νέων ποίημα ἐγένοι, ἀποδαώθης σοι τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι. Καὶ αὐτες ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ μηδοῦν ἔστι τὸ εἶναι παρθένος, οὕτω νῦν ἔστι τὸ εἶναι παρθένος. Καὶ ἐκτίσθης, οὐκ ἑαν ἄργος, ἀλλ' ἱνα ἑργάζῃ.

The words following seem added, to further explain the ἐσπερισμένον ποίημα κτισθέντες. And the construction is quite Hebraic. For in that language both the relative and antecedent are often used in conjunction, i.e. both the principal and the substitute. The sense is, "in which God hath prepared that we should walk or live." Προηγ. is said by the best Commentators to be put for προηγκαθεμένοι, προηγήθεναι; as at Rom. 9, 23. Koppe and Rosem. take it
simply to denote *willed, ordained*, like the Hebr. וּלַי in 2 Paral. 35, 6. 5, 11. But I see no reason to desert the more literal sense, which is well expressed by Grot. thus: "præparavit, tum præscribendo formam operum, tum dando spiritum qui ad optima quæque nos agat." Some Commentators render: "for which God hath before prepared us to walk." But this would require ἡμᾶς to be supplied, and would render ἐν αὐτοῖς useless.

Rosenm. observes, that in the words following, the Apostle mentions another benefit conferred on Gentiles and Jews by the doctrine of Christ, namely, that before the reception of Christianity the Jews and Gentiles were separated, and kept apart, the former hating the latter, and the latter despising the former; but now they are united into one society."

11. διὰ μηνυμωθετε. The Apostle concludes from what has been said that *all* true converts unto Christ owe thanks to God, but chiefly the Gentiles. (Rosenm.) He now reminds them of *what* possession they had been made equal inheritors, and how great was dignity; q. d. "Wherefore (that ye may understand the magnitude of the benefits ye have received, and the obligation ye are thereby laid under to do good works) remember, &c. At ἡμᾶς must be supplied, not δυτες (with Pisc. and our English Translators), but ἤσαν, were. 'Ἐν σαρκὶ is rendered by Koppe, Rosenm., and Mackn. *natalibus*, "by natural descent." Grot. and Est. render: "by carnal origin." 'Ακροβυστία *is for ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχουσιν, or ἀκροβυστοῖ* (Acts 11, 8.), abstract for concrete. See Rom. 1, 25—27. 8, 30, &c. The τὰ ἐν, ὑπερ, it may be observed, was the contemptuous appellation bestowed by the Jews on the Gentiles. Περιτομή is here, as often, for περιτεμομένοι. With respect to the terms ἐν σαρκὶ and χειροπονήτου, they are (as Grot. observes) very significant, since there is another circumcision of the heart and mind, which is ἀχειροποτότος. (Col. 2, 11.) Now this was made common both to the Jews and Gentiles.
12. ἢτι ἤτη—κόσμῳ. The ἢτι is resumptive; q. d. "Remember, I say, that," &c. Ἑως Χριστοῦ, "without any communion with Christ, or participation in the benefits of the Gospel;" the promises of the Messiah being to the Jews only. See Rom. 9, 4. "Now (the Apostle adds) ye, though heathens by birth, enjoy the benefits of the Messiah not less than those to whom he had been especially promised."

12. ἀπαλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἱσραήλ, "Then ye were," &c. The πολιτεία is used to denote divine as well as human government, i. e. ecclesiastical polity; as in 2 Macc. 4, 11, 8, 17. Now in this the Heathens could have no part. Compare Esth. 8, 8. Ἀνθρωπός is for ἀνθρώπος, alieni. So in Aristot. Pol. 2, 6, ἀνθρώποι, to which is opposed at ver. 19. συμπόλιται. The verb ἀπαλλαξ. is somewhat rare; but it is used by Polyb. and Joseph.

12. ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Here ξένοι is used metaphorically in the sense removed from, devoid of. This plural use of διαθήκη is only found in the later Jewish works (as Sapient. 18, 22. Sir. 44, 11. 2 Macc. 8, 15.). There is thought to be in it an allusion to the various periods at which the original covenant made with Abraham (Gen. 15.) was renewed with Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 17, 22, 26, 25.), and finally renewed with the whole people by Moses, and often repeated (Exod. 19, 20 & 24.). See Doddr. The word does indeed of itself imply a promise (see the note on Gal. 3, 15.), but that is here expressed by the addition of the words τῆς ἐκκλησίας, where the genitive has the force of an adjective. See Ps. 147, 20. (Koppe.)

12. ἐλεημονῆς μὴ ἔχων. Rosenm. unites this with the preceding words τῆς ἐκκλησίας. A method, however, which seems very harsh. Yet, I think, the ἐλεημονῆς must not be taken so generally, as many Commentators understand it. The Apostle means to say that they were out of covenant with God, and therefore destitute of any hope of pardon and acceptance from him. Theophyl. explains it τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀντι-
Doddr. rightly interprets it in a more general way, "having no well grounded hope of a future state and of retribution," &c. See his note, and compare 4, 18. and 1 Thess. 4, 18.

The καὶ is rendered by Koppe atque adeo. I should prefer ίμω; q. d. "nay, they were utterly destitute of any knowledge of God, and therefore, as they knew him not, so could they have no hope from him."

12. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. These words, upon the common interpretation, yield a very awkward sense. May they not mean at all? as in 1 Cor. 8, 4. οὐδὲν ἐβαλλον (ἐστι) ἐν κόσμῳ, nihil omnino, nothing in the world: for we have the idiom in our own language. Yet here there is no negative, and therefore the proof may seem precarious; I must, then, acquiesce in the sense laid down by some eminent Commentators, namely, "those who live in the world, and enjoy the bounties of its Creator, though without knowing, or acknowledging, or worshipping him." See Suic. Thes. 1, 109. That this was the case with the Heathens, some few excepted, no one versed in antient literature can doubt. And I entirely assent to Doddr., that "the Apostle would not have given to the Heathens the character of Atheists, if the worship of the one living and true God had really prevailed among them to that degree which some Christian divines have incautiously maintained that it did." The truth of the matter (as he observes) seems to have been, that though several of them speak of their Jupiter in terms properly applicable to the one self-existent and eternal Deity only, yet they taught and believed other things of him quite inconsistent with such perfections: and those who had some knowledge of one supreme, eternal Cause, yet practically disregarded him.

13. νῦν δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ υἱοὶ, οἱ πάντες ὄντες μακρὰν, ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ αἰωνίῳ τοῦ Χ. The νῦν δὲ answers to the πάντε at ver. 11. At ἐν Χριστῷ must be understood ὄντες, "being united in Christ in com-
mon with Christians; having become Christians." Others take ἐν Χριστῷ for διὰ Χριστοῦ, as Grot., Vatab., and Menoch. And this may possibly be the true sense. The phrases μακρὰν εἶναι and ἐγγὺς εἶναι answer to the בִּרְכָּתָם of the Hebrew writers, by which were figuratively denoted those that were worshippers of God, and near his presence, and those that neglected that worship, and were far removed from his favour. So Is. 57, 19: "Peace, peace to him that is far off, and to him that is nigh, saith the Lord." Numerous passages in proof and illustration of the sentiment are cited by Wets. and Schotttg.; as Vajikra, R. 14. meminimus nominis Dei S. B. qui fuimus longè remoti, et appropinquavimus ad ipsum, and Mechila, fol. 38, 12. R. Eliezer docuit Deum ad Mosen dixisse.—Tu quoque, si homo quispiam ad te venit, ut religionem Judaicam suscipiat—propinquum ipsum fac, et non remove. Thus ἕγιος ἐγενήθησε signifies, "have been brought near to his acceptance and favour." There is here, Whitby observes, an allusion to the Jewish custom of allowing different degrees of approach to the presence of God in his tabernacle or temple, according to the character of the worshipper. And he refers to Levit. 10, 3. Ps. 65, 4. 148, 14.

13. ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ is for διὰ τοῦ αἵματος, "by the sacrifice of the death of Christ." One cannot help observing how studiously the Apostle introduces, wherever it is possible, the important and fundamental doctrine of the atonement. See Gal. 3, 13 & 18, and the notes there.

14. αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ημῶν. It is plain that εἰρήνη is for ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην, as in the next verse. So the Jews call the Messiah by the name ἰᾶσις (peace). See the Rabbinical illustrations in Schöttg. and Wets.

14. ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν, καὶ τὸ μεσοτοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας. At ἀμφότερα must be understood μέρη, or γένη; and ἐν must be supplied σῶμα: both were common ellipses: and the sense is: "who hath
united both races or divisions of worshippers into one." With this union there seems to be conjoined a notion of the peace and amity which ought to subsist between the two parts. Thus Koppe thinks the expression equivalent to εἰρήνη του· εν ἄλληλοις at Ez. 37, 17. and ἀνασφαλείμαυσον at 1, 10. The Apostle further unfolds his meaning by the words following, καὶ τοὺς μεσότωχος των φραγμοῦ λύσας, where it is acknowledged there is an allusion to the middle or partition wall of the temple which separated the court of the Gentiles from that of the Jews, and into which it was death for any foreigner to enter. (See the writers on Antiq. and especially Wets.) The term μεσότωχος is very rare in the Classical writers. Wets. adduces one example from Athen. p. 281 ν. ἡ γε καί τοῦτον πεφάρακα τὸν τῆς ἤδων καὶ ἄρετῆς με- σοτωχὸν διαφόρτωται. The genitive των φραγμων is (by a Hebraism) put for the cognate participle or adjective διαφαέσσων, scil. ἡμᾶς ἄλλων ἔθνων. And λύσας is for κατέλυσας, destroying; as often. It is plain that by the μεσότωχος the Apostle means the ritual law, which had been intended to keep the chosen people of God separate from the Heathens; but which necessarily produced that irreconcilable enmity to which the Apostle proceeds to advert.

15. τὴν ἐκδόμῳ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ—καταρρίφας. Since νῦν immediately follows in opposition with ἐκδόμος, that must plainly be taken to denote the cause of the enmity. And such the law was, since it generated an anti-social and haughty spirit on the part of the Jews, which was amply returned by hatred and contempt on the part of the Gentiles. See Mackn.

15. ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ does not merely mean ἐν κατα- τῷ (as Koppe explains), but, "by the sacrifice (for σαρκὶ has evidently an allusion to the flesh of victims offered on the altar) of his flesh," i. e. his body on the cross. Των νῦν; &c., which is in apposition with ἐκδόμος, may be rendered "even the law," &c. Now the law is here accompanied with certain adjuncts which suggest the reason why the separation was
kept up, namely, the ἀνωτέρω and the ἑγεμονία, in which Koppe observes there is no discrimination of sense to be aimed at. Perhaps, however, there may be an hendiadis, and ἑγεμονία may refer to the traditions. Thus Wets. explains: multitudinem praecipitium et traditionum.” Καταργηθεὶς, “having annulled, abrogated.” Such is the peculiar use of the word. It is strange that some antient and modern Commentators should have interpreted ἐν ἑγεμονίᾳ “by the Christian doctrine. To this the term is now where applied, and that sense would require the addition of other words. Besides, the notion is refuted by the parallel passages of Col. 2, 14 & 20.

15. Ινα τοὺς δύο κτισθὲν ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἑνα καὶδυν ἄνθρω-
πος. These words further unfold the nature and the purpose of the abrogation of the law; namely, to unite the two kinds of men (for such is the sense of τούς δύο, scil. ἄνθρωπους; as before, τοὺς ἄμφοτέρους), and in order that the conjoint race should be a new and ameliorated one.* Now this union implies a removal of enmity, and causes of enmity. Κτισθε, “might form;” as supra ver. 10. Ἐν ἑαυτῷ, “by his means,” namely, that of his death and sacrifice.” So ἐν τῇ σαρκί ἑαυτῷ a little before.

16. καὶ ἀνακαταλαβῇ τοὺς ἄμφοτέρους. Koppe takes ἀνακαταλαβὲν for καταλάβαν. But ἀνακαταλαβὲν seems more significant; for, as Theophyl. observes, by the first covenant of the law there was a reconciliation of man to God, and therefore the repeated and final reconciliation is called a ἀνακαταλαβείτο. Ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι is for eis ἐν σώμα, “in one body,” i. e. society, the mystical body of Christ. So Grot., Rosenm., and

* So Theophyl.: Οὗ τὸν Ἑλληνα ἐποίησεν Ἰουδαίον, ἀλλ' ἄμφο-
τέρους εἰς συνῆθεν καταλαβαίνειν ἀνήγαγεν. And a little further on: καὶ τὸν Ἰουδαίον καὶ τὸν ἔθνικὸν ἄναγκεισα, ἦνα ἄνθρωπον καὶ συνῆθεν καὶ συνήγαγεν καὶ συνῆθεν. And again: καὶ ἐν ἔναν τὸν Ἰουδαίον κατατέθηκεν, καὶ κατέθετον τὸν Ἑλληνα, καὶ ἔσχισεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἄλλοτρον ἄμφοτέρως, ἀνέθετον διὰ πνεύμα καὶ θάνατος. And again: ἔσχισεν τὸν ἔθνος τοῦ άλλοτρίου, τὸν Ἱερουσαλημ. τὸν Ἰουδαίον ἄμφοτέρως ἐν τούτῳ κατατέθηκεν.
Mackn. But perhaps there is no reason to desert the method of the antient Commentators and some modern ones, (and recently Koppe,) who take ἐν ἐν σῶματι for ἐν ἑαυτῷ μόνῳ, since one Saviour only was requisite for both Jews and Gentiles.

16. διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, "by means of crucifixion;" as Col. 1, 20. Ἀποκείμενα τὴν ἐξήραν ἐν αὐτῷ must have the same sense as the τὴν ἐξήραν ἐν τῷ σαφεὶ αὐτῷ καταργήσας. The metaphor is somewhat harsh; yet it is significant.* It seems to have been suggested by the ideas respecting the death and sacrifice of Christ with which his mind was filled. Yet there is, as Koppe observes, an allusion to that metaphor by which laws, when abrogated or antiquated, are said to be dead. Ἐν αὐτῷ is referred to by the Syr. Translator, Rosenm., Koppe, and Slade, to σταυρῷ. But this seems harsh. It must rather (I conceive, with almost all Commentators) be referred to Christ. It appears to have been added, to explain the ἐν ἐν σῶματι, to which it corresponds by a sort of parallelism. And it is in vain for Koppe to urge that that sense would require αὐτῷ; for such is the reading of some MSS., though, indeed, in minutiae of this kind, MSS. are of no authority, and we must be guided solely by the propriety of language, and the context.

The reconciliation (Mackn. observes) described in this verse, being the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles to God, the enmity here said to have been slain, is that which subsisted between God and them, through the corruption of their nature.

To the question, how Christ by his death abrogated the Mosaic Law, Rosenm. answers: "The death of Christ is considered as a sacrifice for the sins of men, therefore the Mosaic expiations are now superfluous; and thus a great part of the ceremonial law is annulled. The Gentiles, therefore, being no

* So Theophyl. : ἐν ἐν, λίσας, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐμφαντικῶτερον, ἀποκείμενα, ὅσον μητέρα αὐτὴν ἀναστήναι. Πῶς δὲν ἀνίσταται ἔτεραν δὲ τίκτομεν ἥμεις αὕτης ἀμαρτάνοντες.
longer bound to subject themselves to the Mosaic Law, now hesitate not to unite with the Jews. After the death of Christ the Christian doctrine was every where propagated. Now a communion of religion could not have place, unless by the removal of the impediment in circumcision and the whole Mosaic Law. This impediment the death of Christ was to remove, and did remove."

17. καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐγγελίσατο εἰρήνη ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἐγγώ, "and then having come," &c. This is said to be redundant, like προευθυνθ., and other such words. But it may rather (I think) be called a vestige of Oriental and primitive simplicity of diction.

As Christ did not himself preach this peace to the Gentiles, most Critics take εὐγγέλ. for παραγγέλει εὐγγελίζεσθαι, as we find he did, by Matt. 28, 19. Acts 1, 8. So Acts 10, 46. εὐγγελίζωνες εἰρήνη διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Yet it may be rendered, with others, "he brought good tidings of peace," or, (which I should prefer,) "promulgated a doctrine which brought peace," &c. By εἰρήνη must be understood, a mode of being reconciled to God, and attaining that peace with God which passeth all understanding. So Theophyl.: εἰρήνην, πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν δηλαδή. The form is said to have been taken from Is. 57.

18. τί δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν—πατέρα. Koppe would take the δι' in the sense quod, namely that, uniting these words closely with the preceding. This, however, seems harsh. I would retain the common punctuation and interpretation, "For by him." The αὐτοῦ seems emphatic, i. e. "by him as one and only."

тельный τὴν προσαγωγὴν, "we have our introduction." Such is (I conceive) the force of the article. Οἱ ἄμφοτέροι, "both of us," i. e. Jews and Gentiles. Ἐν ἐνί πνεύματι: the antient Commentators, and most modern ones, take to mean, "by the aids of one Spirit," i. e. the Holy Spirit. And this is assuredly one of the offices of the Holy Spirit; and, as Grot. observes, those who have received the Holy Spirit,
are certain that they are the children of God, and therefore do with confidence address God as their Father, Rom. 8, 15. Gal. 4, 65. Most recent Commentators, however, take it to mean no more than ἡμεῖς καὶ πάροικοι; and this, considering the separation in religious worship which had subsisted, will yield a very good sense; and perhaps the true one. In προσαγωγή it is well known there is allusion to the custom of introduction at courts.

19. ἡμεῖς καὶ πάροικοι. Compare ver. 12., in which the contrary is asserted. "Ἀρα ὡς, "now then." Εἶναι and πάροικοι are nearly synonymous; though with this difference, that Εἶναι (as Koppe observes) is properly used of a city or country; and πάροικος, of a family; the former denoting peregrinus; the latter, hospes. Yet the Sept. express the Hebr. יְהָרָע by both; as in Job. 31, 32. Gen. 28, 4. That the Apostle meant the words to be taken in this their proper sense is (I think) clear from what follows, which is exegetical. Schleus., however, thinks that there is an allusion to the three orders of Grecian inhabitants, the πολίται, the πάροικοι, and the Εἶναι. But those of the second class were called ἑτοικος, as often in Thucyd. and the best writers. There should rather seem to be (as Doddr. thinks) an allusion to the sojourning strangers among the Jews, who are by some called proselytes of the gate. The word συμπολίται, fellow-citizens, is said by the Greek Grammarians to be never used by the Classical writers. Yet examples have been adduced from Ἀelian and Josephus, and the derivatives from Polyb., Xen., and Isocr.

19. τῶν ἐγγον ἐν synonymous with the ἔν τῷ Ἑως, λαῖν Ἑως, κληρονομία Ἑως. 19. οἰκία τοῦ Ἑως, "of the household of God." As, however, ὕπος signifies both a house and a family, so Koppe thinks there is here a dilogia. At all events, this supplied occasion to the Apostle to leave the idea of a family, and, confining himself to that of a house, to enlarge on that notion in a metaphorical
passage of great beauty, in which he is thought to have had reference to the celebrated temple of Diana. *

20. ἐποιεόμεθεν—Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Here the metaphor is fully developed. Ἐποι. is not, I think (as Koppe supposes), for οἰκο., but is a stronger term. Koppe explains θεμέλιον τῶν Ἀποστόλων, "the foundations laid by the Apostles." But this involves great incongruity. The Apostles themselves are considered as the foundation; as Apoc. 21, 14. Προφητεύω is by some Commentators taken to denote the Prophets of the Old Testament, who were heralds of the Gospel. And so the antient Commentators, and many modern ones, as Est., Vorstius, Zanch, our English Translators, Whitby, &c. Yet not a few eminent moderns, as Grotius, Crel., Barrington, Haman., Hardy, and Mackn., and almost all recent ones, as Rosenm., Koppe, and Slade, not seeing how the Old Testament Prophets can form part of the Christian edifice, and especially as those προφητ. are put after the Apostles, take it to mean the superior Christian teachers, so called, and mentioned in 1 Cor. 12, 28 & 29. infra 3, 5. and 4, 11. Doddridge, however, strenuously maintains the former interpre-

* I may here be permitted to introduce a passage on this subject from a Sermon preached by me some years ago at the Primary Visitation of the late Bishop of Peterborough. "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 allusion to that temple which was the glory of their city. 'Ye are built,' says he, 'upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in which all the building, fitly framed, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.' And he adds, ἵνα ἐφικτισμένοι (and, mark well the next word,) καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι en ἀγαπῇ. And again, in the next chapter, do we not read 'He gave some Apostles, some Prophets for the building of the body of Christ;' and, 'that speaking the truth in love, we may grow up unto Him in all things who is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working, in the increase of the body, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ en ἀγαπῇ. In this sentence we have an accumulation of architectural terms."
tation. And he is so far right, that the Apostle intends here, not the Church of Ephesus, but the Church in general; yet he does not successfully establish the interpretation for which he contends. See Koppe’s third Excurs. on this Epistle. Certain it is, that some of the antient Interpreters took it of the Prophets of the New Testament.

20. ἐντος ἀκρογονίας αὐτοῦ Ἰ. Χ. At ἀκρογ. must be understood λίθος. The expression answers to the Hebr. ים בנים. Thus the Messiah is called in Matt. 21, 42. κεφαλὴ γυνίας, ים בנים, from Ps. 118, 31. It signified a large and massive stone, so formed as, when placed at a corner, to bind together two outer walls of an edifice. Now this properly makes no part of the foundation, from which it is distinguished at Jer. 51, 26.; though, as the edifice rests upon it, it may be so called. Sometimes it denoted those massive slabs, which, being placed towards the bottom of any wall, serve to bind the work together; as in Is. 28, 16. where this very word occurs. Of these there were often two layers without cement or mortar.* I cannot but assent to the antient and many modern Commentators (though the opinion is scouted by most recent ones), that as the ἀκρογ. bound the two walls of a building firmly together, so the Apostle here intends to represent Christ as binding together the Jews and Gentiles into one religious society. So Chrys., Theoph., Æcumen., Theodore, and, before them, Epiph. de Hæres. 324. (cited by Soz. Thes. T. 1, 17.) ἰδί τῷ ἐπισφιγγέας περιτομῆν τε καὶ ἀκροβυστιᾶν ὁς μίαν ἐνώσιν. This is, moreover, required by the term συναρμολογημένη in the following verse; and, above all, it is confirmed by the preceding verses 14—18. where the Apostle touches on union of

* On this subject the most important passage I know is Thucyd. 1, 93. δύο γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐναντίας ἀλλήλαις τοὺς λίθους ἐπέγραψεν ἐντὸς ἐντὸς δὲ οὕτω χάλικα, οὕτω πηλεὶ ἡ, ἀλλὰ ἐνυποδομημένων μέγαλως λίθοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἑγγύσισι, συστήρα πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὰ ἔνωθεν καὶ μολέσθω ἐνεσκέπασι, where I shall have several other illustrations of the subject, which will gratify the Antiquary.
Jews and Gentiles, and which he seems still to have had in mind.

21. ἐν ὅ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὐξεὶ εἰς πᾶν ἁγιόν ἐν Κυρίῳ. The ἐν is rendered by Koppe super. I prefer, with Vatab., Menoch., and Grot., "per quem;" the particle having not unfrequently the sense by (from the Hebr. עוֹ). It is rightly remarked by Koppe, that οἰκοδομή here denotes, not edifice, but the work that is building, ἰσορροποιομένη, "fitly conjoined." Schleus. Lex. tells us that the verb is properly used of carpenter's work, in which beams and planks are fitly united together by what is called dovetailing, so as to form an ἀργυρος, or compages. I can, however, find no example of that use, the term being always applied to mason's work; as indeed the λογίων would suggest. So Anthol. S, 32, 4. (cited by Wets.) ἱμαλάγης τάφων: and ἀρμολακίων, Sir. 27, 2. The sense is: "by this corner stone (even Christ) all the parts of the edifice, fitly compounded together, (i.e. both Jews and Gentiles closely brought into one society), riseth into an holy temple." The συναρμ., however, seems to refer not to the union of Jews and Gentiles only, but to the various orders and degrees in the Christian Church, Apostles, Prophets, &c. For, as is well observed by Grot., "there are in the Church, and have ever been, various degrees through which (as in the human body is the case with the head and heart in respect to the arteries and veins, muscles, and nerves,) the Spirit of God flows even to the most minute parts."

"Αὐξεὶ, crescit, assurgit: a metaphor, Grot. and Koppe observe, taken from animal and vegetable growth, to denote edificial increase. It is probably a sort of Hebraism; or was suggested by the ideas of a body and of a building being still in the Apostle's mind."

* Yet something like it may be found in Thucyd. 2, 75. ἄρετο δὲ τὸ ὕψος τοῦ ῥεῖχος μέγα, καὶ τὸ χῶμα οὐ φυλαλοὶ τερον ἀντανηθεὶς αὐτῷ, for ἀναπληραφεῖν, which Dio. Cass. substituted for it in a passage evidently imitated from this in p. 333, 44. Edit. Reimar.

VOL. VII.
En Κυρίῳ is by Koppe and Rosenm. united with ἁγιον, and taken for ἁγιὸς Κυρίῳ, or Κυρίῳ, “holy to the Lord;” as Tit. 3, 5. ἔργον τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Yet I am inclined to think, with Beza and Grot., that the antecedent is expressed (after the manner of the Hebrew), though the relative had preceded. It is, however, added for greater perspicuity, to show to what the ἐν ὑμῖν is to be referred.

22. ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικεῖσθαι τῷ Θεῷ ἐν πνεύματι. The Apostle now applies this to the Ephesians particularly.

Some, as Zanch, Grot., Schleus.; and Koppe, refer the ἐν ὑμῖν to Christ, the corner-stone. Menoch., Rosenm., and Mackn., think that it relates to the temple: a mode of interpretation confirmed and illustrated by another example of this rare word, which I find in Thucyd. 1, 93., where, speaking of the building of the walls of Athens, he says: ἐνυπόκτω καὶ μεγάλοι λίθοι καὶ ἐν τοίῃ ἐγγύῃ. And such, I conceive, is the true sense. The Apostle (I think) means that in the general Church of God they, (i.e. the Ephesian Church,) are built in, and form a part of; as one of the numerous small chapels, or sacellae which are found in the magnificent Gothic cathedrals of ancient times, especially the Sancta Sophia at Constantinople. And this seems alluded to in κατοικεῖσθαι, which is generally used of a small building, or tabernacle; as in Exod. 15 & 33.

22. ἐν πνεύματι is taken by most recent Commentators as an adjectival phrase for πνευματικόν; which opinion is noticed by Theophyl. and Cæcumen. There is meant (they say) a tacit contrast between this spiritual temple and that of Jerusalem, the χαρακτήρ. But I see no reason to desert the interpretation of Chrys. and most other antient and modern Commentators, who by πνεῦμα understand the Holy Spirit, i.e. for διὰ πνεύματος, by means of the Holy Spirit; since (as Grot. observes) God is said to dwell both with individuals and Christian societies by the Holy Spirit. See 1 Cor. 3, 16 & 17. 6,
19. 2 Cor. 6, 16. And this seems the more proper, when we consider the spiritual gifts vouchsafed. Grot. here aptly compares Philo De præmiis: καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ τῷ ὑστὶ βασιλείας καὶ οἴκος Θεοῦ, σῶφος διανοία. To which I add Plut. Dionys. ψυχῆς τῷ βασιλείαν ἀξιοῦντα κεκοσμεμένον.

CHAP. III.

Verse 1. τοῦτον χάριν ἐγώ Παῦλος ο νέος τοῦ Χ. 'I. There are few passages in the New Testament of which the construction has been more debated than the present. It is obvious that after έλθων there appears an abruptness, and something seems wanting. This deficiency the Commentators endeavour to supply in various ways. Many antient (as Chrys., Theodoret, and the Syr. Translator) and modern Commentators, as Whitby, Dodd., and Wolf, and especially the recent Interpreters, as Mackn, Koppe, and Rosenm., suppose an ellipsis of the verb substantive εἶμι (than which nothing can be more frequent), and they remove the comma which is usually placed after Παῦλος. But this method, simple as it may appear, is liable to various objections, which have been ably stated by Bp. Middleton. It requires an unprecedented sense to be ascribed to the article, and for that and many other reasons adduced by the learned Prelate (whom see), this ellipsis of εἶμι cannot (I think) be here admitted. It involves (I conceive), upon the whole, far less difficulty to suppose, with very many modern Commentators, that ver. 1—14. are parenthetical, and that at ver. 14. the thread of the reasoning is resumed, per epanalepsin. Thus, I conceive, the argumentation will be found not less conclusive.* Others would

* It is thus stated by Bp. Middleton: "For this cause I am the prisoner of Jesus Christ, for, or since indeed (εἰπὲ affirmatively, sinee, siquidem, see note Acts 16, 15.), ye cannot but have heard of my divine commission, and of the nature of the doctrine which I am commanded to teach (ver. 9—13.), for this cause (τοῦτον χάριν το-
extend the parenthesis to the end of the Chapter. But this seems incurring an unnecessary harshness.

Theophyl. here (from Chrys.) remarks: Εἰτάν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν περὶ ἡμᾶς θερμαίαν, ἐξεβαινει* λοιπὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ· καὶ ἐπειδὴ, φησίν, ὅ δεσπότης μοι τοιαῦτα ἐπεδείξατο εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἀνάγκη καθὲ τὰ κατὰ δύναμιν εἰσε-νεγκεῖν.

1. ο δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Commentators are agreed, is for διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "one who is in bonds for Jesus Christ's sake and his religion." The words following ἐπὶ ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν signify, "and especially on behalf of you Gentiles;" since the persecutions the Apostle suffered were usually raised by the Jews, because he preached salvation to the Gentiles; and at all times it was suffered for the good of the Gentiles: all which is apparent from the Acts of the Apostles.

2. εἶγε ἡκούσατε. The εἶγε is rendered si modo, or quandoquidem, which comes to much the same thing. The sense is, "If (as ye know), seeing that (as ye know)," &c. It is truly observed by Mr. Slade, that εἶγε does not always imply a doubtful condition, but sometimes an affirmation, since, seeing, that, ch. 4, 21. It seems (he adds) to have the force of the Latin si, when used with an indicative. Si potuit manes arcessere conjurgiis Orpheus, Aen. 6, 119. "If Orpheus could (as doubtless he did)," &c. And thus siquidem. The ἡκούσατε is rendered, by Rosenm. and others, rightly comprehend, understand. At all events, there is no reason to infer from hence that the Epistle was not written to the Ephesians.

2. τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δοσείσις μοι εἰς ἡμᾶς. By the οἰκονομία τῆς χάριτος, most Commentators understand the office of his Apostleship,

peated ver. 14—19.) I pray to God, who has been thus merciful in calling you, that ye may be strengthened with might by his Spirit (ver. 16.), that so Christ may dwell in your hearts."

* I would read ἐξεβαινει, which is sufficiently confirmed by Thucyd. 1, 97. τὴν ἐξολοθρίαν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιήσαμεν, besides a great number of parallel passages which I must reserve for another occasion.
Rosenm. however, is of opinion, that ἐκκομμία has reference to the assigning of parts, as the steward allots to the different members of a family their respective offices. And he renders: “this part of the Ἀποστολη,” namely, to the Gentiles. Χάρις here undoubtedly signifies Apostleship. The complete phrase occurs in Rom. 1, 5. χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν, i.e. χάριν ἀποστολήν. See the note there. The εἰς ὑμᾶς Koppe and Rosenm. consider as equivalent to the Heb. דָּבָר יִשָּׁר, “for your sake and benefit.” And so Dodd. and Mackn.

3. ὡς κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη, scil. ὁ Θεὸς, or ὁ Χριστός, “namely, that God communicated it to me by (special) revelation.” Several MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Commentators, have ἐγνωρίσθη, which is received by Griesbach; but (I think) on insufficient grounds; since (as Koppe remarks) the common reading is the more difficult, and has not the appearance of a mere error of a scribe.

Κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν is for ἐν ἀποκάλυψις. This has reference not only to the personal revelation of the Lord recorded at Acts 9 & 26., but the many subsequent ones mentioned at 2 Cor. 12, 1 & 7. See also 1 Cor. 14, 26., and Gal. 1, 12., and the note. In Sir. 22, 24. and Rom. 16, 25. we have the similar phrase κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου.

The words καθὼς—Χριστοῦ are, by Wets., Koppe, and Griesb., thrown into a parenthesis: which somewhat clears the sense. Καθὼς is, by Koppe, taken for περὶ δι, and τὸ γιὰ τὸ αὐτὸ. The latter is not very necessary. As to καθὼς, it is used for a relative, by a sort of popular idiom common in our own language in as for which. Ὡς the Classical writers not unfrequently use for a relative. So Thucyd. 1, 1. ἠγείραμεν τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, ὡς ἐπιλείψαντο πρὸς ἄλλους, besides many other passages which I could cite, but which I shall reserve for another occasion.

The προέγραψα refers to what just preceded, 1 seq., and also 2, 11—22. The μυστηρίου is supposed, by
many Commentators, to be that of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ. But I rather assent to others, that it signifies the whole doctrine of the Gospel, of which that formed a primary part.

At ἐν ὅλως may either be supplied χρόνος, or ἁγιως, or μέρι. Both methods may be defended by the usus loquendi, and are almost equally suitable.

4. πρὸς ὅ δύνασθε ἀναγνωσκόντες νοσαί τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The πρὸς ὅ is, by Koppe, taken for ἐν ὅ, whereby. And he compares Hierocl. Carm. Aur. Pyth. p. 53. πρὸς ταῦτα ἀπειθούντες γανεῶσα, πρὸς ὅ καὶ αὐτῶ τοῖς βεβείοις νόμοις αὐτὸ πειθόται. Yet he rightly thinks the πρὸς ὅ may be resolved into δὲ ἀναγνωσκόντες δύνασθε νοσαί πρὸς αὐτῶ.

Ἀναγνώσκει implies attention as well as reading. Σύνεσίς signifies knowledge of every kind, both natural, (what we familiarly call mother wit), and, as here, acquired. By the mystery of Christ must here be meant the great, though formerly hidden, truth of the salvation of all men by Christ and his religion.

5. ὅ ἐν ἑτέραις γενεάις οὐκ ἐγνωρισθη—Πνεύματι, "which in other generations or ages (ὥριον) was not made known to the sons of men," i.e. to men, by a Hebraism. See Joel 1, 8.

Ὡς ὑμῶν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς νοίοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Koppe thinks that ὡς is for ὅ, or περὶ ὅ. I cannot, however, agree with him. It must here have (as Beza and Vorst. remark) its usual sense sicut, which signifies "in the same manner as," i.e. with the same clearness as, &c. For the great truth of the salvation of all men by Christ, had, indeed, been revealed afore-time, though by no means so clearly as by the Apostles, and (as T. Aquin. and Est. observe) not with its particulars and determinate circumstances, in respect to time, place, persons, &c., but sub velaminem. The prophecies of Isaiah (which are the most direct) were extremely obscure, and all the prophecies were expressed in very general terms, and quite enigmatical, before the event. Thus the doctrine
was comparatively unknown. Here, however, as Doddr. and Rosenm. remark, there is especial reference to the doctrine of the Gentiles being received into covenant on an equal footing with the Jews. It was, indeed (as Whitby and Doddr. observe), known long before that the Gentiles should be added to the Church; but it was not known that they should be heirs of the same inheritance, and partakers of the promise of the Spirit. The Jews rather thought of their being slaves to them; and least of all did they imagine that the middle wall of their ceremonies should be broken down, and the Gentiles admitted to the full privileges of God's people, without circumcision and obedience to the Mosaic law; which the Christian converts among them heard of at first with great amazement. (Acts 10, 45. 11, 18.)

5. ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις καὶ προφήταις Π. ἀ. The ἀπεκαλ. seems to suggest the idea of such kind of knowledge as in the ordinary course of nature could not be obtained, but required the intervention of Divine assistance. Yet it does not necessarily imply complete knowledge, but only such a degree of it as the revealer, in his wisdom, may see fit to grant. "Ἁγιοι is an epithet appropriate to both Apostles and Prophets, and sometimes applied to Angels. By the προφήτης must (as almost all Commentators are agreed) be meant the Prophets of the New Testament, namely, inspired teachers of the highest class; which confirms the interpretation of the word supra 2, 20., where see the note. ἐν πνεύματι, "by (like the Heb. ἐκ) the Holy Spirit," διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. From this and other passages, it may be inferred that there were in Christian teachers different degrees of divine knowledge; and I would add that this is certain from the celebrated chapters of 1 Corinth. on the spiritual gifts. It is also remarked by Koppe, that this high doctrine of the Gentiles being put on an equal footing with the Jews, seems to have been not known even
to all the Apostles up to a certain period; to Peter it was communicated first, (at the conversion of Cornelius), and then to the others, at various times and with various degrees of clearness.

6. εἶναι τὰ ἑβα—Χριστός, "namely, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs," &c. The adjective συγκληρονόμος is somewhat rare, as is also συμμετόχος and σύσσωμες, what scarcely occurs elsewhere. Koppe maintains that the ἐπαγγελίας belongs only to συμμετόχος. But it may be said to belong to all those adjectives; though it cannot well apply to σύσσωμες, which is inserted, as Theophyl. remarks, ἵνα δηλώσῃ τὴν πολλὴν ἔγγυτην καὶ ἑνωσίν, for the sake of indicating close union. In συγκληρονόμῳ there is the usual figure by which the possession of eternal life is called an inheritance; it being put (as in 1, 14. Acts 2, 32. and Col. 3, 14.) simply for eternal felicity. Σύσσωμα answers to the Latin incorpor. (See Steph. Thes. Nov. Edit.), and signifies members of the same Church. Συμμετόχος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, "joint partakers of his promise (of eternal felicity) by Christ." It is observed by Koppe and Rosenm., that epithets and synonyms are here accumulated, to show that there is no difference whatever between the Jews and Gentiles. The terms, however, are not quite synonymous.

6. διὰ τοῦ ἐπαγγελίου, "through the instrumentality of the Gospel."

7. οὗ ἐγενόμην διάκονος, &c., "of whom I was constituted a minister." Koppe observes that the term διάκονος is used, in a general sense, of the Apostles and any teachers of religion. Compare 1 Cor. 3, 5. 2 Cor. 6, 4. 11, 23. The expression διάκονος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, however, only occurs once besides the present passage, namely, in Col. 1, 23.; yet similar forms are found in 2 Cor. 3, 6. 11, 15. Gal. 2, 17.

7. κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν—αὐτοῦ, "by the gift of the grace of God imparted to me by the energy of the power," i.e. by his powerful energy. Κατὰ τὴν δωρεάν τῆς χάριτος, "by the gracious, free, and un-
merited gift;" the genitive substantive being for the adjective. Or χάρις may, as Whitby thinks, denote the Apostleship, and, I would add, with all its accompanying supernatural χαράματα. 'Ενεργεία is, as usual, rendered by Mackn., inworking. But this, though it seems to be the most literal, is, in fact, not the real sense. The εν does not refer to the object on which the work is employed, but rather implies that the faculty to produce it is in the agent. It therefore denotes ability, efficacy for any purpose. And thus κατὰ τὴν ενεργείαν τῆς δύναμεος signifies "by the efficacy of his power," i.e. by his powerful efficacy. So Phil. 3, 21. κατὰ τὴν ενεργείαν τοῦ δύνασθαι. Nor is this a mere Hebraism: for so Galen. (cited by Wets.) εξ ἐκείνου γὰρ καὶ μάλλον δεδομένα τὸ φάρμακον, καὶ εἰς τὸ φανερὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡ δύναμις τῆς ενεργείας ἐξήλθε. Theophyl., applying this to the Ministers of the Gospel in general, has the following admirable observation. Τρία γὰρ ημᾶς δεῖ συνεισφέρειν εἰς τὴν διακονίαν, νομίμων ψυχικῶν, σωφρινωθείς, καὶ σύνεσιν, καὶ βίον ἱληκτόν τῶν γὰρ Θεοῦ δύναμιν διδόναι, δι' ἑαυτὰ πάντα ἐμπρακτά ἔσται. 8. ἐμοὶ τῶν ἐλαχιστότερων πάντων τῶν ἁγίων δεδομῆ ἡ χάρις αὕτη, "To me (I say) who am incomparably the least of all the saints." Such is (I think) the most accurate representation of the sense of this peculiar term ἐλαχιστότερος, which is a comparative formed on a superlative; many examples of which idiom are adduced by Wets.; as πρωτοτόκως, καλλιμάχοτος, ἐσχατότατος, μείζότερος, and, to omit many others, ἐλαχιστότατος from Sext. Emp. p. 627. By the τῶν ἁγίων Rosenm. and Koppe understand, not all the Christians, but only the Apostles and Prophets mentioned at ver. 5. And so in a very similar passage of 1 Cor. 15, 9. But I do not see how the words of the present passage will admit of such a sense, to which, indeed, it is not necessary to resort; nor is it proper to press upon an expression like this. The Apostle only seems to mean that he was, of all Christians, the least worthy of that supernatural call
and divine illumination which had been vouchsafed. And, considering how exceedingly bitter persecutor he had been of the Church, a blasphemer of Christ, and injurious to his religion, he was, humanly speaking, the least worthy to have been so wonderfully called.

The Infinitive εὐαγγελισθαι depends upon ἀντὶ or εἰς τὰ, "for the purpose of making known the glad tidings," synonymous with κηρύσσειν and διδάσκειν. See the note on Gal. 1, 8. Ἀνεξιχνιαστων πλούτων τῶν Χ., "the unsearchable and inconceivable riches of the grace of Christ;" for we have the full phrase at 1, 7. and 2, 7. On ἀνεξιχνιαστων see the note on Rom. 11, 23. There seems, in the present application of the word, to be an imitation of the Orat. Manass. ver. 6. Ἀνεξιχνιαστων τὸ ἐλεος. Yet there is also a reference to the μυστήριον mentioned both before and after.

9. καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας τίς—Χριστοῦ. Here we have the same sentiment, though further developed. Compare Col. 1, 23. The term φωτίζω has, I think, a stronger sense than διδάσκω. So Ignat. and Rom. (cited by Grot.) περισεμένη ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ. By πάντας is meant, all men, whether Jews or Gentiles.

For the κωνονία of the common Editions, almost all Critics are agreed, ought to be read οἰκονομία, from the greatest part of the MSS., Versions, Fathers, &c. Κωνονία is supposed to be a mere error of the scribes. See Koppe. On the other hand, Mackn. thinks that the transcribers of this Epistle, not observing that the Apostle was contrasting the discoveries made in the Gospel with the discoveries in the Heathen mysteries, and the Christian Church with the Heathen fellowships, were at a loss to know what he meant by the fellowship of the mystery; and substituted the word dispensation in its place." Οἰκονομία is either redundant, like the Latin ratio, or else it signifies method, plan, nature, &c. Μυστήριον, as before, must chiefly relate to that part of the Gospel long kept secret, respecting the admission of the Gentiles to the same favour with the Jews.
9. ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων is said, by Koppe and Rosenm., to be for ἐκ τ. ἀ. But the ἀπὸ is so used in ἀπὸ ἀρχής. This is very erroneously rendered by some, as Mack., "hidden from?" which is contrary to the usuol locundii. The sense is, *for ages, for eternal ages. Ἑν τῷ Θεῷ, "apud Deum."

9. τῷ τὰ πάντα κτάσει διὰ 'Ἰ. Χ. The later Commentators, from the time of Locke (as formerly Vorst., Zanch, and Grot.), suppose this to signify the *new creation by the Gospel*. The antient Commentators, and most modern ones, take it in its physical sense: and they refer for examples to supra 2, 10 & 15. infra 4, 24. compared with Col. 4, 10. And this seems to be the best-founded interpretation: but I see no reason why both senses may not have been intended; and to both the πάντα may be applied. So Wells and Doddr.

Τῷ is used as at 1, 18 & 19., where see the note.

10. ἵνα γνωρίσητε—σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ. "Ina is rightly considered, by some antient and modern Commentators, as having here (as often) the *eventual* sense, "so that, to the end that to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly places," i.e. in heaven. By the ἄρχαι καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις are denoted archangels and angels of the highest rank in heaven. On ἄρχαι and ἐξουσία see the notes on 1, 3, 10 & 20. Koppe understands by ἄρχαι and ἐξουσία those most pre-eminent in wisdom and dignity; which may be admitted. It were, however, presumptuous to speculate too far, and vain to attempt to be wise above what is written.

10. ἡ πολυτεκνίκης σοφία, "the immensely diversified and manifold wisdom."* This is an epithet very suitable to σοφία, since the word is, in the Classical

* Grot. recognizes more meaning in the terms. The substance of his interpretation of πολυτεκνίκης is, immensa, summa, que se variis modis exercit, et imprimis institutorum varietate ad efformandos homines per religionem conspicua est. The reader will do well to consult the able and instructive annotation of the learned Commentator, or the abstract of it in Koppe.
writers, used (as is τοικίς) to denote clever, knowing, and the like; though it is generally used to denote a sort of Proteus-like craft and cunning. Slade explains thus: "That the manifold wisdom of God’s dispensation may be unfolded, by the Christian revelation, to the different orders of angelic beings," who are represented by St. Peter as desiring to look into these things, I Pet. 1, 12.

This, the Apostle adds, is manifested διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας: a brief mode of expression, which seems to signify, "by the founding, propagating, and governing of the Church." For, as Rosenm. observes, "from this the angels understood the Divine wisdom, just as we mortals understand it by considering and surveying the course of events." So Theophyl. ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεῖς ἐμάθομεν, τότε καθεinand θμον, ὁρῶσα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ἠζωτερού, καὶ δὲ αὐτῆς εἰς γνῶσιν ὁδηγοῦμέναι.

11. κατὰ πρόβεσιν τῶν αἰῶνων, ἢν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τ. κ. η. Of this passage, which is somewhat obscure from its brevity, the sense is thus ably expressed by Theophyl.: Νῦν μὲν ἐγνώσθη ἡ σοφία τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς γινομένων, πλὴν ἀνωθέν ἢν προαρισμένη κατὰ πρόβεσιν γὰρ τῶν αἰῶνων: τούτοτε, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν τῶν μελλόντων αἰῶνων. Ηδὲ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἐσόμενα, καὶ οὕτως ὁρισε. Τὸ δὲ, ἡν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, νοεῖται μὲν περὶ τῆς σοφίας, ήτοι τῆς οἰκονομίας ἢν ἐποίησεν ὁ Πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὅ δὲ Χριστότομος, ἂν ἐποίησεν ἀναγνώσον, ἂν ἐποίησεν αἰῶναν, φησιν, ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

At τῶν αἰῶνων I would understand ἄτο (which is expressed in the verse preceding), and regard it as a Genitive of a noun for an adjective. It may be rendered: "according to his most antient purpose, counsel, plan, and dispensation, which, having formed from eternal ages, He executed by Christ Jesus our Lord." See Whitby and Locke.

12. ἐν δὲ ἔχομεν—πίστεως αὐτοῡ, "through whom (as Mediator) we have freedom of address, and access to God with confidence, by means of faith in him." Πάροικοι properly signifies freedom of address (in
prayer), and then fiducia. On προσαγωγή see the note supra 2, 18., from which passage it is clear that we are here to supply πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν. The terms παράθεσις and πεποίθησις are nearly synonymous, and both stand in the place of an adjective qualifying προσαγωγή, “free and confident approach,” i. e. in prayer and supplication. See Rom. 8, 15. Gal. 4, 6. It is rightly remarked by Koppe, that this holy confidence is represented by the Apostle as arising from a sense of the pardon of sin, and acceptance with God, obtained by the death of Christ. And he adds, that both Jews and Gentiles were weighed down with the depression arising from conscious guilt; which they had reason to feel and deeply lament.

It is evident that the we must have reference to all Christians, whether Jewish or Gentile.

The διὰ τῆς πίστεως is regarded, by Koppe and Rosenm., as put for εἰς τοὺς πιστεύομεν εἰς αὐτόν. It is an idiomatic form of expression for, “through faith in him, reposed in him and his merits,” &c.; for, as Theophyl. observes, by remitting sins, he instilled confidence into us.

18. διὰ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, &c. The connexion of this verse with the preceding is thus laid down by Koppe: “The Apostle feared lest, if the Gentile Christians knew of the contempt, hatred, accusation; and injurious treatment of every kind which he met with from his own countrymen, the Jews, they should think the doctrine itself of the Apostle vain, and resting on no solid foundation; to prevent such a supposition, after having explained the cause of the calamities which he had to suffer from the Jews (which arose solely from the ill-will the Jews bore to the Gentiles) ver. 1—12., now conjures them, not to suffer these his calamities to alienate them from the Christian doctrine, but rather reflect that in this his misery they had whereof to boast and exult.” The above is indeed very acutely conceived; but simpler, and perhaps truer, is the following method of Theophyl.: “Therefore, as great is the mystery
of your calling, and as great things are committed to me to preach to you, and I must needs suffer bonds and injurious treatment from those who understand not this mystery, I desire that ye faint not, i.e. be not troubled and disconcerted, as if something unexpected had happened."

Crellius thinks that the Διὰ has a resumptive force, since the parenthesis ends at ver. 12., and hence the Apostle returns to the subject he was treating of at ver. 1.; q. d. "Therefore (I say)," &c. Yet he grants the words may be referred to those immediately preceding, and he pursues a mode of explanation nearly the same with that of Theophyl. The διὰ cannot (I think) have here a resumptive force; and I know not whether it can ever be properly said to have it.

With respect to the words themselves, they involve somewhat of difficulty, arising from extreme brevity, and are susceptible of more than one interpretation. (See Koppe.) Yet the context and the nature of the subject will not (I think) permit us to assign any other sense than that laid down by the antient Commentators, and most modern ones, by which ὑπὸς is understood after αἰτοῦμαι, "Wherefore I intreat you not to faint and despond on account of the afflictions which I endure on your behalf, seeing that this is your glory," i.e. tends to your glory. Rosenm. and Koppe object to the common interpretation of δοξα, on the ground that these afflictions would rather tend to their benefit than their glory; and therefore they explain it felicity, namely, eternal felicity. But there are two handles by which this and most other things may be taken; and the learned Commentators seem to have seized hold on the wrong. It surely was to the glory and credit of the Ephesians to have been converted by an Apostle who approved his sincerity by encountering perpetual afflictions and persecutions for the benefit of themselves and the other Gentiles.

18. ἐκακείν not only signifies to tire, to be tired out
(ex), as in Gal. 6, 9. where see the note; but also to despont, faint, as here and in 2 Cor. 4. 16. where see the note. Περικακείν the Classical writers use in this sense, and also ἐκκακμεὼν, and that not ἐκκακμύν. ἐν τις, but τιν. See St. Thes. on ἐκκακμύν.

The ἔτης is for aῖτινες, by an idiom common to both the Hebr., Greek, and Latin languages, by which the pronoun relative is accommodated either to the former, or the latter of two substantives. Thus (besides many other examples adduced by Wets.) we have in Cicero Somn. Scip. 3. "ignibus quæ sidera vocatis.

14. τούτου χάριν—Χριστοῦ. Commentators are not agreed to what the τούτου χάριν is to be referred. Some refer it to what immediately precedes. (See Koppe and Rosenm.) But this produces but a frigid sense. I rather agree with others, as Crel. and Bp. Middleton, that it relates to ver. 1. (where see the note).

14. καμάτω τὰ γόνατα μου πρὸς, i.e. "I fervently pray to." This expression is accommodated to Oriental manners. See Acts 7, 60. 9, 40. 20, 36. The words τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, are omitted in three or four MSS., and some later Versions and Fathers. But there is no reason to question the correctness of the common reading. The periphrasis Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is used in the place of God, to intimate (as Rosenm. observes) that it is on account of Christ, the only begotten and dearly beloved Son of God, that this felicity altogether results to Christians.

15. εἰς ὁ πᾶσα πατρία ἐν ὑπαναί καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὄνομαζεῖται. It should seem that from the mention of the connection subsisting between God the Father and the Son, the Apostle was led to introduce that which subsists, though of a very different kind, between all created beings and the Father. So Theophyl. (from Chrys.) 'Εκ τοῦ δὲ πάτρος πᾶσα, φησι, πατρίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μεν τὰς γενεάς ὄνομαζον πατρίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν πατέρων ὄνοματος οὕτω καλομένας.
ἐν οὐρανῷ δὲ, ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖνοι ἐξ ὁμοίως γενόμενοι, πατριᾶς
tὰ συντήματα λέγει.

The present is one of those passages which are best understood by a reference to Jewish opinions. It appears from the Rabbinical citations of Wets. that the Jews were accustomed to call the angels in heaven God's upper family; and themselves on earth his lower family.

The πᾶσας, Koppe thinks, is levelled against that narrow notion of the Jews that they alone were entitled to the names ἡγεῖ, ἡγεῖ, ἡγεῖ, and is meant to show (as at Phil. 2, 10.) that all intelligent natures (as originally created and preserved by him), united by the bonds of piety and virtue, whether on earth, or in heaven, are equally sons of God, and belong to the same city and family. See Hebr. 12, 22. compared with 11, 10.

'Εκεῖ οὖν is by some referred to Christ. But it seems more suitable to the Father. And so the antients and the most judicious moderns.

16. ἵνα δὲ ὑμῖν—ἐκεῖνον ἄνθρωπον. Koppe observes that ver. 16—19, are closely connected, and may be compared with a parallel passage of Col. 2, 1—10., from which the following will appear to be the sentiment: "May He by his divine spirit produce in you the firm persuasion that ye are the temple of Christ, built by the Divine goodness; so that ye may comprehend and be sensible of the vast extent of this temple, to which all the pious and good belong, and feel how great is His goodness, who willed that ye should be joined to the same temple."

16. τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. See the note on ver. 7. Grot., Zanch., and Rosenm., render this, "pro maximâ potentia." And so Theodoret: καὶ πλούτου ἐξηρτησμένου ἐχεί, καὶ ἐγείρων ἀμέτρητον. Thus the sense would be, "as, of his great power, he can." But this seems not to be what the Apostle had in view. I am rather inclined to take δόξης (as did Whitby) for the adjective glorious, and refer πλούτον to his abundant mercy, inconceivable bounty. See supra 1, 6 & 18,
2, 7.; and elsewhere. And so Crel. "secundum beneficentiam sua amplitudinem et ubertatem."

16. δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι, "to be mightily strengthened." For δυνάμει is for δυνατῶς. Διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ, "by his holy spirit." Εἰς τὸν ἐσω ἀνθρωπόν. See the note on Rom. 7, 22. and 2 Cor. 4, 16. Koppe here aptly compares Plat. de Republ. 9. τοῦ ἐξω ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπος ἐσται ἐγκατέστατος. He, however, thinks it cannot be inferred that the Apostle had Plato in his mind. Which is very true. But I am surprised he did not see that the coincidence between Plato, St. Paul, and some other writers, was not an accidental coincidence of ideas, but that Plato borrowed this, together with many other dogmas, from the East, where it probably has long prevailed, and was originally derived from the Israelites.

This κραταιωθῆσαι Rosem. confines to the influence of religious knowledge, and the study of virtue, in strengthening the mind. Which is very true; but by no means the whole truth; since the strengthening here meant is that of the Holy Spirit, to whose influence (as Koppe here acknowledges) Christians owe every increase of their faith and virtue. So Theophyl.: αὐτὸ γὰρ ἔστι τὸ τῆς ἱσχύος πάρεχον. And this is required by the next words, κατοικήσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν.

17. κατοικήσαι—τεθεμελιωμένοι. Koppe refers the κατοικήσαι to δώσῃ. But it seems more correct to say that, though closely connected with it, yet it grammatically depends upon δώσῃ understood. So Theophyl. rightly observes, that the κραταιωθῆναι and the κατοικήσαι are not two things, but the latter is the result of the former. And he paraphrases thus: "that you may be strengthened and fitted for Christ's dwelling in your inner man."

This indwelling of Christ in the heart is explained in two ways: by some, of love to Christ; since he whom we love is said to dwell, and have a place in our hearts: and they cite Liban. Eph. 558. But this seems far too feeble a sense. The more judi-
cious Commentators, both antient and modern, are agreed that there is an architectural allusion; as at supra 2. fin. 1 Cor. 3, 16, 18 & 19., where see the note. And certainly in a figurative sense, both God and Christ are said to dwell in the hearts of faithful Christians, as Joh. 14, 23. “and we will come and make our abode with him.” Yet I cannot but admit also another interpretation, which has by some Commentators been thought the only one here intended, namely, the doctrine of Christ. For, as Rosenm. observes, the context requires this, and especially the parallel passage of Col. 3, 16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου ἐνοικίασεν ἐν ἑσφαλίσεωι.

17. διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ὑμῶν. These words are by some antient and modern Commentators separated from κατωκήσαι, and joined to the following. But this seems doing great violence to the construction. Αἰτὰ τῆς πίστεως, “by the exercise of faith.” So Crel. : “vinculo fidei connexa sit animis vestris doctrina Christi.” Here Wets. aptly cites Acta martyr. 2. Τίς ἐστι Θεόφρασ; Ἰγνάτιος ἀπεκρίνατο, ὁ Χριστὸν ἐκ καρδιάς ἐν στέρεοις. Τραίανος ἐλευθερεύοντας ὑμᾶς ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν καθαρόντων μετὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος βίου, ὅσοι καὶ ἀποστρατισμένοι πρὸς τῶν πολεμίων; —Τραίανος ἐλευθερεύοντας ὑμᾶς ὑμᾶς ἐκ καθαρόντων μετὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος βίου, Ἰγνάτιος ἐλευθερεύοντας ὑμᾶς ἐκ καθαρόντων μετὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος βίου, Ἰγνάτιος ἐλευθερεύοντας ὑμᾶς ἐκ καθαρόντων μετὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος βίου. And he observes : “De Christo ut de Numine loquitur Paulus.”

18. ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐφιστομένῳ καὶ τεθεμελιωμένῳ. These words are closely connected with the preceding, and show how this indwelling is to be, namely (as Theophyl. explains), not superficially, but deeply; which, as he adds, is the only way whereby the graces of the spirit and the indwelling of Christ are to be obtained.

Some Commentators, as Grot. and Rosenm., think that there is a transposition of ἵνα for ἵνα ἐφιστομένῳ καὶ τεθεμελιωμένῳ, ἐξεχύσῃ, &c. And this is noticed by Photius. But it seems too harsh. I agree with the Commentator just mentioned (who has
learnedly discussed the phrase), that the nominative is for the accusative. Nor is it necessary to refine so much on the terms ἐφριζόμενοι and τεθεμελιωμένοι as do the foreign Commentators. Both are used in accommodation to the words preceding, in which the faith of a Christian is considered as a building: wherein Christ and God dwell by the Holy Spirit: and though ἐφρίζεσθαι is properly only applicable to trees; yet the word was often used metaphorically to denote founding and establishing anything as immovably as trees are fastened to the ground by their roots. So Philo de Opif. M. P. 9, 7. (cited by Wets.) ἔφαγεν ἀποτείνουσα, οὐσελ ἀθεμέλιου· and Plut. de liber. Educ. p. 6. ε. ἄλλα ἐταν τις μισον τὴν δύναμιν. I add Soph. Oed. Col. 1591. ὕδων Χαλκίδος θάρροις γῆθεν ἐφριζόμενον. Nay, it was sometimes, as here, joined with a verb denoting the founding of any edifice; as Col. 2, 7. and Lucian de saltat. S. (cited by Wets.) ὥσπερ τινες βίοις καὶ θεμέλιοι τῆς ἀξιόλογως ήσαν.

The ἀγάπη must signify love and gratitude to God and Christ for their manifold benefits. And the Apostle adds, "in proportion as these feelings are rooted in the heart, shall we, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, be able to comprehend," &c. For those words represent the result ( ἵνα) of this fervent love and deep-rooted affection and gratitude.

18. ἵνα εἰς ἀγάπην καταλαμβάνει, &c. Here ἐς ἀγάπην is not, as Koppe considers it, merely synonymous with ἂγάπη, but is a stronger term. It occurs in Sirach 7, 6. and Ælian. In the interpretation of this passage the modern Commentators are extremely perplexed. The construction is left imperfect at ἰσα; and various are the modes in which the sense has been supplied. Theophyl. and Phot. (ap. Æcumen.), the latter of whom has most learnedly and ably discussed the sense, think τοῦ μυστηρίων is to be supplied. Others of the antients, and many eminent moderns, as Whitby and Rosenm., "the love of Christ." (See their notes.) And this seems to be the most natural interpretation, and the most suit-
able to the context. Other interpretations may be seen in Pole and Wolfe. But they all, in some measure, merge into one and the same. So Dodd., "the great mystery of redeeming love." And Crell.: "the grace of God, or the Christian dispensation, and its benefits to man."

18. σὺν πάσι τοῖς ἄγιοις is well explained by Crell., "that you and all Christians may comprehend, you Gentiles as well as the Jews."

The expression τι το πλάτος, καὶ μῆκος, καὶ βάθος, καὶ ἡγοιμ (as the most judicious Commentators observe), is not to be too curiously discussed, or pressed on, since it is only a spirited and rhetorical phrase denoting the vast extent of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, i.e. as the Apostle said at ver. 8., the unsearchable riches of the love of Christ: μῆκος being here used for μέγεθος. So Soph. Antig. 388., ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἀστρ. καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χαρὰ Ἐοίκεν ἄλλη μῆκος οὐδὲν ἥδωρ; and Plut. 11, 607, μῆχος ὃθειος.

19. γνῶναι τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The τε has the sense of nempe: for I agree with Rosem., that this is exegetical of the preceding sentence. Ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "the love of Christ towards us; the immensity of redeeming love." Here, as in the preceding verse, I cannot but reprobate the attempts made by many interpreters to lower the sense, as, for instance, Mr. Locke and others, who limit it to the love of Christ in calling the Gentiles. I agree with Dodd., that the most extensive application of this text will be the most correct. For (to use the spirited words of the same pious and judicious Commentator) "well may we recollect on this occasion all that love which Christ has displayed in redeeming his church out of every nation and kingdom under heaven, Gentiles as well as Jews, from final misery, and exalting it to eternal glory."

19. ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως. This verb admits not only the accusative (which is the more usual syn-
tax), but (by the force of ὑπὲρ) the genitive. With respect to the sentiment γνῶναι—τὴς γνώσεως, there is no contradiction in it. The meaning is, “That ye may be able to know, as far as may be attainable by your present faculties, and suitable to the purposes of this life;” though in this, as in other things, we must see through a glass darkly, and must wait for that future state in which we may fully comprehend the mysteries of redeeming love.

19. Ἡμα πληρώσητε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. In the interpretation of these words the Commentators, as on many other occasions, exceedingly differ. But, as often, the most natural, simple, and extensive application will be found the best. Now as the Apostle had been speaking of the immense and inconceivable love of God and Christ, so here (I assent to Grot., Whitby, Crell., and Mackn.) he means to say, that by thus attaining the Holy Spirit, and having suitable conceptions of the great mystery of redeeming love, they may be filled with all the spiritual gifts and blessings, both ordinary and extraordinary, that God can and will impart to his faithful worshippers.

Eis is put for ἐν; than which nothing is more frequent in Scripture. Compare infra 4, 10. and Col. 1, 9.

20. The whole passage concludes with a doxology such as the Apostle, ever filled with a sense of the Divine majesty and goodness, sometimes introduces in the middle of a discourse. (Koppe.)

The sense is tolerably clear; but the Commentators stumble at the phraseology: for the Apostle is here, as in many other sublime effusions of pious feeling, little mindful of the minute properties of grammatical construction. The ὁμιλεῖν is thought by some Commentators (as Rosenm.) to depend upon a μᾶλλον understood. But this seems too harsh. Mr. Slade thinks that the pronoun ὁμιλεῖν does not relate to πάντα, but to ἐκεῖνον understood after ὑπερεκκεριστοῦ. (See Matt. 5, 37.) which may be admitted; yet
the construction proceeds but tamely; as indeed he himself appears to have perceived; for he proposes to expunge ὑπὲρ, on the authority of five MSS. and the Vulgate. But I am surprised that his usual good sense did not suggest to him that this is cutting the knot. For every one must see that in these four MSS. (all of which are such as have been tampered with) the ὑπὲρ has been cancelled from conjecture, and merely to remove the difficulty; though, as every person of taste and judgment will see, by the sacrifice of a portion of that divine spirit which animates this truly fine passage. The ὑπὲρ must therefore be left untouched, and be considered as an irregularity, if the Grammarians will have it so; though the irregularity is little different from a repetition of the same word. Had the Apostle not subjoined ὑπὲρ περισσοῦ, every one would have seen that ὑπὲρ must be taken with δὲ. As it is, it seems superfluous; but it is, in fact, not so; since the two words ὑπὲρ and ὑπὲρ περισσοῦ are the same as either of the two words repeated. The true construction and ratio of the passage seems to have been partly perceived by Castalio, who thus spiritedly renders: "qui potest omnia longè longè copiosius facere, quàm nos poscere et cogitare."

21. ἀνὴρ ἢ δόξα—ἀμὴν. There is here no little diversity of reading: and some have thought that it would thence appear that the words ἐν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ are to be cancelled. But the omission is almost wholly confined to such MSS. as have been tampered with. The clause seems to me to have been thrown out, as rather awkwardly cutting up the sense of the passage, and as being a tautology. But were we to suppose that the words had not originally a place, on what principle can we account for their insertion. And though they may be dispensed with, yet the sense is far more complete with them. That sense is not, however, what Rosenmuller supposes, but (as Castalio explains), "inter fideles:" and ἐν Χριστῷ signifies, "by Christ and his religion." It is easy to
**EPHESIANS, CHAP. III. IV.**

imagine much *more* sense, but not so to establish it clearly: and we must therefore not refine so much as do many Commentators and Paraphrists.

21. εἰς τὰς γενεάς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων. This phrase the Commentators are quite at a loss to account for. It is rightly supposed to be one of the Apostle’s self-invented phrases; and a most expressive one it is. The best mode of viewing it is to suppose, with some eminent modern Commentators, (as Grot., Koppe, and Rosenm.,) two phrases condensed into one, שְׂעֵרוֹת עִירָאָו and רְבִּיעוֹר רְבָּרִים. The sense of it is well expressed by Doddri., in his note, thus: “through all the successions of an endless eternity.”

**CHAP. IV.**

Now commences the later division of the Epistle; and as in the former the Apostle had treated on the extension of the benefits of the Gospel to the *Gentiles* as well as the Jews, and had shown how precious was the blessing, so in this he subjoins, according to his usual custom, *various exhortations* to walk worthy of their high calling, especially in the exercise of mutual unanimity and concord, mildness and lenity in bearing with the errors and vices of men; some passages too are interspersed on the nature of the *gifts* of the *Holy Spirit*, even *from which* Christians used to seek matter for strife and debate. So Theodoret: καὶ ἑπεὶ ἡ χαρισμάτων πνευματικῶν ἀπολαύσης, καὶ θαύματα ἔποιεσ, καὶ γλῶττας διαφόρως ἔλαλουν, καὶ προφητικὴς ἐνέργειας ἀπήλαυσον, καὶ προφητικῆς ἐνέργειας ἀπήλαυσον, ἵκανον δὲ ταῦτα ἰν ὄγκωσα τὸ φθάνημα, περὶ τοῦ τοῦτον προσφέρει παραίνεσιν.

It is well observed by Doddri., that “this Epistle, as it sets forth in the preceding part of it the gracious design of God in the gospel-dispensation, and represents the benefits and privileges that belong to all the faithful in Christ Jesus, as well to Gentiles as
to Jews, is cast into a strain of thanksgivings and prayers, and written (as it were) all in a rapture, in a sublime and elevated style, as flowing from a mind transported with the consideration of the unsearchable wisdom and goodness of God in the work of redemption, and of the amazing love displayed in Christ towards the Gentile world. And the remaining part of it is no less admirable for the engaging manner in which he improves what he had before delivered, urging the duties which became their character with the greatest tenderness, in expressions full of love and endearment, adding the strongest arguments to enforce them, and making mention of his bonds to recommend the exhortations that he offered to them.

VERSE 1. παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δύσμος ἐν Κύριῳ, ἀξίως περιπατήσαι τῆς κλησεως ἢ ἐκλήθητε. The οὖν seems to have far more meaning than the Commentators ascribe to it, (some, as Koppe, regarding it merely as a particle of transition;) namely, “this being the case; such being your high privileges,” &c. See Matt. Gr. Gr. p. 947.

1. ὁ δύσμος ἐν Κύριῳ. The Apostle again introduces the mention of his bonds, to give greater effect to his admonitions; since, as these bonds, like as his other afflictions and persecutions, had been occasioned by his zeal for the evangelization of the Gentiles, so they were the more bound to attend to his earnest injunctions.*

The ἐν is used like the Hebr. ἐν, and the expression may be compared with the τοῦ Χριστοῦ at 3, 1., and must, it should seem, have the same sense: otherwise it might be interpreted (as it is even now done by some) “in the name of Christ.”

Περιπατήσαι denotes (as often) habitual action. On the κλησεως Koppe speculates far too much, and

* Thus Theodoret: 'Ἰκανὴ τῶν δεσμῶν ἡ μνήμη καὶ τοῦλ θεον ἀναληψαν νοοῦται εἰς ἄρετὴν διεγείρας· δε' ὑμᾶς γὰρ, φησι, ταῦτα περικείμαι· εἰ γὰρ κηρύσσειν οὐκ ἔβουλήμην, τοῦτων ἰν παντελῶς ἀπηλλάγην.
(as often) by aiming at giving too fine an edge, he wears it away altogether. Neither can κατηγ. signify (as Mackn. interprets it) the *appellation. It must mean the *state* to which they were called and converted, namely, that of the Gospel. The sense, then, is: "live worthy of that state, and suitably to the duties which it lays upon you."* Compare Phil. 3, 14. 2 Thes. 1, 11. 2 Tim. 1, 9. Hebr. 3, 1.

2. The Apostle now, with admirable address, slides into the mention of those duties (or, as our Lord did in his Sermon on the Mount, *commences* with them), in which the Ephesians were especially deficient.

The terms ταμεινοφροσύνη and πρεδότησι are said by Koppe to be synonymous. But, in reality, they are not so. The latter may be said to be the *result* of the former, since that signifies such a *lowly opinion of one's own merit and claims* as will effectually produce a temper of mildness and indulgence, not requiring too much from our brethren, who are encompassed with the same frailty as ourselves; it is obvious how requisite this is in those who should feel how equally unmerited by *all* is the grace of God.

The πάντα is explained by the antient Commentators as extending to all persons, places, and times.

Μακροθυμία denotes the bearing patiently those trials which proceed from the provocations of our brethren. With respect to the *construction*, there was no occasion for Blackw. and Doddr. to connect *μακροθυμία* with the preceding πρεδότησι, in order to avoid the *solecism* which they (from Hamm. and Le Clerc) thought involved in the common construction. The Apostle, it is to be observed, does not attend to such minutiae. It was rightly supposed by Grot., that this is an usual *anacoluthon*. The Apos-

* So Theophyl.: Ἐκι μεγάλος γὰρ ἐκλήθησε· ἐκὶ τῷ συγκαθισαν Χριστῷ, ἐκὶ τῷ συμβεβελεύσα, καὶ οὐ δει κατασχυνειν τὸ λέγωμα ήμῶν δὲ ἐργῶν ἁμαξὼν Χριστοῦ. Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ δογματικοῦ, εἰς τὸ ήδίκον κατέβη, καταγυλκαίνων τὸν λόγον.
the, as he says, regards the ἐν συνεργείᾳ. Nor is this confined to him; but it is to be found more or less in most of the Classical writers, from whom Eiker adduces examples, to which I could add, if it were necessary, a whole squadron from Thucyd. That the words must not be separated, we may infer from doctrinal reasons; for, as Theophyl. observes, these virtues must be united, εὐστία γερίναι μὴ ἔσομεν, ἐὰν εἶ μεν ἐνεργεῖν ἀλλ' εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐνεργεῖν.

2. ἐνεργεῖαν ἀλλήλους ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. Ἀσχ. is obscurely, if not erroneously, rendered by our English Translators forbearing; and most incorrectly by Mackn., "supporting one another." The sense is (as the antient Interpreters tell us) "bearing with one another," i.e. one another's errors and failings; See Matt. 17, 17. Acts 18, 4. 1 Cor. 4, 12. 2 Cor. 11, 1 & 4. and several other passages which may be found in Schleus. Lex. Koppe compares the Hebr. לְּכוּ in Is. 46, 4. “Moreover (observes Theoph.) the Apostle shows the mode in which the duties are to be fulfilled, and the use of them; by the ἐν ἑαυτοῖς suggesting the principle on which we must bear with the conduct of others, even when abusive and injurious, namely, on that of Christian love.” It is scarcely necessary to remind my readers of the ἐνεργείας and ἐνεργείας of Epict. See Zanch. ap. Whitby.

3. οὕτωσις τοιῶν τῆς ἐνεργείας τῶν πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνεργείῳ τῆς ἐνεργείας, "anxiously striving after the unity of the Spirit by a strong bond, even the study of peace." Such appears to be the general sense. And here I cannot but reprove that licence of interpretation by which τῶν πνεύματος (contrary to the opinion of the antient and early modern Commentators) is degraded to mind. Had that been the sense intended, probably the article would not have been used with either of these substantives; but, in fact, the interpretation is disproved by what follows. For it is plain that the Apostle has in view disputes between Christian brethren, therefore the unity of the Spirit must denote that which the posses-
sion of such great privileges and high gifts of the Spirit * especially bound them to observe. The συν-δεσμὸς τῆς εἰρήνης indicates the mode in which this was to be done, namely, by the cultivation of that peaceful temper, which especially binds all together in unity.

Grot. and others interpret the τοῦ πνεύματος, "of the spiritual body," namely, the Church: others, the doctrine itself of the Church. But this seems wandering too far, and is unnecessary; since it is included in the first interpretation.


4. ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν Πνεύμα—ομοίω. Koppe lays down the following as the sentiment contained in ver. 4—6. "Omnia in religione Christi, quam profitemini, ad studiorum voluntatumque consensionem vos cohortantur. Nihil est in ea sibi contrarium, nihil quod secum pugnet. Omnes eundem Deum atque Dominum, modo rituque eodem colimus, eandem olim felicitatem omnes speramus, cur igitur in rixas diversaque studia abripi nos patiemur?"

Here the Commentators, as usual, differ. Some connect the construction with the former by an εἰς τὸ εἶναι. But this seems too arbitrary, and is doing violence to the sense. For the Apostle here means to enforce his previous exhortation to unanimity by an argument derived from the unity of every thing connected with their faith. It is plain that there must be supplied either ἢστε, οге ἢστι; and σῶμα needs no explanation. On πνεῦμα, however, Commentators are not agreed. If ἢστι be the ellipsis, I should think, with some ancient and most recent Commentators, that it signifies mind. But then ἢστε, when repeated at ἐν πνεῦμα, must signify, "ye ought to be of one mind;" which is too arbitrary. I cannot,

So Theophyl.: "Ωσπερ ἐν τῷ σώματι πνεῦμα ἢστι τὸ πάντα σύνε-χον καὶ ἑνότητα, εἰς διάφορα δει μέλη οὐτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς οἰκουμενικῶς τῷ ἀγίῳ Πνεύμα ἢστιν, δειν ἑνότηι πάντας, εἰς διάφορα ἑχομεν καὶ γένη καὶ γένους καὶ ἑκτερεύματα καὶ διὰ τούτων τοῦ ἀγίου Πνεύματος ἐν σῶμα γενόμεθα.
then, but accede to the opinion of most antient and early modern Commentators, that ἐστὶ is the true ellipsis. For such it is just after in εἰς Κύριος, &c.; and perhaps the words καθὼς—::_(' ويم') are parenthetical, and refer to the πνεῦμα, which they further prove, must denote the Holy Spirit. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: "even as ye were called (by one Spirit) to one hope of the blessings of the Gospel, as resulting from your calling." Ἐν ἐλπίδοι is for εἰς ἑλπίδα, by a very common idiom. Nor are the words τῆς κλησεως redundant, as they are supposed by Koppe. There may indeed seem here to be no mention of the gifts of the Spirit; yet they appear to be implied and intended, and they are soon after mentioned. Mackn. has therefore well paraphrased thus: "There is one body or Church which comprehends you all, and one Spirit which animates that body by its gifts." The argument is, that all Christians have the same hope of acceptance and reward, and ought not to despise one another." So Chrys. and Theophyl. See a long and able note of Whitby.

I would compare a similar sentiment in Aristid. 2, 4, 881 B. (in his Oration περὶ ὄρωνολας) ὑμεῖς τοῖν ἀστερ ἐλέγχους τούτας κατὰ τῆς στασεως τάς ἑπεννυλίας ποιομένως, κοινὰ μὲν τὰ βουλευτήρια κοίνως δὲ νεως καὶ τῶν ἁγιωσ, κοινὰ δὲ παυσ' αἰς εἰπείν τὰ μέγιστα προερήματα, and Eurip. Orest. 1190. where Electra, speaking of Orestes, Pylades, and herself, says: πάν γὰρ ἐν φίλων τόδε where the Scholiast paraphrases it ἐν σῶμα καὶ μία ὄψιν ἑσμένιν.

5, 6. εἰς Κύριος—ستراتيج. The Apostle, it may be observed, ingeniously seeks out every thing in the religion in which there is unity. It is well remarked by Theodoret: Πανταχοῦ τὸ ἐν καὶ εἰς τέθεικεν, εἰς συμφανίαν συμπάστων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἑνα, φησὶ, Κύριον ἐχο- μεν, ἐνὸς βαπτισματος ἀπόκλαυσμεν, μιὰν πίστιν προερη- μόχαμεν, εἰς ὁ πάντων ὑμῶν Θεὸς καὶ πάτερ προστήκην τοῖν ὑμῶς, ἀις ἀδελφοίς, τὴν περὶ ἄλληλους ἐχειν ὄμο- νοιαν. It is plain that there is an ellipsis of πάντων.
On the meaning of πάτηρ here the recent Commentators too much refine. It seems best to take it in its plain and natural sense, of the simple and fundamental principles of belief which suffice to fit any one for baptism. Hence the Apostle makes mention of baptism.*

6. εἰς Θεός καὶ πατὴρ, "there is one and the same God and Father," i. e. God, who is your Father. The expressions εἰς πάντας διὰ πάντων, and εἰς πᾶνσε, are treated by Koppe as merely synonymous, denoting the same thing, i. e. "to whom you owe everything." But I can never cease to protest against this slovenly way of wrapping up matters, into which the recent Commentators so often fall, and which is the other extreme to that of the excessively minute, and sometimes fanciful, distinctions into which the earlier modern Commentators ran. On the sense of the words there has been much discussion. Many of the Fathers understand the three clauses as referring to the three persons of the Trinity, εἰς πάντας having respect to the Father; διὰ πάντων, to the Son; and εἰς πᾶνσε, to the Holy Spirit. But this has been adopted by few moderns; nor do I see how it can be admitted, as it is liable to serious objections. I agree with Chrysost., Theophyl., and, of the moderns, Grot. and Whitby, that there is no reference

* In this sense it seems to have been taken by Whitby, who has the following able annotation. "It is plainly asserted in the Holy Scriptures, that there is one common faith, Tit. 1, &c. one like precious faith, 2, Pet. 1, 1. of all that bear the name of Christians. An unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, to which we must all arrive, Eph. 4, 13. As faith once delivered to the saints, Jude 3. for which we must strive earnestly, and in which we must build up ourselves; a faith of the Gospel, for which we are exhorted to contend as with one soul, Philip. 1, 27. But vain is here the inference of the Papists, that this one faith must be either their's, and then we cannot be saved without it; or our's, and then they cannot be saved; for this one faith, into which all Christians were baptized, contains neither the doctrines in which they differ from us, nor we from them, but only the Apostle's Creed, which the whole Church of Christ for many centuries received as a perfect system of all things necessarily to be believed in order to salvation."
to God the Son. 'O ἐν πάντων must (notwithstanding what some recent Commentators say) mean, He, who is over, above, rules over all. Nor does the ἐν πάντων signify (as Koppe explains), "qui omnibus adest fortunae ipsorum auctor moderatorque;" for that is contained in διὰ πάντων, which, as Theodoret and Whitby rightly observe, imports, "by his Providence." The ἐν πάσι, I agree with the antient and modern Commentators, must signify, "is in all by his Spirit." Theodoret briefly and ably explains thus: ὂ τοῦ ἐν τῷ πάντων τὴν δικτοτειαν σημαίνει, ὃ δὲ διὰ πάντων τὴν προσολα, τὸ δὲ ἐν πάσι τὴν ἐνοίκησιον.

For a sufficient answer to the Socinian perversion of the ὅ ὁμὶ ἐν πάντων, see the able note of Whitby. The antient Commentators are agreed, that ἐν is for ἐνάνω. It must import universal dominion over all persons and things. It is singular that the Commentators should not have cited the celebrated passage of Rom. 9, 5. ὅ ὁμὶ ἐν πάντων Θεὸς first applied to God the Father, but then applied to God the Son.

7. ἐν δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἑαυτῷ ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δοσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is intended to meet an objection, namely, that there are different gifts of the Holy Spirit in different persons; to some the greater, to others the lesser, which, it seems, had generated envy. To this the answer is, that on each the gift was conferred as the Giver measured it out; q. d. "Since, therefore, it is a gift, and not a debt, ye ought to rest content, and not be too anxious as to the measure which God hath determined. For if God hath done this, he hath done all things profitably for you. Thus the necessary things without which no one can be a Christian, are common. And if such a one hath more, grieve not, since the greater is the labour he will have to undergo." The Apostle, it may be observed, does not say, "unto the measure of faith," lest he should disgust those that had less, but, in order to silence all clamour, "at the will of the Giver." (Chrysost. and Theophyl.) And nearly the same view is taken by Koppe.
7. η χάρις is for τὸ χάρισμα, and seems to refer to the words immediately preceding, ὁ ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, which are by almost all Commentators admitted to have respect to the Holy Spirit.

8. The Apostle now proceeds, by an argument taken from Ps. 68, 19. to prove what he had laid down at ver. 7., "that Jesus the Messiah is he to whom Christians owe the χαρίσματα τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου. The sum of the argument is this. "In the Jewish sacred books some one is said to have ascended up unto heaven, and from thence to have distributed gifts unto men. But since God himself cannot be said to have ascended unto heaven, inasmuch as he always is in heaven, and never descended from it, the Prophet must necessarily have had in mind some other person, who, after he had descended from heaven to earth, afterwards ascended from thence unto heaven. And he can be no other than Jesus the Messiah, who we know to have descended from and again ascended to heaven." The argument proceeds on these two reasons: 1. that God himself cannot properly be said to have descended from heaven; 2. that τὸ ὅνος in the Psalm is to be interpreted of heaven; and δόματα δοθέντα τοῖς ἄνθρωποις of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. (Koppe.)

At λέγει must be supplied γραφῇ; of which ellipsis Wets. adduces examples from 5, 14. 1 Cor. 6, 16. James 4, 6. 1 Macc. 7, 16. Philo de Opif. Mundi, p. 37. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα φησίν, p. 36, 9. φησίν οὖν. The οὖν must not be pressed upon. Here the recent Foreign Commentators, however, raise great difficulties. Rosenm. maintains that the Psalm has no reference to the Messiah. I need not enter into all their long-winded discussions and tortuous explanations. It may be sufficient to say, that though the Psalm may not, in its original and primary sense, have reference to the Messiah, yet in a secondary and mystical one it may. And the Jews, it seems, have always interpreted part of this Psalm of the
Messiah.* If this be not admitted, it must be considered as an accommodation of this part of the Psalm to the present purpose.†

Between the words of the Apostle and the words of the original there is a slight discrepancy. The clause is rendered by the Apostle, “thou hast received gifts for men;” but the Hebrew signifies, “thou hast taken.” Dr. Hamm. translates the ἐδοξε “he received gifts to give to men;” which version, though objected to by Le Clerc, has been defended by Whitby (see his note), and seems to be approved of by Koppe. It may be sufficient to refer the reader to the copious notes of Mackn.: and I will only observe, that Theophyl. (from Chrysost.) touches on the discrepancy thus: Καὶ μὴ ἐξεφήνας, ἐλαβές, φορά, δόματα ταῦτα δὲ ἐστιν διδάξει ό Θεός τὰ χαρίσματα, ἀντιλαμβάνει τῷ διακοινών ὁ γὰρ λαβὼν χάρισμα, διὰ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν τῇ κοινῇ λαμβάνει.

8. ἡχυμαλάνευσεν αἰχμαλώσιαν, “he has taken and led captive,” &c. Αἰχμαλώσια is used frequently in the Old Testament (as Num. 21, 2. 31, 12 & 19. Ps. 68, 19. 2 Chron. 28, 5, 11 & 15., and other passages, which may be seen in Schleus. Lex.), and sometimes in the New; as Apoc. 13, 10. εἰ τίς αἰχ-

* It is well observed by Koppe: “Confidentum esse arbitramur sapientiae et divinae Apostoli auctoritati: eum non usurum fuisset loco hoc, nisi ejus de Mesid, hujusque in calos ascension, interpretationem suo tempore inter Judaeos receptam et probatam fuisset bene intellectisse.”

† So Dodd: “I cannot undertake to prove that the passage here referred to is, strictly speaking, a prediction of Christ’s ascension, and of his shedding down the gifts and graces of the Spirit. The Psalmist, celebrating a late victory, goes back in rapturous meditations to God’s victory over the Egyptians, and the spoils with which he enriched the Israelites, ungrateful and rebellious as they had been, and by which he prepared for himself in the course of his providence a dwelling among them; for the tabernacle was built principally with those spoils. And the Apostle beautifully accommodates the words to the triumph of an ascending Saviour, and to the royal donative of the Spirit; which he shed down on his Church, into which many who had once been rebellious were admitted, and whereby it was fitted to be his habitation.”
The sense, however, chiefly to be kept in view is the beaten enemy thus led captive; and here there must, according to the accommodation, be meant all the enemies of the Christian faith, both men and demons, and perhaps also (as the antients, and many moderns, as Dodd., suppose) all things that were adverse to the Gospel, as sin, the world, and death, which are often personified. Dodd. would understand by αἰχμαλωτίαν those who of conquerors and oppressors are made captives.” But this seems too harsh: and the mode of interpretation above adopted seems preferable.

It is well observed by Dodd., that Christ might poetically be said to lead captivity captive, when he triumphed over those that had subdued his people, and acquired such a power over the infernal spirits as a conqueror has over a captive that he drags at his chariot wheels.

9, 10. From the passage just brought forward the Apostle now draws an argument to prove that no one else is to be understood in that Psalm but the Messiah. (Koppe.)

These verses are, by Koppe, thrown into a parenthesis; as has been also done by our English Translators. The words may be rendered: “But this αὐξην, what is it calculated to prove (see Whitby) but that he had first descended to the lower parts of the earth? On the meaning of τὰ κατάτεθα μέρη τῆς γῆς, Commentators have been much divided in opinion. Some antient and early modern ones took it to import that Christ went down into hell. But (as Dodd. observes) Bp. Pearson, on the Creed, p. 399., has shown how very precariously this is urged as a proof of that opinion. All the most judicious Commentators, both ancient and modern, adopt one or other of the two following interpretations. Some by the τὰ κατάτεθα μέρη understand the grave, Hades. And this interpretation, which is supported by most antient and modern Commentators, is much countenanced by the usus loquendi. For that signi-
fication is not unfrequently found in the Old Testament; as Ps. 68, 10. "those that seek my soul to destroy it shall go into the lower parts of the earth." Ez. 26, 10. 32, 18. And Koppe maintains that this is not (as some have supposed) at variance with the course of argumentation pursued by the Apostle; so that we only bear in mind that in κατέβη there is not a notion of any descent, but of a descent from Heaven: and, he adds, it is supported by the modes of thinking and speaking prevalent in that age, by which the mansions, both of demons and the dead, were placed under ground. And he refers to Philo. 2, 20., and 1 Pet. 5, 19. Thus the sense will be: "he descended from Heaven into the inmost recesses of the earth." But I do not comprehend that Heaven and the grave can well be opposed to each other. I therefore accede to the opinion of many eminent modern Commentators, that τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς (for μέρη is omitted in many MSS., and appears to be a mere gloss) signifies the earth itself; τῆς γῆς being (as is often the case with Genitives in the Hellenistical style) used exegetically, "the lower parts, namely, the earth." Then the κατώτερα will be for the positive τὰ κάτω, said as opposed to heaven, which was just called ὅψις.* Thus the expression καταβαίνω εἰς τὰ κατώτερα will denote the incarnation of Christ, his life on earth, his death, burial, and resurrection; and thus this interpretation may be said to comprehend the first-mentioned ones. See Is. 44, 23., which passage, however, is thought by Koppe not quite to the purpose. But his objections have been well answered by Rosenm.

10. ὁ καταβὰς, αὐτὸς, ἕστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν. The sense is said, by Rosenm., to be either, "idem Jesus rediit ad cælum summum, qui eo deserto in terris humilis fuerat; or, "idem est ad summam dignitatem evectus, qui anteas se ad

* A word exactly answering to our heaven, which is the past participle from the Ang. Sax. verb heapan, to raise. And so lyft and the Scottish lyft, the sky, from the Ang. Sax. līpan.
sepulcri adeò humilitatem demiserat.” Whitby very
well paraphrases thus: “He that descended (thus
into the lower parts of the earth) is the same who
(after his resurrection) ascended up far above all
heavens, that he might fill all things with his gifts,
according to his promise, that when he was ascended
he would send the Spirit upon his Apostles and

The strong expression ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν φύσεων
is well illustrated, by Whitby, from Heb. 7, 26.
“He being made higher than the heavens.” Ps. 8,
1. “hath set thy glory above the heavens,” and 57,
5 & 11. 108, 4 & 5. “exalted above the heavens.”

10. ἐν παρθένῳ τὰ πάντα. Here, as the best
Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed, the
neuter is (as frequently in St. Paul) used for the
masculine. Thus the sense is: “that he might fill
all persons with his benefits, blessing, and gifts,” of
which the last seem especially to be meant, both by
what preceded at ver. 7., and by what follows at ver.
11. Some Commentators, by confining themselves
to the neuter, and interpreting the passage of the
completion of the plans of Providence for the good
of man, very unwarrantably lower the sense.

11. καὶ αὐτὸς ὃδεκε τῶν μὲν—διδασκάλους. This
verse connects with ver. 8. There is here declared
the Divine counsel that, in the diversity of spiritual
gifts, it was perpetually to be borne in mind that all
those were given πρὸς τῶν καταρτισμῶν τῶν ἁγίων. See
at ver. 12. (Koppe.) Here is exemplified what was
said at ver. 7. (Rosenm.)

Ἤδηκε is for τέθηκε or ἀπέσταλκα. So the Heb.
ἦν. On the προφηταὶ Koppe’s 3d Excursus may be
consulted, and the note on 1 Cor. 14, 1., as also other
passages of the three celebrated Chapters which treat
on the spiritual gifts.

With respect to the εἰδαγγελεῖται, placed between
the προφητ. and the ποιμ., the term occurs too seldom
in the New Testament (being only found in Acts
21, 8., and 2 Tim. 4, 5., besides the present passage),
and is used in too general a way to enable us to judge of the exact nature of the office. But we learn from the Fathers and early Ecclesiastical Historians (see Suic. Thes. 1, 1234.), what is of itself highly probable, that the name was, in the age of the Apostles, given to those Christian teachers, and assistants of the Apostles who were not appointed to the charge of any particular Church, but were itinerant, and sent by the Apostles to such congregations as might be most in need of their labours; and it is supposed that they did not commence the work of conversion, but followed up the rudiments first communicated by the Apostles.

On the distinction between the terms ποιμένας and διδασκάλος, there has been some difference of opinion among modern Commentators. Doddr. does not pretend to determine whether two different offices be intended here: but he thinks that, if that had been the case, they would have been expressed distinctively, as were the others, namely, by τῶς δὲ ποιμένας, τῶς δὲ διδασκάλως. But this, in so irregular a writer as St. Paul (as Koppe observes), is a very precarious principle. Since there had been three τῶς δὲ's before, the Apostle might use καλ (which, indeed, stands for καὶ τῶς δὲ) for the sake of euphony. Certain it is that the most eminent Interpreters, antient and modern, admit that by the ποιμ. are meant such as are called ἐπισκόποι.* at Acts 20, 28., and (as it seems) πρεσβυτέροι at 1 Pet. 5, 1 & 2. The word, indeed, carries with it far more of meaning and dignity than διδασκάλος. For it was originally applied to Kings, Generals, and, indeed, Prefecti in general. A use found in the earliest Greek authors, and which was probably derived from Oriental phraseology, since frequent examples of it occur in the Old

* So Grotius: "Nomen Pastor in Ecclesia compend. τῆς προεστώτης τοῦ κοινώτη διὰ λόγου, 1 Tim. 5, 17. qui carere ἐξαίρετο dicitus ἐπίσκοπος, inspecor gregis. Nam docere est pascere. Doctores sunt Episcopi et ipsi, sed in eminentiore gradu positi, quales dixit postea μετακολουθεῖν, ut diximus Rom. 12, 7. & 1 Cor. 12, 28."
Testament; as Jer. 3, 15. And thus, as Koppe observes (from Grot. and Vitringa de Synag. vet. 621 seqq.), these τοιμένες seem to have been similar to the governors of Synagogues, who were called Ἰσραήλ. In 1 Pet. 1, 25. the two terms are conjoined. It is thought, by Theodoret and Schleus., that the τοιμ. had the charge of cities; and the διδάσκαλοι, of villages. Which may have originally been the case; but, from their more important situations, those would acquire a sort of influence and authority over the country Pastors. From the difference of appellation, however, we may presume a difference of situation; though we are not to suppose but that the τοιμ. discharged all the offices of the διδάσκαλοι, as teaching, preaching, &c.; yet we may imagine some duties to which the διδάσκαλοι were not appointed.*

12. πρὸς τῶν καταφημιμὸν τῶν ἅγιων, εἰς ἔγγον διακονίας, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σωματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. These words have been strangely misunderstood by some Interpreters, who take καταφημιμ. to denote the bringing together all, both Jews and Gentiles, into one Church; or initiation by the office of baptism;

* No Commentator has so well treated on this subject as Whitby in the following annotation: “That these Pastors and Teachers were, in the first ages, men of extraordinary gifts, is evident from this very place; for the preceding words, He gave gifts unto men, some Apostles, some Prophets, &c., show that all the persons mentioned here were partakers of the gifts which Christ, ascending up on high, and sending down the Holy Spirit, gave to men. Hence, among the different χαράματα, gifts, of the Holy Ghost, are reckoned διδασκαλία, teaching, Rom. 12, 6, 7., and, among the gifts exercised in their assemblies, διακή, doctrine, 1 Cor. 14, 6 & 26. Among the persons who had received the διαρ-θέσεις, χαρισμάτων, diversities of gifts, are reckoned after Prophets διδασκαλοι, Teachers, 1 Cor. 12, 28. Rom. 12, 6, 7., and here. And so Tertullian makes mention of them as persons educated with the grace of knowledge. The Pastors seem probably the same with the κυβερνῆεις, Governments, 1 Cor. 12, 28., and the προεστῶτες, Rom. 12, 8. And it is evident, from both those places, that they were also men endued with those spiritual gifts there mentioned. Hence it is observable of those Doctors, that when the extraordinary gifts to the Church ceased, their very names grew out of use, they being very rarely mentioned in the succeeding ages of the Church.”
both at variance with the context. As to the exposition of Blackw., Doddr., and Mackn., “for the fitting of holy men to the work of the ministry,” that is against the usus loquendi. By the τῶν ἁγίων (with the article) can only be meant “the saints,” i. e. all good Christians. And so the antiquits, and the most judicious moderns. Πρὸς suggests the purpose for which all the gifts were imparted, and to what they ought to tend. It has been rightly remarked, by Grot. and Koppe, that there is here a transposition; the natural construction being εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, πρὸς τῶν καταρτισμῶν τῶν ἁγίων; as in the Æthiopic Version. Koppe says we have here an inverse construction for ἕως εἰς ἔργον διακονίας (i. e. εἰς τὸ διακονεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις) πρὸς τὸ καταρτίζειν. The words are rendered by Rosenm.: “that by them Christians may be well instructed and fitted to their religion.”

After all, therefore, our common translation, “for the perfecting of the saints,” appears the best, and is confirmed by the Syriac Versions. In 2 Cor. 13, 11. we have εὐχαρίστητε—τὴν ὑµῶν κατάρτισιν. On καταρτίζειν see the note on Gal. 6, 1. 1 Cor. 1, 10. 2 Cor. 13, 11.

Εἰργὸν διακονίας is not so much a pleonasm as a stronger expression. Διακονία, “office undertaken for the good of Christians.” See Schl. and Wahl. On the metaphor in εἰς οἰκοδοµὴν see the note on Acts 20, 32. By the τοῦ σωµ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ is obviously meant the Church.

18. μέχρι καταντήσαμεν—πληρώµατος τοῦ Χ.

On the sense of these words there has been much discussion among Commentators, yet I know not whether they have ever been better expounded than by Theophyl., (after Chrys.), thus: Μέχρι τότε ἐργάζεσθαι, φησί, χρὴ πάντας τοὺς χάρισµα λαβῶντας, καὶ κοπῆς καὶ οἰκοδοµέων, ἐως ὅσον φησάσωμεν εἰς τὴν ἐνύπτα τῆς πίστεως τοῦτον, τούτου τοῦτον, ἐως ἅν δειξηθῶμεν οἱ πάντες μιᾶν πίστιν ἔχοντες, μὴ ταῦτα δόγμα τα διαφέροντο, μὴ ταύτα κατὰ τὸν βίον σχίσµατα ἔχοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους. These Commentators are the only ones that have noticed the ellipsis at μέχρι. Καταντ., is well explained by Theophyl., φθάσωµεν. On the sense and construction see Acts 6, 1. and the note there.
The sense of this passage is copiously treated by Morus, in a Dissert. on Eph. 4, 11—17. He is of opinion (as I learn from Rosenm.) that the Apostle is exhorting the teachers of each congregation to mind and endeavour that all and every one of the Christians therein, be carried forward in knowledge, till none remain quite ignorant, so that all and each, one as well as another, may be confirmed in faith, until no one be left who is in doubt, or fluctuates in uncertainty, or does not know more of the Christian doctrine than he formerly did. The os πώτερ (he adds), which must denote all Christians (those just called the saints and the body of Christ), will then be equal; they will have εν, or πίστεως and γνώσεως ἐνώπιον, if they be all brought into the state just described. Therefore, ἐνώπιον may be better rendered parity than unity. This mode of interpretation is adopted by Mr. Valpy; and certainly it is ingeniously and acutely conceived. Whether it be true is another affair; and of that I must profess a doubt. It appears to me that needless difficulties have been raised by pressing on the sense of the terms in this verse. I apprehend that the Apostle only means that they should earnestly strive to promote this unity of faith and knowledge in all the essential and fundamental doctrines of the gospel: for that seems to be the sense of εἰς γνώσιν τοῦ ισότο ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ. Koppe renders: "usque dum omnes in eum perfectionis gradum, ad quem assurgere debet ecclesia Christi, erecti fuerimus." The words, it must be observed, are highly figurative, and were suggested by the metaphor in εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, just before; and they are, as in the former clause, not to be pressed upon. The sense, then, after withdrawing the metaphor, is (as Whitby lays it down) this: "so as to be Christians of a full maturity and ripeness in all the graces derived from Christ Jesus to the body." For, as the Apostle elsewhere says that our knowledge is imperfect, he must mean the assertion to be taken comparate. So Theodoret: Τῆς δὲ τελειώτητος ἐν τῇ μελλόντι, βλέπω τευχόμεθα ἐν τῷ παρόντι τοῖς τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ προφητῶν, καὶ διδασκάλων βοηθείας δόμεθα. And Theophyl.: ἄνδρα τέλειον, καὶ μέτρων ἥλκιας, λέγει τὴν τελειοτέραν τῶν δογμάτων γνώσεως ἄστερ καὶ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν παντελῆ καὶ δόκλητον αὐτοῦ γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως. On the metaphor, the Philological Commentators compare Polyb., 6, 4, 29. ἔκτισαντες ὧς παιδὶ νηπίῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ Фιλίππῳ, εὗρον αὐτὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα. Τοῖς ἐκτελεσθησθαι. Bion. Od. 2, 13. ἥν δ' ἀνεύοι εἰς μέτρον ἄθρου. Theocr. Id. 13. 13. ὅς αὕτως κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ πάντα πεποιημένος εἰς, ἄντρῳ δ' εἴ τε συνεν ἐς ἀλαθίνων ἄνδρες ἀποβαίνει. It is observed, by Morus, that both the Apostle and the Classical writers use the term τελειος ἄνδρες, of those whose faculties have attained to maturity. Wets. cites Philostr., V. Sophist. 1. p. 543. τὸ δὲ μέτρου τῆς ἥλκιας ταῖς μὲν ἀλλαὶ ἐκπιστήμαις γῆρως ἀρχήν.

The application of the figure is obvious.*

* On the scope and purport of the whole verse it is well remarked by Koppe: "Nempe cum opinionum, quae inter Christianos erant,
14. ἡν μὴκέτι—τῆς πλάνης. These words, Koppe thinks, have reference to ver. 11 and 12. ἔδωκε—εἰς οἰκοδομὴν—τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and the ἡν expresses the reason why these various kinds of teachers are constituted by Christ himself, namely, that we should not be any longer tossed to and fro by the stormy gusts of error. This view of the connexion is supported by the authority of Chrys. and Theophyl., who explain thus: "It was, that we might keep secure this little measure which we have received, and not, like children, be carried away by every teacher. For this reason (I say) were those καθεματα given us, namely, "to build up and confirm, that the edifice be not shaken." Most modern Commentators, connect this closely with the preceding. So Whitby: "That (so arriving at this perfection in faith and knowledge), we henceforth, &c." But the Doctor here forsakes his usual and safe guides very needlessly, and from an ill grounded fear, lest the reasons which the Roman Catholics plead for a succession of infallible guides in Christ, might seem to be countenanced. It surely does not follow, because God was pleased so to secure the steadfastness in faith of persons of the Apostolic age, that he should always do this. Nay, there are many reasons why he should not; since it would have been little necessary after the Scriptures of the New Testament had been promulgated; and we do not find that the Almighty, either in the gifts of nature or of grace, uses profusion. The note, however, of Whitby, is full of instructive matter.

The μὴκέτι, seems (as Theophyl. observes), to hint that they had been aforetime so tossed, &c.; which some explain of the period before they embraced the

varietate, homines multos in errores deducti, multaque inde incommoda et damnas ipsi religioni accidere posse et sole Paulus animadvertent; hinc, ut solet perpetuo ex hujus vitae miseris et infirmitatis vitæ futurae gaudia atque felicitatem humana mens deducere, ad illa ipse gaudia in regno Messiae olim expectanda, itaque alias etiam hanc Christianorum perfectionem referendam putavit Apostolus; quæ iones omnium Christianorum unanimes et in religionis doctrinâ maximè consentientes futuri videntur. cf. ad v. 3."
Gospel; others, of that which had passed since; and, considering the history of the infant Church, as we find it recorded in the New Testament, the latter seems to be the more probable opinion.

The νηπίοι are opposed to the ἄνδρες above.

In the words κλοῦνιζόμενοι—διδασκαλαί, is contained a nautical metaphor, similar to some others which we find in the Apostle’s writings. Nor is this surprising; since, from his history, we have some reason to think he was by no means ignorant of nautical affairs. Κλοῦνιζοθαί, from κλοῦν, a stormy wave, or strong current of water, signifies to be hurried away, and carried out of one’s course by such a κλοῦν. There is the same metaphor employed in James, 1, 6. ὁ γὰρ διακρίνομεν ἐσάκε κλοῦνι
dιαλάσσεις ἀνεμιζόμενοι καὶ ἔπιπλομένοι, and Hebr. 13, 9. διακαίρω ποικιλαῖς καὶ ξεναῖς μὴ περιψέεῖς. Compare Is, 57, 3. Nor is it unexampled in the Classical writers.*

Chrys., Theophyl., and ὙΕκumen. remark, on the delicacy of the Apostle, who says, not ye, but we, διὰ τὸ ἀνέμοις.

14. πάντι ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας, Koppe observes, is for πᾶση διδασκαλίᾳ ὥσπερ ἀνέμῳ. The ἀνέμος here meant, is not one of the steady winds, but the light, shifting, inconstant, changeable gusts of wind which prevail in the mediterranean, and carry ships out of their course, and whose violence the Apostle, doubtless, had often experienced in his various voyages. See Acts 27. It is observed, by Koppe, that in ἀνέμῳ, there is implied an idea of levity and muta-

* Thus Arist. 1, 27. (cited by Wets.) προσέδων, ἐπαγρυπνήσῃ, μαθέων διαλέγων; μόνον δὲ κλοῦνιζόμενος εἰς τοὺς πάθους, ἐνθα, φθορά, ἀνεμός οὐτε μένειν οὐτε πλείνει εἰς. Joseph. Ant. 9, 11 and 3. The same metaphor is used by Philo Jud. 410 ο, εἰσὶ γὰρ τίνες εὐθυδοκοῦσαι καὶ ἐπαφόρετοι πρὸς ἐκάτερον τοῖχον, ἄστερ σκέφτετο· ἣς ἐναντίον πνεύματα διαφέρομεν, ἀποκλίνοντες· and 754 ο, ἄστερ τε (I conjecture ye), ἀνερματίστα σκάφη, ὥς τε κέρατον σαλέους. Whence may be understood, Pollux 6, 121. ἀπαγίης, ἀμβλώσεως, ἀνερματιστίας, σαλέων τοῦ φέροντος σε πνεύματος, where I would read the τοῦ not before, but after, the ἕρι.
bility, such was inherent in the Sophists and Judaizers, to whom the Apostle here alludes.

14. ἐν τῇ κυβεῖᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Κυβεῖα, literally, signifies a playing at dice, from κύθος, a die, or square tessera, or ψῆφος. But this carries with it a notion of dexterity, both in a good, and a bad sense; and, as mountebanks have always cheated the eyes of the vulgar at dice, and by slight of hand tricks, so it came to denote craft and trickery in general (like that of coggings the dice). Thus, the sense is, “by the crafty, sleight, and trickery of men.” Such is the usual mode in which the words are explained, from which, however, that of the antient Commentators, and Morus, somewhat differ. They consider the κυβεῖα as meant to refer to the keeping the minds of the taught in an unsettled state, by either promulgating, or suppressing, or altering doctrines as they please, just as Dicers change the places of the dice at their pleasure. Thus ΟΕκumen.: Κυβεῖα τὰ λόγων λέγονται, οἱ πότε μὲν τοῦτο, πότε δὲ ἐκεῖνο διδάκτοντες, καὶ μεταβαίνοντες ἄλλο ἀπὸ τοῦτο εἰς τὸ τοῦτο πανούργος. And this, Morus observes, is confirmed by the context. There seems, however, no reason why both interpretations may not be conjoined.

The Apostle then adds, by way of explanation; ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης. A brief and somewhat obscure clause, which is well explained by Theophyl.: πρὸς ἄπερ ἡ πλάνη αὐτῶν μεθοδεία βούλεται, πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μετατθείμενοι καὶ περιφέρειμεν. δι’ οὕτων γὰρ ἄλλο πάντα μεθοδεύομεν καὶ τεχνάζομεν, ἡ τὸ πλανάν. Perhaps we may account for the ellipsis thus. From κυβεῖα understand κυβεῦστων, and take ἐν πανουργίᾳ for πανουργῶς.

The words πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης, signify, “with concerted and methodized plans of deceit.” Morus (who rightly compares this form with ἑφοδεία and περιοδεία) explains it, “artem, modum scienter fallendi.” Hence Hesych.: μεθοδείας, τέχνας. Grot. cites from Hermes Trismeg. the phrase ἀμεθοδευτος
κριτής, “a judge not to be practised upon by the tricks of orators,” and, as we say, impracticable.

15. Ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ, αὐξησαμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, ὥσ ἔστιν ἡ κεφαλή, ὁ Χ. The δὲ signifies, “but, on the contrary.” The αὐξ. (as ὁμεν at ver. 14.) depends upon ἰνα. Ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ, is explained by Mackn. (from the early modern Commentators) of the preaching, as faithful ministers and teachers, the truths of the Gospel from love to the people. And, in a note, he remarks that this must be a direction to ministers to teach their people sound doctrine. Doddrs., too, renders: “maintaining the truth in love.” And, in a note, he gravely admonishes his Clerical readers to observe that it was the design of the ministry to preserve peace and charity as well as orthodoxy, regularity, and discipline in the church. This no well instructed “divider of the truth” will deny: yet such cannot (I think) be the sense here meant to be inculcated, though Noesselt, I find, adopts it. The Apostle is speaking of the people in general, not of ministers. And the best Commentators, both antient and modern, are agreed that he is treating rather of practice than doctrine. So Theophyl.: ἡμεῖς δὲ Ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ, τῇ τε πρὸς τὸν Θεόν καὶ πρὸς τὸν πλῆθος, καὶ μηκέτι ἴσον ἰδίματα ἐχοντες, μήτε ἐν ὑπερκρίσει ἐχοντες (ἐνταῦθα γὰρ δοκεῖ καὶ περὶ βίου αὐτῶς διαλέγονται) αὐξησαμεν εἰς Χριστὸν τὰ πάντα ἡμῶν, τάντε βίον καὶ τὰ ἰδίματα. By Ἀληθεύειν, Koppe and Rosenm. observe, is meant to be true, both in thinking, speaking, and acting. (So Gen. “we be true men, and no spies.”) And they compare Philo. 787. μὴ κατα-ψεύσασθε τὸ πάθος, ἀλλ’ ἐπαληθέσθων. And by the ἐν ἀγάπῃ, Rosenm. thinks, the Apostle means that their love of truth must be so regulated as not to interfere with concord and mutual Christian love. Grot. and Morus render the ἄλθη ἐν ἀγάπῃ, “to sincerely love each other; be full of genuine love.” (See more in Rosenm.) But this seems too limited a sense. I therefore prefer the second interpretation; and must
observe that our common translation better represents the sense than any other.

15. *αὐξησομεν εἰς αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα.* It is strange that Koppe should take τὰ πάντα for σι πάντες. It is usually (and rightly) taken for κατὰ πάντα, and, in conjunction with *αὐξησομεν,* will, as Morus and Rosenm. observes, signify, making all proficiency and progress in knowledge, virtue, &c. *Eis autow* they rightly explain, “in respect to Christ; referring this increase to him as the cause.” So *eis Θεον* in Rom. 11, 36., and *eis Χριστον* in Eph. 1, 5. and Col. 1, 20. How all our proficiency in such points is to be ascribed to God and Christ, must be sought for from the Theologian rather than the Commentator.

16. *ἐξ οὗ τὰν τὸ σῶμα—ἐν ἐγώγη.* Compare Col. 2, 19. There is somewhat of irregularity in the phraseology, which may be thus adjusted: τῶν τὰ σώμα ἐν τῷ αὐξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται; q. d. τὸ σῶμα τῆς αὐξησιν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖται. Here, after the manner of the Hebrew, the same substantive is put twice; though in the place of one the reciprocal pronoun ought to have been used. Here the whole congregation is said to be connected, each contributing what it has in common: which is the sense conveyed by the figurative words, τὸ σῶμα—ἀφῆς. *Συμμετοχολογία* (i. e. συμμετοχολογία) and συμμετοχολογία, are synonymous. The ἀφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας is the junctura, which consists in supplying, under all circumstances, what each hath, for the common use. Offices and duties are compared to bands. (Rosenm.)

The words are rendered by Rosenm. thus: “Ex quo (cujus vi et virtute) universum ecclesiae corpus conjunctum et copulatum per diversos commissuras inter se adjuvantes, pro modo quo unumquodque membrum alicui operatur pro virili, crescit, ut per amorem perfectius evadat.” And Koppe observes that the sentiment, after withdrawing the figure, is as follows: “Under whose government God hath been pleased that the whole church should, by the various ministry of men, attain gradually greater and
greater increase." So Rosenm. "As from the head all the other parts of the body derive life, vigour, and motion, so that each by their mutual ministry assist one another; so the universal body of Christ is so conjoined by that virtue which it derives from Christ as its head, that each part may in its own way lend its vigour to another, by which the whole may grow and thrive."

16. κατ’ ἐνεργείαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνδε ἐκάστου μέρους, "by the operation or working of each individual part or member, according to the measure (of its power)."

For, as Rosenm. observes, Christ does not carry forward his congregation himself without the intervention of man, but by ministers, whose co-operation he employs, and whom love should prompt to exert their whole powers to bring about what he wills, namely, εἰκόνωμι ἐνωτό (scil. τοῦ σώματος) ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

17. Now follows an exhortation to the cultivation of other Christian virtues, which being first (ver. 17—24.) propounded generally, are then (at ver. 25 seqq.) illustrated by some single specimens of virtues and vices. (Koppe.)

Ματαιώματι is for παρακαλέω, obtestor, conjure. See Schleus. or Wahl. Ἡ ἐν κυρίῳ, ἡ τελευταία, "by the Lord," or "as ye love the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom we owe the benefits above mentioned." Μη-κεῖτε, "no longer, now that ye have been Christians." This seems to hint that some were then so living. Καθὼς ἐκαὶ τὰ ἱλάσατε ἐθνη, as the rest of the Gentiles (i, e, as other, viz. unconverted Gentile persons) live." Ἡ τέκνη ἡνοίᾳ ἀνδρῶν. Supply (For they walk) in, &c. The sense of this clause it is no easy matter to adjust, the word ματαιώματι being (especially in the Hellenistical use) so general a term signifying both vanity, and especially that of idolatry, and also improbity, &c. The best modern Commentators render, "they live suitably to the erroneous opinions which, as Gentiles, they have imbibed." Upon the whole, it seems most prudent to conjoin all the above senses, though the first chiefly
be kept in view. Thus Theophyl.: οὕτος τὰ ἑπτά στιγματέα, καὶ οὕτος τὰς πέλεις ἐκεῖνας, καὶ τῶς τοῦ ἐκείνου μετὰ τις προστάσεως εἰς μετατάσεις λέγεται, ὅτι "αὑτὸ, τούτῳ ὅτι ἔκει currentValue μετὰ τις χαρά. οὐ γὰρ τῇ ἑπτάνυσι τῆς πέλεις εἰσὶν οὐδὲ γὰρ λόγω ἐκτίθενται.

18. ἐπισκόπησε τῷ ἔθεια—αὐτώ. The Apostle here illustrates the nature and cause of this mental folly.

"Επισκόπησε is for ἐπισκόπησε, which was required by ἔθει (by the τῆς το στηδίσεως). Koppe compares a passage of Xen. Mem., where after τόλμες comes ταῦτα. And here this was the easier, as ἔθει had signified Gentile persons. The figure in ἔτοι, for ἐφόροι, befuddled, besotted, is frequent, and its ratio obvious. Compare 5, 8. Rom. 1, 21. And so Joseph. 400, 14. καὶ τῇ διαμαθί ἐπισκοπήσεως. Joseph. 1288, 25. ἐπισκόπησε γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰς γυναῖκας ὁ Θεός. Hesych. καταφράκτως ψυχᾶς ἐπισκοπεύει. It is observed by Theophyl.: Τὸ µὲν φῶς ἔλαμψε τῆς τε θεογνωσίας καὶ τοῦ καθαροῦ βίου, αὐτοί δὲ ἐκκύταρος ἑαυτῶς, ἀσθενεῖς παύσαντες τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς διαφανές διὰ τὴν ἀχίλη τῶν καὶ τῶν βιωμάτων φρουρίων.

18. ὧτες ἀγγελορυφομένω τῇς ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ. The ὧτες seems to have little force, but, in truth, the ἀγγελορυφ. is (as supra 2, 12. ἀγγ. τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ) to be treated as an adjective or substantive rather than a participle, and might be rendered (as there) aliens from. The very same construction is found in Col. 1, 21.

18. τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ. The τοῦ Θεοῦ is for κατὰ τῶν Θεοῦ, "a life approved unto God, and regulated by his will." So Ps. 51, 18. "the sacrifice of God is," &c.* It is well remarked by Theophyl., that the life

* Wets. compares Hierocl. in Aurex. Pythag. Carm. εἰκός τῆς θεοῦ θυητολ λέγοντο ἀν ἀνθρωπιᾶς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἀνθρώπων. τότε τίν πειαν ἐνδιώκειν τῇ ἁπτο τοῦ Θεοῦ φυγή, καὶ ἀνασωκομέναι πάλιν τῇ πρὸς τον Θεόν ἐκπορφή, καὶ αὖτω µὲν εἶναι τον Θεον λίον, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἀνθρώπους, ὡς ὅπνερ ὁμανη ὅσης ἰδίων μεταλλάζειν, τῇ τί εἰς τῇ µή εἶναι ἐκδέχεσθαι, ἀλλά τῇ τοῦ εὖ εἶναι ἀποτίθον: θάνατος γὰρ λογικῆς ὅσης ἰδίων καὶ ἀγνοία, ὦς ἐπεται καὶ ἵ πρὸς τῶν βιων
of a rational being consists in apprehending truth: but he who is blinded to this, really does not live, because truth and the light of reason are the substance of it.

18. διὰ τὴν ἀγνοίαν—αὐτῶν. This clause suggests the cause of their blindness and alienation; which, however, is expressed popularly, and not with philosophical exactness. The πάροσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν is taken by Koppe as a mere synonyme of ἀγνοίαν; as if διὰ τὴν—αὐτῶν were a clause exegetical of the preceding. But I rather regard the whole as expressed perhaps somewhat too briefly, but of which the sense is this: “By this ignorance (of the nature, attributes, and providence of God and a state of retribution), an ignorance partly occasioned by hardness of heart, contracted by sinful habits, and engendered by bad example and corrupt principles.” For so Whitby has explained the ἀγνοίαν and πάροσιν, and, I think, rightly. It is of consequence not to confound the two clauses; since the διὰ τὴν πάροσιν supplies the reason for the former. So Theophil. (from Chrys.), noticing the objection, “why, if ignorant, not instruct rather than accuse them?” judiciously adds, by way of paraphrase: Ἀλλ’ ἡ ἁγνοία διὰ τὴν πάροσιν αὐτῶν ἐπεγένετο, δ’ ἐστιν, διὰ τὴν ἀναισθησίαν ἤ δὲ ἀναισθησία ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἀκάθαρτον βλέπον διαβέβαις αὐτῶν. Ἡστε ἐγκαλείσθαι ἄξιοι. And Koppe observes that this ἀναισθησία, implied in πάροσιν, is in many antient languages a symbol of malignity and depravity of mind, as well as ignorance and stupidity. On the ratio metaphoræ in πάροσιν, see the note on Rom. 11, 7, and compare Is. 6, 10.

19. ἀπηλευκότες ἐαυτῶς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελειγίᾳ.

The ἀπηλευκότες. Wets. illustrates from numerous examples, scarcey any of which, however, are to the purpose, merely importing de-
spoir; which is not here the sense of the term; though the Syr.,
Vulg., and Arabic translators so understood it. As to the reading
ἀνέγκαιαστες in D., E., F., G., that is a mere emendation of those
who adopted the above sense, and, in order "to make surety more sure,"
altered the reading. To comprehend the import of ἀν. we must
attend to that force of διό in this and a few other words by which
it denotes ceasing from the action expressed by the verb. To which
purpose Wets. aptly cites Theucyd. 2, 61. ἀναλύομενες ἔστω ἱλικ
τοῦ κωποῦ τῆς σοφίας αὐτολαμβάνωσιν where the scholiast ex-
plains it "ceasing to grieve," and compares ἀναλυομέρεις, which
occurs elsewhere in the same author.* The sense of the expression
is explained by Theophyl.: κατερεβληθήκες, καὶ μὴ θέλως ἐγείρεσιν
καὶ κατέθεσαν τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ ἀναλύτως ἐθαύμασας, καὶ ὁλο
μεμφωμένοι. The recent Commentators take it to be equi-
valent to παρεσεῖν. But perhaps both senses may be con-
joined thus: "ceasing to feel remorse; ceasing to feel at all; becoming
callous to all sense of right and wrong; having no care or wish to
exert themselves about the matter."

Παρέδωκαν αὐτοῖς τῇ ἀναλυείᾳ. It is well observed by Theophyl.,
that hence may be explained and reconciled that passage of Romans,
where it is said that God gave them up to a reprobate mind, i.e.
God permitted them to give themselves up, &c., and abandoned
them to their own guidance. Ἐις ἔργασιαν, Kopp remarks, is for
εἰς τὸ ποιεῖσθαι ἔργασιαν. It is of more importance to notice, with
Theophyl., that the εἰς indicates that this was their settled and con-
tinued purpose. On the ἀναλυεία and the ἀκαθαρσία it is unneces-
sary to dwell, since they denote all those abominable impurities
which the Apostle ascribes to the Gentiles in Rom. 1. The Apostle
does not here enter into a detail of the disgusting particulars, as
there; but the term πάσης, which he uses, is doubtless meant to
include all there mentioned. And ἐν πλεονεχία is (I think) meant
to have an intensive force, and seems very significant. It is (I
conceive) an adverbial phrase for the advorb πλεονεχέτως, greatly.
So Phot.: καθ ἐπερσολον, ἀνερεχόμενος. And thus πλεονεχέτως is
by the Glossographers explained αὐδιν. They gave themselves up,
then, to such lasciviousness and sensuality, as if they never could
have enough. Compare Is. 66, 11. It is shrewdly remarked by
Chrysost. and Theophyl., that this ἐν πλεονεχία implies that it is
voluntary and self-engendered. And they both take πλεονεχία for
ὑμερία, which is confirmed by Polyb. Exc. Legat. 53. p. 1309,
where μετρεῖν is opposed to πλεονεχία.

* This rare sense also occurs in Herodot. 9, 31. ἀπεκάθεσαν,
Μ., "when they had ceased to grieve for." See Valck, in loc.,
who compares Suidas: ἀποκοπονικός. Ἀποκεκρυμαλισμος. Ἀπο-
κρυμασα. Ἀποκουπονίας. Ἀπερηφάνιας. And so ἀποκόσμως in
Aeschyl. Agam. 15, 22. Blomf. where see the note of the learned
Editor. Also Plut. Cleom. 92. ἀναλύομενες τῷ πένθους & Thocrr. Idyl.
1, 138. ἀπεκάθεσαν, ceased to speak.
The above is so natural and suitable a sense, that it is surprising almost all the recent Commentators (after Grot., who seems to have derived the opinion from Photius,) should explain the ἐν πιεστείᾳ, "for the sake of lucre and gain," since sometimes, they observe, even males prostituted their bodies. But I need not remark how flat and frigid a sense this yields, and little agreeable to the words παρέδωκαν ἡσελγείᾳ, (with which I would compare Diod. Sic. I. 17, 108. έδως ἐν εκατόν εἰς τροφὴν). Besides, the Apostle is here giving some general traits of character among the Gentiles, and especially depicts that insatiable sensuality which blunted all the feelings of virtue, deadened the force of conscience, and darkened the understanding and moral perceptions, so that they neither knew nor cared aught for living unto God. Moreover, corrupt as might be the state of morals among the Heathens, there is no reason to suppose that this male prostitution would be ascribed to them as a general trait. And it is in vain to plead that the Vulg. has avaritia; for Jerome himself explains that of insatiable greediness of pleasure; which signification occurs in a passage of Sallust, cited by Koppe: avaritia corpus animoque effeminat.

21. ἐγεί αὐτῶν ἡκούσατε, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔδιδαχθητε, καθὼς ἐστιν ἀληθεία ἐν τῷ Ἰσσα. Almost all the recent Commentators render the ἐγεί since, which signification may be admitted; but there seems no necessity to abandon the common interpretation si modo, which delicately hints a doubt whether the persons who acted as some of the Ephesians seem to have done,* rightly understood what they had been taught. See Phot. ap. Æcumen.

21. ἐν αὐτῷ ἔδιδαχθητε, "have been instructed in his doctrine." Καθὼς ἐστιν ἀληθεία ἐν τῷ Ι. Koppe would take ἀληθεία in the sense true virtue, as opposed to ἁσελγείᾳ of every kind; as Rom. 1, 18. 2, 8. But this seems very harsh; nor is there any need to desert the common interpretation, namely, "if ye have been taught and have understood the pure and sincere doctrine of Jesus," i. e. pure Christianity, which, as the Apostle immediately subjoins, involves the following duties, all inconsistent with sensuality. From this and the preceding verse we may (I think), with Doddr., Mackn., and Rosenm., infer that there was a certain manner of teaching and

* That there were such we may infer from the μαρτύρωμαι ἐπάν μηντε περιπάτειν, &c. at ver. 17. And compare 4, 1.
of earning the Christian doctrine not more inconsistent with such irregularities; and that this may
glance, like some other passages in the Apostles' writings, at those Christian teachers who were too
little wise to imitate the virtues of practical morality.
Now this, we know, was much the case at Corinth:
and it seems to have been so, though in a less degree,
at Ephesus. And no wonder, since the two cities
were supposed to be the most vicious and immoral
of any in the world. Indeed, the morals of the
Jews were almost proverbially depraved. My
learned readers will remember the Hippamus zeug-
det bonum of Hor. Carm. 3, 6, 27, and will know the
sense which it bears, on which Hitchenstich may be
consulted.

22. ἢ οὖν οἴονας ἐὰν λέγω τινὰς ἐπισκόπες
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐρωτήσῃ. The ἢν depends upon the
ὅταν. The sense is: "You have, I say, been
taught that you should put off." &c. On salarium
dehors, see the note on Rom. 6, 6, and the notes of
Whitby, Doddridge, and Wells. Κατὰ τὴν ἐπισκόπε
ἐπισκόπησιν, "which was (only) suitable to your
former mode of life." So Theophyl. explains: τὸ
τῆς προτέρας ἐπισκόπησις τέταρτον, καὶ τῷ σαλαρίῳ ζευκ
μετὰ ἐλοινήματος.

Romans, thinks the Apostle here refers to both
Jews and Gentiles. But from ver. 17 we may infer
that he only adverts to the latter.

22. τὸ φυλακτονοῦσα κατὰ τὰς ἐπισκόπους τὰς ἐπισκοπάς,
"corrupted by deceitful lusts." The genitive τῆς
ἐπισκόπης is (by a Hebraism) for the adjective ἐπισκό-
πην. It is strange that any should have explained
the ἐπισκόπης of the deceits of the priests and philoso-
phers, by whom (they tell us) the grossest vices
were excused. It is so much more natural to inter-
pret it, (with the antient Commentators,) of that de-
cuit which the heart and the passions practise on the
understanding, by the gratification of those lusts
which (to use words of Chrys., Doddridge, and Macknes)
delude by vain appearances and fallacious hopes,
always ending in disappointment and shame, and which deceive men into the belief that they are harmless, notwithstanding they will be their destruction at the last. So Hebr. 3, 15. "lest ye be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."

23. ἀναευθυνθείν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ νόις υλῶν. Most recent Commentators, as Koppe (from Grot.) regard the πνεῦμα, τοῦ νός as a periphrasis for "mente animoque," or a sort of hendiadys. Which is certainly getting rid of the difficulty; but perhaps not satisfactorily. The antient Commentators take τὸ πνεῦμα of the Holy Spirit. So Chrys.: τὸ πνεῦμα ταῦ ἐν τῷ νῷ. And Phot. ap. Æcumen. thus: 'Ἀναευθυνθεῖν δὲ δίᾳ τοῦ ἄγιου πνεύματος, τοῦ ὄντος ἐν τῷ νῷ υλῶν τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα παλαιῶν ώκ ἀνέχεται πράξεων καλῶν δὲ τὴν τοινύτω ἀνακαίνησιν ἐν πνεύματι γίνεσθαι λέγει· οὐ γὰρ σαρκατικῶς ἄλλως ἄντ᾽ ἄλλων γινόμεθα, ἀλλὰ δίᾳ πνεύματος ἐστιν ἡ ἀνακαίνησις. So also Theophyl. and Theodoret, as also Cajetan, Zanch, and others. Yet it may be questioned whether such an interpretation can be admitted, since it requires too much subaudition. And the influence of the Holy Spirit in producing this change (which the above excellent Commentators seem to have been intent to secure) may perhaps be attained in another way. Noς may, as Doddr. suggests, be put for the whole soul, and πνεῦμα, the spirit, for its intellectual and leading faculty, on which the Spirit of God might chiefly operate, yet not exclusive of some influence on the inferior powers." For this thought he was indebted to Budeus and Menoch. ap. Pole. Rosenm. (with a better spirit than he usually shows where the word πνεῦμα is concerned) remarks: "Πνεῦμα h. l. est melior sensus, quem acceprimus per πνεῦμα, dum discimus doctrinam, Divino spiritu emendamur. Compare Gal. 5, 19. where see the note."

24. ἐνδύωνοςτε τὸν καυνὸν ἄνθρωπον, &c. By the καυν. ἄνθρωπος. is meant, the regenerated heart, disposition, and manners. See Col. 8, 9. seqq. Some explain this κατὰ as put for διὰ, ut δ Ἐν. ; as in ver. 21. and
1 Cor. 12, 8. But it may be rendered, "in conformity to the will of God;" or, what, from the comparison of Col. 3, 9, will seem preferable, "after the example of God." (Koppe.) Thus our Common Version, "after God." And so the antient Commentators. Κτισθειτα, efformatum. This word is frequently used by St. Paul of moral regeneration and reformation; as supra 2, 10 & 15. 3, 9. (where see the notes), and Col. 3, 10. This is, however, always supposed to be effected with the co-operation and aid of the Holy Spirit, as Koppe here acknowledges.

The terms δικαιωσύνη and ὁσιότης are so distinguished by the best Classical writers, that the former is used for the discharge of duties towards men; the latter, towards God. And probably the Apostle here meant to observe the distinction; though the terms are treated by Koppe as mere synonyms. See the numerous Classical passages cited by Wet.

It is plain that the genitive τῆς ἁλαθείας is not put for truth, i.e. the Gospel (as Ap. Tillotson and Dr. Owen suppose), but is for the adjective ἁλαθεία. And I assent to the antient Commentators and Wet., that it is not to be confined (as it is done by most Commentators) to the latter, but understood also of the former, since both δικαιωσύνη and ὁσιότης may be dissembled, as in the case of the Pharisees.

25. δοὺ ἀποδέμενον τῇ ψευδο, λαλείτε ἁλθείαν ἐκπαι- τος μετὰ τῷ πλησίων αὐτοῦ. Up to 5, 20. follow various kinds of virtues common to all Christians, of which, however, the Apostle seems to have especially selected such as were, at that time (he suspected) not only very little practised among men in general, but even among Christians. (Koppe.) This is a just remark; but still I think, with Chrys., that there is so far a connection with the preceding, that the Apostle, as he had before mentioned the old man in a general way, now proceeds to give some chief characteristics of it, for the sake of warning.

Under ψευδο, Koppe and Rosenm. rightly remark,
is comprehended deceit of every kind; as appears from the reason subjoined. In ἐκατ. μετὰ τοῦ πλήσιον there is an Hebraism (as in ἡμικενος, ὡ σικαρίαν) for ἄλλος μετ' ἄλλων, or ἄλληλων. Compare Zach. 8, 16.

25. ὅτι ἐσμέν ἄλληλαν μέλη, "for we are each with another members of one body; and, as such, are formed and intended to help and assist each other: but lying and every kind of deceit (which implies more or less of injury) is contrary to this; for such vices tend to loosen the bands of society, and dissever the members of the body politic and ecclesiastical from each other, by destroying mutual confidence." As the Philological Commentators here produce no Classical citations, the following beautiful passage of Pindar may be acceptable: Ἡγ. incer. ἡκ. ἱκ. μεγάλης ἀρετῆς, ᾠνοσοῖ. Ἀλάθεια, Μη πταίσῃ ἔμων συνήθεων τραχεῖ πότε ἔνυθεῖ.

26. ὑγιὲσθε, καὶ μὴ ἄραρτάνετε. In this injunction the peculiar turn of the sentiment is especially to be attended to. It is plain (as Doddr., from Whitby, observes,) that we have here, not a command to be angry, but a concession only, with a caution to beware of sinning in it. Compare Is. 8, 9 & 10. and Nah. 3, 14 & 15. Koppe, too, compares Prov. 24, 16. 1 Cor. 7, 21 & 27. James 5, 14. 1 Pet. 2, 20. And Whitby, Nah. 3, 14. and Sir. 30, 9.* The καὶ (like the Hebr. י) stands for ἄλλα. The Commentators express the sense in various ways, but with little difference in the import. Perhaps the following paraphrase may best represent the sense: "Be angry, (if so it must be, and there be a reasonable cause, and then only), but beware (even then) lest you run into sin by intemperance in yielding to its emotions."

* I add Eurip. Suppl. 557. γνότας ὁν' χρεών γάρ, 'Αδικουμένους τε μεριλα, μὴ θυμή φέρειν, Ἀδικείν τε τοιαύθ, οἷα μὴ βλάψαι πόλιν' where Markland annotates thus: "Non autem putandum est Poetam permittere, nendum jubeere, ut injurias quis faciat: sed vult, Si quis alteri injuriam faciat (quod vix evitari potest, prout est vita hominum), caveat tamen ne ea sit injuria quem Rempublicam sive Patriam suam iedat." And he compares the present passage of St. Paul.
Thus is forbidden not only *injust*, but too harsh, and *intemperate* anger. On the nature of the passion of anger and the rules for its regulation see a sensible note of Dr. Mackn. Of course (as Dodd. remarks) the Apostle’s words imply that it is possible. He knew that it was no more practicable to eradicate all anger than to suppress all injury and hostility (nay, even our Redeemer himself was sometimes angry; as Mark 3, 5. et alibi). Therefore the Apostle elsewhere says, “*If it be possible, live at peace with all men.*” Hence his direction at Tit. 1, 7. is, not to be *soon* angry.

I would here compare a very admirable passage of Plutarch, Solon 21. where, after mentioning the penalties which Solon enacted by law against those who should be guilty of angry abuse towards any one publicly, he adds: τὸ γὰρ μηδαμὸν κρατεῖν ὄργης οὔτως μήπως ἐκλιπομένῳ καὶ ἀκόλουθων τὸ δὲ πανταχοῦ, χαλεπῶς ἐνιός ἐκδύναις δεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὸ δύνατον γέφυρες τὸν ρόκον, εἰ βούλειται χρησίμας ὄλγοις, ἀλλὰ μὴ πιλλοὺς ἀχρονώς καλάζεις. Similar sentiments occur in Eurip. Troad 53. ἐπιθετει ὁργας ἠπίως. Eurip. Bacch. 597. πρὸς σοφοὺ γὰρ ἀμφοὺς ἄσκειν σοφῶν εἰσρησταν. Eurip. Orest. 710. τῷ λίαν χρησθεὶς καλῶς, ἢ τῷ θυμικῷ; (as it is well explained by Schol. on Phæn. 587). See also Eurip. ap. Philoct. frag. 1.

26. ὁ ἠλιος μη ἐπιθυμητω ἐτὶ τῷ παροργηματι ώρων. These words seem intended to further illustrate the duty of Christians as connected with anger; and in the former clause its purport appears to be, that the anger should not be taken up causelessly, or entertained too violently; so here it is meant that it should not be permitted to *continue*, but that the irritation must be, as speedily as possible, subdued. The sentence seems to have the air of an adage. At least, such was the custom of the disciples of Pythagoras; as we learn from Plut. 2, 488 b. (cited by Wets.) ἐβα μεμεῖθαι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν, οἵ γένει μεθεν προστίκτοντες, ἀλλὰ καινοῦ λόγοι μετεχοῦσες, εἷστε πρωαχθὲν εἰς λοιπορίας ὑπ’ ὀργῆς, πρὶν ἢ τὸν ἠλίου δύνατον τὰς
The phrase μὴ ἐπιδύνετο ὁ ἡλίος ἐπὶ signifies not to extend anything beyond the day. So Philo, 2, 324, (cited by Wets.) μὴ ἐπιδύνετο ὁ ἡλίος ἀνεσκολοκισμένος, ἀλλ' ἐπικρυπτέσθωσαν γιὰ τὰ δύσεας καθαρεύετες. To which I add Liban. Or. Parent. in Julian, § 98. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν ἐπεγένετο τῷ βραχεὶ τούτῳ καὶ κοφῷ, ἐστὶ, τῷ τιμωρίας. And in Thucyd., and other authors, frequently occurs the phrase νῦν ἐπεγένετο τῷ ἵππῃ.

The above idiom, however, seems to have been common to both the Greek and Hebrew; for in Deut. 24, 15, it is said of a labourer: “At his day (i.e. his pay-day) thou shalt give him his hire (his wages), neither shall the sun go down upon it (unpaid).” It is plain from what the Apostle says, that he considered a sudden feeling of resentment excusable in a Christian, but not settled hatred. In which view I would compare Tacit. Agric. 22, apud quosdam acerbior in conviciis narrabatur—ceterum ex ira-cundia nihil supererat; honestius putabat offendere, quam odisse. At any rate, the Apostle’s words must imply an exhortation to very speedy abandonment of anger. For the term παραγγελία, the Commentators are agreed, implies no more; though they acknowledge that the παρὰ has usually an intensive force. Why then, it may be asked, was it used? Because (as I before observed) the Apostle means to hint that no other kind of anger but sudden resentment is tolerated in a Christian. But, indeed (as Koppe remarks), the word is sometimes applied to the wrath of God; as Deut. 32, 21. ἀνθρωποὶ, however.

27. μήτε διδότω τόπων τῷ διαβόλῳ. Strange it is that almost all the recent Interpreters, as Rosenm. and Schleus., should take τῷ διαβόλῳ to mean the adversary, the calumniator. And still more surprising that the former should pronounce this the more natural and easy sense. Such, indeed, I grant, it would have been to a Pagan, who had accidentally
taken up the New Testament; but not to a Christian, who has learnt from the sacred writings the existence of a Being who, by himself and his agents, tempts men to the commission of sin, and who is ever ready to assault us when the more violent passions of any kind are in commotion. Besides, the sense which those Commentators here introduce is not only harsh, but very rarely found in Scripture, and scarcely ever with the article. Even Koppe (sufficiently prone to innovation) admits that the common interpretation is supported by the tenour of Scripture, which represents Satan as the author and exciter of all bad passions. And, from the note of Schoettg., it appears to have been the opinion of the Rabbins that violent anger was excited by the Devil.

It is rightly remarked, by Chrys. and Theophyl., that by giving place to the temptations of the Devil, is meant to indulge hatred, and enter into continued hostilities with others.

28. ὁ κλέτων μὴ κεῖτι κλετέτω. Most of the Critics, as Grot., Koppe, and Rosenm., take κλέτων for κλέψας, after the manner of the Hebrew; since in that language the participle present is used for the preterite; as ἐπήθη. But it may be the participle imperfect. At least, almost all Translators assign it to the past sense. Yet I am rather inclined to agree with those who assign to it the present sense, “Let him that stealeth.”

With respect to the thing itself, the Apostle, it may be observed, imputes to them other vices as bad as theft; and we need not suppose that many were guilty of it, and such as were probably consisted chiefly of the lower orders. I agree with Koppe, that there is no reason to think theft, properly so called, was so prevalent among the Gentiles of that age, as Whitby, and some other declaimers (see the Commentators ap. Crit. Sacri, Pole, Wolf, &c.), would have us to believe. Those writers (as Koppe observes) confound very different ages and countries
in speaking of theft publicly tolerated among the Greeks,* Egyptians, and other nations.

The Apostle then suggests the best cure for this vice, which arises from idleness, by inculcating the formation of habits of patient and manual industry; and then engraves upon that an admonition to another virtue, which can have no place among the working classes except when united with industry, namely, charity to those in distress.

In the construction, we have a trajectio. The words may be taken thus: κοπιάτω τῶις χερσὶν, ἔργα-ζομένος τῷ ἄγαθῶι. By ἄγαθωι, most Commentators are agreed, is meant that which is right, honest, and useful to the community. The sense, then, is: "Let him exercise some useful handicraft." See 1 Cor. 4, 12. 1 Thess. 4, 4. Acts 20, 34. It may seem strange that τῷ ἄγαθῳ should be mentioned; but let it be remembered that thieves are sometimes laborious enough for evil. Or τῷ ἄγαθῳ may mean, "Let him study to do good to the community rather than evil."† When the Apostle says, "that he may have

* I should suppose that some of those writers must have adduced Thucyd. 1, 6, where speaking of piracy, it is said: ὥστε ἔχοντος τοὺς ἀναγόμενον τούτῳ τούτῳ ἔργον, φέροντο δὲ τὰ καὶ δέος μᾶλλον δηλοῦσι δὲ τῶν τε ἡπειρωτῶν τινὲς ἐτέ καὶ νῦν οἰς ἑαυτοῖς καλῶς τούτῳ ἐφίλον, καὶ τῶν ταλαίων τοὺς πορεύνοντας ταῖς πυτείς τῶν καταπλεύσαντος πανταχοῦ ὁμοίως ἐργούσιν, εἰ λειταὶ εἰποῦν, ὡς οὖστε δὲ πυροδόται ἀπαξίωσιν τῶν τοῦ ἐργοῦ, οὐκ ἐπιμελεῖ εἰπὲ εἰδέναι, οὐκ ὑπειδικέων ἐλπίζοντο δὲ καὶ καὶ ἐπιστρέφον ἀλλάξοντι. To which might be added many other passages. But such will not prove the point. It is sufficient to say that theft was, doubtless, prevalent among the lower classes, of which the Christians were chiefly composed, and will justify the Apostle in what he says. And this is confirmed by the expression, "labouring with his hands."

† Some, as Schleus, render τῷ ἄγαθῳ τέρα. "earning their food." And he adduces examples, to which may be added Alex. Sam. Athen. 572. Τεμπλωτὸν ἔγραψαν οἱ ἐπαιραι—ἐγραζόμενοι ἰσαυρῷ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρμῆς. But the common interpretation is confirmed by a very ancient imiation of the present passage, which occurs in Pseudo Phocyl. 13, 142. Ἐργάζομαι, μοχθάνω, ὡς εἰς ἰδίων βιοτεύνων. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀργός ἄνθρωπος κλοπής ἐς εἰς ἐπιτεύχων ἰδιώτων ἐπώνυμον Μήδη ἄλλον παρά δαίτων ἐδοκεισθαι καὶ ἑαυτῷ τραπέζῃς. Ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων βιοτεύμων ψάγεις. The writer of this seems to have also had in view Ps. 128. "for thou shalt eat
(something) to give to him that needeth," he adverts (as Koppe observes) to the nobler end of Christian industry; at the same time supposing the other, that of supporting himself and his family. Yet Koppe thinks he might have reference to persons who practised robbery, and thought it no sin, provided they gave part away in alms to the poor. And he cites Vajjkra Rabba. s. 3. fol. 147, 1. Melior est is, qui abit ἐν ἄσυρμε (et laborat) μὴ ἄθλετα ἔστησαν (et dat eleemosynas de suo) quām is qui alios injuriā opprimit, ίδρυμα τῶν ἱερών eleemosynas erogat de opibus aliorum.)

29. τὰς λόγος σασρᾶς ἐκ τού στόματος ὑμῶν. The Commentators are not quite agreed on the sense of σασρᾶς, which many recent ones take to signify inutilis, pravus, malignus. And so we say good for nothing. But I see no reason to desert the antient and common interpretation, addle, corrupt, filthy, obscene, in illustration of which sense the Commentators compare Hor. Od. 1, 36, 17. putres oculos. And Wets. observes, that in Arrian Epict. 2, 15. it is opposed ὑγειῖ πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν. Yet the sense is not (I think) confined to that, but extends to all brawling and foul-mouthed railing and calumny. See Mackn., Chrys., and Theophyl. Koppe observes that the contrary to this is signified at Col. 4, 6, "by speech seasoned with salt."

Koppe notices the Hebraism τὰς—μη (as ὧτι ἄτο), for μηδεῖς. The ἀλλ’ εἰτις is for ἀλλ’ ἢτις, "but what is:" of which idiom had Doddr. and Mackn. been aware, they would not have interpreted as they have done.

29. ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν, "adapted, fit for edification." Rosenm. cites Ach. Tat. L. 14. ἀγαθῶν εἰς φιλίαν οἶδα σε. This use, indeed, is found in all the best authors. Now to the οἰκοδομὴν is added τῆς χρείας, which Koppe thinks is for τῆς χρείας τῶν ἐστὶν.*

the labour of thine hands;" i. e. that which thine hands have laboured for and earned.

* So Theophyl.: ὅπερ οἰκοδομεῖ τὸν πλησίον, ἀναγκαῖον ὅν τῇ
I should rather think that ἐκεῖνος is to be understood. But may not the Genitive τῆς χρείας be taken (as often) for the cognate adjective? Or there may be an hypallage. As to the reading of some few MSS. and Fathers, and also of the Vulg. and some Latin Fathers, πίστεως, it is evidently ex emendatione; as might be expected from the character of the MSS., and as appears from the nature of the change. As to the omission of the word in the Syr., Arab., &c., that will prove nothing. The Translators omitted it, because they did not perceive that it added any thing to the sense. I cannot but censurc the temerity of Semler in rejecting both words as spurious.

29. ἵνα δὲ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούοντι. Koppe and Rosenm. explain the expression διδόναι χάριν by χαρίστα ἐίναι. And they observe that χαρίς in the sense acceptableness of words often occurs. Koppe cites from Xen. πρὸς χάριν λέγειν, which, indeed, perpetually occurs in the Classical writers; but it is quite of another nature. Wetstein's examples seem more apposite, since they all contain the very phrase χαρίν διδομένη. Yet the similarity is rather verbal than in sentiment. Most to the purpose is Eurip. Suppl. 414. ὁ δ' αὐτίχ' ἄρ συ, καὶ διδόναι πολλὴν χάριν, εἰκασίδες ἐβλασφ. And this mode of interpretation is supported by Theodoret: ἵνα φανὴ ἔκτος τοῖς ἀκούοντι. And so Menoch. Zanch, and Mackn. But I am not certain that this sense, supported though it be by Classical use, is the true one. That of our Common Version ('that it may minister grace to the hearers') is much more natural and suitable to the modes of thought of the Apostle. And so the Vulg. (approved by Grot.) prosit. Moreover, this is supported by Chrys., Æcumen., and Theodoret. And here Theophyl. has the following beautiful thought: ἀσπερ γὰρ τὸ μύρον χαρίν προκειμένη χρεία. And so Plut. 156 c. (cited by Wets.) Περιλήφη ἑρεί χαρίς τοῦ λόγου εὐθυμίας ἢν, ὧς ἀλήθει διὸ πρὸς τὸ βῆμα βαδίζων ἔχειτο τοῖς θείοις μηδὲ βήμα μηδὲν ἐκέχεισιν ἀκοντοὶ αὐτῶν, πρὸς τὴν προκειμένην χρείαν ἀνάρρησθαι.
διδάσκει τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν, ἐστὶν καὶ δόγμα θείος καὶ ψυχαμβελίς.

This latter interpretation is, I doubt not, the true one, especially as it is confirmed by the words following, which seems connected with these. See Dodd.

30. καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε—ἀπολυτρώσεως. This sentence contains a reason why they should abstain from the above mentioned vices, namely, because they would thus grieve the Holy Spirit, and cause him to depart from them. For the Holy Spirit is represented ἀνθρωποσκόπος as being grieved when men fall into actions, words, and thoughts, the contrary to what he suggests.* Thus, Rosenm. and Koppe remark, the Israelites, Exod. 23, 23., are said by disobedience to grieve the angel of God. And see Is. 63, 10. There is a very similar passage in Hermas Pastor. p. 210. (cited by Koppe) μὴ λυπεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιὸν τὸ κατατείχων ἐν σοί, μὴ τότε ἐντε ἦτα τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀποστῇ ἀπὸ σου, and Seneca Ep. 41. Sacer intra nos spiritus sedet bonorum malorumque nostrorum observator et custos, hic, prout a nobis tractatus est, ita nos ipse tractat.

I know not what Koppe and Rosenm. can mean by taking the τὸ ἁγιὸν πνεῦμα for τὸ Θείον; which is evidently averse to the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Spirit. Not so the Greek Commentators, and the modern ones up to the middle of the last century.

30. ἐν φόβῳ δοξαγισθείτε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως. On ἐσφόρησε ὑπάρχειν. See the note on 1, 13. And on ἀπολυτρ. see 1, 14. The term here signifies the resurrection.

* So Whitby (cited by Slade): "Passions and actions are often metaphorically attributed to the Deity, by which it is only meant that he will act in regard to us as men do when under the influence of such passions. We cannot suppose that the Holy Spirit of God is capable of suffering actual grief, but that he will deal with those who sin against him as men do when they are grieved, i.e. he will forsake them, and give them over to "a reprobate mind." To grieve the Spirit, then, is to oppose his dictates; therefore they may be opposed. See Rom. 8, 13. 1 Thess. 5, 19." See also Mackn.
31. πᾶσα πικρλά—κακία. By πικρλά is meant bitter, biting speeches. See Rom. 3, 14. and the note. The word is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. Ὑμῶς and ὁγγη are nearly synonymous: but the latter is rather the stronger expression. (Compare Rom. 2, 8.) Yet both may denote a high degree of either; or else the two terms must be taken with the qualification at ver. 26.: though the words following may, indeed, suggest the kind of anger here had in view, namely, that which produces the κραυγή and βλασφημία. They may be rendered, "brawling and abuse."

In order to pluck up by the roots every vice of this kind, he adds σων πᾶση κακία, "together with all other vices of the same class;" namely, violations of the principle suggested in the next verse, of being kind, gentle, and forgiving; and especially secret calumny.*

32. γίνεσθε δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλους—ἐμῖν. The terms χρηστοι, εὐσπλαγχνοι, and χαριζόμενοι are treated by Koppe as synonymous. But, in fact, they are not so; though they all bear a strong affinity to each other, there seems to be a sort of climax. The difference between the two first may be seen by consulting the notes on 2 Cor. 6, 6. and Gal. 5, 22. Koppe interprets the χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς (i.e. ἀλλήλους) not only of forgiveness of injuries, but of showing kindness. Yet the other passages in St. Paul's Epistles (2 Cor. 2, 7 & 10. 12, 18. Col. 2, 18. & 3, 18.), where that sense is found, do not countenance the notion: neither is it supported by the words following, which suggest the stronger motive for this, namely, that we are to so forgive other men as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven us, and put us into a state of salvation.

* So Εὐκμεν. 44. v. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι ὑπερ τῶν κυνῶν οἱ λαβροδάκτυαι, αἰς ωστε κραυγους, οὖτε δήλων ποιούσι τῶν ὀργήν, ἄλλα καὶ ἄγαλμmes ἔχοντες ἀμένονται ἐν καιρῷ τῶν λυπήσεως, βουλεύονται καὶ τὴν ἐνδομυχώσαν κακίαν αἴρεσθαι καὶ τὸρίζεσθαι.
EPHESIANS, CHAP. IV.: V.

Καθὼς is explained by Koppe: because. But to this sense it is unnecessary to resort. Ἡ Ἑρεμω is for διὰ Χριστοῦ.

CHAP. V.

VERSE 1. γίνεσθε οὐν μιμηταὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὥς τέκνα ἁγαπητά. This, it must be observed, is closely connected with the preceding; and the οὐν shows the inference. The sense is: "Be ye therefore (in these last respects, i.e. the being kind and forgiving) imitators of God,* who hath set you an example of those virtues which, as dutiful children (of God), ye ought to follow." So Grot.: "Liberorum est patrum moribus referre. Theophyl. observes that ἁγαπητά is mentioned, since all children do not imitate their parents; though such do. The Commentators give it the sense "bene morati." It may be rendered; "well disposed and dutiful."

2. καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἁγάπῃ—σμᾶς. These words are meant to excite them to the same duty, as imitators of Christ. For that is implied, though less clearly expressed, in καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. Περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἁγάπῃ does not merely signify ἁγαπᾶτε ἄλληλα. (as Koppe explains), but rather (as Grot. observes) the verb περιπ. expresses, not this or that action, but habit and perpetual tenor of life. Καθὼς is used as at 4. 32., i.e. "after the example of."

2. καὶ παρέδωκαν—εἰσδίας. These words express the great doctrine of the expiation of our sins by the sacrifice of the death of Christ, with more than usual distinctness. Koppe remarks on the constant and perpetual opinion of men, that no sure hope of pardon could be conceived without the death of a victim. He also observes that προσφορὰ and θυσία are

* So Strabo 631, 97. εἰ μὲν εἰρήται καὶ τούτο, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὸν μᾶλλον μιμεῖσθαι τοῖς Θεοῖς οὐκ εὐφρατεῖσθωσ.
not synonymous; the former (which answers to the Heb. הרמח being used of any gifts offered to procure the favour of the Deity, unbloody sacrifices; the latter (which answers to the Heb. הרמח) being used solely of victims, as Heb. 10, 3. והנה הקא פרושופא. Dr. Bates thinks that the 프רוספאה refers to the peace-offering; and the והנה to the sin-offering. Be that as it may, they seem conjoined (as Doddr. observes) to signify the completeness of the sacrifice.

Koppe construes thus: εἰς ὕσμην εὐωδίας τῷ Θ. And he thinks this answers to the Heb. לוהי לזרחה (as in Genes. 8, 21. and Levit. 2, 12. 3, 5.), which the Sept. perpetually render εἰς ὕσμην εὐωδίας (for εἰς εὐωδίας; and thus the expression came to signify nothing more than the adjunct grateful, acceptable.* So in Philip. 4, 16. the offering of the Philippians, sent to Paul by Epiphanius, is said to be an ὕσμην εὐωδίας and a והנה εἰκὺ. Compare Heb. 13, 16. and the able notes of Whitby and Wolf.

3. In this verse, up to ver. 21., the Apostle admonishes them to abstain from every sort of obscenity, whether in action, or speech. (Koppe.) The Apostle again adverts to the subject he had treated of at 4, 29., on obscene and ribald conversation, and considers it in conjunction with action.

Πορεία denotes both fornication and adultery: and ἀκαβαρσία, all those horrible impurities mentioned or hinted at in Rom. 1. So far all. Commentators are agreed; but not on the sense of the term πλευκεγεία, which is associated with these. Most of the antients understand it of covetousness; some, of idolatry; which sense, however, can by no means be admitted. And as it is associated with illicit venery, it cannot simply denote covetousness.† Hence almost all

* Koppe remarks that the phrase was derived from the opinion, (common to all nations,) that the Deity was himself present at the sacrifice, and ate of the flesh, or inhaled the fumes and fidor. And hence the most fragrant sacrifice was deemed the most acceptable to God.

† Though many Commentators endeavour to justify it on the
recent Commentators are agreed that it denotes *prostitution for lucre's sake*; not, however, to the exclusion of all false methods of money-getting, as that of bawds, procurers, &c.; which, Grot. thinks, was a necessary admonition to a dissolute trading-place like Ephesus. Thus it would answer to the ἀισχροκεζεία of which Theophrastus, Eth. Char., has given so masterly a sketch. But, after all, I do not see how this can here apply. I am inclined to think, with Hilary, Est., Hamm., Heins., Whitby, Locke, Olearius, Franckius, Dodd., and others, that the term here signifies intemperate even in lawful indulgence; for it cannot apply to *illicit* (as some Commentators think); since *there* the crime is not altered by the *more* or the *less*. That παιεία may have that sense none can doubt. See the note supra 4, 29. To *this* interpretation I see not what possible objection can be made; whereas, if that of *covetousness*, or *base gain* be adopted, it is impossible to comprehend why the Apostle should direct *them* not even to be *named.*

On the ὄνομαξεία, indeed, Commentators are divided in opinion. Some, as Mackn., render it, "mentioned with approbation and delight." But it could scarcely be *supposed* that the Apostle would give such a direction: and the sense is extremely feeble. That the simply *naming* the vices cannot be unlawful, Mackn. thinks, is plain, otherwise the Apostle would not have himself named them. But that is a weak argument. The most eminent Commentators are agreed, that it is *efficaciter dictum*, for μη ἐστω ἐν ὑμίν, "let them not be heard of among you." To this there is no objection, except that thus the μηδὲ seems to have no place. Why should we not suppose that the Apostle meant to direct that

ground that that sometimes leads to prostitution. And they refer to Juvenal Sat. 14, 173. But this is too far-fetched.

* I formerly thought that it might signify *seduction*, in which sense the word seems to be used in 1 Thess. 4, 6. And, were it not for ver. 5., I should still continue to think so.
such vices should not even be talked of among them. For conversation on such subjects, even when the crimes are not mentioned with approbation, is pernicious to morals; since, as Theophyl. shrewdly remarks: οἱ λογοὶ ὀδοὺς πρὸς τὰ πράγματα. And so Ἐξεκομ.: οἶδα γὰρ τῶν περὶ τούτων λόγων ἡμέραν μετακομα καὶ προκοπᾶς τῶν ἐργῶν γινομένων. See Abp. Leighton ap. Bulkley, and Abp. Secker ap. D'Oyley.*

4. καὶ αἰσχρότης, καὶ μορωλογία, ἢ εὐτραπελία.

The καὶ signifies and not, nor. So the Hebr. preceding by κ. Αἰσχρότης literally denotes smutiness and the immorality in speech. Koppe extends it also to immodesty in action. But this seems not to have been here had in view. The μορωλογία and εὐτραπελία must, in this connection, mean indecent talking and coarse jokes. The μορωλογία seems to denote a lesser kind of αἰσχρότης: though the words μορας, μωρα, &c. as also ἀφρασία, and many such terms, were (as Heinsius and Eslner in loc. observe) often applied to obscenity.† Koppe compares the Hebr. נא אágina (which literally signifies naughtiness of the mouth), dultilium in Plaut. M. G. 2, 3, 25, and morologus in Pers. 1, 1, 50. Eυτραπελία, joking. The word originally denoted no more than the faculty of giving a neat turn to words and phrases, witfulness: but it came at length to have the bad sense of coarse joking, and securility. So Aristot. Eth.: ἢ εὐτραπελία πεπαιδευμένη ὑδρος. Thus Koppe extends it to securile and coarse talk of every kind. But the context will scarcely permit this; and that was included in the λόγος σαπρὸς supra 4, 29. Here (I conceive) it especially denotes double entendre. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) acutely remarks: Ἡσπερ τὴν κραυγήν περιείλειν,


† We may, I think, reckon such words among the numerous euphemisms with which the Greek language abounds, and which is always a proof of corruption of manners. Thus Thucyd. mentions it as an evidence of the increase of immorality in the Peloponnesian war: καὶ τὴν εὐθυνὴν ἀξίωσιν τῶν όνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντίλαμπιν τῇ δικαιώσει. On which curious subject I shall adduce many illustrations (in loc.) in my forthcoming Edition of that Historian.
The words ἀεισχυλογία, μυρολογία, and ἐπιστελελογία depend upon μὴ ἀνομαζόνθω, which must (I think), by a dilogia, be taken in the sense heard or practised. The ὥσεὶ ἀνήκουσα are in apposition with those words, and are best rendered (as in our Common Version) by a relative and a verb, i. e. "which things are not suitable,"* namely, to our Christian calling, and our engagements as professors of a religion which was especially prosanctuated, to suppress all such abominations.

With the construction at ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰκαρτισία the Commentators are evidently perplexed; though they pay little attention to it. Some supply "is proper," (as Mackn.), or (as Whitby) "let your employment be." But these subauditions are too arbitrary. It is better to repeat ἄνομαζόνθω from the preceding μὴ ἀνομεῖ, and, by a slight accommodation of sense, render: "let εἰκαρτισία be named and practised among you." It remains, however, to determine the signification to be ascribed to εἰκαρτία. Almost all Commentators, ancient and modern (see Grot., Zanch, Hamm, Whitby, and Wolf,) explain it, "giving of thanks." But this, though the usual signification of the word, is here inconvenient, especially if we consider that the Apostle is rather treating of the duties of Christians in society, where it would be harsh and frigid to say, that "giving of thanks to God is rather to be practised than lewd and indecent conversation." The most prevalent interpretation among recent Commentators is that formerly propounded by Jerome, Hilary, and others, who explain it polite, temperate, graceful, honest, in opposition to scurrility and indecency. But (as Koppe observes) this use of the word is not found in the Apostle's writings, nor that of any of its derivatives, as εἰχάρις, εἰχαρίς, and εἰχαρτία. Indeed it would seem scarcely worthy of the Apostle's notice. I am therefore inclined to adopt the interpretation of Hamm., who explains it, "discourse full of grace," i. e. edifying, pious, and instructive. And this is strongly confirmed by the passage at 4, 29. (which the Apostle appears still to have in mind, intending, it should seem, to repeat the admonition,) where (as Hamm. observes) the corrupt con munication is forbidden, and, instead of it, the good commanded, for profitable instruction or edification, this is designed ἵνα δῦχαρὲν τοῖς ἀκούσοντες, that it may give grace, i. e. afford spiritual advantage, by increase of piety in the hearers. And he aptly compares Col. 4, 6. Let your speech be always ἐν χαρίᾳ, with grace, i. e. gracious, pious, seasoned with salt, contrary to the putrid, corrupt, of which the Ephesians are cautioned. See the note on 4, 29.

5. τωτὸ γὰρ ἐστε γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς πόρος, &c.

* The reading of some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, ὥσεὶ ἀνήκουσα is manifestly a gloss; though (with an ἀκροατικα not unusual to him) Griesbach puts it nearly on a footing with the textual reading.
Many MSS. read ἵστε, which is approved by Mill and Rosenm., and received by Giesb. And certainly this is the reading which would immediately strike a Classical scholar as being the true one: for this use of ἵστε often occurs in the Classical writers; in proof of which I could adduce numerous passages from Thucyd. But this may increase our suspicion that the reading has arisen from emendation; especially as the chief MSS. are those which we know to be full of interpolations and emendations. As to the Versions, they are no good evidence in a matter of this kind. We have here (as Grot. and the best Commentators are agreed) an Hebraic and somewhat emphatic form of expression for γινώσκετε, “and of this be ye well assured.” The sense, indeed, is the same according to either reading.

There is also a Hebraism in τὰς —οὐκ, for οὐδέλα. Koppe compares Theogn. 177. τὰς γαρ ἀνὴρ πενηδεμενος εἰτε τι εἰτειν οὐδ ερξαι δύναται, which he thinks a relique of antient phraseology. And this may be true, if the passage be really from an ancient author; but it seems not a little to countenance the opinion, that that work has been at least considerably interpolated. If the passage be genuine, it may also be regarded as affording a vestige of the Oriental origin of the Greek language.

The sense of the words πόρος, ἄκαθαρτος, and πλεονεκτής must be determined by the corresponding terms at ver. 8. where see the note.* Koppe observes that the ἐδακλατρος is to be applied to each of the three nouns preceding. And so Rosenm., who thinks the general sense is, “facinorosissimus est et pessimus,” i. e. he is as bad as an idolator, which was regarded by the Jews as the most abominable of all characters. So that the Apostle means to say, that those who commit such crimes are as bad as idolaters. For instance, the miser makes his money his

* See Philo and the Rabbinical writers cited by Wet.
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god.* All this is very true, but it will equally apply to all persons who so attach themselves to the world and its sensual pleasures, by intemperance and excess, as to abuse the word rather than use it, and of whom the Apostle elsewhere says, "they make their belly their god." Thus fornication and idolatry are regarded in Scripture as cognate crimes. The interpretation, therefore, above detailed of πλεονεξία is not at all shaken.

5. οἵκ εἶχες κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, i. e. "is not (to be) any partaker, will not participate in or enjoy the fruits of the eternal blessings prepared with Christ and God." See the note on 3, 18. The present tense in ἐχ. may, however, imply that he is neither really any member of Christ's Church here, nor will be any of the Church and general assembly of the just made perfect hereafter. Bp. Middleton (after Granville Sharp and Dr. Wordsworth) would render the τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, "of him who is the Christ and God." And he supports this version by a long annotation, the substance of which may be seen in Mr. Valpy.

6. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἄπαντα κένοις λόγοις. It should appear, as Theophyl. observes, that there had been some who had suggested that God issued heavy threatenings with respect to these comparatively light offences, but never meant to put them in execution. And I am the more ready to believe this, since I have known men, nay even Churchmen, of great ability and extensive learning, avow the same opinion. Where, then, is the wonder that persons who, though converted, still retained the leaven of vain philosophy, should have so reasoned. Hence I cannot agree with the recent Commentators, who maintain that the Apostle has reference to those phi-

* So Dodd.: "In whatever sense πλεονεξία is used, it may be called idolatry; as it is setting up something else, and (be it what it will) something comparatively very base and contemptible, and pursuing it as if it were something that could be to us, as in the place of God, a supreme happiness."
losophers who thought that there was nothing wrong in fornication, adultery, incest, sodomy, and egregious cheating. This is, I think, doing an injustice to the Philosophers, who, whatever might be their practice, never held such opinions.* But the truth is, that the Apostle has reference to Christians who wavered between the Gospel and Heathenism.

The above vain opinion, then, the Apostle destroys by the expressive formulas with which he commences both this and the preceding verses, λόγοις κένοις, empty words. See the Commentators. I would compare Soph. Phil, 5, 79. διεμπόλα λόγοι—ο ναυ-βάτης; where the Schol. explains ἔπατρα.

6. διὰ ταύτα γὰρ ἔχεται η ὁργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν τῆς ἀπειθείας, q. d. “the Divine wrath and punishment will really be visited on the heads of those who are disobedient to these injunctions.” The punishment here mentioned must, as Koppe, says be presumed to be eternal. Τίως τῆς ἀπειθείας. See the note on 2, 2. Koppe compares an antient oracle ap. Herodot. 8, 355. ὕπνιος υἱὸς. A very similar passage to the present occurs in Col. 3, 6.

7. μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμετόχοι αὐτῶν, “Beware lest ye, by partaking in their offences, participate in their punishment.” On συμμετ. see the note on supra 3, 6. Here the adjective is treated as a substantive; and the Glossarium seems to have reference hereto, which explains συμμετόχοι by particulones, partakers.

8. ἦτε γὰρ πότε, &c. The sense seems to be this: “For though ye were then (as they are) dark (in the ignorance of heathenism and idolatry), yet now ye are enlightened in the Lord, and his doctrine. Live therefore as children of the light, as enlightened per-

* As to what is called simple fornication in young men, I grant that the charge may be not unfounded; though there the proofs alleged are not conclusive. Whitby among the Philosophers mentions Cicero; and cites a passage from his Orat. pro Cælio. But it should be remembered, that those are not the words of Cicero the Philosopher (nor contain his deliberate opinion), but of Cicero the Pleader for Cælius. And when do we hold Pleaders accountable for all that they say in their harangues for another person?
sons." It is observed by Koppe, that ἔκτος and φῶς are symbols, the one of ignorance and its concomitant vices (on which see 4, 18.), and the other of knowledge of the will of God. Σκότος is by Koppe and Rosenm. taken for ἐν σκότει. But it seems better to regard it as put (abstract for concrete) for οἱ ἐσκοτισμένοι; as in Rom. 2, 19. ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ δίκαια, and infra 6, 12. See also Luke 22, 53. The ἐν Κυρίῳ Koppe and Rosenm. take for ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ. But the interpretation above adopted seems preferable. Τέκνα φῶς, "those who are studious of light and knowledge." So Hos. 10, 9. τὰ τέκνα ἀδικίας. Matt. 11, 19. τέκνα σοφίας, where the Syr. cultoribus. Αποκ. 2, 28. So the similar expression περιπατεῖν ἐν φωτὶ in 1 Job. 1, 7.

9. ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς—ἀληθεία. Several MS. Versions, Fathers, and Editions, for πνεῦμα read φωτὸς, which is confirmed by most Critics, and is received by Griesbach. The common reading is supposed to be undoubtedly introduced from Gal. 5, 22. (where see the note). The latter opinion, however, seems doubtful. It seems rather to have arisen from a marginal gloss. At all events, the sense is not materially altered; since φωτὸς imports not only the Divine knowledge in the ordinary way promulgated by Jesus Christ and the Apostles, but that which was in an extraordinary manner by the Holy Spirit.

Καρπὸς, "the effect," i.e. the practical effect in words. An idiom common to both the Hebrew and Greek. Ἐστὶ is explained by Koppe σωστῇ. And he (as does also Rosenm.) regards the terms ἀγαθοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀληθεία, as entirely synonymous, though accumulated for greater effect, and meant to comprehend the whole range of Christian virtues, viz. probity, integrity, and virtue of every kind. I am aware, indeed, how difficult it is to determine the sense of terms of this kind thus associated; but ἀγαθοσύνη (on which see the note on Gal. 5, 22.) seems to signify goodness of every kind, as it regards man; δικαιοσύνη, virtue both towards God and towards man. Ἀληθεία seems to stand in the place of an adjective.
qualifying both the preceding. See Schleus. Lex. or Wahl.

I must not omit to advert to the force of γάρ at the beginning of the verse; though it is unnoticed by the Commentators. It refers to a clause omitted, which may be thus supplied: "Live as children of light (and this, if ye be children of light, ye will do), for the effect of that light and the Spirit is," &c.

10. δοκιμάζοντες τι ἐστιν εὐάρεστον τῷ Κυρίῳ. On the construction Critics are divided in opinion. Some take the δοκιμ. as a participle for a finite verb, namely, δοκιμάζετε, in the imperative. But this seems harsh. I prefer, with others, to regard the δοκιμαζ. as connected with περιτατείτε; ver. 9. being parenthetical. The sense is, "trying in order that ye may know." See 2 Cor. 11, 28. Gal. 6, 4. and the notes.

11. καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνείτε—ἐλέγχετε. In the expression ἀκάρτως τοῦ σκότους there is a continuation of the metaphor at ver. 9. καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός. Compare Rom. 6, 21. "Ἀκαρπός is equivalent to ἀχρεόν. The sense is: "opera inutilia, prava." So Plut. 2. p. 15. τὰ γλυκά τοῦ λόγου οὐκ ἀκαρπῶν ἐστὶ οὐδὲ κενῶν. (Koppe.). It is strange that Mackn. and others should not have been aware of this litoles, which was distinctly seen by Theophyl. and Dodd., the former of whom observes that such works only produce death and shame.

11. τοῦ σκότους. The word has here the same sense as at ver. 8. By συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις is meant, "participate in any action either directly or (by approbation) indirectly." See Rom. 1, 32. Μᾶλλον δὲ ἐλέγχετε, "but rather reprove, and so correct them," namely, by avoiding all society with them, and discountenancing their vices by marked disapprobation, and especially by setting them an example of the opposite virtues. So Phot. ap. Æcumen.: ἐλέγχετε τῇ παραθέτει τοῦ οἰκείου βίου στουδαίου. He also observes, that this does not imply bitter censure. And so Theophyl., who adds: "Ἀλλο δὲ ἐλεγχει, καὶ
Ephesians, Chap. V.

By the συγκοινωνεῖτε, Chandler understands, "participation in the Heathen mysteries." But this seems too hypothetical. It may, however, be included.

12. τὰ γὰρ κρυφὴ—λέγειν. Koppe observes, that, ver. 12—14, are to be conjoined, and the sense may be thus expressed. "Some of their works indeed are so abominable, that to even speak of them might seem a violation of decency. Yet, if this be done to the end that they may be corrected and repressed, and the persons themselves return to a sense of duty; it is certainly the part of a good and wise man to animadvert on such. For he that enjoys the benefit of light, is bound to impart it to others also, as darkness is illuminated wherever light shines on it." (Koppe.) Yet the Apostle seems to hint at the mode in which the ἐλέγχοι is to be conducted, namely, by a marked disapprobation, and setting a contrary example, rather than by personal, ill timed, and coarse animadversions on their vices; which would be inconsistent with the maxim at ver. 8. The words are, a refined way* of saying that their conduct is most corrupt; and this, therefore, suggests a reason for the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε.

13. τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φαυτὸς φανεροῦται πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερώμενον, φῶς ἐστὶ.

These words are somewhat obscure, and their sense is variously discussed by the recent Commentators. The most favourite opinion is that of Storr. Diss. Exeg. 22., and Kuinoel, who take τὰ πάντα and πᾶν as masculines for neuters, and things put for the

* In which we may remark, that the γενόμενα (done) and λέγειν, are antithetical, and strongly emphatic. Many examples of this elegance are adduced by Wets., of which, the following are the most apposite. Isæus: τοῦτο ἐγκαλούσαν, ἀ ἐγὼ αἰσχύνομαι λέγειν, οὕτω δὲ τοῖς ὦκ ἡσύχετο. And Isocrat. ad Demonic. ἀ τοιεῖν αἰσχρὸν ταύτα νόμιζε μηδὲ λέγειν εἴναι καλόν. I add, Aristid. 3, 290. ἀ τοιεῖν αἰσχρὸν οὐδὲ λέγειν καλὸν. Athen. 256. E. τὰς ἐκ τοῦ βασιλέα τοῦ ἐν τρόπῳ τοῖς ὄμιλοις δίεθεσαν οὐδὲ λέγειν καλὸν. And so Joseph. (by Whiston): "They cannot bear the works of those crimes of which they commit the works." See the note, supra, ver. 3.
parions, ἑλέγχομενοι ἀπὸ φανερωμένων. They take ἑλέγχειν, here, to signify "patere monitis," (ἕλεγχυ λοις), and from thence, "recognise and feel horror at their wretched and lost condition; derive advantage from the ἑλέγχοι; begin to repent, and hearken to admonition." But it is difficult to see how such a sense can be elicited from the words, of which I think the more natural interpretation is that brought forward by the antient Commentators, and adopted by most modern ones. Koppe rightly observes, that the τὰ πάντα (like the τὰ γινόμενα at ver. 12.), must have reference to the facinora, or evil deeds. And it is justly observed by Rosenm., that a reason is here given why Christians ought to study to correct the bad morals of the Heathens (ver. 11.); a. d. "Such things as we are in darkness, cannot be manifested without light. So also, there is need of some light, that the vices of the Heathens may appear what they are; and such lights are Christians." This, I conceive, is the true interpretation; and it is confirmed by Theophyl., who excellently explains thus: Εἰκών δεὶ φῶς ἐστε, τὸ δὲ φῶς ἑλέγχει τὰ ἐν τῷ σκότει γινόμενα, ἐπάγει ἀν τοινυν ἵπτει εἰρήκοι, οὖν ἐννήστει λαθεῖν τοι πονηροῖ. Οὐ γὰρ λέγοντος φαίνοντος ἀλλὰ τοιείτης αὐτὴν ἀπετέλθη. οὕτω τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς ὀμερᾶς ἀρετῆς λάμποντος, ἐκείνοι ἄλλωσινται.

Ἑλέγχαι, has (I think) been well derived by Scheid ap. Lennep Ετυμ., from ἑλω or ἑλω, to drag. Hence, indeed, our word haul. It signifies, properly, to haul, or drag; which implies, pulling forwards; and, by the adjunct, to bring closer under the view of any one; or, generally, to bring to light, both as any thing is brought out of darkness to the light, and when any dark place is irradiated by the introduction of light. In this sense the word often used (especially by Artemid. See Wet.), but almost always in a metaphorical sense; as in the present passage, with which may be compared a locus geminos gemellus in John 3, 20. πᾶς γὰρ φαύλα πράσσων μοιεῖ τὸ φῶς, καὶ οὐκ ἐρέχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἑλέγχη τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, where, in the Antithesis, we have ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα. The admonition of the Apostle exactly accords with that of his Divine master, Matt. 5, 14—16.

Πᾶν τὸ φανερωμένον, φῶς ἔστι. We have here a clause of no little difficulty, the general sense of which (or at least the intent of the Apostle), is tolerably clear; but how to bring this to any regular grammatical proof is by no means easy. The question is, whether the φῶς is to be taken in the passive, or in the middle voice. Some antients (as Theophyl., Ἔκκομεν, and Phot.,) and moderns (as Wolf and Elsner), take it in the former, i. e. "evil deeds thus manifested and reproved are changed into good ones, i. e. evil persons thus become good persons." But, if this was the Apostle's meaning, he has expressed it most obscurely and harshly. Such an ἑλέγχος only tends to reform the bad, by making them (from the comparison) objects of detestation to themselves and others, and thus rousing conscience to do its office, which is the first dawn of amendment. Koppe, who also adopts the passive sense, renders: "Whatever is illustrated by the beams of light, shines (i. e. ought to shine) as a light to others. And so ought it to be
with you Christians." But this is too arbitrary and harsh. Othee, as Grot., take the ὅμοιον to be an active, and regard the ὑπό as an accusative, in this sense: "Whatever doth manifest any thing, that is light." Thus the application to Christians is obvious. The same method is adopted by Mr. Slede, who renders: "For it is the property of light to make every thing manifest." But it is very harsh to take ὑπό as an Accusative. It is, I think, plainly a nominative. And as to ἅπαξ ὑποίσχειν, it may be taken either as a passive, or a middle; since the sense will be nearly the same; but it seems to be the latter, i.e. "quidquid se exserit:" "whatever is manifested, or shows itself (as the life of good Christians), is light, or tends to enlighten the dark and ignorant Heathens." So in Matt. 5, 14. our Saviour (speaking of such) says: "Ye are the light of the world; a city standing on a hill cannot be hid." And then he admonishes them, to let the light of their good example shine, to be admired and imitated by the Heathens." * This interpretation is supported by the authority of the antients. Thus Theophyl.: δι' ὅ μὲν ἑπότερον βίος, φανεροῖς ὑπό, φανερώς ὑπό, φανερωτικός γὰρ ἐπιτείχει τὴν ἀμάθειαν κίνησιν καὶ πράξεις τὰ θεωρητήματα, διὰ τὸ ἀλά ἐνερ γεών κατάφερται, ἢ δεὶ ἐλεγχεῖν καὶ φανεροῖς. See also Chrys. and Οἰκουμεν.  

14. διὰ λέγειν Ἡγεμών ὁ καθεδρικός, καὶ ἀνώτερα ἐκ τῶν ἄνω τεκνῶν, καὶ ἐπιφανείᾳ σως ὁ Ἱστός. On these words the Commentators are divided in opinion. The antients regarded them as a quotation, or application of a passage of Scripture. And so most of the early modern Commentators. They think the Apostle has reference to Is. 60, 1-3., or 26, 19., or to both passages. Surenhus. fixes on Is. 40, 1 and 2. Some think he has reference to these and other passages generally. But to this it has been objected by the recent Commentators, that the first mentioned passages have little resemblance. Some antients and moderns suppose the words to be taken from a lost canonical book, and Epiphanius thinks, a prophecy of Elijah, or (as Syncellus and Euthalius) an apocryphal book of Jeremiah. But these opinions seem to rest on mere conjecture, and are only hypotheses made for the

* I cannot but suspect that the Apostle had in view these very words, derived perhaps from the Gospel of St. Matthew, which, in the opinion of some eminent Critics, was published long before the period when St. Paul wrote this Epistle; whether, with Bp. Toulaine, Drs. Owen, Townson, and Mr. Horne, we take A. D. 37 or 38, at that date; or 41, 42, or 48, with others. See Mr. Horne's Introduction.
noted, besides being liable to other objections. The most favourite opinion among the recent Commentators is that of Heuman, that λέγει is put for λέγεται, and the words are three verses of some pious hymn then sung in the Churches. And this may seem to be countenanced by the Apostle’s direction to the singing of Psalms, Hymns, &c., at ver. 19. That is, however, but a slender support; and the opinion cannot (I think) be admitted, not only as resting merely on conjecture, but because it is countenanced by the words themselves, which plainly have the air of an application of some passage of a sacred writer; as, indeed, is always the case, wherever the formula occurs in St. Paul; as 2 Cor., 6, 2. Gal. 3, 16. Hebr. 1, 6. And so a little before, at 4, 8. ὡς λέγει, scil. ἣ γραφή. I must, therefore, finally acquiesce in the ancient opinion that we have here a citation, perhaps, with accommodation, of Scriptural language.* On the words ἐγεῖρας—ἐκαίνων, indeed, nothing certain can be pronounced; though there may be an allusion to Is. 26, 19.; but, in the latter, καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς τῷ Χριστῷ (notwithstanding what the Critics say), there is clearly an allusion to Is. 60, 1—8. φωτίζων—ὁφθησαται.

The sense can require no explanation. Sin is here, as often, compared to death; and regeneration and reformation, to resurrection from the dead. See Rom. 13, 11. and Eph. 2, 1.

It is remarked, by Wets., that the Jews have always interpreted this passage of the Messiah. And he well illustrates the ἐπιφανεῖς, from Orph. Hymn., ὁς ἐβάλεις θυτοῖς ἢ ἀδαμάτοις ἐπιφαύσκων.

* Koppe indeed, and others, object to the verbal diversities. But until the var. lect. of the MSS. in these verses of the Sept., and other Greek Versions, be settled, nothing certain can be pronounced on the degree of discrepancy. The question, too, of the degree of license allowable to an inspired writer like St. Paul, in the application of passages of the Old Testament, has not yet been considered with sufficient attention. On this subject, the masterly work of Surenhus., and the observations of the two Vitringa, including the work of Owen, deserve consultation. Those who have not those works, may find a good substitute in Mr. Horne’s Introduction.
15. βλέπετε ὁδὸν τῶν ἀκριβῶς περιτατείτε. In determining the sense of these words, many Commentators, antient and modern (as Grot.), have erred, by supposing here a new admonition, namely, to the exercise of Christian prudence, in avoiding dangers. But some antients (and also Koppe) here rightly maintain, that the Apostle proceeds with the subject he had commenced at ver. 3., and insisted on at ver. 8., namely, to lead a life uncontaminated by the vices which defiled the heathens: on which he engrafts an admonition, especially against the vice of drunkenness, then so prevalent.

I cannot assent to those Commentators who unite ἀκριβῶς with βλέπετε; since, wherever it occurs at the commencement of any admonition, it has never an adverb. So 1 Cor., 1, 26. 10, 18. Mark 4, 24. βλέπετε τι ἀκούετε, and (to omit many other passages, which may be seen in Schleus. Lex. in voc. § 14, 15 and 16.) in a very similar one of Luke 8, 18. βλέπετε πῶς ἀκούετε, and 1 Cor., 3, 10. ἕκαστος βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ. The ἀκριβῶς must be construed with περιτατείτε: and πῶς is for ἐνα, or ὅτι; as it is taken by our English Translators. Ἀκριβῶς, I know not why Dodd. and Mackn. should render accurately. It is better translated, in our Common Version, circumspectly, i. e. carefully, diligently.

By the ἀσοφοί and σοφοί, the Apostle means those whom he has before called σκότος and φῶς; and, just after, ἄφοροις and σωίτερες, by a common Hebrew idiom, by which wisdom is put for virtue, and folly for vice. Some think, that, by ἀσοφοί, he adverts to the pretended σοφοί of the Heathens, and represents the Christian alone as really so.

16. ἐξαγόραζομενοι τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηράι εἰσι.

There are few passages that have more exercised the ingenuity of Commentators, and on which more various opinions have been brought forward. Some antient, and several modern Commentators, as Grot., Hamm., and Whitly, explain thus: " using all
prudent means to prolong your lives, because the days in which you live are evil, and therefore perilous, and such as will require much wisdom to preserve you from dangers." And so Locke and Mackn. Thus (to use the words of Doddr.) they explain it of the caution to be observed in avoiding persecution, that so they might draw out their time as long as possibly they could, and not provoke their enemies to cut them off. Compare Dan. 2, 8. See also the note of Whitby. This (Doddr. adds) was certainly their duty, and it had been well if the zeal of some primitive Christians had regarded the precept in this sense. But the interpretation expresses only a part of that Christian diligence and prudence to which the Apostle meant to direct and exhort us."

I could, indeed, easily add to the examples adduced by the above learned Commentators, in proof and illustration of this sense of ἐκαγ., especially from Eurip. Hippol. 1116. Δὲ ηὲ μὴ ν τρεφεὶς, μὴ αὐτοὶ παράσιμος ἔνειη. Ρήθη τὸ ἄκη τὸν κύριον Μεσαβαλλομένα χρῶνον ὡς Βίον ζωντευκοινη, and of κερδαίνει τὸν χρῶνον, from Thucyd. 1, 32. Lips. Yet I must confess, that though this interpretation seems to be countenanced by the parallel passage of Coloss., I see not how it can be reconciled with the context. For, in ver. 15., the βλέπετε οὗτος, &c. is closely connected with the preceding, and can have no regard to this subject. (See the note there.) But if this be so, the words ἐκαγ., &c. can have no other reference. And the words of ver. 17., seem to be little more than a repetition of those at ver. 15. Such being the case, I grant, that ver. 16., would seem to be parenthetical. But, if parenthetical, yet, as being closely connected with the preceding, they cannot be supposed very different in subject. So that, though every attention to the parallel passage in Coloss. ought to be paid, yet, it should not be so as to entirely sacrifice all attention to the context of the one with which we are more immediately concerned; especially as the context in that passage and this is totally different; and no Author is confined to use the same phrase precisely in the same way in two different works. Besides, there, the context as much requires the interpretation in question, as here, it rejects it. The interpretation in question must therefore be abandoned (as it is also done by many eminent recent Commentators), and the words interpreted in accordance with the preceding and following verses; either (as the antient, and many eminent recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Koppe, and Slade), "using the opportunity we have of living holily, righteously, and godly in this present time, though it be evil and wicked, and this be especially arduous, on account of the peculiar trials under which we labour, from the temptations and the persecutions to which we are exposed." (See Schleus. Lex.) So Koppe, who compares a similar sentiment of M. Antonin. 4, 36., κερδαίνει τὸ πάρον, which seems an imitation of the present passage. And ἐκαγοράζουσαι τὸν καυμόν, he explains, "diligenter uti opportunitate oblatā ad vitam meliorem redendī;" and the ὅτι ἡμέραι πονηραὶ εἰσὶ, "tempora enim hæc sunt periculosa virtuti et felicitati vestrae. Innumeræ sunt hæc vestrae estate voluptatum et calamitatum illecebræ, quibus a religione averti, et ad incredulitatem ac vitia quævis seduci facile poteritis." I cannot, however, but
think, with Dodd., that the Apostle also alludes to the time which had been lost in their heathen life.

Bp. Middleton, intending, it should seem, to reconcile the two foregoing interpretations, observes, that it seems to the purpose of the Apostle in this place, as well as Eph. 5, 16., to admonish his Christian readers to "purchase the opportunity (viz., of gaining over the Heathens) by judicious concessions, and by a virtuous example." The reason subjoined is, "that the days are evil; i.e. the times in which ye live are so unpropitious to the conversion of the Jews and the Pagans, that the zeal and circumspection which I have recommended are indispensable." With all due deference to so high an authority, I must confess that I cannot but consider this interpretation very harsh and farfetched, and neither countenanced by the context in this, nor in the parallel passage.

17. διὰ τῶν — Kupíou. The sense of this passage has been explained in the preceding verse.

18. καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἶνῳ, ἐν δὲ ἐστὶν ἀσωτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ πληρώσετε ἐν πνεύματι. The Apostle here adverts to a vice for which the Greeks, both Asiatic and European, were proverbial. Hence, the phrase Graecissare, which may be compared with several in our own language. Some recent Commentators think that he speaks with reference to the systematic drunkenness practised at the Heathen feasts; others, that of which the Christians were sometimes guilty at the celebration of the Eucharist; and there is no reference, they think, to private custom. That he here alludes to the second kind, they think, appears from the next verse. But as I am never willing causelessly to limit what may seem left general, I would suppose that the Apostle means to follow up a special admonition on the subject with this general one; though he may have had in view especially the more frequent commission of it in society, and its religious feasts; especially as the custom had been introduced from the religion which they had abandoned.

But to turn to the consideration of the phraseology, the οἶνῳ (which rarely occurs in conjunction with μεθύσκεσθαι, though I find it in Dio Chrys. p. 307, 11. οἱ μεθυσθέντες ἀπὸ οἴου) is used on account of the antithesis in πνεύματι. The phrase μεθύσκεσθαι,
to be inebriated (for which μεθών is more usual),
comes from μέθυ,* strong drink.

18. εὖ ὁ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία. This is not well rendered,
"in which is excess;" for the very term suggests
excess. The sense depends upon a delicate use of
ἐστίν, by which it signifies inest, originates, produces,
tends to, &c. At εὖ ὁ must be understood, not ὁ ὁ
(with some Commentators, though Doddr., with his
usual ingenuity, recognises in it a strong and beauti-
ful figure), but τῷ μεθύσκεσθαι τῷ ὁ.
The term ἀσωτία is, as Koppe observes, a vox prægnans,
signifying properly, "the life of a person abandoned to
every vice, marked out for ruin, whom, to use the
Classical dict. not even the goddess of salvation her-
self could save!" See Dr. Powell's Serm. ap. Clapham,
t. 2. p. 428. It may be well expressed by dissolute-
ness, profligacy. See Prov. 23, 29. Yet the Apostle
seems to have had a reference to the etymology of
the word. For of whose reformation do we so much
despair as the drunkard's? the vice of drunkenness
destroying both body and soul. Of such sensualists
it is well observed by Theognis: Πολλῶ τοι πλεινας
λιμων κροτος ἀλεσεν ἦν άνδρας, οὐοι μολῆς πλεῖον ἔχειν
ἐθελον, "would have more than their share of the
good things of life."

On this admonition against a vice too frequent in
society the Apostle engrafts an exhortation to a
virtue too much neglected in society, namely, think-

* A word (by the way) which has exceedingly perplexed the
Greek etymologists, who endeavour to seek its origin in the Greek
itself. But they ought to have gone to the Goth rather than the
Greek. It comes from the Gothic and Ang. Sax. æræ, Angl. mead (as the Welch metheglín), and formerly meath (as Milton, Par.
Lost. 5, 345.

"for drink the grape she bruises, 
Inoffensive must, and meaths from many a berry,
And from sweet kernels press'd she tempers dulcet creams,")
which is derived, I think, from the Latin mist-us, or Ang. Sax.
/Area, or Ærice, from whence, by another comparison, our Mist.
The word is explained in the Dictionaries, a drink made from honey
and spices.
ing and speaking to the edification of the company, and feeling and returning grateful thanks to God for the good things in which they may jointly participate. Such is, I conceive, the scope of the Apostle in the next two verses, whose sense has been obscurely seen by the Commentators, and misunderstood by confining it to religious assemblies. So supra, ver. 5. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία: and 4, 29. πᾶς λόγος—ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, ἵνα διὸ χάριν τοῖς ἁκούοντι: where see the note.

There is an antithesis between the μεθώσκετε and πληρώσει. In both these is the same leading idea of being filled. When it is said, “be filled with the spirit,” we are (I think) to understand the endear-avour; q. d. “study to be filled with the spirit,” and especially advertling to the effect, “aim at making your conversation such as may, by the aid of the spirit, be edifying.”

19. λαλοῦντες—Kupīn.

Adverting (according to his custom) to the opposite vice, while he is inculcating any virtue, the Apostle means to admonish them, when, in society, they feel themselves elevated beyond ordinary conversation, to give vent to this cheerfulness, not (as did the Heathens) in dissolute Scolia, or drinking catches, and, such incentives to vice, but in reciting aloud to each other psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs; or, when inclination and opportunity served, singing and playing on musical instruments to such psalms, &c. in a heartfelt manner, to the honour of God. Such is, I conceive, the complete sense of the verse, which has been strangely misunderstood.

Λαλοῦντες εὐαυτίς. Some explain this, “cosmet ipsos excitate ad gaudia, non vino intemperranter bibendo, sed carminibus Deo Christoque canendis.” But this seems harsh. I agree with Koppe that εὐαυτίς is for ἀλλήλοις; as at 4, 32., and Phil. 2, 12. Λαλοῦντες is thought by Koppe synonymous with δοῦνες. But I rather think it refers to the words being always recited by some previously to being sung. And if not sung, the recitation promoted the end in view, namely, mutual edification. Thus the passage will be reconciled with the parallel one in Col. 3, 16. διάκονες καὶ νοθετοῦντες εὐαυτίς ψαλμοῖς, &c.

With respect to the ψαλμοῖς ὑμνοῖς and φίλαι, these terms admit of no very certain discrimination; and Koppe (as usual) waves the difficulty by pronouncing them all synonyms, but associated, to strengthen the sense. But it should seem that they are no otherwise synonymous than as all denoting religious compositions. As
to the ψαλμοὶ, some, as Schleus., confine it to the Psalms of David. But had that been the sense intended, the article would have been used. Koppe understands any carmina. The truth will perhaps be found to lie in the medium between these two extremes. It should seem that they chiefly consisted of the Psalms of David, the καθορισμένοι, but certainly comprehended other compositions also adapted (as they were) to instruments and voices, i.e. consisted of compositions in parts, accompaniments, &c. (as our verse anthems and instrumental anthems.)* See Burney’s Mus. Dict.) Of course, this included the antiphonia, or singing alternatim, as in our cathedral services; which Bp. Bull thinks is denoted by the λαλοῦντες καταφορίς: and if it were not for the parallel passage of Coloss., I should agree with him. That the ψαλμοὶ were thus performed is also shown by a passage of Pliny in his letter to Trajan (cited by Bp. Bull): “Carmen quod Christo quasi Deo dicere secus sum invicem.

The ψαλμοὶ were probably plainer compositions (chiefly in praise of God), both in words and set to music, and perhaps in one part (called homophonia, see Burney) without instrumental accompaniments,† according to the mode pursued in many of our churches. These are thought by some Commentators to have been extemporaneous. But of this there is no proof (for the passage of Acts 16, 25. is not such); nor is the supposition countenanced by probability. That seems rather to apply to the last class, the ώδαις ψευματωσ. Now these must, I think with the patient and best modern Commentators, signify not merely religious, or spiritual and edifying, in opposition to the carnal and impure songs at the Heathen festivals and entertainments, like the Scolia,‡ but suggested by the Holy Spirit. So Zanch. and Hamm. ap. Pole, the former of whom explains “et a spiritu S. profectis, et de rebus spiritualibus, et verbis spiritus S.;” and the latter, “ex dono illo spiritibus, de quo 1 Cor. 14, 26.” These, as may be conjectured, were sung by the person alone, like our solo anthems.§ It is, however, probable from the λαλοῦντες and διδασκόντες at Coloss. that they were not always sung, but merely recited; and if so, the ώδαις ψευματωσ. would be something like the strains of the Italian Improvisatori, in that sort of composition, half poetry and half prose, so characteristic of the

---

* Thus in 1 Cor. 14, 26. εἰς τοὺς ψαλμοὺς τῶν Χριστοῦ, where the word denotes an inspired, and, as some say, extemporaneous composition of this kind.
† So Justin Resp. ad Orthod. 107. says the Christians of that time sang only ausco voce, δρέν ὑπαρχόντας.
‡ To which purpose there is a curious passage in Eurip. Rhees. 360.
§ Which word, by the way, does not come from antiphonia (as Nugent supposes), nor δρένυμος (as Skinner and Lemon), but from δρόμος, as being a more florid composition than the plain chant. So Plut. de Musica.

VOL. VII.
Oriental style.* The Commentators instance the songs of Elizabeth, of Mary, and of Zacharias, recorded by St. Luke, c. 1. Estius thinks that the Apostle means to recommend it to them to sing Psalms, &c., not only in their religious assemblies, but in private societies. This is very probable; and the Apostle (I would add) meant to hint to them that their social cheerfulness ought to find vent in such a way as this, and not in the impure songs of the Hellenists. So St. James, in a very similar passage, 5, 13. καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ προσευχήσετε εὐθυμεῖ τις, παλιντὺ. There is a similar admonition of Pythagoras, preserved by Diogen. Laert. L. 8., where we have both the ύμνοι and ἱδία: ὑδίας χρήσαι πρὸς λύραν, ὑμνοὶ ἐν Θεῷ, καὶ ἀνθρώπων εὐλογος χάρις ἔχειν.

It is strange that Koppe and Rosenm. should take προσμεταρ. to be meant of all three. Grammatical propriety will not permit us to apply it to more than the last. To the first, as consisting chiefly of the Psalms of David, it would not be necessary, nor to the ύμνοι; since these were, doubtless, premeditated praises, and such alone would be proper to be sung in unison or chorus. But the third being sung or recited by one person for the edification of the rest of the congregation, such a quality as is denoted by προσμεταρίως would be unnecessary. It may be supposed that none were allowed to sing or recite these but such as possessed the spiritual χάρις adapted to this purpose.

From all that has been said, it is easy to perceive what is the meaning of the phrase ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, at which Koppe, Rosenm., and other recent Commentators stumble, rendering it: "secum tacitâ cogitatione;" or, at least, not animo, but mente, with reference to the τῇ ρολ at 1 Cor. 14, 15. But there the sense is very different (see the note), and here that interpretation would require, not mente, but animo. The antients, and some moderns (as Beza and others) rightly explain it, "with the heart, and not the lips only; with the attention of the mind," καὶ μὴ μεθοπαθεῖς τῆς καρδίας (to use the words of Chrysost.), and not with the heart wandering here and there.

I must not omit to observe, notwithstanding what some recent Commentators think, that no direct argument can be hence drawn as to the use of the Psalms of David, or what are called Hymns, in public worship; since the Apostle is here only speaking of private societies. See the note on vcr. 18. μὴ μεθοπαθεῖς τῆς καρδίας. Yet an indirect one may be deduced. For there is no reason why the same routine should not have been adopted also in public worship; and from what is said at 1 Cor. 12, 13 & 14., which passage concerns public worship, this seems highly probable; and it is placed beyond a doubt by a passage of Tertullian Apol., cited by Grot.: Ut quisque de Scripturâ sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio, potest, provocatur in medium Deo canere, where the Sacr. Script. must mean the Psalms.

* The subjects were probably more diversified than those of the ψαλμοὶ and ὕμνοι, and contained not only the praises of God, but (as Zanch. thinks) exhortations, doctrines, prophecies, and, indeed, all religious subjects whatsoever.
of David, and the words "de proprio ingenio" have reference to
the ά́δαλ.

By τῷ Κυρίῳ may be meant God, or rather (as most Commenta-
tors think) Christ: and this is strongly confirmed by the passage of
Pliny above cited. The version, however, of Grot., and the recent
Commentators, "in honorem Christi," is scarcely significant
enough. Jaspis (by a manifest perversion) renders "de Domini
præconio."

20. εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων. It is
strange that most recent Commentators should take
the participle here for a finite verb, q. d. "Be assiduous in returning thanks," &c. No sufficient at-
tention has been paid to the connection and scope of
these words, which, as being closely united with the
preceeding, are meant to suggest what should form
the subject, or chief subject, of these Hymns and
sacred Poems, namely, returning God thanks for all
things. Whitby has expressed the force of the
πάντων thus: "for his sparing mercies, Ps. 103, 3, 4.,
his preventing mercies, Eph. 1, 4., Tit. 1, 2., his dis-
tinguishing and peculiar mercies, Heb. 2, 16., for
his common mercies and benefits daily bestowed
upon us, as well as his extraordinary favours; for
past mercies, to be celebrated by annual festivals,
Exod. 12, 14, 17 & 24., Lev. 23, 21., for the mercies
we hope for, 1 Pet. 1, 3 & 4., for adverse as well as
prosperous events, blessing him who doth thus give
us warning, Ps. 16, 7., but chiefly for spiritual bless-
ings." An exposition in which he was, I find,
much indebted to his usual guides, the Greek Com-
mentators. So Chrys. and Theophyl.: πάντοτε οὐ
γὰρ ἐν ἀνέσει μόνον, άλλα καὶ ἐν λύπαις, καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ
τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνον, άλλα καὶ τῶν λυπηρῶν, καὶ οὐν ἱσμεν
καὶ οὐκ ίσιμεν καὶ γὰρ διὰ πάντων εὐεργετούμεθα, καὶ
ἀγράμεν. Dodd. observes that Dr. Barrow gives
another important and noble sense, namely, "all
persons." And he remarks that this is hinted at
in the excellent form of general thanksgiving in
the English liturgy. I must add that this interpre-
tation had been, before Dr. Barrow, propounded by
Cajetan, nay even Theodoret. Hence it was un-
doubtedly supported by some of the antient Fathers, on whose authority, it should seem, the learned and venerable authors of our Liturgy (a Liturgy which has wrung praises from the mouth of dissent itself) ventured to introduce it. It may certainly be included with the other and more general sense.

20. ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ᾽Ι. Χ. At these words the recent Commentators stumble. Koppe explains, "from the authority of Christ:” Rosenm., “according to the will of Christ.” But this is strangely lowering the sense, and overlooking the mediatory office of Christ. Not so the antient, and the earlier and orthodox modern Commentators. Thus Theophyl. : ὀνομάζοντες καὶ τῶν Κυρίων Ἱερεῶν καὶ συμπαραλαμβάνοντες αὐτῶν, ὡς μετίτιν ὀντα καὶ τῶν ἄγαθων καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς εὐχαριστίας. See also Chrys. and Doddr.

21. ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ. Almost all modern Commentators separate this clause from the preceding, and think that here commence admonitions of another kind, namely, respecting subordination, natural, civil, and ecclesiastical. If this be the case, the ὑποτασσόμενοι must be taken as a participle for a verb in the imperative; which (as I have before observed) is somewhat harsh. I am inclined to think that the antient Commentators were more in the right, who, following the connexion pointed out by the grammatical construction, unite this clause with the preceding. And so Vatablus. They do not, however, show how the words apply. If I am not mistaken, they are meant to advert to that kind of subordination, which must exist in even private societies in the performance of religious exercises, as well as in public assemblies. In both cases there must be some to direct and take the lead, and others to follow their guidance; especially under the peculiar circumstances in which the Christians were then placed, some of whom, there is reason to think, enjoyed the ἄγιοσμα of the Holy Spirit. Those, for instance, who recited or sung the ἀσα
in the exercise of which gift the admonition ἵππος ἄληθις was not the less requisite. The Apostle elsewhere orders, that as in the case of those who spoke in unknown tongues, only two or three should speak, and that by turns, so in that of the prophets, only two or three should speak (by turns), and the others sit by and judge. And he directs that if any thing be suddenly revealed to one of the others that sit by, the first shall hold his peace, to prevent confusion: for (he adds) "the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets;" which, as almost all recent Commentators are agreed (and, among the rest, Bp. Middleton), signifies that those who are directly inspired are bound, at all proper seasons, to give way to others who have been gifted with the same inspiration. But this both requires and supposes subordination to a power vested somewhere, and to be obeyed (as the Apostle adds) in the fear of God; which expression does not signify, as Koppe explains it, "with a pious mind," but "in reverent obedience to the will of that God who hath rendered the subordination necessary." Here, then, the precept ὑποτάσσεσθε ἄληθις is meant to inculcate the order and subordination with which even these private religious exercises should be conducted.

23. αἱ γυναῖκες, τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθε. The mention of ecclesiastical subordination brings the Apostle to introduce the subject of civil subordination, both natural and social, together with the relative duties. And of each of these he treats in their order.*

* Doddridge thinks he might the rather choose to insist on these, as some were ready to imagine that Christian converts were released from any further obligations to those who still continued in a state of heathenism, and might consider the relation as dissolved between them. (Compare 1 Cor. 7, 10—24. and 1 Tim. 6, 1 & 2.) The Apostle therefore presses it upon them, in whatever station they were placed, to show a due regard to relative duties, and to remember that Christian privileges did by no means exclude them from the duties resulting from natural and civil relations of life, but rather did
In the phraseology there is nothing that requires notice, except that ἰδίως has no more force than the pronoun would, for which, however, the article might stand. Thus Koppe explains it as put for ὑμετέρως. And so it is used in Coloss. 3, 18. This use of ἰδίως is not found in the Classical writers (though it seems to have place in Polyæn. 676. ἐκατός τῶν σταθμῶν τῶν Ἰουν ἐπίσταβον—καταμεθύσας ἀπέκτεινε), who employ, instead of it, a pronoun; as Eurip. Alc. 85. ἄφιστη δέκασα γυνὲ Πόσω εἰς αὐτῆς γεγενήθαι.

This obedience, the Apostle hints, is not to be sullen, but accompanied with affectionate respect, and voluntary, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ, i. e. as if rendered to the Lord. So in the parallel passage of Coloss. 3, 23, "whatever ye (servants) do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not to men." (See Grot.) Koppe, however, Rosenm., and Mackn., think it clear, from what follows, that the sense here is: "be subject to your husbands in the same manner as ye are subject to the Lord," i. e. as Mackn. explains, "in all civil affairs the husband stands in the same relation to his wife as Christ does to his Church." The nature of this similarity he ingeniously illustrates.*

23. ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναῖκος, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, &c. It is here remarked, by Grot., that the husband has dominion over the wife both by the law of nature and nations. And the learned Commentator maintains this position by intrenching himself deep in Classical dicta, with one of which my fair readers (if with any such I am honoured) will

enforce the obligation they were under to observe them." He also judiciously observes, that the Apostle, in treating of the relative duties (as in Col. 3, 18 seqq.), begins with the lower relations, and then proceeds to the higher; and this probably because the duties of inferiors are commonly most apt to be objected to, as what are thought most difficult to be complied with; and where these are well and faithfully performed, the correspondent duties of superiors will be more readily attended to, and more effectually secured.

* On the duty in question I would compare Eurip. Οἰδιπ. frag. 1, πᾶσα γὰρ δούλη πέφυκεν ἄνδρός ἡ σώφρων γυνή, Ἡ δὲ μὴ σώφρων ἀναλ ὁ ἵππον ὑπερφορεῖ.
be content. Menander p. 244. Τὰ δευτερεῖα τὴν γυναῖκα δεὶ λέγειν, Τὰν δὲ ἡγεμονίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνδρόν ἐχεῖν, which may be Englished: “Let the wife play the second fiddle, or sing the under part; but let the husband* in all things take the lead!” I wonder the learned Commentator did not think of Eur p. Ædip. frag. 2. πᾶσα γὰρ ἄνδρας κακῶς ἀλοχὸς, κᾶν ὁ κακιστὸς Τῆμη τῆν εὐδοκίμοσαν, which goes beyond any thing I have seen, though it can excite no surprise, as coming from the woman-hater!

29. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτῆρ τῶν σώματος. This may be rendered, “And he (i.e. Christ) it is who is the saviour and preserver of the body, namely, the Church;” by which it is hinted, “so ought the husband to be the safe-guard, defender, and preserver of the wife.”†

24. ἄλλα ἁπάντες η ἐκκλησία—πανι. The ἄλλα is not (as Koppe would have it) a mere particle of transition, but signifies now, or moreover. Sir H. Tooke ἔπι Πτ. under the particle but. The ἐν πανι must, of course, be understood with the restriction of every thing at all lawful, permitted by the laws of God or man, and consistent with the duties of them both, as Christians. The Apostle is here (as Theophyl. observes) speaking of Christian husbands:

* Here I cannot but observe on the terms in the Greek and Latin languages, ἀνὸς and vir, neither of which is very significative, and in both the application seems derived from the Heb. יָנָה, a man; though that language has another term to express husband, namely, יָבָע, which signifies master. So the German ehe-weiber, a high man. The German weib, Angl. wife, probably signifies no more than woman, κατ' ἐξοχήν, like the Greek γυνή; or perhaps it comes from weiben, to unite, conjoin, like the Latin maritus and marīa. I know no term in any language that is so significant, or so expressive of the duties annexed to that state as our husband, i.e. the house band, or bond of the family.

† In which view no language (as I have just observed) is so well provided, as our own, with a term to designate this relation, which is beautifully touched on by the Shakespeare of the Grecian Dramatists, in his sublime Agamemnon 839., where Clytemnestra calls Agamemnon ἄνδρα—τῶν σταθμῶν κῦνα; Σωτῆρα γὰδε, πρότενον ἐπηλῆς στέγης στύλων πόληρη.
only, not Heathen ones; for a Christian wife could not be expected to show her obedience by forsaking her religion.

25. οἱ ἀνδρεῖς—αὐτῆς. The Apostle had, in the last verse, hinted at the defence and protection implied in the authority with which the husband was vested over the wife. He now further unfolds his meaning by especially enjoining the exercise of love, affection, and kindness towards the wife; and (as in the former case), he illustrates this from the relation in which Christ stood towards the Church; since, in a mystical sense, He is considered as the spouse of the Church.

The force of the article (which is here not attended to by the Commentators) may be expressed by the personal pronoun, "Ye husbands love," &c. 'Εαυτός, which is here unnecessarily made emphatic by some Commentators (see Mackn.), merely stands for ὑμᾶς; on which idiom see Pors. on Xenoph. Anab., and compare 2 Cor. 7, 11. and 1 Thess. 2, 8.

This love (as Rosenm. observes) comprises every kind of care for the safety and welfare of the wife; and, in the case of Christ, as respects the Church. It, however, imports something more, namely, an affectionate demeanour, and a magnanimous indulgence to the frailties of the weaker sex. So Theophyl: ἐδώκαν καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἀποτρεφόμενη τὸ ἔδωκαν καὶ ῥωπτομένη, τῇ τολμῇ ἀγάπη καὶ τῇ προφορᾷ προσαγαγόμεθα σπειρεῖ, κἂν πάθη τι υπὲρ αὐτῆς, μὴ ὄνειδος. The antient Commentators, however, carry the principle too far.

25. καὶ οὐρνῳ παρέδωκεν ύπὲρ αὐτῆς. This passage, up to ver. 28., contains the substance of Christ's merits towards men, which the Apostle takes every occasion of introducing. Παρέδωκεν οὖρνῳ, "delivered himself (to death) for it." Compare Tit. 2, 14, Gal. 1, 3.

26. ἦν αὐτῆς ἁγιασμός, καθαρίσας τὸ ἱερό τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἁματί. These words represent the whole extent of Christ's merits towards men. The ἦν αὐτῆς ἁγιασμός denotes the final purpose, which may (I think) be
compared with that of Tit. 2, 14. "that he might purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." The words καθαρίσας, &c. represent the means of effecting it, and seem to refer to the efficacy of baptism. Such is supposed to be the general purport of the passage. Proceed we to consider the particulars. Ἄγιον is said, by Rosenm., not to signify "obtain the pardon of sins," but "render them virtuous." And he refers them to ver. 29. But this seems to be mere sophistry, since one is the result of the other. Christ, indeed, delivered himself to death for the expiation of our sins; but he had in view our being excited to purify ourselves to him as a peculiar people, as zealous of good works, as if those could have saved us. And even Koppe grants that this doctrine is not to be excluded. He takes καθαρίσας for καὶ ἐκαθάρισε, Aorist for the Present καθαρίζει. But this is too violent a mode to be relied upon. Καθαρίσας is closely connected with ἅγιόν, and may be better rendered (with Rosenm.), "having purified it."

26. τῷ λαυρῷ τοῦ ὑάτος must be understood of baptism, in which the new Christian is washed from the stains of original sin (see Acts 2, 38.), and which is also a symbol of that purity to which the new professor binds himself. Such appears to be the chief sense. With respect to the terms themselves, it is not improbable that (as Elsner and Doddgr. think) there is an allusion to the methods taken in Eastern countries to purify the virgins who were intended for the royal embrace. See Esth. 2, 8, 9, 12. and Ec. 16, 7—14.

On the sense of ἐν πλωμασι Commentators are not agreed. Some think it adverts to the words of the baptismal form, as accompanied with prayers. And this is supported by the antient Commentators. But, many, and indeed not ill-founded, objections are made to it by the moderns. Others think it means "by the religion itself." See Schleus. Lex. And Koppe would take ἐν πλωμασι for a formula equivalent
to ἔνεκα τοῦ, &c., i. e. eis τὸ παραστήσαι. But his proofs are too weak to be admitted. The preceding interpretation is deserving of more attention; but, upon the whole, I prefer that of Locke, Beza, Rosenm., and others, “by the doctrine of Christ, the Gospel,” as the means of their original conversion and progressive sanctification. So the Vulg. and Beza, “by the word of life.”

In the λουτρό there is an evident allusion to baptism by immersion; and some think by baptism is especially meant adult baptism. On this subject the recent foreign Commentators have many over curious speculations, into which I think it not worth while to enter; since the refutation of misrepresentations, and the removal of misconceptions, would occupy too much space, and be more suitable to a Theological discussion on the doctrines, than an exposition of the sense of the passage.

27. ὡς παραστήσῃ—ἀμώμος. The metaphorical allusion in the preceding is here still continued. The same sentiment is inculcated, with another view of the same metaphor, namely, of Christ’s dying to expiate our sins, and to lead us to holiness of life.

It is not necessary to press on the etymological sense in ἔφασεν. It signifies shining, beautiful. The παραστήσῃ has the popular sense of parare, produce, make. Ξυλον, which is supposed to come from σύκελας impure, signifies a “spot, or stain, on a garment, or a freckle in the skin;” as in Dioscorides. Examples of this signification may be seen in Wets. Ρήπια signifies a wrinkle; and the washing is just before mentioned as the means of removing it. Yet we need not press on a metaphor. Nay, slight ρέπια are removed by lotions. Ἰγια, “pure from the stain of vice.” Ἀμώμος answers to the Hebr. וּלְמַעַף; for μῶμος is derived from וֹלֵם, a blemish.*

* Wets. has here some curious matter from Gitten and Maimonides, of which the former is as follows: “Qui despended sibi uxorem sub conditione, si masculinum non habeat, et inveniantur in ea
The words, it may be observed, are skilfully adapted both to the metaphor, and to the thing signified. See 2 Cor. 11, 2.

28. οὖν δὲ εἰλικρίνεια — σώματα. The Apostle now turns to another argument whereby to impress on them the same duty, namely, that by loving and cherishing their wives, they love themselves, since their wives are their second selves.

Some Commentators, as Rosenm., say that τὰ έαυτῶν σώματα is for themselves (like the Heb. דִּעָן); which may be true; but the Apostle adopts the idiom (as Koppe observes) in conformity to the preceding figure, of Christ being the head of the body; or rather (as Mackn. thinks) with allusion to the formation of Eve from a part or Adam's body, and an explication of the instruction God intended

* It is beautifully observed by Doddr.: How bright an idea does this give us of the grand plan and design of Christianity, to bring all the millions of which the church consists to such a state of perfect virtue and glory, that when the penetrating eye of Christ, its great and holy bridegroom, shall survey it, there shall not be one spot or wrinkle, or any thing like it, in the least to impair its beauty or offend his sight!" So Pearson, ap. Slade: "As the church is truly holy, not only by holiness of institution, but also by a personal sanctity in reference to these saints (i. e. such as are properly so called) while they live; so it is also perfectly holy in relation to the same saints glorified in heaven. And at the end of the world, when all the wicked shall be turned into hell, and consequently all cut off from the communion of the church; when the members of the church remaining, being perfectly sanctified, shall be eternally glorified, then shall the whole church be truly and perfectly holy. Then shall that be completely fulfilled that Christ shall 'present unto himself a glorious church,' which shall be 'holy and without blemish.' Not that there are two churches of Christ, one in which good and bad are mingled together, another in which there are good alone; one in which the saints are imperfectly holy, another in which they are perfectly such; but one and the same church, in relation to different times, admits or not admits the premixture of the wicked, or the imperfection of the godly."
to convey to mankind by forming Eve in that manner.

Wets. compares Sánhedrin 70, 2. Qui uxorem amat ut corpus suum, ejus domui pax erit. And Rosenm. cites from Arbax Turin 1. Debet homo diligere uxorem suam sicut corpus suum, et hono-

rare illum supra corpus: tum etiam indul gere ei, et custodire illum, ut custodit unam e membris suis.

28. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, ἑαυτὸν ἁγάτη. Ro-

senm. observes: "Sunt enim conjuges unum quid per individuum vitae societatem. Uxor altera pars est hominis, qui constat ex vino et frumento. Ideo dictitant virum absque uxor tantum esse semihominem, sive hominem dimidiatum. Vid. Drus. ad b. l. And Koppe remarks, since the husband is the head of the body, he must participate in whatever good or evil may happen to her. See the sensible note of Mackn.

29. οὐδεὶς γὰρ—ἐκκλησίαν. Here we have a popular argument; and the γὰρ does not import reason, or cause, but answers to our why. This being a popular illustration, the words must not be pressed on.

Oudels, "no one (in his senses)." 'Εμποτή, "harshly treated;" by a metonomy of the cause for the effect. Nor is it to the purpose to say that monks and ascetics do so; for the strong term ἔμπτωτον would imply to so utterly hate as to entirely deprive the body of all food, and destroy it. Σάρκα is for σῶμα; by a sort of Hebraism. I would here com-
pare Aristot. Eth. 283., where he says that any one's son is διὰ τοῦ μέρους αὐτοῦ. And he adds: αὐτὸν δὲ οὐδεὶς προαρέιται βλάπτειν. The ἐκτέλεως refers to food, and the ψυχή to clothing.* But in applying this to Christ, we must only keep in view the general idea of support and comfort. On the mode in which

* There is also implied an indulgence to the frailties of the wife. And Theodoret observes, we do not soon cut off an ailing member, but seek to heal it.
this is done see the note of Grot. The recent Commentators most unwarrantably explain all this away, and think that no more is meant than, "prospicit omni modo utilitibus et commodis Christianorum."

30. ὥστε μέλει ἐσθήν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, "for we are united in the closest connexion with Christ, as members of one and the same body." So Koppe: "Suscipimus Christo conjuncti quemadmodum membra corporis invicem sunt conglutinata et consociata, hoc est, artissimè." Thus his body will be put for himself. And so the Armenian Version. The Apostle, however, adopted the idiom, since he had in view the words of Adam concerning Eve, Gen. 2, 23. It also occurs in Gen. 29, 14. 2 Sam. 5, 1., and elsewhere. And this, Whitby observes, shows that he had his eye on the mystical sense of the production of the woman from the man of which the Jews speak.

Rosenm. observes, that we are represented as related by blood to Christ, because he assumed our human nature, and was in all respects made like as we are, only without sin. See Hebr. 2, 14.

31. ἀμὴ τοῦτο—μέα. Here (Theodoret observes) the Apostle reminds them of the very words that were used of the woman. For (as Rosenm. remarks) we have no argument, but merely an illustration by a citation of the words of Gen. 2, 24. This is one of those instances (somewhat rare) in which a citation is introduced without any inchoative formula; on which see Surenhus. on the Quotations. Such is (I think) never done except when the passage is (like the present) so well known as not to need any formula of that kind; as in 6, 2.

Ἀμὴ τοῦτο is for ἀμὴ τοῦτο. Doddr. well renders it "answerably to this." And Theodoret (from Chrys.) thus excellently illustrates the scope of the Apostle: τὸν πρῶτον αἰδέσθητι νόμον, ὅς μετὰ τὴν τῆς

* With which I would compare Plato: Symp. εἶ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐπιθυμεῖτε, εἰδόθω ἡμᾶς συνήκασα καὶ συμφωναίοις τὰ τῷ αὐτῷ, διότι ὁ γὰρ ὄντα εἶνα γεγονέναι.
γνωστῆς δημιουργίαν ἔτεθεν, καὶ τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐμπέπηγε τοὺς γὰρ γεγεννηκότας καταλημάταις ὁ γάμος προσωπικῶς, τῇ γνωστῇ συνάστεια, καὶ τοσαύτη συνάστεια γίνεται, ἄστε μιᾶν σάρκα τοὺς δύο μιμήσεσθαι.

31. καταλείψει, will leave. The Hebrew future, like the Greek aorists, sometimes denotes what is customary. With the προσκαλεθήσεται (answering to the Hebr. ἐρχείται) Koppe compares συγκατατήρεσθαι, in Marc. Antonin. 5, 1.

32. τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. The words may be rendered: “Great is this mystery,” i. e. in this saying, or matter, there is a great latent mystery; q. d. “This union of Adam and Eve, as relating to Christ and his Church, is a great mystery, containing important truths and illustrations, which for ages were imperfectly understood.” (Slade.) The Apostle evidently recognises an allegorical sense in that passage, involving an image of the intimate union between Christ and his Church.

Μυστήριον, as Chrys. well observes, is equivalent to ἀλληγορία. Hence an allegorical writer is called mystical. See Jaspis. Koppe offers the following paraphrastic version: “and this very passage, if mystically accommodated to Christ and the church, see what truth it contains! namely this: That Christ left his father and mother, i. e. voluntarily relinquished every thing that could be thought dear to him, life, comfort, and all worldly advantages; rejected the Jews his countrymen; that he might form unto himself a church from among the Gentiles.”

In tracing the allegory the Apostle did no more than imitate the mystical mode of interpretation then usual with the Jews, by which (as Rosenm. observes) with any person, history, and rites, is compared something else which may be illustrated by it.*

* So Dr. Allen, ap. Whitby, says, it was a Jewish notion that the union of Adam was a type of that between the Messiah and his
It were scarcely necessary to notice the shameful blunder of the Vulgate translator, who renders μονήγιον sacramentum, were not this the passage (for it is the only one) on which the Romanists have founded their doctrine of marriage being a sacrament. Mr. Valpy observes, that the word sacramentum was long used very indefinitely by ecclesiastical writers; it came at length to acquire a meaning more precise and fixed.

33. πιλευ καὶ ὑμεῖς—εὐθεῖα. The πιλευ is a particle of transition. Here the Apostle resumes the subject he had been treating of at ver. 29. (ver. 30—32. being, in some measure, parenthetical); and again enforces the injunction to married persons, the husband to love his wife as himself, and the wife reverence and respect her husband.

33. οἱ καὶ ἕνα, “each of you in particular;” or rather, “vos omnes et singuli.” This phrase is rare with the article. Αγαπάτω is put for ἀγαπάτε, by accommodation to ἐκαστός. See Tychsen ap. Koppe,

church. Thus, the Jews say, according to Voisin, ἡ ἡμέρα ὡς ἡ ἀνάστασις, and the mystery of Adam is the mystery of the Messiah, who is the Bridegroom of the church. These two writers therefore (Whitby observes) confirm the remark of Munster, “That the creation of the woman from the rib of the man, was made by the Jews to signify the marriage of the celestial man who is blessed, or of the Messiah with the church;” whence the Apostle applies the very words, which Adam said concerning Eve his spouse, to those Christians who are the spouse of Christ, saying, “We are members of his body, and of his flesh, and of his bones,” ver. 30.

And Dr. Mackn. has a long and instructive annotation on the subject of this mystical and allegorical interpretation so usual in the Jewish church. I can, however, do no more than refer my readers to it. Doddr. expresses his wonder that so many difficulties should be raised on so obvious a point. “The mystery (says he) certainly was, that the eternal Son of God, receiving the degenerate race of men into an union with himself, should have loved them with affection exceeding that which is to be found among the most intimate human relations. This sublime doctrine had long been concealed, and cannot now be perfectly comprehended; and therefore may, with the greatest propriety, be called a mystery in every sense of the word.”
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Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 19. καὶ ἐν δὲ ἐκαστὸν περὶ τοῦτον ἕκαστῳ.

39. ἢ δὲ γυνὴ ἢν φοβήται τον ἄνδρα. Koppe says, that φοβήται is for φοβεῖσθαι. But it is more regular to subauda βλεπέτω, which is expressed supra ver. 15, where see the note. The φοβ. denotes reverence; and that implies the subjection enjoined at ver. 22. See Theophyl.

CHAP. VI.

VER. 1. τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γυναικὶς ἐν Κυρίῳ—δίκαιον. The article has here the same sense as at 5, 25. Ἐν Κυρίῳ is equivalent to ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου at 5, 21., where see the note. Of course, this takes for granted that the parents are Christians, and command nothing inconsistent with the duties of Christians. For though, as in the case of the wife with respect to the husband, the obedience is expressed without limitation, yet it must be understood.

1. τὸῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον. Some Commentators here run into needless refinements of interpretation. The Apostle merely means to say that this is right and just, both by the law of nature, and the law of Scripture. So Theophyl.: καὶ φύσει δίκαιον ἐστι, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου προστάσσεται. Thus δίκαιος, in popular use, may mean both. Though Koppe observes that δίκαιον is always to be referred to the will of God. That the duty in question is morally right, has been invariably acknowledged by the most barbarous nations.

2. τίμα τῶν πατέρα σου καὶ τῆς μητέρας. Here is another example of citation without an introductory formula; as at 5, 31. where see the note. Koppe here compares the following Greek dicta: ἰκανῶς βιωτείς γεροβάσκων τοῖς γονεῖσι, and ἔλπιζε τιμῶν τοῖς γονεῖσι πράξεων καλῶς.

Τιμᾶν, which properly signifies to perform one's duty
towards any one, must be understood to comprehend all those lesser duties and offices of affection, care, and support which seem included in reverence: a signification found also in the Classical use of τιμᾶν; as τιμᾶν τὸν ιατρὸν. So in the use of ἵστοσεσθαι and φοβεῖσθαι, as spoken of the wife towards the husband, is included all duties suitable thereto. On the present subject see the note of Schoettg.

2. ἦτε ἐστιν ἐντολή πρῶτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ. As this is assuredly not the first commandment with promise, so there must be some limitation intended in the assertion, or the word πρῶτη be otherwise interpreted. Grot., Whitby, and Doddr. think the meaning is, the first with a special promise; that which is annexed to the second commandment being rather a general assertion belonging to all the commandments, and being a general declaration of the mercy God would show to those who kept not only that, but all his commandments; while this of which the Apostle speaks is really the first and only precept of the decalogue that has a particular promise annexed to it, peculiar to itself. (See Doddr.) To this, however, it has been objected by Hamm. and others, that it is the only one with a special promise. He would interpret, “which is the first commandment of the second table, and that with a promise annexed.” But this seems too arbitrary a method. Preferable is that of the later Commentators, as Wets., Koppe, Rosenm., Schleus., and Jaspis, adopted by Slade and Valpy, who explain, “a primary precept; one of the principal;” which sense of πρῶτη occurs in Matt. 19, 30. 20, 27. 22, 38. 1 Tim. 1, 15 & 16. And assuredly a primary precept it is, vel ad fructum, vel ad necessitatem observandi, as Rosenm. remarks;* and

* Wets. aptly compares a similar sentiment of R. Simeon on Deut. 20, 6. Preceptum quintum inter gravia gravissimum est. Deus mercedem praeceptorum suorum non aperuit, exceptis duobus, quorum alterum est gravissimum, alterum facillimum. Honora patrem et matrem maximum est præceptum, et merces ejus est vita vol. vii. 2 u
(as Mr. Slade observes) is of peculiar importance, as tending, by the injunction of early discipline, to secure an obedience to all the rest. The εν ἐπαγγελίᾳ must (I think) have the sense laid down by Hamm., “and that too has a promise annexed to it.” It cannot signify, “is a primary one because it has,” &c.; since (as Rosemon. observes) “there is no great difference, whether a blessing is promised, or a threat denounced; for both are equally attached to, or implied in each commandment.” And even when there is a communication, God at the same time promises a blessing, if that law is observed, and vice versa.” I would add, that the above interpretation of πράξιν which I have adopted, is confirmed by the authority of Chrysost. and the Greek Commentators, who plainly so took it. Thus Theophyl. remarks, that οὐ φορεύεται, οὐ μοιχεύεται are mere primary commandments; but this is εν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, hath a promise annexed, and therefore is of higher importance: for (he adds) ἐκεῖναι γὰρ αἱ πράξεις, those primary ones have no promises or rewards annexed.

3. ἦν εὖ σοι γενήσει, καὶ ἐσθι μακρὸχρονος ἐκ τῆς γῆς. In the Mosaic Law is promised a long life in Palestine; it being added, “which the Lord thy God giveth thee.” But the Apostle, not writing to Jews, but Christians, applies what is said of Palestine to others also, extends the application, and makes it common to all men. The sense of the promise was, that the Jewish state should be flourishing and permanent in the promised land, if the children were well educated.* But this is applicable to all

longeva. S. D. Of his Classical citations the most important are the following: Aristot. Nic. 9, 2. δεῖν—καὶ τιμὴν δὲ, καθάπερ θεός; οὐ πάντας δὲ γονεῖσιν, οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν παρὰ καὶ μηρί, οὐδ’ αὐτῇ τὰν τοῦ σώφρου, ἢ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν πατρικήν ὀμολογίαν καὶ τιμήν καὶ παντὶ δὲ τῇ προσευχή τιμήν τὴν καθ’ ἡλικίαν, ἐκατεροτάσιες καὶ στατικίσει; and Plut. de frat. nat. p. 479 ε. πάτερ—λέγοντι καὶ ἰδονεῖ, ὡς γονεῖν τιμὴν μετὰ θεοῦ πρότερον καὶ μεγάλην ἄνευ φόνας δε τῇ των φθονῶν σφέκεν ὅμοιο ἀπέδωκε. See also Mark 12, 28.

* The words, however, can scarcely be applied to education, unless in a circuitous manner, namely, since a good education can
tions: for the discharge of the duties of life must depend upon a careful and religious education, and without the due discharge of those duties no state can flourish. As to "long life of individuals," of that the passage does not treat. (Rosenm.)

The Apostle, as writing to Gentile converts, very probably omitted the clause "which the Lord thy God," &c. since (as Doddr. observes) it better suited the case of the whole Church to express the promise in a general way. As to the interpretation given by Rosenm., of the promise, it is highly ingenious, and has been adopted by almost all recent Commentators. Yet I cannot consent to exclude the first and more obvious application to individuals, which, considering that all the promises to the Jews were temporal, was likely enough to have been given, and (as Chrys. remarks) was a sort of promise calculated to have weight with children, and so plain that it could not be misunderstood: whereas the promise of national continuance in Palestine would have but little weight with children. Of course, however, this, like all other temporal ones, can have no application to Christians.

4. μη παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, "Do not provoke and irritate them by unnecessary harshness. See the note on 4, 26. We have ἐρεθίζετε at Col. 3, 21, where is added ἵνα μὴ ἀδυμάσων, i.e. "lest they fall into a stupid despair, which injudicious severity tends to generate." The Apostle then subjoins an admonition which, if attended to, would make severe correction little necessary, namely, to give the children a sober and religious education, including moral training and careful instruction in such knowledge as may be requisite for the station in life they are to occupy.

alone secure this obedience. But a good domestic education depends on the observance of the above-mentioned duties of the husband and wife. For, as Theophyl. remarks (from Chrys.) τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς μοιχελαθητῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων οὓς αὐτοὶ φθάνασθε ὅπως, οὐκ οὐκ λογίας καμίνως τί δεοίνα τυπόθεται.
The ἀγάλα is rendered by our English Translators nurture. But this is scarcely significant enough. By Mackn, correction; which, however, is too strong a term. It is taken by Koppe to denote the whole of the disciplina puerilis, the instruction, whether by example, benefits, admonitions, or punishment: and it is (he observes) synonymous with νοθεσία, which signifies, like the Hebr. ṭῶ, the training of the mind to virtue; as 1 Sam. 3, 18. (speaking of Eli), εἰς ἐνουθέτει τοῖς παιδίσκων τοῦ. Rosenm. and Schleus. explain it, “institutio et disciplina,” whether in learning or morals. And they render the whole clause: “educere eos institutione et ad bones mores conformare, accommodate ad præcepta religionis Christianæ:” which may be the sense; but it seems harsh so to take the word. Some separate the ἀγάλα from Κυρίου, and take it to denote (as Doddr. observes) such a knowledge of books, men, and things as may fit them to appear in life with honour and usefulness. But the Κυρίου cannot but be referred to both; and I can by no means think that the Apostle had merely in view literary and professional education. That had never been much neglected among the Heathens. He probably meant (to use the words of Doddr.) “such a course of discipline and instruction as properly belongs to a religious education, which ought to be employed in forming them for the Lord, by laying a restraint upon the first appearances of every vicious passion, and nourishing them up in the words of faith and of good doctrine.” (1 Tim. 4, 6.) After all, however, it is not quite clear that the Apostle had in view anything of training in learning and professional knowledge at all. He seems rather to apply the terms properly denoting training in general, to moral and religious training, as the likeliest means of securing the obedience of the children.

5. οἱ δὲ οἱ συνεκύροντε τοὺς κυρίου κατὰ σάρκα. The Commentators’ remark on the prudence here shown by the Apostle, who does not aim at political inno-
vation, nor interferes at all with the established relations between bond-servants (for such are here meant) and their masters. "Obey (says he) your earthly (κατὰ σάρκα) masters." The σάρκα, it may be observed, is introduced with an indirect reference to the Spiritual Master in heaven.

5. μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου (in which τρόμου is, as Theophyl. observes, intensive of φόβου) is a formula importing the deepest reverence. Sometimes it is used in the New Testament of the fear of God. One may remark on the distinguishing characteristics of the Law, and of the Gospel, as implied in the words by which the religious principle is expressed; i.e. in the former, by the fear of God; in the latter, by that "perfect love which casteth out fear." Yet I cannot assent to the criticism of Koppe, that the phrase is here meant to apply directly to God.

5. ἐν ἄπληθηι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν, "unfeignedly and without sullenness." Koppe compares the Hebrew בֵּל יִשָּׂ in 1 Paral. 29, 17. So we say, with right-heartedness. The Classical writers use ἐν ἄπληθηι. And so 2 Cor. 1, 12.

5. οἱ τῷ Χριστῷ, i.e. (as Koppe explains) "as if the service were unto Christ, the heavenly head, who is, in a more eminent sense, the Lord of the Christian."

6. μὴ κατ' ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν αἰς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ'—ἀνθρώπων. Here is further explained the mode in which the service is to be rendered, namely, both in the presence and absence of the master. Compare Col. 3, 22.

'Ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν is a word of rare occurrence, in which, as well as in ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, the first part of the compound is emphatical, by a sort of subaudition of μόνον. Compare Gal. 1, 10. The latter is found in Ps. 53, 5. The Commentators compare the Latin phrase auribus et oculis servire. But that seems not quite of the same nature. More apposite is the sentiment adduced by Wets. from Ter. Adelph. 1, 1, 44. Malo coactus qui suum officium facit, Dum
id resciirum iri credit, tantisper cavit; si sperat fore clam, runsum ad ingenium redit: quan beneficio adjungea, ille ex animo faciet, studet par referre, presens absensque idem est.

The words ἀλλ' ὡς δεῖλα τῷ Χριστῷ are explanatory of the ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ. The words ποιοῦτες τῷ θεῷ ἐκ ψυχῆς may be paraphrased: "Doing the will of God, by whose providence ye were placed in a state of servitude, and therefore performing your service heartily and willingly, as being rendered to the Lord." Compare 1 Pet. 2, 16.

6. ἐκ ψυχῆς, ex animo, readily. Mer' εὐνοεῖ, with well-affect edness, without sullenness. Compare Rom. 13, 5. Wet's. cites T. Mag., who remarks that εὑρίσκει applies as well to the inferior with respect to the superior, as to the superior with respect to the inferior. And he gives many Classical examples of the former use. Eὐνοεῖ may, in this sense, be rendered well-affect ed.

8. εἰσίτε ὅτι δέ εἶν τι ἐκαστὸς τοῖς ἄραθιν. The good here spoken of is that which results from the discharge of duties whether towards God or towards man, and in whatsoever station. This good, it is figuratively said, κανεῖται, he shall receive, viz. the reward of it. Koppe compares the Latin hæc referat, for factorum praemia hæc referet. See 2 Cor. 5, 10. 1 Cor. 7, 22. 2, 13. Gal. 3, 28. Korwov, it is plain from the context, must mean Christ, not God, as some explain.

9. καὶ ὅλ καίρων, &c. The καὶ is explained by Koppe, contra vero. But it may rather be rendered vicissim. On the words τὰ αὐτὰ τωσεῖτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, it is not necessary to press, as do the antient Commentators; nor to confine them to the πάρα εὑρίσκει, as do the more recent Commentators; nor to take τὰ αὐτὰ τωσεῖτε (as do some antients and also Capell.) of condescension. And Capell. cites Senec. Ep. 47. where he calls servants our comiters, humble friends, fellow-servants. It may be better regarded as a popular phrase, importing "Do your duties towards
them with like sincerity and alacrity.” Perhaps also the Apostle may hint at the injunction of Jesus, to “do unto others as we would they should do unto us.” Nay, Seneca in Ep. 47. (cited by Wets.) concludes a similar admonition to condescension and kindness to servants with a similar precept, “Sic cum inferiore vivas, quemadmodum tecum superiorem vellas vive re.” See also Joseph. Ant. 6, 7. cited by Wets.

In order to illustrate the injunction as to what they are to do, the Apostle gives an example of what they are not to do: adverting to a fault in matters which is inconsistent with any sense of responsibility towards a common master, namely, a minatory, objurgatory, and passionate demeanour, since it tends to destroy that well-affectedness which is the most powerful of all human motives to fidelity of service. Such is (I think) the sense of the expression áνέτετις ἀνέκλητος, and not that which is assigned by some early moderns, namely, “remitting the punishments ye have threatened:” for a habit of not carrying threatened punishment into effect is what the Apostle could never have meant to inculcate. Nor can I approve of the expositions of more recent Commentators, “Do not treat them harshly, as before.” The Apostle’s injunction (I think) reaches further, and forbids all menacing and passionate demeanour. (See Doddr.) Nor need we fancy in áνέτετις any reference to what they had done; (in which view Mackn. renders, “moderating your threats.”) It merely signifies to let alone, forbear; as in Ps. 27, 8. which the Apostle seems to have had in mind; (though the Commentators do not notice it): “Abide patiently upon the Lord. Leave off wrath, let go displeasure; fret not thyself, lest thou be moved to do evil.” Wets. adduces several examples of the phrase; as Thucyd. 8, 10. τὴν μὲν τοῦ Μηδοῦ ἔχθραν ἀνέτετις; and Plut. Alex. p. 667 ε. ὡς δὲ ἐπείρα τῷ ἤκτον ἀφελότα τὴν ἀνέκλητον.

The article seems to be used, as when applied to nouns of virtues and vices; in which case it appears
to designate habit. On προσωπολογία see the note on Gal. 2, 6.

10. The Epistle at length concludes with a most weighty exhortation, namely, that the Christians be constant in the religion, even amidst their direst calamities, with which the Apostle does not discharge every Christian must, especially in those times, struggle. Now the exhortation is expressed under the similitude of a soldier, who, thoroughly armed, proceeds boldly to battle, and stands out, till he either fall in the fight, or leave the field conqueror. (Koppe.) Compare 2 Cor. 10, 4. 1 Thess. 5, 8.

The above, however, seems an undue limitation of the sense. The Apostle treats of constancy in resisting temptations of every kind to desert the faith of Christ.

We have here a military allusion. Grot. compares 2 Tim. 2, 1. Ps. 52, 7. Sept. But I am surprised he and the other Commentators should have omitted a locus geminus in 1 Cor. 16, 13. γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἀνδρόζεσθε, κρατεῖονσθε, where see the note.

Ἐν Κυρίῳ is by almost all Commentators rendered "per dominum." And thus the words ἐν τῷ κράτῃ τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ will signify, "in dependance upon his strength." But it seems better to take Κυρίῳ for the religion of Christ, and interpret the phrase of steadfastness in the profession of it; as in a parallel passage of 1 Cor. 16, 13. στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει. Both the antient and modern Commentators agree in regarding κράτῃ τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτοῦ as a Hebraism, by which two substantives of cognate signification are used, to express the sense of one of them in a greater degree.

11. ἐνδοῦσας τὴν πανωτίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρὸς τὸ δύνατον—διαβολοῦ. The Apostle here follows up the military metaphor, and evolves it by a kind of allegory; first comparing, in a general way, the strong motives to steadfastness in the Gospel supplied by the aids and supports it imparts here, and the glorious hopes it reveals hereafter. Having first expressed this gene-
rally, and shown its spiritual meaning he then proceeds to apply it particularly.

Πανορμία signifies the complete apparatus of arms for an oplitic, whether offensive or defensive. On which Koppe refers to a remarkable passage of Polyb. 6, 21. Τοι Θεοί, i. e. supplied by God, as it were the spiritual armour; though all the support comes, either directly or indirectly, from God. The application is obvious: but the reader may consult the notes of Mackn. and Dodd.

11. στήναι πρὸς. The sense is, "to stand against, effectually withstand and resist." Koppe compares Marc. Anton. 6, 41. πρὸς ἄνθρωπον στήναι στάσιν πολέμιον. The word is properly applied to persons, but sometimes (as here) figuratively to things. Μεθοδείας is another military term, and denotes stratagems, literally manœuvres. See the notes on 4, 14. and 2 Macc. 18, 18. So in Philo 63 B. (cited by Loesner), μέθοδοι and τεχναὶ are synonymous. I add Nicephorus Hist. 46 B. ἡ ἐγέραις πάλιν τρόποις τοῦ πολεμοῦ μεθοδείας τὴν ἀπάτην εἰσδεχόμενο τῇ ἐπάγγελμα ἡβέτων, "abandoned their profession."

It is remarkable how studious the recent Commentators are to remove from this passage, as well as others, all notion of demoniacal agency. The term διάβολος properly signifies a calumniator, reviler; which may apply to the case in question as regards God, and even men: but it is more probable that there is especial reference to the sense of deceiving, often found in διαβάλλω and its derivatives. See 2 Cor. 11, 3.

12. ἢτι οὐκ ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἵμα καὶ σάρκα. The word πάλη is properly a gymnastic term. So Plut. 2, 698. (cited by Wets.) τεχνικάτατον καὶ καυμαργότατον τῶν ἀθλημάτων τὴν πάλιν οὖσαι. But the Apostle, as in other places, unites military and agonistical allusions. I would compare a similar passage of Max. Tyr. d. 5, 9, 1, 79, where we have mention of Socrates struggling with Melitus, with bonds, and
poison: next the Philosopher Plato, struggling with a tyrant's anger, a rough sea, and the greatest dangers; then Xenophon, struggling with the perjuries of Tissaphernes, the snares of Ariesus, the treachery of Menoe, and royal machinations; and lastly Diogenes struggling with adversaries even more formidable, namely, poverty, infamy, hunger, and cold.

The Commentators here rightly supply ποιών. By αληθείαι εἰς σάρκα is plainly meant mere man; as in Gal. 1, 16. where see the note. Hebr. 2, 14. ἐκ μαρτυρίων. Se Herod. 1, 17. Hom. II. φ. 309. and Virg. Aen. 9, 375. cited by Wets. Theophyl. explains: αἰαντοὶ ἡμείς προσευμαθεῖς και ἐνθοῦσας. By the force of the antithesis we cannot but see that demoniacal opposers are meant; as is clear, too, from ver. 1 6. τὸ δὲ θεὸν τοῦ παντοκράτορος.

In the ἀγαθὸς and ἐξωρίας the Commentators notice the same adaptation as in the case of good angels to the customs as yet prevalent in earthly government. See Theophyl. and Matt. 12, 26. On the sense of κοινοκρατίας, or at least to whom it is to be applied, Commentators are not agreed. Some refer it to the Jewish rulers and doctors. But those exercised far too little power to make any such term applicable. The antient and most modern Commentators rightly regard the term as meant to designate demoniacal powers holding their habitation in the world, and exerting much influence in its affairs. The best modern Commentators notice that the Jews not only applied the term κοινοκρατεῖν to sovereigns, as the Emperors of Rome, Persia, &c.* but also to the Devil, who is in Joh. 12, 31. called the ἁγαθὸς τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου. So Vajikra, κ. 18. (cited by Wets.) eo tempore Deus S. B. vocavit angelum mortis, ipsumque dixit; quamvis te seci κοινοκρατεῖν super homines, nulla tamen tibi in hanc gentem (Israelitas

* Thus the word is used by the Schol. on Aristoph. Nub. 397. of the king of Egypt; and is applied by Orpheus to Apollo and Pan. See Wulf.
scil.), quia sum filii mei. And so in Jambl. de Myst. Egypt. § 2 & 3. the κοιμακράτορες are the οἱ τὰ θεὸ
σεληνίῳ σταιρεῖται διαισίωτες. So also Irenæus 1, 1.
διάβολοι ἐν οἷον κοιμακράτορον καλοῦσιν. Thus, then, the
words here used designate powerful enemies and op-
posers of the Gospel of every kind, both human, and
superhuman.

12. πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνεύματος ἐν τοῖς ἐπιραγμένοις.
These words are not a little obscure, and have been
variously interpreted. One thing seems certain,
that the τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πνεύματος must designate
the bands of evil demons just before adverted to,
ταχυμαστά being understood. Τὰς πνεύμονας is put
for the cognate adjective, by a common Hebraism.
But on the ἐν τοῖς ἐπιραγμένοις we are not enabled to
pronounce with such certainty. Rosenm. remarks
that the words cannot be connected with πάλη γὰρ
ήμων ἐστιν, since the context is on earth; nor with
πνευματικὰ, for the evil spirits are never said to be
resident in heaven. He notices the common opinion
(supported also by Koppe) that μὲν is to be under-
stood: and he does not deny that the habitation of
the angels, both good and bad, was, by the Jews,
placed in the air. See supra 2, 2. ἔσχος τοῦ νεοῦ
(where see the note). But, he adds, the τὰ ἐπιραγμένα
are not places under heaven, in the clouds and air:
for those are ἑπεραγμένα. And he, in conjunction
with others, supplies πραγμαστά, and assigns this
sense, “in order to obtain the heavenly benefits.”
But I see not how this sense (though it may not be
inappronate) can be elicited from the words. And as
to his objection to the common interpretation, it
seems to be very frigid. Upon the whole, indeed,
that interpretation seems to involve the least diffi-
culty. On the terms here used it is not necessary
to press. It is sufficient for us to regard the words
(which Locke renders, “the spiritual managers of
the opposition to the kingdom of God”) as design-
nating (as Dodd. says) those revolted spirits who,
whatever be their residence, are continually employed in propagating wickedness.

18. διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν χαράλατον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The διὰ τοῦτο, like ón elsewhere, has a resumptive force; the exhortation at ver. 11. (for ver. 12. is parenthetical) being repeated. Ἀναλάβετε is synonymous with the ἔνωσθεν at ver. 11., and as it properly signifies to take up (ἀναλάβετε), so it is often used with words signifying arms. See Wetstein’s examples. (Koppe.) It was therefore used both of putting on a cloak or vest, and of putting on armour; as in Joseph. Ant. 4, 5, 2. 20, 5, 7. The ἀντιστῆναι is here nearly synonymous with the στῆναι πρὸς at ver. 11.

18. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, “in the evil day of calamity and persecution;” such as the Apostle knew was then, and would be more and more the case. It signifies, too, the evil day of temptation, from the remains of unsubdued passions worked upon by the great spiritual foe and his inferior agents.

18. καὶ ἀναλάβετε κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι. Here we have a finely conceived sentence, to which great spirit is imparted by the point at στῆναι, as opposed to ἀντιστῆναι. On the sense of κατεργ. Commentators are not agreed. Almost all the early moderns, and also our English Translators and Doddrr., render, “having effected, accomplished, done all to stand.” Others, as Beza, Zanch, and Koppe, render, “having conquered all enemies;” the neuter being taken for the masculine. And the verb is often so used. The sense, indeed, is nearly the same upon either interpretation; but the latter seems the most apposite, and least violent. Certain it is that στῆναι cannot have the sense which some Commentators (as Rosenm.) ascribe to it, namely, to stand ready for the engagement. Στῆναι is used for περιγραφάσαι to survive the contest, stand triumphant over the difficulty. So Thucyd. 5, 102. fin. καὶ ὑμῖν τὸ μὲν εἶχας εὐθὺς ἀνέλπιστον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦ ὀραμένου ἔτι καὶ


The ἀκανθα refers to all obstacles, whether of persons, or things, including (as Theophyl. explains) all the passions and evil affections excited in the heart by the author of all evil.

14. The Apostle, again, for the third time, resumes the former exhortation; and this, in order to develop the nature of the duty, by tracing its various parts. Here it is well remarked by Jaspis: "Totus locus est comparatio dilatata cum perpetua explicatione. Quare non argutandum est in singulis verbis; nam omnes h. l. commemoratæ species armorum, redeunt tamen ad unum genus: arma; in applicatione: subsidia constantiæ. Ornatus nostræ dilatatæ comparationis minimè est cum pulvisculo discutiendus." And yet I agree with Mr. Valpy, that though "there is no need too curiously to explain in what the peculiar correspondence between the Christian virtues and the several parts of armour consists, it is plain enough, in most cases, what the Apostle means, and how he would have believers be armed for their warfare."

In this accommodation of the metaphor the Apostle shows admirable acuteness and address. The στήνε signifies stand to your arms, or stand firmly; that being (as Theophyl. remarks) the first thing the soldier learns. Περιθωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, for ἐπὶ τ. ὅ. ὑ. ἐ. α. ὡς ξαστῆρι, or περίσωματ. There is here an allusion to the belts with which the flowing vests of the Orientals required to be girded up for any active employment, the γίρλα. Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, "truth and sincerity, true and sincere belief, the bracer up and support of religious constancy." See Ps. 109, 18. Of the figurative sense of περίς. Wets.
gives many examples. I would add similar sentiments in Philo Jud. 139 E. προ ὑπερεκτικοῦ καὶ
tριῳ τῷ παντεκράτερος οἴον τοι καὶ εἰσερθόν γνώριμον,
καλλικαγαθια καθελθαμένου & 1405, 45. καλλικαγαθια
τῆς τοῦ Θεου λογίσμοι πανκρατείας.
14. ἐνδυσάμενοι τῶν θράκα τ. 8. The ἐνδυσάμε
swers to the Heb. πον, and signifies Lorica, breast-
plate. By διακομών, must be here meant the con-
stant practice of the moral and Christian virtues,
(so Theophyl.: τῶν καθόλου ἐνδυσάμενος βίου), which
would be the surest safeguard against the calumnies
of Pagan adversaries, and would be the best defence
against the arts of those who tempted them to for-
sake their religion; since they would have to show
such parts of it as would evince its efficacy. It
would also be the best internal support and consola-
tion, like the nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culp
of the Poet.
15. καὶ ὑποδημάμενοι τοῦς πόδας ἐν ἐμπαρσίᾳ τ. ε. τ. ε.
These words have occasioned the Commentators no little trouble;
now it is easy to see the interpretation as to remove all doubt.
Mackn. thinks the preparation of the Gospel of peace means the virtu
ces which, in the first ages, were necessary to those who travelled
through the world to preach the Gospel, namely, fortitude, persever-
ance, self-government, and peaceableness. For these qualities
were a great preservative against the evils to which they were ex-
posed. And this mode of interpretation is supported by the an-
tent. Yet it seems erroneous; for surely the words refer to all
Christians, and not preachers of the Gospel only. Some eminent
modern Commentators, as Koppe and Rosenm., observe that the
first were shod, to promote firmness in standing (so ver. 14: οὔτε
οἶν), which the military boot would give, by means of the
spikes or hob-nails with which the heels were armed. And they
refer to Juven. Sat. 3, 32. 16, 34 & 25., and the notes of Rupert.
To which I add Thucyd. 3, 69. ἦσαν δὲ εἰσαλέει τῇ ἁλίνθῳ, καὶ
tῶν ἄφθερον πόδα μέσον ὑποδημάτων ἀφαιτείται ἄνεκα τῆς πρᾶ
τῶν ποδῶν. They also refer to Ezra, 2, 68. 3, 8., and Zach. 5, 11.
But the chief purpose for which shoes are worn is surely defence
against the roughness of the road; and this is manifestly alluded
to in the word ἐμπαρσία. For although the above Commentators
think it denotes firmness and constancy, as of the base and founda-
tion of an edifice, yet (as Schleus. remarks) even granting (what
could not well be proved) that it might signify firmness, and there-
fore, by a metaphor, constancy of mind (as in the noble passage of,
Young, "On reason build resolve, that column of true majesty in man."); yet that signification would not here be opposite: for the Apostle is speaking of those helps to constancy in religion supplied by God." Schleus. renders it: "instar pedum armature sit vobis doctrina salutaris, animo vestro semper obserans, qua vobis semper in promptu sit." I cannot, however, but think that the Apostle had in view not merely constancy in maintaining the faith, but in fulfilling its moral precepts in the whole tenour of our conduct. So Theophyl.: βασιλευτες κατα το ειαγγελιον: for, he adds, the feet are a symbol of life and conduct; as before, "See that ye walk circumspectly." Nor must the ἐρωμασία be explained, as it is done by Schleus., and partly by Locke; by which the word loses much of its native force. Besides, the military allusion in ἐρωμασία will not permit this. Liable to the same objection (namely, that of undue limitation of the sense) is the interpretation of Dodd. and Slade, who think it is meant to point out the preparation which the Gospel makes for our defence, by that peaceful temper it inculcates, that mild and moderate demeanour, which was of so much importance in protecting the early Christians from the fury and malice of persecution." It is surely very uncritical to make the whole sentence, as it were, turn on the pivot of a genitive at the conclusion of it. The ἐθίμων rather has reference to that "peace between God and the soul," produced by the Gospel, and which is an earnest of happiness hereafter, what St. Paul, at Rom. 5. 1., calls peace with God, which, at Phil. 4. 7., he says, passeth all understanding, and therefore generates that holy confidence with which we may rely on his support and defence. In fine, preferring, as I systematically do, the most extensive sense any words will bear, I would propose the following paraphrastical version of the passage. "And (like as soldiers have their feet shod with sandals armed with iron as a preparation or defence against the roughness, and security against the slipperiness or miriness of the roads) so do ye arm yourselves against the roughness, and secure yourselves against the slippery temptations of your Christian course, by being, as it were, shod with the preparation and defence supplied by the Gospel of peace, even the strong motives to constancy in religion, and a holy life, supplied by the Gospel of salvation." So Jaspis: "ad prolixiganda et debellanda omnia irritamenta malorum."

16. επι τῶν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν θυρεόν τῆς πίστεως. The επι τῶν, may either be rendered, "in all things," as it is done by the antients and the moderns, as Montan. and Est., or, with the early moderns, "above all:" which interpretation is supported by Col. 3. 14. Yet most recent Commentators render it "over, or upon, or in addition to all." But this yields a feeble sense, and the second interpretation (which was also adopted by our English Translators) deserves the preference.
'Ἀναλαβόντες, "taking up." See the note supra ver. 13. Τὸν βυρὰν τῆς πίστεως, "the ample shield of faith." Such, I conceive, is the sense; ἄσπις and ὀφές being, as the recent Commentators observe, used without distinction. Yet the ὀφές, properly denoted the ample, oblong, and door-like shield used by the hoplites, which the Apostle has here in view; and ἄσπις* in the later writers, at least denoted the small round buckler of the Peltastæ, or light armed. Wets. compares Sil. Ital. 11, 206. Armatumque fide pectus.

At the words following ἐν οἷς δυνάσθε πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ τὰ πετυρυμένα σβεσαι, some Commentators have unnecessarily stumbled. There is no incongruity, but only a somewhat harsh dwelling on the metaphor. The βέλη πετυρυμένα, it is well known, were small slender spicula of cane, made use of to set wooden buildings or tents on fire.† Now,

* With which word the Etymologists have been somewhat perplexed. There can be no doubt but that it comes from ἄψις, the future tense of ἄπτω, to join, by a common metathesis. It is therefore (as Lennep says), the same word with ἄψις or band, the Gothic and Ang. Sax. ëarp; and our old term hasp is the same word. Thus, it properly signifies a band, or buckle, and then a buckler, or shield with a buckle or strap to fasten it to the arm.

† Their form is accurately described by Ammian. 23, 4., Veget. 2, 18., and Servius on Æn. 9, 705., all cited by Wets., together with many other passages, from which it would appear that the earliest account of their use on record is that of Thucyd. 2, 75., where he says that the Platæans covered their wooden wall with raw hides, &c., to defend it from the fiery darts of the enemy, διὰ μῆτε πυρφόρου διότοι βάλλεις. But I am surprised Wets. should have omitted Herodot. 8, 52., who makes mention of a yet earlier use of them by the Persians against the wooden walls of the Arcopagus at Athens. His words are these: δὲ πυρφόρους ἑκατον περὶ τοὺς δίστοι πετυρυμένες ἀψιάν, ἐκδέχεσαν ἐς τὸ φράγμα. Wets. has collected numerous passages from Philo, Appian, Diodorus, and Herodian, and to these I could add many from Dio Cass., Arrian, and other writers, from which it would appear that these were almost always called πυρφόροι δίστοι, or πυρφόρα βέλη. The only instance in which πετυρυμένα occurs, is in Apoll. Bibl. 2, 4. Hence, in Diodor. Sic. t. 9, 119., for πυρφόρους, I would read πυρφόρους, and in Zosim. 3, 25, B., for πυρφόρων βέλων, πυρφόρων β. Hence, too, is confirmed and illustrated, Aeschyl. Theb. 441., πέτοιθα δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐν ἔκπαρχον τῶν πυρφόρων ἰθεὶν κεραυνοῦ, where Br. Blomfield
shields being usually coated over with brass, or other metal, would effectually extinguish these burning darts; for, as we find from the passage of Arrian, cited by Wets., they were easily extinguished by any rapid or sudden jerk, and required some soft substance whereon to fix themselves, being always thrown from a very weak bow; and therefore, they must have been, as to metal, or any stiff leather tela imbella sine ictu.

It is evident that τοῦ διαβόλου cannot signify (as Rosenm. and other recent Commentators would explain it,) the adversary, or persecutor, but (as Koppe acknowledges,) the Devil, mentioned supra ver. 11., whose inferior agents, the adversaries, calumniators, &c. were. Besides, the term ὁ διαβόλος, is a very common one in Scripture, to denote Satan.

Πίστις must here denote “entire, complete, and unshaken reliance on God and Christ for present protection, and future salvation.” With the use of the θύσεως πίστεως, I would compare Ps. 18, 35., ἐδωκας με ὑπεραντισμόν σωτηρίαν μοί. Nor is this a Hebraism. Thus Ἐσχ. Ag. 1412. ἀστίς—θεόσφοι.

17. καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε. As the Apostle is alluding to the full armed soldier, he adds: “Take unto yourself the helmet of salvation.” It is plain that τοῦ σωτηρίου is for τῆς σωτηρίας; as in Is. 38, 11., Ps. 84, 7., Luke 2, 30, 3, 6., Acts 28, 28. By salvation, however, as the best Commentators are agreed, is meant the hope of salvation; q. d. “Take as an helmet the hope of salvation.” And this is placed beyond doubt by a similar passage of 1 Thes. 5, 8., ἐνυσιαμένον περικεφαλαίαν ἑλπίδα σωτηρίας. The ratio metaphoræ is too obvious to need explanation.

17. καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος. On the sense of this clause Commentators are divided in opinion, ingeniously conjectures πυροβόλον. But the allusion which the Poet (himself a military man) has to the use of these fiery darts, sufficiently defends the present reading, which is also confirmed by what I suspect to be a kind of parody upon it by the old δραμάγμο- μαστὶ, Aristoph. Av. 1248., μέλαθρα—καταίθαλῶν πυρφόδους herois.
Many recent ones, as Rosenm., would take τὸ πνεῦμα to signify animi. But this is manifestly lowering the sense. Others take τὸ πνεύματος for Θεοῦ. But this is unnecessary. To omit many other interpretations, which may be seen in Pole, Wolf, and others, I maintain, with some antient and modern Commentators, that τὸ πνεῦμα must mean the Holy Spirit; and ἡμα Θεοῦ, which is usually thought to mean the Scripture (though, by the recent Commentators, explained by the vague term doctrine of the Gospel), must denote both the revelations of the Holy Spirit to man in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and also in the promulgation of the Gospel of Christ with such glorious power in that age. Now this would supply the best offensive weapon against all the attacks of adversaries, as supplying abundant matter to refute all their objections.

18. διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς. The Apostle now drops the metaphorical allusions of the preceding elegant passage, and inculcates a duty by which alone the important helps and precious advantages above represented can be secured, namely, the exercise of prayer; and by engrafting it so closely on the preceding clause, he intends especially to suggest the mode by which the sword of the Holy Spirit, even God’s word and Gospel, can be made effectual, by prayer for grace and assistance to comprehend and apply it.

The phraseology presents nothing of difficulty. The only thing worthy of notice is that appearance of pleonasm, which is usually ascribed to Hebrew idiom, but (as on many other occasions) has been occasioned by intense fervour of mind in the sacred writers. Here the Ephesians are directed not only to pray, but to pray “with every kind of prayer,” with earnest supplication; in which there is a climax, and the terms are not (as some say) synonymous. So Theophyl.: οὕτως ἀπαύγαστος, ἀλλὰ διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως, τῆς μετὰ κλαυδιμοῦ, τῆς μετὰ στερεκτυπίας, τῆς μετὰ γονικλυσίας. I would add
Hebr. 5, 7.: "he offered up prayers with strong crying and tears." Now this they are to do at all times, and ἐν πνεύματι, which signifies ex animo, heartily. So ἐκ ψυχῆς, supra, ver. 7.

The words following are meant to illustrate the mode in which this duty is to be performed: and εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦτο ἄγρυπνωντες, explains the ἐν πάντι καυρῷ, "assiduously continuing in it;" as when it is said of "praying night and day." It denotes (as Theophyl. observes), τὴν νίψιν τῆς ψυχῆς. The προσκατέρθησις is a stronger expression than προσευχῆς, since it signifies a long continuing in prayer, i.e. long continued prayer. And at δεῦσει we must repeat πάσης, and understand it, of supplication of the most earnest sort. On the injunction of earnest supplication and fervent prayer for spiritual aids, under the trials and persecutions which awaited them, the Apostle engraves that of prayer, for the support and welfare of Christians in general.

Such, I conceive, is the true purport of the passage; of which the recent Commentators (as Koppe) have, by too much refining, whetted away the edge.

Of εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τοῦτο, examples are given by Wets. from 2 Pet. 1, 5., Rom. 13, 6. 9, 17., 2 Cor. 5, 5., 7, 11., Gal. 2, 19., Coloss. 4, 8.

19. καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμὸν—τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. The Commentators remark on the modesty of the Apostle in entreaty their prayers. On the sense of ἤνα δεῦρι λόγον, they are not so well agreed. It is, by most Interpreters, thought that διδόναι λόγον signifies to give a power and ability; by others, an occasion of speaking. And the phrase is of frequent occurrence in the Classical writers, from whom Wets. produces many examples. Perhaps both senses may here be united.

12. ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματος μου savours of Hebraism; but the examples of Kypke prove that the metaphor extended to the Greek language in general. It is regarded by many as a mere pleonasm. It seems, however, to import boldness of speech. So that I
know not whether the sense can be better represented than in our common translation. Doddr. thinks the Apostle has here reference to his impediment in speech. But that seems to be too hypothetical. In the parallel passage of Col. 4, 3., we have θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμᾶς τὸς ώρας τοῦ λόγου, with which Kypke compares Liban. Ep. 575. From what follows, it should seem as if, being in bonds, he expected soon to be brought to an hearing, and to be permitted to speak for himself. (So Acts 26.) Yet I have sometimes thought, that this language, and what follows, might be partly meant to soften the chagrin they might feel at the freedom of censure he had previously employed, which might easily be paralleled with many other examples of similar delicate contrivance. And it ought not to be objected, that λόγος is used; since the very same application of λόγος to writing occurs in the best authors, and is found in 1 Cor. 6, 11., το στόμα ἡμῶν ἀνέειρε τρεῖς ψυχαί.

The term μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου can require little explanation. It must have reference to those parts of the Gospel which had been especially a mystery to both Jews and Gentiles, as that of the Gentiles being placed on an equal footing with the Jews; that all are equally guilty before God, and therefore cannot be saved by works, but by the free grace of God; and such other "deep things" as the Apostle has revealed in his Epistles.

20. ἐν τῷ προφήτεῳ ἐν αἰώνει, "for which Gospel, and the dissemination, of the mysterious truths which it reveals," &c., Ἰνδρήμη, ἐ. ἄ., does not signify "I am grown old in bounds." The verb προφήτεων signifies to act the part of προφήτεως, namely, in delivering

This, Theophyl. observes, shows that he did not meditate what he said, but, as Christ saith (Matt. 10, 19.), "take no thought how, or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak;" so Paul, opening his mouth, uttered what God supplied to him, and thus accomplished every thing by divine grace. Hence (he adds), may be understood what is meant by the sword of the Spirit, namely, the word of God.
a solemn message from one prince or state to another, and, in a general way, to discharge the office of ambassador. So it is used by the best authors. Koppe remarks that it does not differ from ἀποστόλος εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. It is strange that the Commentators should not have compared the very similar passage of 2 Cor. 5, 20. "Now, then, we are ambassadors in Christ's behalf: be ye reconciled unto God." This office (he says) he discharges ἐν ἀλωσί, scil. ἀν.* Koppe compares 8, 1. δεσμιον εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

The words ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ—λαλῆσαι are further explanatory of the words at ver. 19. where see the note. Ἐν αὐτῷ, in the speaking of it." Koppe and Rosennm. join παρθένωσαι with λαλῆσαι. But the common mode of construing the passage seems preferable. See Gal. 4, 16, and the note. It is remarked by Theodoret: τόλη δὲ τὴν ἄλωσιν ἔδειξεν παρθένωσιν αὐτούς, καὶ διδάκτων, αἱ ὁ δὲ ἄλωσιν, ἡ ἐρυθρίαν ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν Δικτὴτων πανθηραμιστήν, ἀλλὰ σεμνώσθαι καὶ λαμπρώνεσθαι.

21, 22. These verses form the Epilogus or Coda, which in this chapter is very brief.

At τὰ κατ᾽ ἡμὲς must be understood πράγματα. This is further explained by the more Classical phrase τι πράσσων. Examples of both phrases are adduced by the Philologists. The sense is, "see what is the state of my affairs," as we say, see how I do. Sp. & Samh. 17, 18. "See how thy brethren fare." The Apostle had doubtless other reasons for sending Tychicus. For (as we have before seen) he left it to the bearers of his Epistle to explain some matters contained in them, to see that the directions were carried into effect, &c.

Tychicus, who is mentioned also in Col. 4, 7, 2 Tim. 4, 12, and Tit. 3, 12, was one of Paul's δικτόνων, or assistants in the propagation of the Gospel. We find

* Theophyl., Wets., and Dodd., here recognize an allusion to the violation of the person of an ambassador, which was always sacred. This, however, seems not very probable.
from Acts 20, 4. that he was born in Pricomæus Asia.

On the terms ἀγάπης and πίστις it is well observed by Theophyl., that if ἀγάπη he must know all things; and if πίστις he will not deceive. Ἐν κυρίῳ is taken by Koppe and Rosenm. for ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Κρίστου ἑνεκα. It simply signifies "in the business of the Gospel;" as ἐν αὐτῷ in the verse preceding. So Theophyl.: ἐν τοῖς θείοις.

ἐν τῇ ἐπιμέλειᾳ—ὑμῶν. The Apostle here declares the further purpose he had in view in sending Tychicus, namely, that he might comfort, and confirm them in the faith. For all this the ταπαζάμενσα seems to import; though the Commentators only dwell on the first sense.

23, 24. These last two verses contain the usual Apostolical benedictions, which here, however, differ in some slight respects from those elsewhere.

Ἐπιφήνα must (as in the preceding formulas of benediction) signify, not concord (as Koppe explains it), but blessing of every kind, spiritual and temporal. The ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως has not before occurred: and as in 2 Pet. 1, 5. we have, "Add to your faith virtue," so here St. Paul prays, that with their faith may be conjoined Christian love, in which it seems they were deficient. So at 12, 10. the Apostle exhorts to brotherly love: and at Gal. 5, 13. he has the admonition, by love to serve one another. But especially at Gal. 5, 6. he bids them, "strive after faith which worketh by love;" (where see the note). It is observed by Hardy, that these two united have the promise of eternal life.

At εἰρήνη—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ must plainly be supplied ἐκ, "be (granted)."

24. This benediction slightly differs from the others.

24. ἡ χάρις is rendered by some, "this grace;" article for pronoun. But I prefer repeating Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου I. X. from the preceding verse. Ἀφθαρσία
must not be joined with Χριστοῦ (as it is done by Wets.), but with ἁγάπη; and it is well explained by Grot., Hamm., Koppe, and Rosenm., constantly, perpetually, unceasingly; though it may also denote sincerity, as Erasmus renders it. And so Locke, Whitby, and Wells, “without mixing or joining anything with him in the work of salvation, thus corrupting the simplicity of the Gospel.” 2 Cor. 11, 3. Gal. 5, 2. Both senses (I agree with Mr. Slade) may be included. Theophyl. explains: μὴ ἐν πλούσιον, ἢ ἐν δόξῃ, ἀλλ’ ἐν τοῖς ἀφθάρτοις.
To the Philippians

CHAPTER I.

Verses 1. Paul and Timotheus. Timothy being accompanied Paul in each journey to Philippi; see Acts 16, and was therefore known to and esteemed by the Philippians. The present Epistle seems to have been dictated to Timothy.

1. διακόνοις.] This was the name applied to ministers of Christ employed in preaching the Gospel. (Rosem. I have before remarked that the term is not peculiar to the Scriptural writers, but is sometimes found in the Classical ones, as applied to priests of the heathen gods.

The reason why he does not here, according to his custom, prefix the title of Apostle, Wets. thinks is this, that he might not seem to have received what they had sent as a debt, but as a free gift, 4, 11, 14, 15 & 16.

On the exact import of the term διακόνοις there has been much discussion among Commentators and Theologians. If the term have here the sense in which it is usually taken, the difficulty will be how to account for the mention of bishops (two or more), when we should expect but one. This difficulty some Episcopalian writers, as Harn., would remove by supposing that the Epistle was intended for several cities, of which Philippi was the metropolis; and that the salutation is meant for the presidents of each. But this is evidently an hypothesis formed "for the nonce," and only cuts the knot; not to say that it is inconsistent with the striking particularities in the Epistle, which evidently fix it to the Christians of Philippi and its vicinity. On this, as on most occasions, I see no reason to forswear our venerable guides, the antient Commentators, who inform us that these διακόνοις were the Presbyters of the several congregations of Christians in Philippi, (and, I would add, its rich
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On this subject see the long and able Annotation, or rather Dissertation, of Whibley, who (inter alia) says: "The Greek and Latin Fathers with one consent declare, that τοις πρεσβυτέροις οἱ Βαπτισταὶ, the Apostle here calls their Presbyters their Bishops. So Chrys., Theodoret, Æcumen., and Theophyl., among the Greeks, and among the Latins, St. Jerome, Pseud. Ambrosius, Pelagius, and Primasius; and that not only for the above-mentioned reasons, that there could be but one Bishop, properly so called, in one city; but for another alleged by them all, viz., that τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, then the names were common to both orders, the Bishops being called Presbyters, and the Presbyters, Bishops. And this, Theodoret says, is manifest in this place, because he adds here Deacons to the Bishops, making no mention of their Presbyters." Therefore acquiesce in the opinion of Theodoret, who says that St. Paul then wrote to the Presbyters and Deacons of that city, because their Bishop Ephroditus, whom he styles his brother and his companion in labour, and fellow-soldier, and their Apostle, was then with him at Rome, 2, 25. and that he therefore mentions them, because they were so instrumental in sending the contribution to him mentioned in 4, 15. Many distinguished Commentators and Critics go yet further, and maintain that there was no distinction at all between Presbyters and Bishops till after the Apostolical age. But this is far more than can be proved. Bingham, Eccl. Antiq. L. 2, 1., seems to have satisfactorily established the existence of a power equivalent to that of Bishops in the Apostolical age, and both the exercise of the power and the assumption of the title in the next age to the Apostolical, See Mr. Slade's note, and especially a long citation introduced by him from an able Treatise on the Claims of the Established Church, p. 23—25. Lond. 1815.

With respect to the Deacons, they superintended the secular affairs of the society (see Acts 6.), as distributing the alms, attending on the sick, and sometimes exercising the subordinate sacerdotal offices, especially assisting at the Eucharist.

2. χαίρε ὑμῖν—Χριστοῦ. Compare Rom. 1, 7. 2 Cor. 1, 2. Gal. 1, 3. Eph. 1, 2. and the notes.

3. εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου ἐπὶ πᾶσῃ τῇ μελα ὑμῶν, "I return my thanks to God." This is for the more Classical χαίρε ἐμοί. ἐπὶ πᾶσῃ τῇ μελα ὑμῶν, "as often as I remember you all," i.e. remember your Christian faithfulness, and progress in the Gospel. I cannot think, with Pierce and Michaelis, that there is here any reference to the presents the Apostle had received from the Philippians. Heinrichs remarks, that it is usual with St. Paul to thus commence an Epistle with the commendations of those to whom it is addressed; and that he has scarcely ever omitted
this, except in the case of the Galatians. Here he has used stronger expressions than he elsewhere employs, from the extreme affection which he seems to have borne towards this his favourite church. One cannot, too, but observe the delicacy with which in every Epistle these praises are introduced and expressed. Thus here, as Theophyl. observes, when he says the remembrance of them gives him joy, he indirectly commends their virtue.

Hāvrome is (as Rosenm. observes) used populariter, in the sense saepissimē. Meta χαρᾶς τῷ δέησιν πονομέον. The sense here is clear: though the construction is somewhat involved, on account of the accommodation of words pleonastically used, but highly expressive of the warmth of the Apostle’s feelings. It is therefore unwarranted to have recourse to critical conjecture, and even unnecessary to resort to alterations of the punctuation. The simple sense is, “which prayers so continually offered up for you, are always offered up with joy.”

5. ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐἰς τῷ εὐαγγέλιον. On the sense of these words there has been no little difference of opinion. Some think that κοινωνία ἐἰς imports constancy in the profession of; others, sincerity in embracing the Gospel. But these interpretations are little agreeable to the usus loquendi. Many eminent interpreters, as Crell., Whitby, Grot., Menoch., Heinrichs, and Rosenm., including the authors of our common Version and most English translators, explain, “participation of the Christian doctrine, by having embraced the Christian faith.” See Gal. 2, 9. and 1 Cor. 2, 9. Thus ἐἰς is taken for ἐν. But the construction is not supported by the passages adduced; and to take ἐἰς for ἐν would here be rather harsh. Though, therefore, the sense this interpretation yields is sufficiently agreeable to the context, and especially ver. 6. (see Whitby), yet there is surely no occasion to abandon the common interpretation, which is supported by the authority of the Greek Commentators, and has been main-
tained by some eminent modern ones, as Pierce, Oder, Michaelis, Wells, Pyle, and Hardy, and recently adopted by Storr and Slade, namely, "for your liberality in contributing for the furtherance of the interests of the Gospel," a sense of κοινωνία found in Rom. 15, 26. 2 Cor. 8. 4. 9. 13. Of liberality of this kind the Philippians had, it appears, given striking proof ever since the period of their conversion; insomuch that the Apostle, at 4, 15. (using the same term κοινωνία) says, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκκοινωνήσεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως, εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι. This interpretation is, moreover, required by the words following: ἀπὸ πρᾶτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. For on the other they would seem superfluous, or worse. It is supported, too, by the authority of Phot., who explains: ἔτει τῇ εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κοινωνία ὑμῶν, τῇ ἀπὸ πρῶτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν διακοσμενήν. And he observes: οὖσιν ὑπὲρ της ἡμέρας μέχρι τοῦ νῦν διακοσμενήν. And so Theophyl., who well explains thus: Πᾶς δὲ κοινωνίτε; πέμποντες μοι τὰ πρὸς χρείαν, καὶ κηδεμονία μου ὑπὲρ τῶν καλῶν τι μεταχειριζόμενω συνεργῶν καὶ βοηθῶν πας τρόποις, μεριστῆς αὐτῶ τοῦ εἰργού γίνεται.

6. πέμποντες αὐτὸ τούτο—Χριστοῦ. These words must be interpreted according to the view taken of the sense of the preceding verse. Upon the interpretation of Grot., Whitby, and others, the good work will be, the good work of faith (see Joh. 6. 29. Rom. 2, 7. 1 Cor. 15, 58. 16. 10. Phil. 2. 30. 2 Thess. 1, 11. 2, 17. 2 Tim. 2, 21. 3, 17.), believing and embracing the Gospel, and regulating their lives by its precepts; their reformation by the Christian doctrine, &c., which would be carried forward to the day of the Lord. In conformity with the last detailed interpretation the sense has been thus laid down by Rosenm. "Spe confusis, fore, ut qui inter vos cœpit bene facere idem illud conficiat, usque ad
diem Jesu Christi." But this is not a correct version: for according to it the οἱ ἐγκαθέσθηκεν may still be God. So Theodoret: πιστεύω δὲ, ὅτι τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὸ ἐκκλησιάς τὴν ἀγάπην προβιβάσει, διότι τὸ ἔργον τῆς σωτηρίας ἦμων ἐκφαντίζεται. By ἔργον may be meant this and any other kind of good work.

The day of the Lord is by most Commentators understood of Christ's second advent to judge the world. But this interpretation carries with it much of difficulty, which can only be avoided by paraphrase. (See Dodd.) I therefore prefer the interpretation of some antients and moderns (as Menoch, Est., Zanch, Mackn., and others), who understand it of the day of death, which is to every one, as it were, the day of the Lord. If, however, the former interpretation should be adopted, there will be no reason to consider the passage as countenancing the Calvinistic dogmas. For, as Grot. remarks, the Apostle supposes (as appears from what follows) their co-operation.* Though he chuses to mention only the principal and nobler cause. So Philo. Alteg. (cited by Grot.) Πολλοὶ ἀρχήτων, &c. Multi qui se applicarunt ad virtutis studium circa finem defecerunt: sed cui Deus firmam dat scientiam, ei largitur utrumque, et operari virtutes, et ab iiis nunquam recedere, &c.

7. καθιστεὶ δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, "for it is (only) just and right that I should

* So Whitby observes, that the Apostle speaks this not out of any opinion of the election of all the Philippians to eternal life; or of the certainty of their perseverance to the end. Otherwise why the exhortation at 2, 12. 4, 1. 2, 16.? He therefore speaks this from a judgment of charity, because, he says, it seems just, or fit, for me to conceive this good hope of you, by reason of that great affection you retain to me, and your patience in enduring the like afflictions: Now he that only gives these reasons of his confidence, gives us just reason to conceive he knew nothing of the necessity of their perseverance by virtue of any absolute election to salvation. Indeed the Greek Commentators had carefully and ably exerted themselves to secure the words from doctrinal perversion.
thus think of you all." See an example of this sense of ἔχειν ἐστί in Acts 4, 19. Φρονεῖν, "entertain this opinion, and cherish this hope." Οὕτω τοῦ ἔχειν μὲ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ υμᾶς. The Commentators are not agreed whether this signifies, "because I have you in my heart," or, "because you have me in your heart." The latter interpretation is supported by Hamm., Whitby, Oder, Doddr., Pyle, and most recent Commentators. But surely this is not so natural a construction as the former; nor is it (I think) so well supported by the context. The former, then, which is confirmed by the antient Commentators, and espoused by all the modern ones up to the time of Hamm., seems to deserve the preference. The explanation of it, indeed, involves somewhat more of difficulty; but that is no ground for supposing it the less true. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) well lays down the sense thus: Φρονεῖν τοῦτο ὑπὲρ υμῶν, διότι ἐάν ἔχω ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ υμᾶς, καὶ οἶδα τὰ ὑμέτερα κατορθώματα, καὶ ὅτι στοµᾶζετε καὶ ἀπόντες συγκοινωνίᾳ μουγενεῖσθαι τῆς χάριτος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν. Ὡστε δίκαιον ἐστιν ἐμὲ τοιχίτα στοχασταὶ ὑπὲρ υμῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν προσφυγῶν τεκμαίρεσθαι καὶ τὸ τέλειον ὅτε ἐγκαθίσθων τὸ ἐν καρδίᾳ εἰναι Πάσης οἰκονομίας, τούτων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κρίσεως καὶ τῶν ἀξίων ἀγαπητῶν;

7. καὶ τῇ ἀστολῇ. This is supposed to have been when he had to plead his cause before Nero against the Jews who were at Rome requiring him to be put to death. See Acts 28, 17. sq.

7. συγκοινωνίας μεν τῆς χάριτος. On the sense of this very vague and extensive term χάρις the Commentators are divided in opinion. Most modern ones, as Wets., Menoch., Storr. and Rosenm., render it "the Apostatical office bestowed upon me by Divine grace." See Rom. 12, 3. "Of this, (says Rosenm.) the Philippians were partakers, because they rejoiced at the great success of the Gospel." But I agree with Heinrichs, that this mode of interpretation is very harsh. Other less probable ones may be seen
detailed in the Crit. Sacr., Pole, Wolf, &c. Upon the whole, the best founded seems to be that of the ancient Commentators and, of the moderns, G. W. Hamm., and recently Noesselt, Storr, and Jastrow, who explain it, bonds, imprisonment, and persecution, which are by the Apostle accounted a mark of Divine favour. See infra ver. 19, 20 & 22. in ὃμιν ἵχαρίσθη τῷ ὑπὲρ Χ.—πάσχει. Acts 5, 41, and especially infra 4, 14. συγκοινώσαστε μὲ τῷ θαύμα. This, Rosenm. observes, is to be connected with ver. 4.

8. μάρτυς γὰρ μου ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς. Heinrichs compares the Hebr. ζυγύς τῷ in 1 Sam. 12, 5. Gen. 31, 50. See also Rom. 1, 19. Theophyl., with his usual good taste, illustrates the scope of the words thus: ὁγι γὰρ ἀπεισοδίμενος μάρτυρα καλεῖ τὸν Θεόν, αὐτῇ τῷ πολλῆς διάθεσις ὁγι ἓμων παραστησάι διά λόγου, τὸ τοῖς καταλιμπάναι τοῦτο, τῷ τὰς καρδίας ἔμεταξώσε τοῖς τῷ ἀληθεὺσιν αὐτῶν τεκμήριων.

Ἐνυποθεῖν, Heinrichs observes, answers to the ἱκεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, &c. at ver. 7., and merely signifies umare, like the Latin desideratissimus, for carissimus. It is indeed a very strong term, in which the ẹni is intensive; as ἐν, in Ps. 119, 131. The phrase ἐνομπάγχως ἵησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is quite Hebraic. The ἐνομπάγχω (as Rosenm. observes), answers to the Hebr. ὅψανα, the inmost affections of the heart; and ἐν (like ẹ) signifies similitude; as in Col. 2, 6. See also Philem. 7 & 12. Heinrichs well renders: "qualis animi affectus in I. C. esse soletabat, qualemque et a cultoribus suis desiderat." And this is confirmed by Theophyl., who paraphrases thus: ὅτι πατήρ ἡμῶν γενοιας διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἔσε Χριστῶν, ἐνομπάγχω ἔχω ἐφ' ὑμῖν, ὀδ φυσικά, ἀλλ' ὃς Χριστὸς χαρίζεται τοῖς γενοιοὶ αὐτοῦ δούλοις, τοῖς αὐτῷ γεννασί τὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τέκνα.

9. καὶ τοῦτο προσεύχομαι—αἰσθήσει. The Apostle here gives them a specimen of the prayers which he addressed to God on their behalf.

In the interpretation of these words much de-
pends on the sense to be assigned to ἀγάπη, on which the Commentators are not quite agreed. It can hardly be supposed (though some antient and modern Commentators entertain the opinion) that the Apostle would pray that their love to himself might abound more and more. I rather agree, with Theodoret, and many modern Commentators, that by ἀγάπη is here meant the principle of love, whether as borne to himself, or to other Christians; and the present is elegantly described, at 1 Cor. 13, 13., as the queen of all virtues. Of this he prays for a plentiful and progressive increase, in the energetic words ἔτσι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον περισσεύῃ. For Kypke has shown that περισσεύειν has here the passive sense to be increased. See Schl. Lex.

9. εἰς ἐπιγνώσει καὶ τάσῃ αἰσθήσει. The prayer, Heinrichs thinks, is that the increase of their love may have added to it a perpetual increase of knowledge. And Rosenm. remarks, that love is increased by Divine knowledge and understanding; since the more we understand of the benefits of God and Christ, and the more we experience the force of heavenly truths, the more is our love to God and Christ augmented. This may, in a certain sense, be true; but I cannot think that this is the truth the Apostle meant to express. I am rather inclined to think that the antients were right in supposing that the Apostle meant to pray that their knowledge and understanding might keep pace with that increase of love and affection: since, by that means, Christian love produces better fruits. They had, it should seem, been, from the first, docile, well-disposed, and kind-hearted. But, as would appear from the words following, their simplicity had been somewhat abused by crafty false teachers, chiefly Judaizers, &c. So Theophyl.: ὅνα μη ἄπλωσ πάντας ἀγαπάτε, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δοκιμασίας, καὶ γνώσεως, καὶ κρίσεως. And Theodoret: Εἰσελθόμενοι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ύμῶν ἐπιθέσεις λαμβάνειν ἁλί, καὶ γνώσεως ύμῶς ἐμφορεῖσθαι, καὶ διακρίσεως ἐνταῦθα δὲ τῶν ἀπατεῶνας
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ἐκεῖνος ἡμῖν, καὶ διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς τὸ πρακτέων αὐτῶς διδάσκει, ὡστε γινώσκειν τις μὲν ἅλθης διδασκαλίας τῆς ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας ἔστερημένης. The ἐπιγρ. is well explained by Theodoret διακρίνεις, discernment, that natural sense (explains Heinrichs) by which they discern and feel what is true, right, and excellent in Christian doctrine. So Slade renders, "perception or discrimination of right and wrong." Whitby says the word is so used twenty times in the books of Proverbs, and he refers to Heb. 5, 14. Thus the ἐν will have the sense of σω.

10. ἐις τὸ δικαίματε—Χριστοῦ. The Apostle here develops his meaning in the preceding verse. Δικαίματε signifies so to try as to discern and ascertain what is true and genuine. Τὰ διαφέρουσα. This is one of those words which admit of two senses; though which ought to be assigned, Commentators, as in many other cases, are at a loss to determine. Διαφέρουσα may either signify to differ, or to be excellent, of importance, superior, &c. Of these senses either may here have place. The latter is adopted by many Commentators, including our English Translators,* and is well illustrated by Kypke. And undoubtedly there were points enow of superiority in the Gospel over the law of Moses, on which this faculty might be exercised. Others, as Wolf, Pierce, Pyle, Dodd, Heinrichs, and Schleus, adopt the former interpretation; and think this advert to the difference between the doctrines of genuine Christianity, as compared to those of Judaizing teachers. And if the Apostle had here in view (as Theodoret says) false teachers, this interpretation would seem to deserve the preference; especially as it seems to include the other: for, indeed, both interpretations appear to come to the same thing.

10. ἵνα ἦτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπήλθοτοι ἐις ἡμέραν

* It is also supported by the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl, who explains: τὰ συμφέροντα. 'Εαν γὰρ μετὰ δικαιωμάτων καὶ κρίσεως ἄγαπας, δύνασθε τὸ συμφέρον δοκίμασαι.
Christ. The word εἰλικρίνης, which signifies integer, purus, is, by most modern Commentators, regarded as synonymous with ἀπρόσκοπος, and equivalent to the integer vitae of Horace. And Rosenm. cites Plut. ὁς δὴ τις εἰλικρίνης καὶ ἀπαθής. But it should rather seem, from the context, that the antient Commentators rightly applied the εἰλικρ. to purity and sincerity of faith and doctrine, and the duties towards God; and ἀπρόσκοπος, to purity and irreproachableness of life and manners, and the duties towards men. And this (I find) is approved by Heinrichs. On ἀπροσκ. see 25, 16. 1 Cor. 10, 32., and the notes. Heinrichs observes that whether the active or the passive sense of ἀπρ. be adopted, it matters not.

Εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ some (as Rosenm.) would explain “in, or at, the day of the Lord.” But that will depend on the signification ascribed to the ἡμερεῖ just before. I see no reason to desert the common interpretation unto, until, which is strongly confirmed by ver. 6. (of which this is a kind of repetition per epanalepsin) ἐγὼν ἄγαθων ἐπιτελέσει ἄχρις ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In both cases, though most Commentators explain the day of judgment, yet it is most suitable to understand it of the approach of death, which is so represented in many parts of Scripture.

11. πεπληρωμένων καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης—Θεοῦ. Here many excellent MSS. of various recensions, and some Fathers and Translators, read καρπῶν—τῶν, which is adopted by almost all Editors; and, on critical principles, it would seem to merit the preference. And yet so uncertain are all reasons of this kind, that it is not improbable the common reading may be the true one, and the other an emendation. The plural form is, indeed, somewhat unusual in this sense in the New Testament; yet it occurs in John 3, 17., where he says the ἡ ἀναβας σοφία is μέση καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν: and in the next verse he has the very expression καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης. Besides, many MSS. are
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such as are full of glosses, &c. And as to the Versions, they are here no direct evidence. As to the Fathers, they are few and insignificant. The testimony of Chrys., who has the common reading, is of more weight than them all. On these grounds the common reading may be retained, which seems to have been preferred by three eminent and cautious Critics, Wets.,* Matthæi, and Schleus. As to the sense, it is the same on either reading. By good fruits are, by a common Scriptural metaphor, meant good works. For the words explain the ἀποστολή. Theophyl. well points out the sense thus: ἵνα μετὰ τῆς τῶν δογμάτων ὀρθότητος καὶ βίου ἔχῃ τε ἀκατάγραψτον.

Now these good works are said to be performed διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is taken for διὰ διδαχῆς Ἰ.Χ. But this is too vague. It may signify "suitably to the commands he has issued for our observance, and of regard to his will." So Chrys. and Theophyl., who observe that this is mentioned, since the Heathens claimed the praise of performing that part of δικαιοσύνη, which regards men; but it was done through vain-glory and to gain human approbation, and not done in the way Christ would have it, namely (as the Apostle adds) to the praise and glory of God.

12. ἢ τὰ καὶ ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκατηγορεῖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλπίζων. It is observed, by Heinrichs, that from hence to ver. 26. St. Paul speaks of himself and his bonds, lest the minds of the Philippians should be pre-occupied by false and contrary rumours." The Apostle evidently means to say what is calculated to comfort them.

Γνωσκεῖν ὅτε ὑμᾶς βούλομαι is a phrase serving to introduce any communication. Τὰ καὶ ἐμὲ. The expression properly signifies any one's affairs; as in Eph. 6, 21., where see the note and Wetstein's examples. It here signifies, the events which have happened to me; and is said, by way of euphemism,

* For though, as an Interpreter, he can by no means be considered as a safe guide, yet, as Critic, his opinions are marked by singular judgment and caution.
for "my bonds at Rome." The phrase ἐκλήθης εἰς προκοπὴ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου is for ἀπεβαινεν or ἀποβαίνειν ἐξ οὗ, cessit in, have tended to; as Mark 5, 26. Προκοπῆς, increase, propagation; a sense perpetually occurring in the best Greek writer, from whom examples, in superfluous abundance, are adduced by Wets. and Kypke.

It is easy to conceive how the Apostle’s being taken to Rome, and kept in bonds, would tend to the spread of the Gospel.

18. ἀφοτε τῶς ἐσόμοις—πᾶσι. The construction and sense of the passage seems to be that laid down by Pierce, Mackn., Rosenm., and Heinrichs, “so that my bonds and imprisonment suffered on account of Christ’s religion only, and not for any fault, are become plain to all the Pretorians, and to all other persons,” i. e. “so that it is manifest that,” &c. It is objected by Doddr., that γενέσθαι must thus be taken twice. But ἐνρας may be supplied after πανέρους. Such a syntax is frequent in the Classical writers. Ἐν Χριστῷ, is for διὰ Χριστοῦ.

Πραύτριον may signify, literally, the Pretorian Camp, or Palace; and then, at λοιποῖς πᾶσι, we must subjoin τότες. But this is here a somewhat harsh ellipsis. So that I prefer, with most recent Commentators, to take πραύτερι for the Pretorians themselves, the whole camp. And λοιποῖς πᾶσι may be rendered, “and (by their means) to the public at large.” Some take πραύτερι to denote the Palace, called by the provincials Prætorium, since that was the name given to the residence of the Provincial Military governors. But it is observed, by Heinrichs and Rosenm., that the custody of the Emperor’s prisons (over which, he who was placed in command, bore the title of Præfectus prætorii), was called πραύτριον. Hence, by metonymy, the same name was applied to the Prætorian camp, situated at Rome. See Acts 28, 16., where it is related that Paul was delivered in charge to the Præfectus Prætorii, and bound with a chain to a soldier.
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How this became so generally known we are left to conjecture. Some suppose that it was by the guard on Paul being very frequently changed. Perhaps, too, the guard might have been converted. All this, however, is mere speculation.

14. καὶ τῶν πλέον τῶν λόγων λαλεῖν. Her τῶν πλέον seems to signify very many. By ἰδεῖμαι εἰς Κύριον are meant, either Christian brethren, brother Christians, or, as some think, brother preachers. Περιστότερα τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, Rosenm. and Heinrichs explain: “relying on, or confiding in, the hope that if they should be apprehended on this account, they should come into no danger of death, but be as humane as I myself.” Thus, τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, will denote “honesti vinculum meorum.” But this seems a frigid sense: and to interpret δεσμοῖς in this manner is very harsh. I am aware that the clause is very elliptical; yet this kind of ellipsis would be almost unprecedented. I see no reason to desert the interpretation of Grot., and almost all other modern Commentators, supported as it is by the antients, namely, “taking courage at the intrepid manner in which I bore my bonds, and excited by the example of my patient endurance.” Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: πρότερον μὲν ἐπαρφησίαν ἔμε, ὥσ περ ἑπτάτερον ἐκ τοῦ ἐμε ἰδεῖν πλέον παράμοιαν ἔμενον, καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν ὑποκομήσανον. And Theodoret: ταύτας δὲ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ βάρσος ἐκ τῶν ἐμᾶς δεσμῶν ἐνεγέρθη. ὅραν τε γὰρ με σὺν ἡμοῖς τὰ δυσχερὰ φέρων, ἀδειάς τὸ βιόν κροττουσιν εὐαγγελιον. And Æcumen.: βάρσος γὰρ αὐτῶς ἔλαβε, βεβαιωθέντας διὰ τῶν Παύλου δεσμῶν πρὸς τὴν πίστιν εἰ γὰρ μη βείων ἴν, φησι, τὸ κήρυγμα ὡς ἐν δὲ Παύλος ἰσθεῖτο ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεδεσθαι. Nothing can be more satisfactory than this sense; since persecution, or rather patient endurance of persecution, for religion’s sake, is the strongest recommendation of it: and certain it is that Protestantism has been rather benefited than otherwise, by the sufferings of her glorious army of Martyrs and Confessors.
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In ἑρμοσυνέτερος ἄγοθως the θερμοσ. merely signifies more; and than before is implied, which must refer to the period before Paul’s being brought to Rome: for Christianity had been planted there, and had flourished sometime before.

15. τινές μὲν—κηρύσσεσθαι. These words obscurely hint at the existence of a party at Philippi similar to that which existed at most other places where Paul preached, hostile to him. These are supposed to have been Judaizers. Certainly they were not Jews (as Grot. thought); for they would not preach Christ in any way; but they probably consisted also of those too worldly persons to whom the humbling doctrines of the Gospel, pronounced by Paul, were unacceptable; and those timid persons to whom the boldness, and what seemed incautious zeal of the Apostle were matter of alarm. These, it appears, preached the Gospel indeed, but rather controversially, and actuated by envy and hostility to Paul.

Others, however, did this δ’ εὐθείαν, which Heinrichs explains, “of their own free will, and not actuated by a party spirit.” But I prefer the common interpretation, “out of good will and sincere affection,” i.e. towards Paul. And this seems to be supported by ver. 17. Others refer it to God; i.e. “through a love of God, and through piety.” So Theodoret: αἰς θερμοῖς περὶ τὴν εὐθείαν διακείμενοι. Οἰκουμεν: διὰ πιστίν, ἀγαθήν, γνῶμην καὶ θυσίαν ἀγαθήν. And Theophyl.; μετὰ εὐθείας γνώμην. These significations in some measure merge into each other.

16, 17. These verses are explanatory of the preceding: 16, of the τινὲς μὲν, &c.; 17, of the τινὲς δὲ, &c. But in several MSS., Versions, and Latin Fathers, the verses are transposed: and the transposition is adopted by most Critics; but (I think) on insufficient grounds. For, though the transposed order is more agreeable to the usage of the Classical writers, yet the other is more suitable to that of the Scriptural ones. I am entirely of the opinion of
Matthei, that the common reading is the more genuine: and it is defended by ver. 15. The Apostle, it seems, in order to make the adaptation the more striking, places the adapted portions in the same order: the ὅ μὲν corresponding to the τινὲς δὲ. And this is certainly the more natural order; though the other is the more elegant, and as such, was introduced by the Correctors of the MSS. in question, most of which are full of similar emendations.

Ἕκ ἐπιθείας, through strife, is explanatory of the διὰ ζημίας. The phrase occurs also at Rom. 2:8, τῶν δὲ ἐκ ἐπιθείας, scil. οὕτως. So here many Commentators think ὅμοιος is to be supplied. But that is not necessary. Οὐκ ἄγνως signifies, "not with a sincere mind and pure motives," i.e. (as it is explained at ver. 18.), οὐκ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. So Theophyl.: οὐκ εἰλικρινώ, οὐδὲ δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ καλὸν. Others think it alludes to an admixture of Gospel truths with Jewish errors. But this is less agreeable to the context.

16. οἵμαι τελίς ἐκτείνειν τῶν δεσμῶν μου. Οἵμαι signifies intending, wishing. See Schl. Lex. The words τελίς—μου are explained by Dodd., "desire to add yet more affliction to my bonds, by strengthening the cause of those who, while they call themselves Christians, seem to place a point of honour and conscience in hurting my reputation, and abetting unreasonable prejudices, which have been so eagerly raised and propagated, to the disadvantage of my character." So indeed the words are usually interpreted; and this may be the sense. But the antient Commentators, and many eminent modern ones, think that these persons endeavoured thus to excite the fury of the ignorant multitude, or perhaps of the rulers, against Paul, and aimed at producing an increase of the severity of his imprisonment, by malignantly preaching Christ with excessive publicity. So Theodoret: Ἕκε ταῦτα ἐνταξεὶ τῶν τῆς διασεβείας δουλείας καὶ τῆς διασκεδασμοῦ τῶν εἰκόνων τῶν θείων ἐν τῷ ὁμολογ. καὶ τούτων τῶν θεοπράτων Παῦλου ὑπέλειψεν ἐνεπήγγελται τῶν τῆς ἐκείνων θυμῶν παραβάσεστε.
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ἀναλήπτων κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν περιώντες ἐκήρυττον τῶν Χριστῶν, οὔ τις τῶν ἀκούστων προμηθεύμενοι σωτηρίας, ἀλλὰ κινδυνεύοντος τῶν ἀποστάλων τυφειστες. Both these motives may have had place in different persons, or even the same persons. So that the two interpretations may be united.

Of ἐπιφέρω, in the sense to add, examples are adduced by Lössner. But the word also signifies to occasion, bring upon; as in Thucyd. 3, 46., ἐπιφ. τὴν αἰθίαν. 1, 70., ἐπιφ. ὕπων.

17. οἱ δὲ εἰς ἀγάπης, εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κέιμαι, "some, on the contrary (preach Christ), out of love and good will both to me and the Gospel. Eidoûtes—κείμαι. Some, as Pisc., Est., Michaelis, Endius, &c., render κείμαι, "I lie in prison." But it is not probable that the Apostle would express so much sense in that one word, for which (as Heinrichs observes) there is no authority, nor is it agreeable to the εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: for it would have required δι' ἀπολογίας. The antient Commentators, and the most eminent modern ones, are agreed that it must signify τίθεμαι, "I am placed where I am, in this situation;" as in 1 Thess. 3, 6. Compare Luke 2, 32. The use of κείμαι for τίθεμαι, to be destined, ordained, &c., is frequent in the Classical writers. The sense, then, is, "well knowing that I am placed here for the defence of the Gospel, and to plead its cause."

18. τί γὰρ, Rosenm. subauds διαφέρει. So we say, what then? where there must be a similar ellipse of matters it. But this does not represent the full sense, which seems to be this: "what, then, signifies saying more." So Theophyl.: τί γὰρ δεῖ πολλὰ λέγειν. And Οἰκουμεν.: τί γὰρ μακρολογοῦ. Other antients explain it τί μαι μέλει; q. d. "what have I to do with the motives of those who preach it." This, however, can scarcely be admitted. Doddru. and Rosenm. explain, "what is the result of those attempts." But I prefer the former interpretations,
which may be united. Macknight's subaudition ans I sorry, is very harsh.

Πληρ. is for πληρ ὑπ. 18. εἰτε προφανεῖ, εἰτε ἀληθεία. It is plain, from the preceding verses, that προφ. must here be taken in the sense, not by occasion, but in pretence, with dissimulation, pretest, and hypocrisy. The ἀληθεία, answers to the καταγγέλλωσιν ἐν ἀγνὸς, at ver. 16., where see the note. So also in 1 Cor. 5, 8., εἰλακρυνεία and ἀληθεία are conjoined. It is well observed, by Rosenm., that the Apostle does not mean to say it is the same whether the Gospel be taught in this or in that way, but that it is better for the Heathens and Jews to have some than no knowledge of Christ. So also the next words καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρίσματα must be taken with the same qualification, namely: "In this spread of the Gospel, though it has partly proceeded from improper motives, and though the doctrines may not have been quite correct, I," &c. See also Doddr. Theophyl. paraphrases: Ἁκείων μὲν διὰ τὸ λαυθήσατε με ταύτα ποιοῦσιν ἢγιὸν δὲ χαίρω ὑπὸ τὸ Χριστὸς πλέον κυριεύεται καὶ εἰς τό τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ἐπὶ πλέον χαρίσματα.

This is all that needs be considered; nor is it necessary to enter into those curious speculations on the nature of Paul's joy in which some Commentators indulge. See Wolf's Caræ and Heinrichs. 19. οὖν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦτο μοι ἀποβηθεταί εἰς σωτηρίαν. By the τοῦτο, some, as Rosenm., understand his captivity. But this is too limited a sense. It rather seems to refer to the whole of the matter just mentioned. So Theophyl.: τὸ αἰώνια τὸ κήρυγμα διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐνθρατι καὶ τοῦ ἐλθοῦν.

19. μοι ἀποβηθεταί εἰς σωτηρίαν. Almost all the recent Commentators, and among them Matthæi, Slade, and Valpy, embrace the interpretation of Tiren. and Pearce, "deliverance from captivity." See Pearce. And this is confirmed by Theophyl. on ver. 20. But it is well observed by Doddr., that, waving other objections, such an event could not be
said to proceed from the supply of the Spirit of Christ. Yet it is not (I think) necessary to interpret it of eternal salvation. Though indeed the ἀποθέσεται may denote tendency to salvation; q. d. "it will materially promote my spiritual good." "And this (he adds, with edifying humility,) will be through your prayers for me, and the supply of the aids of the Spirit promised by Christ;" which supply being in proportion to the necessity, would be more abundant as these trying circumstances required it. Such, I conceive, is the general sense of the passage, which is much mis-stated by the recent Commentators, who understand by the πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ "the disposition and mind similar to that of Christ;" as in Rom. 8, 9. Or τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ they could explain of Christ himself; q. d. "adjuvante Christo;" which is entirely sinking πνεῦμα. And in nearly the same way even Mackn. seems to have interpreted. But this is utter perversion. By τὸ πνεῦμα must be meant the Holy Spirit. And this the strong term ἐπιχαρηγίας (which signifies a liberal supply) suggests. So Gal. 3, 5. ἀν ἐπιχαρηγηθών ὑμῖν πνεῦμα, where see the note. Theophyl. (from Chrys.) here well explains it τὰν πλείον ἀποδοσίν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ πνεύματος. And Theodoret admirably paraphrases the words καὶ ἐν τούτῳ—Χριστοῦ thus: Ἔγια δὲ εὐφραί-νομα, καὶ ὅτι τῶν ἐνακτῶν μαρτυρουμένην ὄραν τὴν ἐλλήθην καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἐνεχθεὶς δυσμένης κινήθη, ἐμοὶ προ-ξενοῦσι τὴν σατιρίαν, καὶ ὑμῶν δηλούσι ταῖς εἰκόνις συν-εργοῦσιν, καὶ τοῦ θείου κρυπτὸς πνεύματος χρησιμοῦν τὴν χάριν ταύτη γὰρ πεποίθεις, οἴδα ὅτι κρείττων ἐσομαι τῶν δυσχερῶν τούτο γὰρ λέγει, οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσομαι πνεῦμα δὲ Ἰησοῦ τῆς χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος προσηγόρευσι, ἐκείνη αὐτὸς ταύτην αὐτῶς ἐφορήγησε κατὰ γὰρ τὸν θεσπέσιον Ἰσαάκην, ἐκ τοῦ πληραμάτως αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάθο-μεν. This interpretation, too, is strongly confirmed by what follows.

20. κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου, "according to my anxious expectation and hope." On ἀποκ. see the note on Rom. 8, 19. "Ὅτι ἐν συνελευθησι-
σους, "that I shall have no reason to be ashamed of any part of my Apostolical conduct." Koppe thinks that there here commences a new sentence. But he seems to have fallen into error, by not sufficiently attending to that peculiarity of the Apostle by which he accumulates periods on periods.

20. ἐν πάσῃ ταράσσει. This is explained by Οἰκουμεν. σαφῶς, φανερῶς, οὐ συνεκκεραυνωσ. And by Theophyl. ἀνατίθητος.

By Χριστός is meant the honour and glory of Christ and his Gospel. Ἐν τῷ σώματι μου. The recent Commentators take this for ἐν ἐμι; which may be admitted: but the other is much more spirited and significant; since there is an allusion to sufferings in the body: and (as Heinrichs himself acknowledges,) martyrs are said (John 21, 19,) to glorify God in their bodies, as here St. Paul is said μεγαλώνει τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι. And I would add, St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 6, 20. δεξιάσατε τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ῥεῖν.

20. εἰτε διὰ σάρις, εἰτε διὰ αὐτῶν, i. e. (as Rosenm. explains) "if I survive, the whole remainder of my life will be consecrated to the glory of Christ; and if I have to die in his cause, by my death the truth of the doctrine of Christ will be confirmed." Here the antient Commentators, Chrys., and Theophyl., &c. well deserve consultation.

21. καὶ γὰρ τὸ γην, Χριστὸς γειτν. καὶ τῷ αἰτεομαίνει, κέδες. There is something rather elliptical in this sentence. The γὰρ has reference to the clause omitted, which may perhaps be thus supplied: "And for both these events I am alike prepared, having reasons equally strong to reconcile myself to either; for," &c. On the sense of the words following, which form an acutè dictum, there has been some difference of opinion. The most favourite interpretation for the last century is that of Pierce, who thus explains: "Christ is gain to me, living or dying." But (as Dodd. remarks) this destroys the antithesis which evidently subsists between the two members of the
sentence. And in so antithetical a writer as St. Paul is very uncritical. Of these two members the first alone presents any real difficulty. And if the connection be what I have above suggested, and the sentence be antithetical, the sense will be as follows: “For my life (if I live) will be dedicated to Christ and his religion; and if I die, I shall be rather the gainer.” Some slightly vary the expressions. But be that as it may, it would be very injudicious to press or refine on the sense of an acutē dictum like this, in which something must be allowed for the point. According to the above explanation, τὸ ἔργον will be (as frequently) for ἡ ἐργα. Theodoret well paraphrases thus: Ἐν σαρκὶ τοῦτο μας καρπὸς ἔργων. There is some obscurity in this sentence, produced by the same cause from whence it has so often elsewhere arisen, namely, excessive brevity. In this case our chief guide is the context, and the chain of thought. Rosenm. renders: “Quodsi vero vita mea in corpore utilitatem afferret muneri meo.” Heinrichs and Reichard: “Quodsi vita longior majorem docendi occasionem attulerit.” For ἔργον often signifies the office of a Christian teacher; as in 1 Thess. 5, 13. And καρπὸς signifies fruit, utility, καὶ, sanē.

Of these two interpretations the former seems preferable; but they in some degree merge into each other. Perhaps the most able view of the ratio sententiae is that of Theophyl. (from Chrys.: ἥπα μὴ νομίζης διαβαλλεῖν αὐτῶν τὴν παρούσαν ἐργήν, φησιν ἡ

23. ἱστέων ἔν σαρκί, τωτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου, τουτέστιν, εἰπὼν μὲν ὅτι κέρδος μοι τὸ βασιλεύ. Πλὴν ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ ἔν σαρκί ὅπως ἀκαρτον μοι ἦστι (καρποφόρος γὰρ, διδάσκων καὶ φαντάζων πάντας), ὅπως ἰδία τι αἰσθήσομαι. The sentence is certainly very elliptical, and perhaps there is an apophasis after ἔργου. The sense may be represented in the following paraphrase: "But if my life in the flesh be of use to the Gospel (be it so, I say no more), verily what I shall chuse I see and know not." Schleus. compares Job. 34, 25. γνωρίζων αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα; where the Vulg. renders, "novit eorum opera." Prov. 3, 6. Marc. Ant. 4, 29. And Wets. compares Curtius 9, 6. "Mihi maximus laborum atque operum meorum fructus est, si Olympia mater immortalitati consacretur, quandocunque exesserit vita."

Tān signifies, the two following. Τὴν ἐκτιμηματίαν ἔχων εἰς ἀναλύσαι, καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, having the desire to depart (from this life) and be with Christ." Ἀναλύω primarily signifies to loose, and is a nautical term, denoting to loose cable, i. e. to depart. Though it often signifies, in a general way, to depart, and may very well be applied, like may other verbs expressive of departure, both in Greek and Latin, and
indeed all languages, to departure by death. Hein-
richs compares the Rabbinical phrase *dissolvit ex hoc
mundo*; and Cic. de divinit. L. 1. Qum animus ex
corpore exesscent, tum demum reedit. Very many
other parallel passages are adduced by the early mo-
dern Commentators (see Crit. Sacri and Pole's
Synop.), and many, as it should seem, superfluous
illustrations of the metaphor. From the antithetical
phrase *ἐκτιμένειν ἐν τῇ σαρκί* it should appear, that *ἐκ*
*τῆς σαρκός* must here be supplied. The truth is, that
the words *ἐν τῇ σαρκί* were added by way of explain-
ing the former phrase. Compare 2 Cor. 5, 1 & 2.

On the sentiment of the preference of death over
life, Wetstein adduces many Classical citations.

23. *πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον.* A common ple-
onasm (Heinrichs observes), intended to increase the
force of the comparative; as Mark 7, 36. 2 Cor. 7,
13. (where see the notes.) Nor is it unknown in the
Classical writers. See Wets. The reason why the
Apostle thought it preferable is obvious. Wets. has
here the following able annotation: "Tria tempora
distinguit Apostolus, tempus hujus vitae, tempus a
morte ad resurrectionem, et tempus post resurrec-
tionem. Secundum præstat primo; tertiurn autem
utroque. Neque enim qui ex hospitio solvit, ut in
patriam reedet, eo ipso statim momento, quo pedem
ex hospitio effert, in patriam redit: sed iter aliquod
emetiendum prius est. Ergo mortem præoptavit
Paulus, ut liberaretur ab hujus vitae molestiis; quod
et plurimi fecerunt faciuntque: non vero quod cre-
deret, mortuos citius ad Christum pervenire quàm
vivos. 1 Thess. 4, 14—17. 5, 10. Jud. 14, 10 & 11."

On the powerful confirmation which this passage
affords to the doctrine of an intermediate state be-
tween death and the resurrection see the able notes
of Whitby and Slade.

24. *ἀναγκαῖότερον, scil. ἕστι.* Loesner explains this
præstat. And he cites as examples several passages
of Philo; as de Musicâ 17 p. οἱ ἄνθρωποι—ἀναγκαῖό-
tερον καὶ οἰκειομαντίαν τέχνην τῷ βιῷ παρέδωσαν. I add
Apollon. Epist. 55. οὐχ οἷος τε ἐγενόμην πλείωνα γράψας,
kal oude elchoi anagkaiostera toto. This significance, too, is frequent in Thucyd.; and I shall find some other opportunity of illustrating the nature of it. Our version needful very correctly represents the sense, which is well illustrated by Bengal thus: "Antiquius mihi est vobis inservire, quam caro frui citius. Caelum mihi non decerit." And it is briefly, but ably, expressed by Theodoret thus: Kai tis doupen apibimias exw did tis sumpherei opoioi kai tov thsanou, did tis synevai tao Xristo stoekatan ou exw tov alreion, eteidi kai tis doupe oida perdoi, kai tis antebain apanallaghs tov orphron ichton.

Wets. compares Seneca, Epist. 104. Bono viro vi-vendum est, non quamdui juvat, sed quamdui or-portet.—Ingentis animi est, aliena causa ad vim reverti.

25. Kai touto pethoidas olda oti meno kal sumtar mevno tois oun. Most Commentators, including our English Translators and Rosenm., join touto with pethoidas. Others connect it with olda, in this sense: "being persuaded that it is very needful for you that I should live a while in the body." Which seems the more natural construction, and is supported by the authority both of the Greek Commentators, and many recent ones. But the sense is the same on either mode: for if the latter be adopted, we must at touto subaud kara, "on that account." Theophyl. paraphrases thus: 'Eteidi anagkaiostai oti to epimenein tis sarke, pethoidas kal adistaktos oida oti meno. Heinrichs observes, that we must not press on the signification of olda (for it appears from ver. 27. and 4, 17, that the Apostle was not without doubt and hesitation),* but take it populariter as signifying a good courage, and firm confidence that he would be permitted, by Divine Providence, to remain and fulfil his important Apostolical office, till God should raise up another to supply his place. So also Slade.

The expression meno kal sumtaramevno is a strong

* Some think that this includes a direct revelation.
one, indicating, not continuance in life, but occasional enjoyment of their society; a beautiful trait of the overflowing kindness of the Apostle's heart.

25. εἰς τὴν ὑμᾶν προκοπὴν, καὶ γέραν τῆς πίστεως, "for your improvement in the faith (and religion of Jesus), and your comfort therefrom.

26. ἵνα τὸ καίχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν Χ. Ἰ. ἐν. These words are susceptible of more than one meaning. But the best founded opinion is, that καίχημα simply signifies joy, rejoicing (as it is rendered by our English Translators), exultation. The sense, then, is: "that your exultation on account of Christ, and the success of his doctrine may be increased by me." Διὰ τῆς ἑμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, "by my (safe) return again to you." "For (as Rosenm. paraphrases) from the safe return of your beloved teacher you will know that Christ favours you."

27. μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ πολιτείας. On the above passage, so finely representing his own views and hopes, and their glorious Christian prospects, the Apostle skilfully engraves an admonition which, from the frailty of human nature, can never be unreasonable, and is here introduced most impressively: "Only live and act worthy of the Gospel of Christ," &c. On this sense of πολιτείας see the notes on Acts 23, 1. and Phil. 3, 20. This elliptical use of μόνον (on which see the note on Gal. 2, 10.) is variously explained by Commentators. Perhaps the simplest course is that of the antients, "I only ask this of you."

27. ἵνα εἴτε ἔλθω, &c. This sentence is elliptical, and may be thus expressed: "So that whether coming and seeing you, I may see; or being absent from you and hearing of you, I may hear that ye stand fast, &c. The ellipsis was adopted, to avoid the tautology. At τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν must be understood πρόγνωσις. And thus it will not be necessary to take τὰ for τάσια; as do some Commentators. It ought not to have been supposed that the εἴτε περὶ ὑμῶν, εἴτε ἔλθω, the Apostle expresses uncertainty of coming to them. The words merely mean, whether he were
present or absent from them. (See Theodoret and Theophyl.) For he never indicates any time at which he should be present.


The words following further unfold the Apostle's meaning; and make the sense more definite. In the interpretation of them, however, there is no little diversity among Commentators. Grot. explains: "certantes quasi facto agmine contra hostes Evangelii." Rosenm.: "unanimi consensu certantes pro utilitate Evangelii." Others render τῇ πίστες τ. c. "by means of the faith of the Gospel;" i. e. against adversaries. I see not how either the first or the third interpretation can be admitted. The second seems to deserve the preference. The συναλλάζοντες simply signifies unanimous consent, quasi facto agmine. I see not how the words can be better rendered than in our Common Version. Theophyl. well paraphrases thus: συμπαραλαμβάνοντες ἄλληλους ἐν τῇ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ἄθλησει. And Theodoret: ἕν ἐν τοῖς θείοις ὁμόνοια καὶ ὁ κοινὸς ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἄλληθειας ἀγαθ. "Now contesting for the welfare of the Gospel (observes Heinrichs) implied a resolute and courageous vindication of its doctrines against Heathen adversaries, and a steady adherence to it, in spite of all temptations to forsake it." But there was another way in which it was incumbent on them to unanimously conflict for the Gospel, and further it, namely, by zeal in its propagation, and care to walk worthy of it. That this sense is here included, seems clear from 4, 8. αἰτίας ἐν τῷ εἰκασθεία συνήθισαν μιᾷ.

28. καὶ μὴ πυρόφεροι ἐν μηδείς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων.
The Apostle here adverts to that part of the σωματικὸς which consisted in maintaining the faith with constancy. Μὴ πτυρόμενοι, "not being in any thing terrified by your adversaries." The term may be rendered, by our old participle, afeard (still in the mouths of the vulgar), whence the adjective afraid. Πτυρῶ signifies to scare, and (as the Commentators say) is properly used of animals;* but it is not unfrequently used of human beings. It is of more consequence, however, to remark that this strong term shows that the Philippians were then really suffering for the Gospel; which (as Doddr. says) is to be borne in mind, as serving to explain much of the following part of the Epistles.

28. ἢτις αὐτῶς μὲν ἐστιν ἐνδείξις αἰτωλείας, ὑμῖν δὲ σωτηρίας. Here we have a somewhat obscure sentence, which is thus paraphrased by Theophyl.: "Ὅταν γὰρ ἔσωσιν, ὅτι μιρία τεχναξόμενοι οὐδὲ πτυραί ὑμᾶς δύνανται, οὐ δειγμα τούτο σαφῆς ἔχουσιν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπολύουσα, τὰ δὲ ὑμέτερα ἵσχυρὰ, καὶ ἀνάλαυτα, καὶ αὐτὸδεν ἔχουσα τὴν σωτηρίαν; And so the Scholiast ap. Matth. supplies ἐπιχείρησις after ἢτις, and explains ἐκείνους μὲν ἐπιθυμεύειν ὑμᾶς δὲ μὴ ἐρωμενεῦθαι. See also Mackn. Rosenm. and Heinrichs take ἢτις for ὅπερ or ὅ, τι, because ἐνδείξις follows; rendering: "Which (terrifying) is, indeed, to them a sign of destruction, but to you this (being terrified, afflicted, and persecuted by them) is a sign of future salvation." The former interpretation seems to be the most natural.

28. καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, "and that from God; q. d. "and both their destruction and your salvation will be from God." Rosenm. renders: "ut illi

* And so Hemsterhus. ap. Lennep. But I see not how it can be derived from πτυρός and πτῷ. To me it seems that it is an Omo-motop. like πτῷ, ἐγὼ, and has no more signification than our puerile word boh or bah. It merely signifies to make a certain noise, meant to scare any animal or human being. As the term comes from πτῷον, so that is cognate with πτῶ, from whence πτὸς.
tandem sentiant, sibi ipsis pernicii esse conatus vos vestramque religionem infestandi, vos autem sentiatis, constantiam in religione vergere vobis in salutem."

29. οι ὑμῖν—πάσχειν. The sentiment is plain; and in the phraseology nothing requires noting except a slight transposition for οι ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη υἱὸν, &c. "Ἐχαρίσθη, "is granted as a favour or an honour." This is agreeable to the whole tenor of the Gospel. See Rom. 5, 3. Acts 5, 41. Matt. 5, 12. James 1, 2., and consult Whitby.

80. τον αὐτὸν ἄγωνα—ἐν ἐρω. The Commentators remark on the anacoluthon ἐχορτεῖ for ἐχουσίν (ὑμῖν); as in 3, 19. The ἄγωνα is like the ἀδηλίας adverted to at ver. 27. Ἐν ἐρω Rosenm. takes in the sense "de me." It is rather for ἡ, "in my case." The ἐν ἑρεί is thought to have reference to the story related at Acts 16, 19 seqq., and 1 Thess. 2, 2.; and the τον ἄγωνα to signify, "hear, in this my Epistle, or from other intelligence;" or (I would add) from both.

Doddr. does not confine this to his conflicts with Judaizers, but would explain the passage with greater latitude.

CHAP. II.

VERSE 1. εἰ τις ὁυ—οἰκτημολ. The οὖ is resumptive, and we have here a continuation of the admonition στήκετε ἐν ἐνεργα, &c. at 1, 26. This the Apostle exhorts them to fulfil if they hope for any of the consolations of the religion, or if they have any such fellow feeling as even nature instills and natural religion inculcates. Such seems to be the sense, which, however, is differently explained by some; and, indeed, in such kind of sentences the pathos tends to increase the difficulty. Heinrichs observes that the "si qua est fides" is a formula dubitandi. So Virgil, Æn. 1. 607. (cited by Wets.)
Di tibi, si qua pios respectant numina; si quid usquam justitiae est, aut mens sibi conscia recti, præmia digna ferant.

The παράκλησις is explained by some exhortation. But the antient and modern Commentators are agreed that it signifies consolation, comfort. And this signification (which I have above adopted) is ably supported and illustrated by Heinrichs, who remarks: "Intelligitur autem solatium, quod Christiana religio, Paullo interprete, præstare poterat Philippensibus, fere ut Rom. 15, 4." The antients and most moderns, however, adopt another interpretation somewhat more difficult, but which may be the true one. They supply μοι ἀφ' ὅμων, and take ἔστι in the sense is to be; i.e. "If this is to be, if I am to have my comfort in Christ respecting you (in which view it is well remarked by Theodoret: πα- τερικὴς φιλοσοφίας τὰ ῥήματα)." So Theophyl., who paraphrases thus: εἰ βούλεσθε παράκλησιν τινα δούναι μοι εν τοις πειρασμοις μου εἰτινα παραμιθαν, οἰαν αἱ ἀγάπη γεννα𝑖 εἰ μελλετε δείξαι ὅτι κοινωνίαν τινα ἔχετε μετ' ἐμοῖ εν τοις πνευματικοῖς καὶ κατὰ Κύριον εἰ σπλαγχνίζεσθε καὶ οἰκτεῖστε με ἐφ' ὅς πάσαν γε τινα πάντα εν τούτῳ μοι ἀπόδοτε, εν τῷ ἀλλήλων ἀγα- τῶν. And so Theodoret, Chrysostom, Cæcumenius, and the Syriac Translator. This interpretation is supported by the preceding verse, and seems to be the more natural one: nor can we fail to admire the exquisite delicacy with which the Apostle here expresses himself; for (as Theophyl. observes) he makes their concord his own benefit, καὶ ὁσ νοῦς ἐλέους ἐξουσιώνσει τιβεται.

I cannot, however, agree with the antient Commentators, that πνευμα signifies the Holy Spirit and its gifts. Κοινωνία πνεύματος is a phrase denoting conjunction and unity of mind, the idem velle and the idem nolle. It is well remarked, by Rosenm., that the εἰ, in such a sentence, is strongly affirmative; q. d. "If (as I know) Christians can impart the highest comfort to each other."

2 z 2
PHILIPPIANS, CHAP. II.

2. παρασώτε μου τήν χαράν. The Apostle now shows in what this his παράκλησις (which he here calls, by way of explanation, the fulfilment of his joy) consists, namely, in mutual agreement as to doctrine and concord in society. Heinrichs and Schleus., indeed, maintain that τό αὐτὸ φρονοῦντες and τό ἐν φρονοῦντες are synonymous. And so Theophyl., who explains them both of social concord. And Wets. cites Polyb. 5. p. 441. λέγοντες ἐν καλ ῥα ἡ πάντες, καλ συμπλέκοντες τὰς χεῖρας and Aristid. de Concord. Rhodior. p. 569. ἐν καλ ῥα ἡ πάντες φρονοῦντες. As to the tautology, Heinrichs observes, hence resulting, from which some endeavour to free the Apostle, by making a distinction between the sense of the terms, that is not to be heeded. But we are not to bring in, or suppose, a tautology unnecessarily; nor are all the apparent tautologies of the Apostle real ones, but rather proceed from our ignorance of the nice discriminations of the Greek language. I cannot but think, with Grot., Kypke, Wells, Michaelis, Storr, and Rosenm., that the former denotes consent in doctrine; and the latter, social concord. That the former clause may refer to doctrinal agreement, we have the authority of the very learned Photius (ap. Æcumen.); though he takes the two clauses in the same sense, πάλιν διπλάσιες τὸ ὑμοφρονεῖν. The συμφωνοῦντες is well explained by Photius ὑμοφωνοῦντες. Dr. Middleton agrees with Grot., except that he thinks the ἐν has reference to what follows, namely, μηδὲν κατ' ἐρπεῖαν, &c.; q. d. "minding the one thing, not to," &c. And this is (he thinks) confirmed by the following sentence having no verb, and as being therefore such as may be made the subject of a reference. I would observe that the τήν ἀγάπην ἐχοντες seems meant to regulate the doctrinal concord.

3. μηδὲν κατὰ ἐρπεῖαν ἢ κενοδοξίαν. This verse has (I think) regard chiefly to the former of the two sorts of agreement just mentioned; and perhaps refers to the strife and vain-glory sometimes gene-
rated by the possession of the higher Spiritual gifts; as in the case of the Corinthians and the Galatians. See Gal. 5, 26. (and the note) and 1 Cor. 12, 13 & 14. It is well remarked, by Theophyl., that after strife the Apostle mentions vain-glorious, as being the parent of it.

The following clause suggests the cure for these disorders (and especially the primary one, vain-glory) namely, a spirit of true Christian humility. But the Apostle has, instead of drily enjoining this duty, at the same time described it by its principal characteristic, a disposition to think others superior to ourselves; for (as observes Rosenm.) "it is the nature of modesty to always think more highly of others than oneself." This seems to be all that need be attended to in this popular dict, on the sense of which Commentators have too much pressed, and sought needless refinements; some even thinking it a paradox, or oxymoron.

The ἧγουμένοι only imports, "each being disposed; as far as facts and actual evidence will permit him," &c.; a modification such as is also required in 1 Cor. 18, 7., where it is said of charity, that it believeth all things. Whitby thinks this refers, not to judgment, but to practice: q. d. "Be as ready to assist and help others as if you were their subjects and inferiors." But this is too harsh and sophistical.

α. μη τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐκαστος σκοτειτε. These words are of themselves somewhat indeterminate. Yet the context, both of what precedes and what follows, limits them to the subject of modesty and humility. At μη must be supplied μόνον. The words are usually interpreted as inculcating a disposition to wave private interest when it clashes with that of others, or of religion. And Wets. adduces a great number of Classical passages expressive of this disinterested spirit. But I am inclined to think, with Raphel, Michaelis, Krause, Rosenm., Keil, and Heinrichs, that something more is intended. Considering the κενοδοξίαν of the preceding verse, and what it im-
ports, there appears to be reference to those spiritual gifts and endowments of mind in which some were superior to others; and for want of attending to the endowments of others as well as his own, each (it seems) was apt se metiri suo modo. Hence that spirit of vanity in some, and envy in others, which so much prevailed at Corinth, Galatia, and, more or less, every where, and against which the Apostle was continually raising his voice. See Rom. 15, 1., and many other passages.

5. τούτο γὰρ φρονεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν ὅ καὶ ἐν Χ. 'I. The Apostle here further excites them to this duty by the example of Christ. Φρονεῖται, Rosenm. remarks, is to be taken impersonally; q. d. sentiatur. It is observed, by Heinrichs, that this is a stronger expression than φρονεῖτε, which is found in some MSS.

6. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, ὃς ἀρπαγμὸν ἡγίσατο τὸ εἶναι Ισρα Θεοῦ.

There are few passages of which the sense has been more disputed than the present; and (as Doddr. observes) it is especially remarkable on account of the contrary uses that have been made of it in the controversy relating to the Deity of our ever blessed Redeemer. It will be here my part as well to confute falsehood as to set forth truth. But the subject is so extensive and important, and the annotatory matter which has been written on it so copious, that, to do justice to it, it demands rather a pamphlet than a note. I shall, however, endeavour to form such a digest of the most valuable exegetical matter (together with my own opinions interposed) as may be serviceable to the student, who must, at the same time, recur to the original authorities, and especially Pole, Wolf, the Dissertation of Whitby, and the notes of Wets., Mackn., D'Oyley, and Mant.

But to proceed to examine the words in detail. ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. Here I must first lay before my younger readers an interpretation which has been supported by many eminent modern Commentators and Theologians, as Whitby, Wolf, Carpzov, and Mackn. I cannot do this better than by employing the words of Mackn.:

"As the Apostle is speaking of what Christ was before he took the form of a bondman, the form of God, of which he is said, in ver. 7., to have divested himself when he became man, cannot be any thing which he possessed, during his incarnation, or in his divested state; consequently, neither Erasmus's opinion, that the form of God consisted of those sparks of divinity, by which Christ, during his incarnation, manifested his god-head; nor the opinion of the Socinians, to which, indeed, those who deny the Divinity of our Lord are compelled to resort, or give up their principles.
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that it consisted of the power of working miracles, is well-founded. For Christ did not divest himself either of the one or the other, but possessed both during the whole time of his public ministry. In like manner, the opinion of those who, by the form of God, understand the divine nature and the government of the world, cannot be admitted; since Christ, when he became man, could not divest himself of the nature of God; and, with respect to the government of the world, we are led, by what the Apostle tells us in Heb. 1, 3., to believe that he did not part even with that, but, in his divested state, still upheld all things by the word of his power. Wherefore the opinion of Whitby and others seems better founded, who by the form of God understand the visible glorious light in which the Deity is said to dwell, 1 Tim. 6, 16., and by which he manifested himself to the Patriarchs of old, Deut. 5, 22, 24., which was commonly accompanied with a numerous retinue of angels, Psalm 69, 17., and which is called the similitude of the Lord, Numb. 13, 8., the face, Psalm 31, 16., the presence, Exod. 33, 15., and the shape, John 5, 37. This interpretation is supported by the term μορφή, here used, which signifies a person’s external shape, or appearance, and not his nature, or essence. Thus Mark 16, 12. Matt. 17, 2. This form he had with the Father before the world was, John 18, 5. Heb. 1, 3., and he will appear again with it at the last day, Matt. 16, 27. Lastly, this sense of μορφή Θεοῦ is confirmed by the sense of μορφήν δούλου, ver. 7., which evidently denotes the appearance and behaviour of a bondman, not that Christ was really any person’s bondman or slave.”

This interpretation, for which Whitby was in some measure indebted to Ellis, Fort.Sacr., is certainly very ingenious, and supported with considerable ability by that great Commentator, and some other writers referred to by Wolf. Yet the proofs seem not such as should induce us to abandon the interpretation of the antients and early moderns, which has also been maintained by many eminent Commentators for the last century and a half, and, among the rest, the great Bp. Pearson, Bull, and Burnet, Elnser, and others ap. Wolf, and recently Schlesius. and the venerable Bp. Burgess, also Bp. Tomline, and Archbp. Magee, who explain μορφή, by metonymy, the very nature and essence, the φύσις and ὀνόμα. So Mr. Valpy: “being in the form and nature of God,” i.e. being really God. Of this signification several examples are produced by Elnser and Schlesius., as Plato de Repub. 2. p. 431. (speaking of God) κάλλιστος καὶ ὅρις ἐν εἰς τὸ δυνατὸν ἐκαστός αὐτῶν μένει ἀεὶ ἀπλῶς ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ μορφῇ. I am not willing, I confess, to desert our antient and venerable guides, who, in points regarding the Divinity of our blessed Saviour, the Trinity, &c., rise far above the modern Interpreters. Indeed, from whence have the mighty champions of orthodoxy in modern times derived their most powerful arms, but from this quarter, as the works of Bps. Pearson and Bull will prove. See the notes of Bps. Burnet, Pearson, and Bull, ap. D’Oyley and Mant. Bp. Bull (as cited by Bp. Burgess) says that this passage is almost sufficient for the refutation of all heresies respecting the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. An observation which had been
before made by Chrys. and Theophyl., and especially Phot. ap. Ecumen 80\*β. δρα των έκ των διώξων τούτων ρημάτων του επεμματος, τάσσαν κατακλώνται αι αιρεσεις. And that Commentator, in conjunction with Theophyl., especially exerts himself to refute the heresies of Arius, Marcion, Marcel., Photinus, Sophronius, Paulus, Samot, Sabellius, Apollonarius, &c. To their very valuable matter I can do no more than refer my more learned readers.

The interpretation of the Socinians, though supported by the acuteness of Crell., and the learning of Grot., Le Clerc, and Rosenm., will not bear examination, and has been completely refuted by many modern Commentators and Theologians referred to by Wolf. Bp. Burnet (as cited by Dodd.) well observes, that "it is extremely cold and insipid, as if it were a mighty argument of humility, that though Christ wrought miracles, which they strangely think signified by the phrase of being in the form of God, yet he did not set up for Supreme Deity!"

The ἀπαγωγήν is thought by some to import pre-existence: and this is supported by Suidas in v., who doubtless derived the opinion from some antient Commentator. But it seems sufficient to suppose that the word may import subsisting in the real form of God, one with and equal to the Father.

Οὐκ ἀπαγωγὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα Θεῷ. As in the preceding case I saw no reason to adopt the interpretation of Whitby, &c., so I am as little disposed to do so in the present. His citations from Heliodor. 322, 337 & 390 (for which he was indebted to Bos), to prove that ἄπαξ signifies "a thing to be earnestly coveted," are not to the purpose. For, as Schleus. observes, the word there signifies "a thing which may easily be obtained, to obtain which there is need either of counsel or labour; q. d. "a thing to be taken at a snatch, whenever we please to snatch at it." A signification which is here quite inapposite. Therefore Whitby's interpretation, "he did not covet to appear as God," must fall to the ground. Whitby is, however, right in maintaining that ἀπαγωγὸν is for ἀπαγωγή. It signifies a prey, and metaphorically "a thing to be greedily sought, seized, and held fast." The sense then is: "he did not eagerly seize, and tenaciously hold." So Rosenm. and Schleus.: "non cupidè usus est," the latter of whom compares Longin. § 4, ὡς φορον τινὸς ἑφαστόμενος, where see the learned Toup. This interpretation, which is also adopted and illustrated from Gregor. Naz. by Bp. Middleton, is entirely confirmed by the antients, who almost all took the word in that sense. Thus, for instance, Theophyl. (from Chrys.) ably annotates: "Ὅταν τις ἀπαγόης τις, φοβείται ἀποθέοντας αυτήν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπωλέσῃ, ὡς οὐκ αὐτὸν ὄν ὅταν ἐφ' ἑκείνῃ φυσικῶς, ἐγχείρης αὐτοῦ καταφρονεῖ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἀναποβλητὸν αὐτῷ ἔχει, κἂν δέχῃ ἀποθέον, τάλιν αὐτῷ ἀναλήψει τε. Φησίν οὖν, ὅτι ὁ Θεός τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐκφόβερθη καταβίβα τοῦ οἰκείου δεξιώματος, δι' αὐτὸ εἴην τοῦ ἀπαγώγης τούτου, φομε δὴ τό, τὸ εἶναι Ἰσα τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Παρὰ, ἀλλ' ἀλλάς φυσικῶς αὐτοῦ ἀξίωμα τούτο ἑγίνωσκεν διὰ καὶ ταπεινωθηναι ἐκέντρον, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει τῷ υψὸς αὐτοῦ τηρῶν. "When any one seizes any thing, he is afraid to lay it down, lest he should..."
lose it, as being not his own; but when any one has any thing by
nature, he can very well disregard it, knowing that he has some-
thing which he cannot lose; and if he chooses to lay it down, he
can take it up again. The Apostle therefore means to say, “The
Son of God was not afraid to descend from his own dignity, since
he had not this by rapine, namely, the being equal with God the
Father, but knew it was his natural dignity. Therefore he chose
even to humble himself, as even in his humiliation, still retaining
his exaltedness.” And Theodoret also ably annotates thus: Θεός
γὰρ ὄν, καὶ φύσει Θεός, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἑσόγη ἔχων, οὐ
μὴν τοῦτο ὑπέλαβε· τοῦτο γὰρ ἵνα τῶν παρ’ ἄξιοις τιμῆς τινὸς ἔτει-
χημάτων ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄξιαν καταχράσσαι, τὴν ἱσχαν ταυτοπροσώπουν
ἐπερεῖ, καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπεῖαν ὑπέδω μορφήν.

With respect to the important words ὅτε ἐνπεί Ἰσα Θεὸ, few things
ever more surprised me, on seriously applying myself, with the ap-
paratus of very many years of classical study to the interpretation
of the New Testament, than to find that so many eminent modern
Commentators should maintain that the Ισα signifies not equality
with, but similarity to. This opinion has been almost universally
adopted from Whitby, who has a long annotation, in which he
adduces many examples of Ἰσα in the sense of similarity and com-
parison. And such a signification is of perpetual occurrence in the
Classical writers; but never, I think, in such a context as the pre-
sent. It is a frivolous argument urged by Whitby, that if St. Paul
had meant to express equality with, he would have written Ἰσον;
as Joh. 5, 18., for St. Paul is not St. John. Nay, even the same
writer sometimes uses greater liberties than this. I certainly see
no reason to desert the universal opinion of the antients and early
moderns, that Ἰσα is put for Ἰσον. I am not a little gratified to
find that that very learned and accurate scholar Schleus, has in his
Lex. in voc. Ἰσας, had the courage to revive this opinion, which had
been scouted by the German Commentators; and he subjoins the
following examples. Job 5, 14. 10, 15. 16. Hippocr. Jur-
jurand. Col. 1. p. 42. δύναμις ἡγησάσθαι μὲν τὸν διδακτὸν μὲ τὴν
τέχνην ταύτην Ἰσα γενέτριαν έμοίοι. Αἰλιαν. V. H. 8, 38.; referring
also to Glass Phil. Sac. p. 65. ed. Dath. I myself remember to
have met with several such in the Classical writers; but neglected to
note them down. I cannot, however, go so far with Schleus, as to
deny that Ἰσα is put (as most recent Commentators say) for καὶ
Ἅσα μέρη; since we thus arrive at the same sense, and in a more
regular manner; for καὶ Ἰσα μέρη εἴσα signifies to be at equal
shares with, be on an equal footing with any one; which is the same
as to say, be on an equality, be equal with.* Finally, Schleus ren-

* Doddr. and Slade render, “to be even as, appear as God,
assuming the highest divine names, titles, and attributes, by which
the Supreme Being has made himself known, and receiving from
his servants divine honours and adoration.” Which does not ma-
terially alter the sense; for equality is thus imported, but is capable
ders the words thus: "non rapinam duxit, Dei personam sustinere, seu aequalem natura et majestate Deo esse."

7. ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, &c. The ἐκένωσε cannot be better expressed than by the Vulg. seipsum exinanivit, emptied himself of. A signification of which Wets. has adduced several examples. It cannot merely mean "humilem et tenuem se gessit," as Rosenm. explains, but (as Schleus.) "se ipsum ad statum tenuem depressit." So at the next verse, ἔταξεν πρὸς ἐαυτὸν. And this interpretation is adopted by Heinrichs.

Hence it is clear what sense is to be assigned to μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, which is not that of Rosenm. and Morus, who interpret δούλος, minister Dei, inasmuch as he undertook the business committed to him by the Father."* This (I repeat) cannot be admitted. All the antient, and the best modern Commentators, rightly explain, "he was made like unto a servant in the lowly and distressed condition which he voluntarily assumed, when he became man, and was even as one of us." See Wetstein's examples and the note of Mackn.

The next words ἐν ὁμοίωματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος denote the state in which he submitted to this humiliation; and simply signify: "being made like unto men by assuming such a body as theirs." So Rom. 8, 3. ἐν ὁμοίωματι σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας, where see the note. It is, however, rightly remarked by the Greek Commentators, that the ἐν ὁμοίωματι ἀνθ. γενόμενος, suggests those points in which Christ was above a man, namely, in partaking of the Godhead, being free from sin, being born of a virgin, &c. So Theophyl.: οὐκ ἦν δὲ τὸ φανόμενον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ of perversion. The same applies to the interpretation of Wets., "ut Deus, ut Dei filius."

* And they add: "Nam duo membra orationis, ἐκένωσεν ἐαυτὸν, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, et ἔταξεν πρὸς ἐαυτὸν, ὡθηκος γενόμενος, tia sibi respondent, ut unum, ὡθηκον γενέθαι, explicando alteri, δούλον μορφὴν λαβεῖν, inseverat. Quum igitur instar Dei esset, tamen se submisit se Deo, periciendo negotio sibi a Patre tradito."
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Θεὸς οὖν ἴας ἡμῶς ἀνθρώπος. Διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν, ἐν ὑμοιόματι ἀνθρώπων ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι ἐκεῖνος δὲ ψυχῇ καὶ σώμα, καὶ Θεὸς. So also Theodoret: τερί τού Θεού Λόγου ταύτα φησίν, ὅτι Θεὸς οὖν οὖν ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ φήσειν, τὴν ἀνθρώπειαν περιείκεινος φύσιν αὐτῷ γὰρ τοῖς ἀρμόττει τὸ αὐτὸ ἀνθρώπος. οὐ χαίν ἐκαλυθείσης φύσις ἀληθῶς τοῦτο ἴναι αὐτὸς δὲ τούτο μὲν οὖν ἴναι τούτῳ δὲ περιέχειτο. See also Chrys., ὈΕκουμεν., and Photius. I cannot but subjoin the able annotation of Theodoret on ver. 6 & 7. Θεὸς γὰρ οὖν, καὶ φύσει Θεὸς, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἰδιότητα ἔχων, οὐ μέγα τοῦτο ὑπέλαβε τοῦτο γὰρ ἰδίον ταῖς παρὰ ἄξιαν τιμής τινος τετυχόντων ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄξιαν κατακρύψας, τὴν ἀκραν ταχειοφοροῦσαν ἐκείνω, καὶ τὴν ἀνθρώπειαν ὑπεδόν μορφήν. 8. καὶ σχῆματι εὑρεθεὶς ὃς ἀνθρώπος, &c. These terms are of a peculiar cast, and very strong; though their force is little attended to by the recent Commentators. The scope of the sentence is well pointed out by Theophyl. (from Chrys.) thus: “After having said ἐκένωσεν, that he might not be supposed to mean a change and transformation, the Apostle adds, “Remaining what he was, he took what he was not;” his nature was not changed, but he was changed in σχῆματι, i.e. ἐν σαρκί. The ὃς, it must be observed, has much force. For he was not one of the many, but as one of the many; inasmuch as the Logos did pass into a man, but appeared as a man; and though himself ἀσχημάτιστος, he went ὑπὸ σχῆμα.” Theophyl., however, notices another sense of ὃς, by which it signifies not as if, but really. And this is preferred by most modern Commentators. They also take εὑρισκ. for γινέσθαι. But this latter seems to be a mere refinement: for wherever εὑρ. appears to be used for γινέσθαι, or εἶναι, (like the Hebr. קיים for ויהי), it has usually, as here, a stronger sense. The antient Commentators also remark on the ἐκατ. as implying willing condescension. 8. ὅτι τὸ περὶ μεγαλοθανατοῦ. A brief phrase, which, however, carries with it much meaning; q. d. “he was obedient to, and fulfilled all his Father’s injunc-
tions, even to the submitting to death, nay, the ignominious death of the cross." The phraseology, however, imports not only free will, but good will and love to the Father. See Joh. 14, 31. 10, 18. Here not a few refinements (as usual) are excogitated by the earlier modern Commentators (see Christ. Sacr. Pole's Syn., and Wolf), but which have little of solidity. Such curiosities of Theology I am accustomed to leave in medio. It may be sufficient for the reader to consult Whitby and Mackn.

9. διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν ὑπερψώσε, "Wherefore (in reward of this obedience) God hath exceedingly exalted him." The ὑπέρ implies an exaltation beyond that of all other human beings; the exaltation being in the very nature in which he had humbled himself. So Theodoret: Δῆλον καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ θεία φύσις ἀνενδήμη, καὶ ἐνανθρωπίσασ, ὥς ταπεινῶς ἀν υψώθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμῖσος ὁ εαυτῶν ἑταπείνωσεν ὡς τοῖς ἑλαβεν ἀ μή πρότερον ἐλέην, ἀλλ' ἑλαβεν ὡς ἀνθρώπος, ἀπερ ἐλέην ὡς Θεὸς.

By ὄνομα is meant a title, dignity, &c.; which signification is found in the Latin nomen, and the Hebr. נֵּם. It occurs also in Rom. 9, 17., and Hebr. 9, 4., and often in the Old Testament. Examples of it are adduced by Wets., to which I add Thucyd. 5, 16., and 1, 3. The most apposite is Achmet Onir. 1. 172. (cited by Schleus.), εὑρησεν υψος καὶ ὄνομα πλέον τῶν ἀλλων βασιλέων. And so in our own language. I need only refer to the Johnsonian line, "And left a name at which the world grew pale," &c.

Ἐξερήσατο is well rendered, by Mackn., bestowed.

10. ἤν, ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ πάν γόνων κάμψῃ ἐκτορπιών καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ κατακεφαλιών. This verse and the next are meant to show the nature of the ὑπερψώσεις before mentioned, in which the obedience is expressed in two ways. 1., by the bending of the knee; 2., by the offering of praise.

The recent Commentators, remark, that ὄνομα and ἐν are superfluous. But this seems an unwarranted
criticism. On the other hand, the Romanists run into the other extreme, of refining on the pronouncing the name of Jesus. Nay, even Protestant Commentators (as several, ap. Pole and Mackn.) strangely misapprehend the force of ὑνόματι. The Apostle (I apprehend) means no more than to represent the supreme dignity of Jesus by such a form of expression as would designate that of a man in the highest dignity, namely, in not only having the knee bowed to him when present, but even at the pronouncing of his name; which, if I remember right, is an Oriental custom. This ἐν is not superfluous; but answers to the Hebr. ἐν, at. It is needless to enlarge (as do the Commentators) on genuflection being a sign of obedience from the earliest times, and especially in the East.

There is something particularly elegant in the expression every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, for, "every one should bow and confess," which is, with reason, thought to be borrowed from Is. 45, 23. Chrys. remarks, that by ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, is meant the whole universe; i. e. the various orders of persons in the universe. On these words the modern Commentators run (as usual) into endless diversities. They are explained by most of the antients as denoting angels, men, and devils. The best moderns, however, take the κατα-χθ. to signify the departed. And so Theodoret. And of this sense Wets. adduces numerous examples. The latter interpretation seems preferable. But both may be included. See the note of Whitby.

11. καὶ πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὑπὶ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστοῦ, εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρὸς. The sense of πᾶσα γλώσσα is clear from the preceding verse. Ἐξομολογ. is a stronger term than ὄμως. At ὑπὶ Κύριος Ι. X. must be understood ἐστι. The words εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρὸς, are to be referred to ἐξομολ. and indicate the tendency of the confession, namely, to the promotion of the glory and praise of God the Father. For, as ÓEcumen. 85 d. observes, "it is
to the glory of the Father to have such a Son, the Lord, Creator and God, of all, and to whom every knee boweth, and every tongue confesseth."

12, 13.

On the doctrine of the humiliation and obedience of Christ to God the Father, and the reward thence resulting, the Apostle, by means of ἐστε, engraves some exhortations, (up to ver. 18.) to obedience in its more general acceptance, as from man to God. So Theophyl. τοῦτο λέγων, ὅτι ἐδείκτα ἴμιν ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκεῖνος γένος, ἐμπήκοα μὲν ὅν ἔκειν, ἐμπήκοα δὲ καὶ ἱερών. 

Καθὼς πάντως ἐμπήκοας, "as ye have always obeyed, viz. me and my injunctions, or God and the Gospel. Of each mode of interpretation passages are adduced in support. But the sense is the same on either. Some Commentators, as Rosenm., would take ἐμπίστευσαι as an Imperative; and, upon the whole, the same sense is produced: but, I think, the construction is less natural. 'Ος is so far pleonastic, that it is not easy to assign any definite sense; yet it is not without force, or, at least, elegance; and a similar use is often found in the Classical writers. On the τόλλα μᾶλλα it is not necessary to refine, as if they had been less obedient in his presence. It should seem, that circumstances had arisen during his absence, which gave them an opportunity of setting forth that obedience in a stronger light. And Theophyl. ingeniously suggests, in his paraphrase, Τὸ τε μὲν γὰρ ἵνα ἐκεῖτε διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐμὲ αἰδώ πάντα πράττειν τών ἔν πρὸς ἀπετίθην ἐπικείμενη, δεικτεῖ ὅτι οὐ δὲ ἐμὲ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν Θεόν. See also Ecumen and Theodoret. It is strange that some modern Commentators, as Pierce and Mackn., should join μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου with the preceding, instead of the following words: a most unnatural construction, and at variance with the opinion of the best Commentators, both antient and modern. Indeed, the words are here required by the τῶν εἰσ-τῶν συντριπτῶν κακεργάζεσθε, which does not mean, "promote the good of each other" (as the innovating Pierce supposes), but must be taken in the sense ascribed to it by the antient and almost all modern Commentators, "exert yourselves vigorously to work out and effect your salvation." As to what is urged in support of the other interpretation, from the connection, that has little force. One thing, however, has been unnoticed by the Commentators, which, if considered, will set the connection in the clearest light, namely, that as καθὼς requires an οὕτως to correspond to it, so must it be supplied from this admonition; q. d. "So also now hearken to my admonition, and especially this, work out," &c. In this view of the construction I find I have been anticipated by Heinrichs. One cannot but observe the strength and significance of the terms employed: for the καὶ in κακεργ. is intensive, q. d. "laboriously work;" &c.; and the μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, at which the modern

* So St. Barnabas (in imitation of this) says, in his Epist., p. 251. Voss. Διά τῶν χειρῶν σου ἐφράγμη εἰς λύτρωσιν τῶν ἀμαρτίων σου.
Commentators needlessly stumble, simply signifies, "with great anxiety, care, and circumspection:" for, as Theophyl. observes, without fear no proficiency is attained either in the liberal or mechanical arts.

The term ἐνεργῶν, is plainly meant to suggest that something is to be done on man's own part towards effecting his salvation."

"O Θεός γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, ἐνεργέως εὐδοκίας. These words assign the reason why they are expected to work out their own salvation. The sense is: "For it is God that, of his own good pleasure, worketh in you both the will and the faculty to do." For it is truly observed by Hamm. (who has treated on this verse), that to work in us the τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, is the giving us that strength, working in us those abilities which are required for our willing or working, as necessary to prepare, and assist us to do, either. So Schleus. Lex. 1, 833., explains: "cui vires debetis exsequendi hanc voluntatem vestram."

The infinitives are put for the noun ἐνεργήματι and ἐνεργήμα, which latter occurs in 1 Cor. 12, 6. 'Ἐνεργεῖ is the same as κατεργεῖ just before, and ἐνεργεῖ in a similar passage, at 1, 6. It is well remarked, by Dr. Hamm., that ἐνεργῶν must, in reason, be so interpreted as shall be answerable to the exhortation to work out their own salvation. Consequently, as this which is done by God is done of his own free mercy, without any merit of ours which may claim it from him, and therefore requires not only our humility, but our diligence, caution, solicitude, and fear of displeasing so gracious a father, who may, if he be provoked by our unworthiness, withdraw it from us; so it is not to be conceived to be wrought by God in such an irresistible manner, as that it shall be impossible for those in whom God thus works, to contradict or resist his working." Dr. Whitby also truly remarks, that God worketh in us to will and to do, not by a physical operation which may make it necessary for us to do what he would have us to do; for why exhort another to do what God doeth for him, without his concurrence." "The

* The Calvinistical writers are exceedingly embarrassed with it: and Doddr. has, in his paraphrase, pursued a most disingenious course, by rendering κατεργεῖ: "be solicitous, that you may work out your own salvation with great earnestness and assiduity; yea, considering its infinite importance, with holy fear and trembling. I say your own salvation, for that will be most effectually secured and promoted by the temper I have now been recommending." Thus, he dexterously, but not very creditably, contrives so to dilute and neutralize the strong sense contained in the words, as, in effect, to silence them, or render them only subservient to the following clause, which treats of the part God taketh in the effecting of salvation. When we see so sensible a writer and so good a man acting so disingenious a part, we cannot but perceive the weakness of the system of doctrines he adopts, which drives him to such unwarrantable measures.
term ἐσπεργεῖν (continues he) must be here understood, not of physical but moral operation; as when Satan is said to work in the children of disobedience, Eph. 2, 2. 2dly, when it is attributed to those causes which produce not their effects by any physical, but only by a moral operation, as when the word is said to be ἐσπεργεῖν, powerful, Hebr. 4, 12. The word ἐσπεργεῖν, which effectually worketh in them that believe, 1 Thes. 2, 13. 3dly, when it is ascribed to God sending upon men ἐσπεργεῖαν πλάνης, the efficacy of deceit, for surely God worketh no evil physically. In a word, did God thus work in us to will and to do, the work would be no more ascribed to us than the motion which was impressed on the body of Lazarus when wrapt up to the third heavens, could be ascribed to them, and the will would not deserve that name, as being neither free nor praiseworthy.” In the same light the sense is viewed by the most judicious modern Commentators and Theologians. See Bp. Tomline, as cited by Mr. Slade, who also refers to Bp. Sherlock’s Disc. vol. II. Disc. 4. See also the able note of Dr. Mackn. But perhaps the subject has been by no writer so well treated as by Dr. Balguy, in a most masterly Sermon for Whit sunday. From this I shall forbear to make any extracts, but content myself with respectfully recommending it to the attention of my Clerical brethren.

I will now sum up the doctrine contained in these celebrated verses as follows. It is said of God, and it is truly said, that he worketh in us to will and to do: it is said of man, and it is said as truly, that he is to work out his own salvation. Nothing can be more accurate than the distinction which is here made between the agency of God and the agency of man. Nothing can be more certain, on the one hand, than that without the assistance of God, man cannot be saved at all; nothing can be more certain, on the other hand, than that by his voluntary co-operation man ultimately is saved, and saved, be it remembered, in the very manner which the Scriptures themselves describe, and upon the very terms which God hath himself been pleased to appoint.

But it may perhaps be enquired, how far these expositions are supported by the authority of the antient Interpreters? To this I answer, that they are in perfect accordance therewith. The orthodox and enlightened Chryst. everywhere adopts these views. Thus on Matt. 26, 35. Ἕστεθεν οὖν μέγα δόγμα μακράνομεν, διὸ οὐκ ἄνθρωπιν προδομία καταρσοὶ τι χωρὶς τῆς θείας ῥωπῆς, οὐκε θεία ῥωπὴ κέρδος φέρει χωρὶς ἄνθρωπιν προδομίας. See also his admirable Homily on this passage. His chief remarks (and they are very acute and supposit) are embodied in the following abstract of Theophyl.: Αὐτὸς ἔστιν ὁ καὶ προδομίας διδοὺς ὑμῖν ὅσε θέλειν τὸ ἄγαθον, καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς τέλος ἄγων. Ἐσπεργεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεός ἐν ἑνὶ τὸ θέλειν τούτου, συνεργεῖ ἑνὶ πρὸς τὸ θέλειν τὸ ἄγαθα, καὶ αὐτὴν τὸ ἄγαθον θέλειν ὑμῖν, καὶ συνεκαίρει ὅσει προμόντερον γενέσθαι. Καὶ ἄλλως δὲ ἐπείδη τὸ τέλος αὐτοῦ ἐπιπίθηκαν, οὐ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἄπερ ἐν ὀρθῶν τελειώμενα πρὸς ἐκείνα καὶ τὸ θέλειν ἐνεργεῖσθαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ λέγει· ὅσον, ἡθελησίας τι; ἐν τῷ πρῶτῳ τοῦτο, κἂν μὲν τὸ τέλος ἐπακολουθή, θέλεις ἡλένο τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον εἰ;
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ἐὰν, ἀποκατασταθῇ η ἡθλίας. Τοῦτον γέλοιον παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπόκοιτο, τοῦ καὶ τὸ θέλειν ἢμῖν συνεκκείστος, εἰκώτος καὶ τότε φησιν εἶναι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. Ἡ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦλης εὐγνωμοσύνης ὁ Παῦλος καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ θέλειν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢμῖν ἐνεργεῖται λέγει, ὡσπερ καὶ τὰ κατεργασματα χαράσσεται καλεῖ, οὐ ὁ αὐτεξουσίον ἀναιρεῖν, ἀλλὰ θαυμάσκεται ἢμῖν ἀεὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, καὶ πάντα ἀναπληρώσει τῷ Θεῷ. "Ὅρα δὲ καὶ τὴν λέξιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἵνα, τοῖς μετὰ φόβον καὶ τρόμον τὴν συντρίαν κατεργασημένοις ἐν γὰρ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐνεργεῖ ο Θεός τὰ πάντα. If am not mistaken, there are here some topics not to be found in, and others handled in a manner superior to that of our best modern Divines.

14. πάντα ποιεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν. Most modern and some antient Commentators consider this as a general exhortation to the constant discharge of all Christian duties amidst whatever difficulties, doubts, and temptations. So Theodoret: προβαθμέας φέρετε τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρετῆς ποιον, τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κινδύνους, μη δοσχεραίνοντες τα προσπίπτοντα λυπηρα, μηδὲ διαφόροις χρωμενοι λογισμοίς ἐκκοιτος γὰρ τῶν πλούτων αδραίτετε, οὐδεὶς αὐτέντες καί ἐκείνοις μέγιστα ἀσχάλλει καὶ τοῦθεν ὅτι. But this seems scarcely reconcileable with the terms γογγυς. and διαλ., unless they be much tortured. I rather assent to Heinrichs, that having at ver. 12 & 13 given them a general exhortation to Christian constancy, the Apostle now recurs to what he had more especially considered at ver. 3—5. So also Crell., Whitby, and Mackn., the first mentioned of whom observes, that he enjoins on them the Christian duty of obeying their pastors, and adds the name of God, because the obedience is to be rendered as unto God. See Eph. 5. and 1 Pet. 5. Whitby (perhaps prudently) unites both, explaining: "obey the precepts of the Christian faith, and of your spiritual monitors cheerfully, and without grudging, and readily, without exacting a reason for every command they lay upon you." The γογγυς. and διαλογισμος. are (as Heinrichs observes) effects of the ἐπιθεία and κενωδοξία, of which he had cautioned them at ver. 3—5. Γογγυσμῶν properly signifies a grumbling, muttering, murmuring: and διαλογισμοῖς denotes that spirit of excuse and subterfuge in which the γογγυσμ. usually finds vent,
namely, a disposition which seeks out doubts, and
magnifies difficulties, ever seizing any flimsy reason
whereon to justify neglect of what is required. So
that the two phrases have nearly the same force;
hence they are both rendered by Schleus. *prompto
animo*.

15. ίνα γένησε ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέφαλοι. The ίνα
simply denotes *result* and *tendency*; q. d. "Thus
will ye be blameless," &c. 'Ακεφ. is *not* (as Heinrichs
says) synonymous with ἄμεμπτος, but it is often
joined with it and its synonyms. So Plut. 2, 439 v.
(cited by Wets.), ἔργων δὲ ἄμεμπθες εἰς ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀκέ-
φαλον οὐκ ἔστι τινι εὑρέθην. I add Eurip. Or. 912. ἀκέφαλος
ἀνεπίστητον ἱστηκός βίου. On its derivation the Etymo-
logists are not agreed. The most probable opinion
is, that it comes from privative and κεφά, to *mix.
So the Etym. Mag. explains it ὁ μὴ κεκραμένος κακῷς,
ἄλλον ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀποκλίτος. It therefore seems to be
equivalent to the integer vitae scelerisque purus of
Horace. Mackn. renders it *untainted*. But by aim-
ing at being very literal, he (as on many other occa-
sions) loses the spirit of the term. The two expres-
sions are well rendered in our Common Version
*blameless and harmless*. The following expression
τέκνα Θεοῦ ἄμορφηα further unfolds the idea; and it
is, as Heinrichs says, a cognomen piorum; as τέκνα
ἐπαγγελλας. See Rom. 8, 16 & 21. 9, 8. Gal. 4, 28.

15. εν μέσῳ γενεας σκολιας και διεστραμμενης:
"among persons of crooked and perverse habits."
The phraseology is rightly supposed to be derived
from Deut. 32, 5. γενεα σκολια και διεστραμμενη.
And in similar terms Jesus speaks of the Jews at
Matt. 17, 17.; and Peter, at Acts 2, 40. So also
Ps. 77, 10. γενεα σκολια: and Prov. 4, 24. 16, 28.
The terms σκολιας and διεστραμμενος, like many
others of a similar sense, as στρεθλας, are, both in
the Scriptural and Classical writers, applied to de-
note *wickedness*. So Arrian Epist. (cited by Hein-
richs) διαγματα στρεθλα και διεστραμμενα. I add
Pind. ap. Plat. 365 B. πότερον δικας τεῖχος υψιον ἦ
Thus, by a similar metaphor, the Heb. ψωπ, * is often used in the sense perverse, wicked.

15. εν ους φαινεθε νως φωστιρες, εν κόσμοι. It is strange that some Commentators (e.g., Theophyl., Erasm., and Mackn.) should take φαινεθε in the Imperative. Nor is the ye confined (as most Commentators think) to the Philippians; but it signifies ye and such as ye. Dodd. has here (I think) evinced less than his usual judgment, by following Saurin (who caught the opinion up from his ingenious countrymen, Beza) in regarding the φωστιρες as having an allusion to light-houses. This is, like many notions of that brilliant, but too fanciful Frenchman, a mere ignis fatuus, or false light, which, though it may pass off very well in a pulpit declamation, is not proper to be transplanted into a Commentary. There is plainly (as the antients saw) an allusion to the heavenly luminaries that gave light to

* I would observe that ψωπ properly signifies to make hooked, to distort, pervert. For both ψωπ and ςψυ, ἐπψυ, ἐψψυ, and ἐψψυ seem to be only variations of one general idea; and even all, though regarded as separate roots, are, in fact, derivatives from the primitive bilateral ψψ, which (I am surprised the Lexicographers should not have seen,) signifies, literally, to hook; indeed our hook (and perhaps yoke) is evidently derived from it. Hence it comes also to mean hook in, edge in, confine, compress, &c. Thus ἐψψυ might well denote the end or extremity of any thing, since there it is confined, and has its limits. The same idea of edging in, confining, &c. is discernible in ἐψψυ, to bind about; from whence ἐψψυ, ring-streaked. ἐψψυ is of exactly the same sense with ψωπ, and it is not improbable that σκολος, of which the Greek Etymologists give so indifferent an account, is derived from it, unless it comes from σκολω, cognate with σκελω, cingo, like ςψυ. ἐψψυ, to lock, is used by the same figure as that which subsists in ςψυ. I cannot forbear adding, that the word wicked does not come, as Skinner (and from him most Etymologists) suppose, from νιτιτιος, but, according to Skinner's first, but rejected thought, from the Ang. Sax. pece, a witch, or wizzard. It therefore literally signifies bewitched, viz. by the Devil; for that was plainly in the mind of those who first used the word. Thus, in our criminal processes, the prisoner is said, in the indictment, to have perpetrated the crime laid to his charge, incited by the Devil. Probably this was borrowed from the law forms of our Anglo Saxon ancestors of the time of Alfred, &c.
the world, and are called by this name in Gen. 1, 14 & 16. Sap. 13, 2. and Sir. 48, 7. The planets also may be had in view; since in Deut. 8, 20, 12, 8. and 1 Macc. 1, 24. persons eminent for virtue, rank, or talents, are so called. Nor is the metaphor unknown to the Classical writers. So Aristid. Pannathen. p. 136. (cited by Wets.) πῶς οὐκ ἔκεινοι διὰ πάντων ἐξελάμπτων ἄστερῃ ἀστέρες; To which I could add, if it were necessary, many other passages. I need scarcely remind my readers of the very similar comparison in Matt. 5, 11 & 16. Eph. 5, 8. and 1 Thess. 15, 5. All this might have shown the Commentators that the ye could not be meant to apply to the Philippians only, but has the general sense which I have above assigned to it.

16. λόγον ὑπός ἐπέχοντες. On the sense of ἐπέχ. Commentators differ. Most render it, "holding forth for the guidance and example of others." And so our English Versions. The same sense, too, is assigned by Grot., who says there is an apodosis mixed with a comparison. And Rosenm. observes that this is required by the context and the lingus ratio. To the latter position, however, I must demur; since neither this, nor any signification like it, is found in the Scriptural writers: and as to the context, that depends upon what these words are to be referred to. Now the Commentators have noticed that ver. 15. is parenthetical, and thus these words refer to the admonition πάντα ποιεῖτε, &c. at ver. 15. I cannot, therefore, but prefer the interpretation of some antients (as Theodoret and Heb.) and moderns, (as (Luther, Knatchbull, Wolf, Whitby, Wets., and Heinrichs,) keeping to, retaining with constancy. Of this sense, indeed, there is no positive example in the New Testament: but the word is often used in significations nearly allied to it; as in 1 Tim. 4, 16. Many similar exhortations occur elsewhere; as in 1 Cor. 11, 2. τὰς παραδόσεις κατέ-

Heb. 10, 28. κατέχομεν ἑν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπί-

διαν ἐν δειδιπλή ἐσπεισισμε.
The λόγος ζωῆς is an elegant periphrasis for the Gospel.

16. eis καίχημα ἐμὴ eis ημέραν Χριστοῦ. The eis denotes the end and result; q. d. "So that your conversion to the faith, and your constancy therein, may be a matter for my rejoicing in the day of Christ," i. e. the day of judgment. The ὅτι signifies namely that; and the words ὅπειρος eis κενὸν—ἐκπόισα — further develope the preceding thought, and contain an elegant litotes, with which I would compare Solon 29. ἄμα γάρ ἄείπτα ἐν θείῳ γῆ ἡμείᾳ, Ἀμα δ' ὁ μάρτυρ ἐδω. In the eis κενὸν ἔδραμον there is an agonistical allusion, also used at Gal. 2, 2. Compare, too, 1 Cor. 9, 26. The eis κενὸν ἐκπόισα is subjoined by way of explanation. How applicable it was to the whole of St. Paul's life, after he began to preach the Gospel, is obvious; and it is surprising that Wets. should have recognized no more in the running and labouring than an allusion to his frequent peregrinations, "Longam iter Hierosolymis per totam Macedonian." I need only refer to the affecting description of his course of life at 2 Cor. 6, 4—9., where, among the rest, we have ἐν κόσμῳ.

17. ἀλλ' eι καὶ σκένδομαι εὗρεν τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως όμοιον. It is well observed, by Heinrichs, that the preceding word κοτιζάν, which denotes the various toils, hardships, and trials he had to encounter in his Apostolical office, might easily suggest to him the possibility of his having to sacrifice, in the same glorious cause, even life itself.

Though such is clearly the general sense, yet there is some obscurity in the phraseology, and an incongruity in λειτουργία. Here Heinrichs has much learned investigation; though, as usual, he is tediously and unnecessarily minute. I shall give the substance of his annotation. "Σκένδοιν, like libarum, is a common sacrificial term to denote the pouring of the wine, wine and oil, or other liquid, on the head of the victim previous to his being sacrificed; and as it was poured upon his head, εἰπερενόνω has much
propriety. The ἐκι signifies for, or on account of. But the Apostle does not plainly say for the Gospel and the faith to which he had converted them, but names, instead, those good works which the Apostle had generated in the Philippians; and these he compares to ὑσία and λειτουργία. Similar metaphors frequently occur; as in Rom. 21, 1. 15, 16. Heb. 13, 15 & 16. Thus he here for ἐγὼ τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν puts ἐγὼ τῇ ὑσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν. Finally, having brought forward the image, he dresses it by comparing his own death to a libation, with which his blood would be, as it were, to be poured over those sacrifices, victims, and oblations, which, by their faith and Christian probity, the Philippians had presented to God." It is observed, by Hamm. and Mackn., that the bringing in of men to the faith of Christ, to the embracing and receiving of the Gospel, is, in other places, also compared to a sacrifice, and the Apostle to an officiating priest. See Rom. 12, 1. 15, 16. And Doddr. observes, that the Apostle considers the faith of the Philippians as an acceptable sacrifice presented to God; and if he incurred martyrdom for his zeal to promote it, he might speak of his blood as a libation poured out upon occasion of it, with greater beauty and propriety than most Commentators have remarked." I would add that a similar metaphor occurs in Eurip. Orest. 188—190.

The Apostle, then, with inexpressible magnanimity, adds καὶ συγχαιρῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, "If this be so, I shall rejoice and congratulate you. For (as Roseau. paraphrases) to you, and to all the faithful, the fruits of my death will reach." Most Critics are of opinion that the Present is here used for the Future. But it seems more correct to say that the Apostle, by a beautiful figure, supposes his impending death already at hand and present. That he must have intended this is plain from the words following at ver. 18. τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ ὑμῖς χαίρετε, καὶ συγχαίρετε μοι, which, if rendered in the Future (as those Critics
direct) have an insipid and frigid air. The antient Commentators, with their usual good taste, seem to have been aware of the true ratio of this use of the present.

19. ἐκπίθετο δὴ ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, Τιμόθεου ταχέως πέμψαι ὑμῖν. After having concluded the exhortations commenced at 1, 27., the Apostle interweaves something respecting himself, Timothy, and Epaphroditus. Of these two brethren, the former had, it seems, at the earnest request of the Apostle (2 Tim.), gone to Rome to see him, and was now with him, and whom, as being well known to the Philippians (Acts 16.), he would willingly have sent to support their minds, but that he could not spare one so dear at so critical a time. However, he endeavours to supply that want by sending Epaphroditus, who had recently recovered of a dangerous disorder, and of whom he speaks in the most affectionate terms. At the same time he comforts them by saying that he hopes shortly to be enabled to send Timothy to them. (Heinrichs.)

The event which he waited for was, doubtless, the determination of his fate, for life, or death.

19, ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ. It is remarked by Heinrichs: "Apostoli, sicut omnia, ita et spes suas, a Deo Christoquee repetebant." So ver. 24. The καλ in καλὰ has much force, and stands in the place of a sentence; q.d. "That not only you may be fully assured of my fate, but I also, being assured of your condition, may be easy in mind," ver. 28. ἐνθυμεῖσθαι signifies to be of good courage; of which sense many examples are adduced by Kypke.

20. οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω ἵσοφυγὸν—μεριμνήσει. This indicates the reason why he would have preferred sending Timothy, namely, he being a kind of second self, who could γνωσίας, &c., "feel as genuine a care for them as himself." Ἐσοφυγὸν, like-minded, one that thinks, cares about the same thing, and in the same manner. So Theophyl.: κιδώμενος τῶν ὑμετέρων ὄμοιος ἐμι. Of this, and similar terms, nu-
merous examples are adduced by Wets.; as Schol. on Eurip. Androm. 419. ἰσόπλευρα τῶν ἀθραίτων εἰς τὰ τέκνα. Ignat. ad Heron. Μαρίας τὴν θυγατέρα μου τῇ πολυμαθεστάτῃ—ὁ ἀντίψυχος γενόμενος & ὁν Ἐφ. εἶχεν ὁμιᾶν ἀντίψυχον. Gloss. ἰσόπλευρον, animæquum. So many later Classical writers say, ἵστο τῇ κεφαλῇ or ψυχῇ of a very dear friend. And Hor. animæ dimidia meæ.

20. γενσίας, "with the same paternal feelings as myself." So Theophyl.: πατρικῶς. Thus at 1 Tim. 1, 2. he calls him his "own son in the faith."

21. οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ ἐαυτῶν ζητοῦν, οἱ τὰ τῶν Χριστοῦ ἤσοῦ. Rosenm. thinks that by οἱ πάντες are meant, not all the teachers known to the Apostle, but only those at Rome, whom he might have sent to them. But it is not likely that he could mean to include Epaphroditus, whom he did send, and whom he so much praises at ver. 25.; any more than Tychicus, who merited no little commendation. I suggest to Heinrichs, that the οἱ πάντες may be taken populariter for οἱ πολλοί, the great bulk. The words are meant, Heinrichs conjectures, for those Christian converts and teachers who were of the Judaizing party, and from whose enmity the Apostle had suffered so much. See supra 1, 15 seqq. This, however, may be going too far: for (as he himself admits) the negative οὐκ may be taken comparatively; q. d. "no one pays so much attention to the interest of Jesus Christ as of his own personal interests." It may, however, (with Theophyl.4) be taken to refer to the Apostle's journey; q. d. "all seek their own ease and safety rather than undertake a fatiguing and perilous journey." So Doddr. thinks the Apostle may possibly speak this in reference to the part which some Christians, and probably some ministers at Rome, had acted, to whom he might have proposed this journey; which they might decline too great a regard to their own ease and conveniency, which laid him under the necessity of parting with Timothy.
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22. τὴν δὲ δοκιμήν—εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, "The proof of him ye have had and known. We here have Substantive for adjective; as in 2 Cor. 2, 9. ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, & 9, 22., where see the notes; q. d. "his commendation does not rest on my testimony." For Timothy had been with Paul at Philippi. See Acts 16, 1—3., and 17, 14.

22. ἐδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. It is here remarked, by Heinrichs and Rosenm., that this is for ἐδούλευσεν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, since the Hebrews express the Greek dative by ἧ. And they render "serviit Evangelio," taking the ἑδο. to have only reference to that idiom by which ministers of the Gospel are called δουλοί τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. So Theophyl.: αἱ Θεοῦ λειτουργοῖς. But, considering the nature of the context, and that this use of the phrase occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, it should seem to have reference to his diligence in the service.

23. τούτων μὲν οὖν ἐλπίζω—ἐξαντῆς. "Him, however, I hope to send shortly, that is, as soon as I see how my affairs will terminate, how it shall fare with me." The termination alluded to is the event of the trial to which he expected shortly to be brought: and it was uncertain whether he would be condemned to death, or perpetual imprisonment, or be acquitted and set at liberty.

Ἐξαντῆς is to be taken with ἐλπίζω. Heinrichs regards τούτων as put for τοιούτων, "talem tantumque virum." But this idiom, though it might be admitted in a Classical writer, is not agreeable to the Scriptural style. Heinrichs also thinks the ἄνα in ἄνοικὼ is intensive; as in ἀπέχω. But the ἄνα never means more than at (as to look at); a sense which may have place here.

25. ἀναγκαῖον δὲ—ὑμᾶς. The δὲ signifies however; and Heinrichs thinks it stands for a clause; q. d. "But (since these things, though probable, are yet uncertain, that you might not be any longer ignorant of the state of my affairs) I judged it necessary
I know Lommielmcinr was in the same re-
member it is certain, you should have ant
saying of my face to me. I thought it better in medi-
and now, without waiting for another on occasion.
On occasion we see the same figure — it.
In times,
the sense applied to Lommielmcinr as another
fame-winner, and fame-winner. In these there is
nothing but what is good, since Lommielmcinr was
not bound a prisoner at Philippi. But of the word
what we understand, Lommielmcinr are not meant.
In opinion, some taking sort... as meaning, if not
appears, of the three causes, sense, reason, or intent
sense, of that of Lommielmcinr, and Lommielmcinr under Paul, i.e.
as Lommielmcinr, in order to confirm these and others.
That, however, Lommielmcinr, is something more we are
to draw as argument for the existence of primitive
Lommielmcinr. Yet the very process might be
referred to positive as expression, since the opinion
is not only supported by some eminent modern Com-
mentators, as Wits, Buck, Wits, and especially
Wits, who proves that Lommielmcinr may be taken in
this inner sense, see 2 Cor. 8, 77 & 8, etc., but
also by some ancient. Nay it is somewhat con-
tenanced by Calvin. Yet, as the point is doubtful, I
grant it may be better to waive the argument, espe-
cially as "non talis auxilio, etc. I cannot, however,
but think that Dr. Doddry stooped quite as low in
urging that it was incongruous to suppose that the
Philippians would have sent their Bishop as a mes-
senger to Paul. Surely, without knowledge of the
nature of the message and business, we cannot judge of
the probability or improbability of the Bishop having
the charge of it. If auxilio cannot be proved to
have the sense in question, neither (I think) can it
be proved to have that of sacred ambassador, like
the Hebr. mlw, conveyor of the sacred monies:
though this interpretation is adopted by Grot. and
Rosenm.: for I agree with Heinrichs that they
make out no proof. I am therefore inclined to adopt
the interpretation of some antients and moderns, who take ἀποστ. simply to signify messenger; as in Joh. 13, 16.

Δειπνοῦσα τής χρείας properly signifies one who discharges any office, which must here be understood of the office of conveying; and τής χρείας denotes (as Rosenm. observes) the things of which he was in need.

26. ἔτειδεν ἐπιστολῶν ἣν πάντας ὤμας, "For he was longing to see you all." The οὐτ οὐτ is left understood, and is supplied in some MSS., doubtless from the margin. Καὶ ἄδημονεὶν, "and was exceedingly troubled." A very strong term, occurring also in Matt. 26, 37., where see the note. So Hippocr.: ἀλών καὶ ἄδημονεὶν ὁ θυμός. This was, as Mackn. observes, a decisive proof of the goodness of his heart.

27. καὶ γὰρ ἡσύχασε. The phraseology is here elliptical, and γὰρ stands in the place of a clause omitted; q. d. "For sick indeed he was, yea sick even almost unto death."* In παραπλησιῶν θανάτῳ, Heinrichs fancies an inaccuracy; and he thinks propriety of language required ἐως θανάτου. This error he excuses on the ground of the Apostle’s limited acquaintance with Grecian literature. But it may be questioned whether this be not too hypercritical. Neither Heinrichs, nor any other modern critic, can tell how far the Hellenistical and provincial idiom extended: and as there seems every reason to think that the Apostle had in view Is. 38, 1. where the Greek translators all differ, so it is not improbable that in the time of the Apostle the words παραπλησιῶν θανάτῳ might exist in some copies of that version. And it is the less likely that the Apostle should have coined the phrase, since he no

* It is clear from this (as Whitby well observes) that "the Apostles could not exercise the gifts of healing at their own pleasure, but only by a special impulse, or suggestion from God. Those gifts were vouchsafed, not so much for the recovery of the sick, as to convince and convert unbelievers."
often confounded by the scrivens: yet αὐτόν is much more frequent than αὐτῷ, they almost always change αὐτῷ into αὐτόν. As to the charge of anomalous construction, i.e., (for, if a correct term, must have the same construction as ἐπιστήμων. Now the numerous examples of Watts show that that word not only has the accented, but the unaccented, especially in the latter senses. It is, moreover, objected by Heinrichs, that the termination αὐτός is nowhere found, and is agreeable neither to analogy, nor to grammatical rules; compound verbs having frequently the terminations λόγος, ἔργον, δόμος, ἔργον, ἔργον, but never αὐτός. Yet the learned Commentator seems to rest too much on this argument. For such instances, though rare, are sometimes met with, as in Ἡσι. lom. 377. ἵνα τε ἐγείρῃ καπνοβιολέσθαι e. a., where, from a similar scruple respecting the analogical formation of καπνοβιολήθαι, Barnes, after remarking: *Componunt a buolà sua præpositiones faciant eam, eam adjectivis in eam desinens; ut et plurimum nis verba a nominibus derivata, ut ἐπιστῆμον, ἀριθμὸν, κ. c. sed καπνοβιολεῖν et καπνοβιολέσθαι,* &c., conjectures καπνοβιολάζων, or καπνοβιολάζοντι, or καπνοβιολάζουσι. And Reiske proposes καπνοβιολάζοντι, which, however, is a loc nihili. As to the other conjectures, they are unnecessary, and have never been adopted by the great critics since Barnes's time. It is plain that καπνοβιολεῖν comes from καπνοβιολός, which is used by the best writers. Thus here, if καπνοβιολάζοντι be the true reading, it may come from καπνοβιολός. Nay, if καπνοβιολός be the true reading, it may come from καπνοβιολός, synonymous with καπνοβιολός: and though that word be rare, it is found in Du Cange's Gloss. Greek accompanied with two authorities, Theophanes and another writer. In short, had καπνοβιολάζοντι been a bad Greek, would Chrys., Damascenus, Nicephorus, and others have used the word? To the anomaly surely is not great; and καπνοβιολός, from which it would thus be formed, was in frequent use.

As to the authority of MSS. and Versions, by which Heinrichs, the strenuous defender of the common reading, admits the new reading is especially supported, I cannot think it is so strong. They are but six in number, and though very antient, are such as have been every where altered by early Critics, who changed the idiomatic expressions into Classical ones. And with respect to the Versions, they are worded so ambiguously, that it cannot be pronounced with certainty what the Translators read: though the sense, "not regarding his life," seems more favourable to the old than the new reading. As to the authority of celebrated Greek Classical Scholars, it cannot decide a question of this kind: for we may account for their predilection in the same way as for the correction (if it be such) of those learned persons who emended the MS. A. B., &c., namely, from the perpetual occurrence of καπνοβιολός and καπνοβιολάζοντι in a sense not unsuitable to the present passage, and the very great rarity of καπνοβιολάζοντι; for the verb has been found no where else: but that is no argument against the existence of it, since it is formed analogically. Παράβουλος is also very rare; yet it is found in the antient lexicons, and, what is more to our present purpose,
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δυσταραβόλως in Ἀշχύλ. Suppl. 113. ed. Stanley, δυσταραβόλως οραματικα, male consultibus animis, where the metre will not permit δυσταραβόλως.

Upon the whole, though I admit that the question can scarcely be brought to any certain determination, yet I think the evidence, both external and internal, is in favour of the common reading. As to the sense it is much the same on either.

From the nature of the expressions employed, some recent Commentators, as Heinrichs and Rosenm., have conjectured that the peril of life, of which the Apostle speaks, was brought on by Epaphroditus’s hastening forward to reach Rome to fulfil his commission, in spite of a severe fit of illness which seized him, and with which he struggled so as to reach his destination and fulfil his commission, though nearly at the expense of his life; since the disorder was so aggravated as to become nearly mortal. A most ingenious, and probably well founded, conjecture, which is equally consistent with παραβύωλ. or παραβύδωλ. For both expressions seem far too strong, except on this conjecture; nor is it easy to see how any one undertaking a journey to Rome and back could be said to be regardless of, or to hazard his life.

30. Ἰνὰ ἀναπληρωσῇ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας. These words are well paraphrased by Theophyl.: “you were not present to personally minister to my comfort, though you sent to the relief of my necessity. This therefore which in you was wanting, namely, the ministration of the mind and body, he hath fulfilled, ministering to me instead of you all.” And so Doddr.: “that he might fill up the deficiency of your service to me, and might, if it were possible, perform to me in his own person all the kind offices which your whole society could have rendered me, had you been with me as he was.” Compare similar sentiments and phraseology in 2 Cor. 9, 9. Philem. 13. 2 Cor. 9, 12. 11, 9. Col. 1, 24.

CHAP. III.

VERSE 1. τὸ λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοί μου, χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ. On account of the τὸ λοιπὸν, and the valedictory χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ, Heinrichs thinks the Epistle, as far as it regarded the Church, ends here; and the τὰ αὐτὰ γράψεις ὑμῖν, he thinks, commences a new Epistle, which having written by itself, the Apostle had
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 addressed to the former, not addressed to the whole Church, but only to certain persons in it, with whom he was more particularly acquainted, or to whom he was at this or that account more especially attached, and whom he knew to be further advanced in the Christian doctrine. But this is resting too much on a usual and extensive formula like to ἄξιον; and in the present sense in its valedictory sense is quite arbitrary, and indeed unnecessary; for it is clearly hortatory. And the ἐπιλογία may either mean henceforth, or (as Dodd. and Mackn.), as if what follows. But the former interpretation seems preferable; for it should appear that the whole of verse is a sort of coda or postscript, similar to what is found in many other of the Epistles. See 2 Cor. 12, 11 Gal. 6, 17. Eph. 6, 10. The Apostle seems to have ceased writing or dictating here, and to have added the rest (which it is probable he originally intended to shorten) at another sitting.

1. τὰ ἐν τὰ ἔργα, &c. Some Commentators, as Dodd., have fancied in this a reference to some former Epistle which has been lost. But the principle is unsound; for as it has never been proved that any one Apostolical Epistle is lost, so there is no reason to suppose it here. Others, as Menoch. and Mackn., take the τὰ ἐν τὰ ἔργα as put elliptically for “write the same things to you which we have written to others.” But the nature of the expression confines it to the Philippians. It is therefore more reasonable, with Beza, Zeger, Flem., and Rosenm., to consider it as referring to some previous personal admonitions. Indeed ἔργα is sometimes used populariter for λέγειν, as also λέγειν for ἔργα. And so Grot. seems to have taken it.

The particles μὲν and δὲ merely serve to the apodosis, and therefore ought not to be rendered by indeed and but. They may be passed by, or rendered, “on the one hand—on the other hand.”

1. ἅμαρτν, wearisome. The word has usually an active meaning, but here it has a passive one; as in
Prov. 31, 27. "Ἄσφαλες, ἵνα (as Zanch, Grot., and Schleus. explain) "makes you safe." Wets. compares a similar passage of Liban. Epist. 61. ὑμῖν μὲν οὕτω ἐργον οὗτε γράφειν οὗτε δεῖ σοι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν σοι ὦ νῦν ἐν ξένῳ καλῶς ἀδικοῦν. 

2. βλέπετε τοὺς κίνας, "look to, beware of the dogs." So videre in Latin. And indeed this seems a Latinism; for βλέπειν in this sense requires the genitive with ἥν. Heinr. renders considerate. But this seems scarcely strong enough. Theophyl, τηγείτε, προσέχετε μη λάθωσί. Both the senses, mind, and beware of may be united; and our look to may well include them. Τοὺς κίνας, the dogs. The article points to some certain persons well known to his readers by that appellation. These are supposed to have been the Judaizers who had privity crept in among the Christians, and were sowing the seeds of Judaism. Now the term κίνας was in the plain-spoken phraseology of antient times, both in the East and West, employed to characterize impudence, petulance, and greediness. See Suic. Thes. 2, 197. and Is. 56, 11. Ps. 22, 16. Matt. 15, 26. Apoc. 22, 15. It is used by the most dignified characters in the Iliad; and it was applied to a whole class of Philosophers who seem to have been little sensible to any disgrace. See Laert. Vit. Diog. and Wetstein's Classical examples. Theophyl. well observes, that as the Jews applied this term to the Gentiles, (as the Mahomedans do now to the Christians), so there was a peculiar propriety in thus retaliating upon them, οἷς ἤταν κακοὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἀληθείας ἀναιτοῦτας, καὶ κατὰ πάντας ἀληθείας.

2. τῶν κακῶν ἔργαται. This does not merely mean wicked persons (as οἱ ἔργαται τῆς ἁδικίας at Luke 18, 27.), but, as the best antient and modern Commentators are agreed, the false teachers, crafty Judaizers, who endeavoured to privily introduce the law. The word ἔργαται not unfrequently signifies teacher; as in Matt. 9, 37 & 39. Luke 10, 2, 2 Tim. 2, 15. The κακῶν ἔργαται are here well paralleled by the vol. vii.
ἐρώτατος δῆλοι at 2 Cor. 11, 13. where see the note. These were, however, κακός in other respects, especially by tearing up (as Theoph. observes) what others had planted.

2. Βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν. On the force of the word κατατομή, and the scope of the Apostle, the Commentators are divided in opinion. The interpretations proposed are for the most part very frigid, as that of Grot., Theodoret, and Michaelis, who take κατατομή for τοὺς κατατέμνουτας, namely, τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Still more absurd is the interpretation of Mackn., "the excision, because God will destroy them." Preferable is the exposition of Vorst: "Est elegans antanaclasis, qua eorum jactationes de necessitate circumcisionis irridet, et simul conditionem doctrinae ipsorum exponit, quippe quā et seipsos et alios a Christo velut absfnderent." And so nearly Rosenm. Upon the whole, I see no interpretation so rational as that of the antient Commentators. Thus Theophyl: μέγα δὲ καὶ γεμίων ἡ τοῦ (read ποτε) παρὰ Ἰουδαίων ἡ περιτομή: 'Επεὶ οὖν τῶν ἠργήσατο, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἡ κατατομή ἐστι, ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐστιν νόμιμον τὸ γενόμενον, τὴν σάρκα μόνον κατατέμνουσιν, q. d. "beware of this cutting and hacking the flesh; for it is no more." So also Schleus. and Heirn., the latter of whom remarks that the expression is used ironically and contemptuously, to show indignation at the fancy that no one could be made a Christian but by means of such an insignificant rite.

3. ἧμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμέν ἡ περιτομῆ, q. d. "They ought not to arrogate to themselves alone the title of περιτομη; for we Christians are, i. e. possess, the true circumcision, even that of the heart." (See Rom. 2, 29.) And on this the Prophets themselves insist. With the τευματί Θεοῦ λατρεύουσιν we may compare that spiritual service enjoined by Christ, Joh. 4, 29. and that reasonable service mentioned at Rom. 12, 1. (see also 1 Cor. 7, 19.), and which did not depend upon external rites. Heinrichs observes, that it was then customary with Christians to assume to them-
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selves those names and attributes on which the Jews prided themselves.

The various reading Θεός seems to have arisen partly from error, and partly from intentional, but unnecessary, alteration.

3. καὶ καυχαίμενοι ἐν Χ., and who make our boast and glory (not in Jewish privileges, but) only in Christ Jesus, whose favour alone we seek, and follow his doctrine.' Καὶ οὖκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποίηται. These words are exegetical of the preceding. By σαρκὶ is meant those external rites and ceremonies in which the professors of the law especially placed their reliance for obtaining favour and acceptance with God.

4. καίτερ εἰῶ ἐγῶν, &c. The scope of the Apostle (as Theophyl. remarks) is to show that he does not deprecate these grounds of confidence in the flesh because he possesses them not. His meaning is not, that he has confidence in the flesh: but he here uses a very brief mode of expression, of which the sense may be thus expressed: 'And yet (if there be any ground of such confidence in the flesh) I have it. If any one thinks he has such grounds, I can show more.' The εἰῶ is emphatic, and at ἐγῶν must be understood εἰμί. The δεῖ is not (as Heinrichs thinks) pleonastic, but (as the ancients saw) is inserted, to show that the Apostle does not recognise any such grounds.

On the εἰς the Commentators trifle. It plainly must mean any Jew, or Jewish Christian, or Judaizer. On the μᾶλλον it is not necessary to press. Doddr. well renders it "probably more." In fact the whole sentence εἰ τίς—πεποίηται seems to mean no more than εἰ τίς ἄλλος, and that is all that a Classical writer would have said. He would probably have written ἔγωγε, εἰ τίς ἄλλος, ἐχώ πεποίηται εἰ σαρκὶ, ἄλλα μᾶλλον.

5. περιτομὴ ὄκταμεν ὁ—Φαρισαῖος. The Apostle rhetorically accumulates many of the attributes of his dignity as a Jew, of which his countrymen, and especially the Pharisees, used, it should seem, fre-
quently to boast in conversation. Compare Rom. 9, 4. seqq. (Heinrichs.) The sense is clearly this: “I was circumcised on the eighth day,” i. e. I was not a proselyte, or adult circumcised. With respect to the reading, however, it is not easy of determination, and on this both the antient and modern Commentators are divided. Some adopt περιτομή, taking it as abstract for concrete, of which they adduce many examples from the Scriptural and Classical writers. But in all the passages they have cited it is used of a plural; and I can find no example of a singular. I therefore prefer, with others, to read περιτομή, sub. ἐν, which yields the very same sense, with less harshness. As to MSS. they are no evidence in such minutiae. In the reading περιτομή I find I am supported by Bp. Middleton, who renders: “I was, in respect of circumcision (circumcised) the eighth day.”

5. ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ, φυλῆς Βεναμιν, “by nation an Israelite, by tribe a Benjaminite.” It is remarked by Heinrichs that the Apostle says an Israelite, since other neighbouring nations, as the Edomites and Ishmaelites, practised circumcision. But it should rather seem that the Apostle means by Ἰσραήλ a true Israelite, and not such as the Samaritans, who pretended to be such. In this view he mentions the tribe of Benjamin, since that had not been led into captivity. Here Wets. cites Meg. on Esther 3, 4. Ego εἰγενέστερος Dei S. B. Omnes enim tribus natæ sunt extra terram: provavus autem meus natus est in terrâ Israelis, de Mardochai ex tribu Benjamin.

5. Ἐβραῖος ἐξ Ἐβραίων. This term is not merely synonymous with Israelite, or the more recent Jew, but, as Carpzov thinks, religionem cultumque Divinum gentis designat. The turn of the phrase* is

meant to show that he was a Hebrew by both parents, and that by a long series of ancestors, and with no mixture of Gentile or proselyte blood. Now of this the Jews were as proud as those Christians in Spain, who (as we learn from Cervantes) call themselves old Christians, as having no mixture of Moorish blood. See Acts 22, 3, 26, 5. 2 Cor. 11, 22. Theophyl. well explains it ἀνωθέν τῶν ἐνδοκίμων Ἰουδαίων εἰμὶ—τὴν πολλὴν εὐγενείαν δείκνυσι.

5. κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαίους. I know not why our English Translators should have rendered this “by law”: for it cannot surely mean the law properly so called, but (as Schoettg. says) the oral law, in which almost the whole of Pharisaism consisted. So nearly Theophyl.: ἐν τῷ μαθήσει τοῦ νόμου. The most antient of our later Commentators render it sect: Schleus. moralia instituta; a signification rare, but of which I have remarked one example, Aristoph. Av. 1343. ἐρῶ δ' ἔγαγε τῶν ἐν ὀρθοστ. νόμων ὁρνιθομανὸς γὰρ κ. τ. λ. Schol. Arist. 577. νόμων ὤν ὃ πάντα τῶν γεγραμμένων φησιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ἔθος. So also Thucyd. 6, 16. νόμος μὲν γὰρ τιμὴ τοῦ τουματα.

6. κατὰ γῆλον διάκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Here, κατὰ signifies quod attinet ad. It is well observed, by Heinrichs, that κατὰ γῆλον has reference to κατὰ νόμον; q. d. “out of my infuriate zeal for the rights and institutes of my sect, persecuting the Church.” Diákōn is not (as Heinrichs and Rosenm. say), the Present for the Preterite: but it is the Participle imperfect. Theodoret well explains: οὗ γὰρ διὰ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν, οὔδὲ διὰ δόξαν κενὴν, οὔδὲ φθόνον βαλλόμενον, αἰς Ἰουδαίων ἀρχοντες, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου φλεγόμενος γῆλα, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπόθεν αὐτοῦ.

6. κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἀμετρτος, “as far as the righteousness which is by the law extends, being blameless.” By the δικαιοσύνην ἐν νόμῳ, is meant, all those observances, especially ritual, which the law enjoined. Ἀμετρτος imports that he never so acted as to give room for spiritual censure. (So Heinrichs). But there appears to be a sort of
necissa. For he seems to hint, that, if justification could have been thus obtained, he should have had it. So Theodoret: ἦν ἐκείνη ἡ ἀρετὴ ὑπερήφανη τῶν ἐπισκόπων.

7. ἀλλ' ἦν ἐκείνη ἡ ἀρετὴ. Under this ἀλλ' ἦν ἐκείνη there is much meaning concealed, which may be thus expressed: "These were such as to bring me into great credit with our Ecclesiastical rulers (see Acts); these made my reputation considerable (see Acts 9, 1st); and would have led to dignities and emoluments, an introduction into the Sanhedrim, &c.; but all these opportunities of gain I (on my change of views, and conversion to Christ) no more regarded than if they had been sources of loss." Wetstein adduces many Classical examples of ἀλλ' ἦν ἐκείνη, and ἦν ἐκείνη ἡ ἀρετὴ, but in a somewhat different sense.

Diē τῶν Χριστίων, "because of Christ and his religion." It is here beautifully observed, by Theodoret: Τί παραδόθη τῶν ἅγιων ἐκείνων ἄφενα τὰ εὐαγγελία, περὶ τῆς λειτουργίας τῶν ἑάνων φασίνοντο περὶ τῆς παραλειμάτως τῆς τῶν τελεσιῶν τῶν σωφρινῶν δεξαμενής, αὐρείον ἐστι τῆς τετηνῆς τοῦ γαλά τῶν μεταπολεμονίων τελεσιῶν τρόφιμος.

8. ἀλλὰ μενοῦν ἐκείνη ἡ ἀρετὴ κατὰ ἡμέραν. The ἀλλὰ μενοῦν is a very elliptical formula, not used by the Classical writers,* and imports: "And not these things only, but all other things which are thought honourable and profitable, did I despise. Nay, to the present time, I continue to think all things but loss," &c. Diē τὰ ὑπερέχουσα τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ. Here diē may mean, "in comparison with." But perhaps the sentence is elliptical, and may be thus paraphrased: "And such they appear, because of the excellency of," &c. Τὰ ὑπερέχουσα is for τήν ὑπεράνωσις or there is an Hendiadis for τήν ὑπεράνωσιν τῆς ὑπερέχουσαν. The γνώσις. X. I., is here put for the revelation of Christ, the religious system revealed by him: on which signification, see Schleusen.

* Heinrichs renders it quid, quod, quin; referring to Irmisch Exc. ad Herodian 1, 804.
Lex. in voce § 6., where are adduced, as examples, 2 Cor. 2, 14., 4, 6., 10, 5., 1 Tim. 6, 20., Malachi 2, 7. Schleus. also refers to Tüttm. de Vestig. Gnost., p. 198.

8. δι' ἐν τῇ πώτα ἐξημολογηθη, sub. κατὰ. There was no occasion for our Commentators to have stumbled at this expression, which is to be taken populariter. When he says he lost all, he means that he lost all the opportunity of gaining. And so the antient Interpreters. I cannot think, with Dodd., that this refers to any confiscation of property; for such he had no means of acquiring.

8. καὶ ἡγούμαι σκόβαλα εἶναι, ἦν Χ. κερδήσω. Here we have a climax on the preceding ἡγούμαι πάντα ἐξημολογώ εἶναι. Thus the καὶ may be rendered yea. Σκόβαλα, dung, or dross. It sometimes signifies the wreck thrown out by the sea (as in Ach. Tat. 2., cited by Rosenm.), and sometimes stubble, such as in farm-yards is trampled under foot by the cattle, and thus converted into dung. The expression may be Englished by "a mere drug," which word comes from the Dutch Drog, dry, barren, useless, &c., and signifies, properly, a dried plant. Wets. has here very many passages illustrative of the sense of the word; and two, of the sentiment; as Apulej. Flor. 2. Cratetem rem familiarem abjecisse, velutonus stercoris, magis labori quam usui. Plaut. Truc. 2, 7, 5., amator, qui bona sua pro stercore habet. Petron. 44., itaque illo tempore annona pro luto erat.

8. ἦν Χριστὸν κερδήσω, "that I may gain the favour and rewards of Christ in his kingdom.

9. καὶ εὐφέβω ἐν αὐτῷ. Rosenm. explains this as merely importing "be a Christian." And most moderns regard εὐφ. as put for εἶναι. But this cannot here be admitted. The κερδήσω just before evidently has reference to the rewards adjudged at the last day: and in this view εὐφέβω will have great force and beauty; q. d. "and be (at the great day) found united to him in faith and love, and therefore be accepted and rewarded." The ἐν αὐτῷ plainly denotes this
union, which is alluded to at Joh. 6, 56., "he dwelleth in me, and I in him." I cannot think with Peirce and others, that this is a metaphor taken e re vestiariad.

9. ὕπερ ἔχων ἐπὶ ὑπ' ἀκαινούμενα τὴν ἐκ νόμου. It is observed, by Rosenm., that ἀκαινούμενα frequently signifies the favour and benignity of God; as in the Epistle to the Romans: but here may denote, by metonymy, the state of a man who has attained the favour of God: a sense (adds he) which is confirmed by ver. 8. seq. Thus the words may be rendered: "this my felicity and hope of eternal life I owe not to the Law, but to Christ." Τῇ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀκαινούμενῳ, "for our Christian state is the gift of God. Ἑστὶ τῇ πίστει, i. e. on account of my faith in Christ and his doctrine." The ἀκαινούμενα τὴν ἐκ νόμου may however, Rosenm. thinks, be interpreted, "virtue conformed to the Mosaic Law." See ver. 6. "For the Pharisaical righteousness (continues he) consisted in the observance of rites. To this is opposed the righteousness by faith in Christ, ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστὶ τῇ πίστει, a virtue which originates in, and is fostered by, the doctrine of Christ, the noblest part of which, consists of faith in the Divine promises, and is given by God under the condition of faith; a virtue far more excellent and perfect than the Jewish righteousness, and to which promises far greater, even eternal ones, were attached." Of these two interpretations the latter alone can be admitted; though it does not go far enough. Heinrichs better explains, "righteousness, and the Divine favour thence obtained for us. The antient Commentators, however, expound yet more solidly. (See Chrys. and Theophyl.) Thus Οἰκουμεν. 96. D: ἐρμός φρονεῖ, τῷ ὅσι ἐξ ἔργων ἐμφάνισεν καὶ πάντω τῶν κατὰ σέρες; ἤ γὰρ τεσσάρας, φρονεῖ, καὶ ἐστὶν καρίσμα σωματικόν (τὰ γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ἀδιάφοράς), ἀλλ' ἢ διά χάρισμα καὶ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, ἐστὶν καρίσμα σωματικόν. Ἀν τῇ ἐκ Θεοῦ, I would subaud δοκεῖται: and ἐστὶτῇ πίστει, is for διὰ τῆς πίστεως. Or ἐστί, may mean on condition of. "This righteousness from God by
faith is (as Mackn. explains) that which comes from God's counting the believer's faith for righteousness, and from his working that faith in his heart, by the influences of his Spirit." But see Whitby.

10. τοῦ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν; sub. ἐνεκα. This is a popular expression for ἵνα γνώ, which the preceding ἵνα εὑρεθῶ requires. Some, as Bengel, join τοῦ ἡμῶν with τίστει. But this is too harsh. Our common Translators and Mackn., very properly retain the common construction. The γνῶναι αὐτῶν must be taken in the same extent of signification as the τῆς γνώσεως Χριστοῦ at ver. 8. (where see the note), namely, of that exalted knowledge of which he now adduces some examples. Καὶ may be rendered némpe, even.

10. τήν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτῶν. This phrase is susceptible of more than one sense. It is well observed, by Heinr., that we are not to understand, "the efficacy of his resurrection to confirm the truth of the Christian religion, nor to excite to a holy life (as Michaelis thought), but its efficacy in producing a sure hope that we also, so that we do not hesitate to bear calamities for his sake (Rom. 8, 17., 2 Tim. 2, 11 and 12.), shall be raised to a like resurrection and glory." It may more popularly be explained, with Mackn., "its power in confirming my faith in him, and my hope of salvation through him."

10. καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν παθημάτων αὐτῶν. These words are (though the Commentators will not confess it) very obscure. The acute and learned Heinr. says this is added conditionis loco ad δύναμιν ἀναστάσεως percipiendum Christianis ineundae. But this is too harsh: and the interpretations of most Commentators are too vague. It should seem best to suppose a dilogia in γνῶναι; so that γνῶναι τῆς κοινωνίας, may signify, "to experience a participation in his sufferings, to know them experimentally." It is, therefore, nearly equivalent to καὶ τοῦ κοινωνεῖσθαι (or κοινωνεῖν) τῶν παθημάτων αὐτῶν, i. e. ἵνα κοινωνῶ.

The words συμμορφώμενοι τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτῶν, are exegetical of the preceding. The sense is: "being
conformed, like unto him in his death." So Theophyl. explains ἐξωμολογεῖτα. The συμμαρφ. may, as Whitby observes, be interpreted; 1st., temporally, by suffering and taking up the cross for his sake, as knowing that if we thus suffer with him, we shall be also glorified with him, Rom. 8, 17., 2 Tim. 2, 11 and 12., 1 Pet. 4, 18. And 2dly., spiritually, by dying unto sin, as knowing that if we be thus conformed to him in the likeness of his death, we shall be like unto him in his resurrection, and shall live with him, Rom. 6, 5 and 8. It may, however, be questioned whether the Apostle had the latter in view.

11. εἰ δὲς κατανεμεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τῶν νεκρῶν. It is amazing that some antient and modern Commentators should have been so perplexed with this passage, as if it implied a doubt of the resurrection: and strange it is that so good a scholar as Heinr. should maintain that it must imply doubt; which involves us in a needless difficulty, various modes of removing which he proposes, all too harsh and far-fetched to be thought of;* and which it is unnecessary for me to detail, since it is certain, that, in the Hellenistical style (whatever may be the case in the Classical), εἰ is often implies no doubt. On this idiom see Glass. Phil. Sacr., Wolf's Curse, &c. So Rom. 1, 10., 11, 14 and 21., 2 Sam. 16, 12., in all which places εἰ is used in the sense of ut, hæ. Thus also εἰ is often used in the same sense. (See Schleus. Lex.) The τῶς, however, should not (I think) be left unattended to. It imports, "by any methods whatever."† The Apostle means (though

* As that the resurrection here meant is the spiritual resurrection spoken of at Rom. 6, 11., Eph. 3, 5., 5, 14. This has been maintained by many Commentators, but is utterly inadmissible, for the reasons assigned by Mackn.

† Perhaps no Commentator has so well expressed this as Crell., thus: "Verba si qua, non dubitantis revera sunt (quam alioquin dubitasset apostolus se per illa media resurrectionem congregatum) sed omnino studio consistiteatis, et bonum illud ad quod constituitur vehic-
he has expressed himself with his usual obscure brevity) to say that he is striving that by any means, both those above mentioned and by any others, he may attain unto the resurrection, &c. So Theodoret: σταυρόν δέ καὶ κομανήσαι αυτῶ τῶν παθημάτων; καὶ τὴν σκυθὴν αυτῶ μεμιστάσαι δάνατον, ἵνα μετάσχω καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως. It is plain that he took ἐν τῶι for ἵνα. If, however, any portion of doubt may be thought implied in the ἐν, it cannot regard the doctrine of the resurrection, but must only be ascribed to that exemplary humility which formed so distinguishing a characteristic of the Apostle. See 1 Cor. 9, 27., and the note. At the same time I would observe that the Apostle seems to say this less with a reference to himself than as a delicate admonition to those whom he is addressing.

On the other terms there ought not to have been any difficulties raised. As to κατανυσσω, it simply signifies arrive at, attain unto; for, though I grant that it is a nautical term, yet I cannot, with Mr. Pierce, think that it alludes to a ship’s arriving at the port it is bound for; since it often meant no more than what is called touching at, and anchoring off, a port. See Acts 20, 15., and the note there, to which I add, that καταδε here signifies κατα, in opposition to ἐν, which meant to sea-ward; and κατα, to land-ward.

With respect to ἐξαναστάσου, though a rather rare word, it is only a somewhat stronger term than ἀναστασις, and (as Chrys. and the other antients rightly saw) signifies the resurrection of the just, such as is described in 1 Cor. 15. It is strange that so many Commentators should have failed to see what appears so plain.

12. ωυχ ̣τι ηνη ̣ελαβον; Mackn., renders: “for I have not received.” But the common version seems far more correct, and only requires to have the ellipsis filled up thus: “Not that I mean to say that I menter desiderantls; licet interim tacitè significet istud bonum tale esse, ut quis illo excidere posset, nempe quia maximis laboribus ac studio paretur.”
have already attained." By *attaining the resurrection*, is meant, attaining the certainty of it. Here, we may observe, the Apostle expresses himself with his usual humility. See 1 Cor. 9, 27., and elsewhere.

With respect to the words following ἡ ὅλη τελείωσαι, some would take τελείωσαι in its usual sense, "of moral and Christian perfection." But this is unsupported by the context. Others think that there is an agonistic allusion; the word τελείωσαι signifying, to have arrived at the goal, and obtained the prize. (See Schl. Lex. and Mackn.) And, considering that agonistical metaphors prevail throughout the next two verses, there can be no reason to doubt but that one has place here. And this is supported by Theophyl. Le Clerc indeed denies that any examples of that sense are to be found in the Classical writers. But Loesner adduces one from Philo, p. 74., ἅρα γὰρ ὅταν τελειωθήσατε βραβεύω καὶ στεφάνων αξιωθήσατε. See also Acts 20, 24.

12. διάκω δὲ εἰ καὶ καταλαβὼ. Here, διάκω is an agonistical term, and signifies, "I follow and pursue my course." Then, at εἰ καὶ καταλαβὼ there is, as usual (see Acts 8, 22., 17, 27., Mark 11, 13.), the ellipsis of some verb of trying or striving; q. d. "I steadily pursue my course, trying by all means that I may reach and attain that prize."

The words ἐφ’ ἐκ κατελήφθην are somewhat obscure; and many modes of interpretation have been proposed, almost all of which seem unfounded, or precarious. The chief point to be attended to is the ellipsis in καταλάβων καὶ κατελήφθην, and also the πλοῦτος, as at 1 Cor. 13, 12., in ἐπιγνώσκω and ἐπιγνώσκεσθαι. The antient Commentators rightly saw that the Apostle here alludes to the extraordinary manner in which he was, as it were, pressed into the service of Christ, and compulsorily introduced to the Christian race-course. And so Grot. Omitting the speculations of recent Commentators, I shall content myself with introducing two excellent expositions of
the antient Commentators. Cæcumen. 98. ά., εν ότι πράγματι ὑποκατελήφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ· ἥδη γὰρ με, διετεῖσαι χείρονον, ἐφ' ὧς οὖν κατελήφθην, ὄλον ἐπὶ τῷ κρύβει, ἐπὶ τῷ βασιλέω τοῦ τοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐμπροσθεν εἶναι καὶ βασιλέων, ἐπὶ τούτως ἐγὼ τρέχω, εἰ καταλαβώ τοιῶτον γενέσθαι ὅτι ἐπεληφθην. And Theodoret: αὐτὸς με πρῶτον καταλαβὼν ἐταχεί- νευσεν· ἐφεύρετο γὰρ αὐτὸν, καὶ λινὸ ἀπεστρέψατο· αὐτὸς δὲ κατέλαβε· θεύοντα· διώκω τοῖς κράτοις καταλαβεῖν αὐτῶν ἐφέμενος, ὡς μη διαμαρτώ ἡς σωτηρίας.

In κατελήφθην there is not (as Doddr. supposes) any allusion to the honorable introduction of candidates to the games. The very nature of the term will not permit this. There is rather an allusion to the pressing persons for the public service; of which we have an example in Thucyd. 6, 22., ἀγεν σιτοποιών ἐκ τῶν μυλάσκων πρὸς μέρος ἑαυτομακρεύως εμμονᾶς, where I shall take an opportunity of further illustrating the custom so similar to that of our impress.

13. οὐ λογίζωμαι κατελήφθειν. Here we have the same sentiment, though further evolved, as at ver. 12., οὐκ ἦταν ἥδη ἔλαβον, where see the note. It is evident that in these, and such like passages, the Apostle intends to hint admonition.

14. εν δὲ, &c. The transposition here proposed by Pierce and others is unnecessary; nor can there by any aposibpesis, as Heinr. supposes. It is better, with the antient and most modern Commentators, to suppose the omission of some verb, such as ποῖον, μερίσθη, σκοπῶ, or the like, of which I prefer the last. Others supply λέγω, but that is too arbitrary. The most unobjectionable subaudition seems to be that of διώκω, from what follows. It should appear that the Apostle intended to join it with διώκω, after the insertion of a parenthetical clause; but, having occasion to use διώκω in that clause, he could not well repeat it, and what was meant to be parenthetical thus became part of the sentence; so that the construction is left imperfect; though it may very well be supplied from what follows.
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14. τὰ μὲν οἶνοι ἐπιλαξαθηκόμενοι, τῶν δὲ ἐκτραβεθεὶς ἐπεκτείνεμεν. Ἀλλ. is here taken in a derived sense for to be careless, unheedful of; as in Hebr. 6, 10 and 13, 2., James 1, 24., and elsewhere. But it is here very apt, as being especially applied to those who run a race. Verbs of forgetting, usually take the Genitive: yet Wets. adduces one example of the use of the accusative from Lucian D. Mērc. 1, 1., though there the word is employed in another sense.

The τὰ οἴνοι are explained by most moderns, and many antients, of the things on which the Jews so prided themselves. But this appears to spoil the beauty of the thought, which requires us to include all his former attainments, and all his achievements in the cause of the Gospel: and, if we consider that such passages as this were intended as indirect admonitions to his converts, we shall see how much more propriety as well as beauty the thought will thus have. For this interpretation I have the authority of the antient Commentators, especially Theodoret. and also most of the early modern ones.

Τοὺς δὲ ἐκτραβεθεὶς ἐπεκτείνεμεν. It is obvious how beautifully appropriate ἐπεκτ. is to the racer, whether on foot, or on horseback, or in the chariot; since the racer stretches his head and hands forward in anxiety to reach the goal. Examples in abundance are here adduced by the Philological Commentators. Wets. cites Ovid de R. A. 1, 221. Nec quot tibi, quaere, supersint Millia. Lucian 2, 657., Nil credens acti, cum quid supererat agendum, instat. Rosenm. compares Diog. Laert. 6, 2, 6., ἐν δειλινὸν ἐβραμαυ, πρὸς τὸ τέλει ἔδει με άνείναι, καὶ μὴ μᾶλλον ἐπιείραναι. He might have more appositely have cited Diog. Laert. 5, 30. ἐρωτήσεις τῶς ἐν πράξεις τινῶν οἱ μαθηταί; ἢν, ἐὰν τῶς προέχεσθαι διακόνης, τῶς δὲ ὀστεροποιᾶς μὴ ἀναμένωσι. On the words κατὰ σκοπὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐκτραβεσίν the Commentators ceaselessly perplex themselves. The phraseology is, indeed, somewhat surcharged, but no
tmesis or parenthesis need be thought of; nor can the sense be better expressed than in our Common Version. The κατὰ and ἐν both denote the end of action; the former, physically; the latter, morally: and the latter was introduced, to better accommodate the comparison to the thing to be represented. Here Wets. compares Eurip. Electr. 954. He might more aptly have cited Philo Jud. 337 a. ἐν τούτω σκότου ὁστερ βέλη τας τοι βίου πράξεις ἀδαμάς ἀφίεται and Philostr. Icon. 861. τυχόντες γὰρ σκότου, ἀξίων λόγου πράξομεν.

The words βραβεύων and ἀνω κλήσεως are supposed to have allusion to the βραβεύοντα or ἀγανοθέταν, who sat on an elevated seat, and called forward the candidates for the βραβεύον or prize.

"Ἀνω, " high and heavenly." So Theophyl. See Gal. 4, 26. and the note. Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, " through Christ Jesus; by his assistance."

Such appears to be the plain sense of the passage, in which some adopt other views, or seek needless refinements. Wets. compares Philo de Palut. p. 333, 12. διὰ τούτων εὖ τῶν χρησμῶν οἱ σοφίας καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀπλωτοί διατελοῦστε ἀνακεκληθοί τελέσατε τὸν γὰρ τὸ θείον ἀνω καλεϊθαι δέσμος τοῦ ἐν τούτω οὐκ ἄνων κατανευρέται.

15. ὅσον οὖν τέλεοι, τοῦτο φρονώμεν. The Apostle changes the indirect into the direct admonition, and exhorts them to feel animated by the same spirit of aspiration after perfection as himself. Τέλεος properly denotes one who has arrived κατὰ τέλος. Hence it denoted an adult, as compared to an infant, or a youth. See Eph. 4, 13. and the note there. But it was sometimes applied metaphorically, to denote one advanced in the knowledge of any art or science, as religious knowledge (whence it was used of those who were initiated into the Heathen mysteries); as in 1 Cor. 2, 6. And such is by most Commentators supposed to be the sense here. Others, however, think that the term is to be taken in sensu moralis, to denote one advanced in moral and religious per-
fection; as Matt. 19, 21. Col. 1, 28. James 3, 1. and elsewhere. Perhaps both these last significations may be united. Τέλειοι must mean those who are aiming at perfection. So Simplic. Comment. c. 75. p. 259. (cited by Bulkley) who says, “Make it a point to live ὁσ ἡ τέλειον, ὡς ὁσ τέλος ἀπειλήφθη, &c. the life of a perfect man, not as though you had already attained perfection, but as always, and without intermission, advancing towards it.” I cannot but think that he had in view some passage of the New Testament.

15. τούτο φρονόμεν. One would have expected the second person; but the first is used instead of the second out of delicacy. The sense is: “let us be affected in the manner above described,” i. e. ἐπιλαοθ., &c. For, as observes Theophyl., τελείον ἔστι τὸ μὴ τέλειον νομίζειν ἑαυτῶν. The words following, καὶ εἰ τί ἐπέραν φρονεῖτε, καὶ τούτο ὁ Θεὸς ἐφισ ἐπικαλύψει are somewhat obscure, and have been variously interpreted. Most recent Commentators take them to advert to the prejudices of the weak, but sincere, Jewish converts. So Noesselt, who paraphrases thus: “Si nondum eō profeceritis, ut hæc Judaica omnia contemnenda putetis, sed aliquam tamen laudem in his queratis, meliorem vobis aliquando mentem dabíti Deus, ut hæc propter excellentiorem Christi doctrinam contemnatis.” Rosenm. observes, that among the Philippians there were doubtless some who entertained low and weak notions of the Gospel, and whom therefore the Apostle wishes God may teach better things. Others, and especially Mackn., think that the passage has a more general meaning, namely, that such of the Philippians as sincerely feared the Lord, if they happened, from ignorance or prejudice, to think differently from the Apostle concerning any important article of faith, would have their error discovered to them, not by a particular revelation, but by the ordinary influences of the spirit, agreeably to Ps. 25, 12. Others interpret thus: “If you have not yet arrived at perfect
knowledge, you will, if it please God, arrive at it.”

The first interpretation, however, seems greatly preferable, and it is very ably supported by Whitby. Grot. understands by τούτο ἄτοκ, “will show you your error.” But this seems very harsh. On the ἄτοκ, it is not necessary to press. It may be considered as said populariter. Whitby would understand it of the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews, which would effectually dispel the prejudices of the Judaizers. But this is too formal and arbitrary. There is no occasion, however, to suppose supernatural or miraculous revelation; but such as might be effected by the exercise of the understanding, and attention to the course of events, under the ordinary influences of the spirit. The sense, then, may be thus expressed: “As to that wherein ye think otherwise, and continue in prejudice and error, God will, in his own good time, and by various means, show you your error, and let in truth on your minds.”

16. τὸ λέγει δὲ ἐφθάσασμεν, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖόν κατονί, τῷ αὐτῷ φρονεῖν.

There is here not a little diversity of reading. The words κατονι—φρονεῖν, are omitted in two MSS., the Copt. and Ethiop. Versions, and some Latin Fathers. Κατονι is omitted in four antient MSS.; and in three or four others there is the following transposition: τῷ αὐτῷ φρονεῖν, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖον. On this ground, by a very common rule in criticism, Mill, Bengel, Griesb., and others, hold that they are all spurious; and as such they have been thrown out of the text by Griesbach, or bracketed, as by Knapp and Vater. But this appears to be a very rash and injudicious step. The critical rule in question, like all other general rules, admits of exceptions, and must be modified in application; as, for instance, when a passage is obscure and difficult, and many attempts are made by the early librarii to remove the difficulty by critical emendation, whether by the omission, alteration, or transposition of certain words or clauses. Now surely, in such a case, if several of those means should be employed conjointly, a strange diversity of readings may and will arise; and yet if, in such a case, an Editor were to cut out the passage, on account of this diversity, he would act as uncritically as he who should cancel a passage merely on account of its being obscure and difficult. Now I apprehend this to be exactly the case with the passage before us; for, as it stands in the common text, it is difficult; all the alterations render it less so,
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(though all founded on false views), and are therefore suspicious. Moreover, the MSS. in which these alterations are found are only eight in number, and nearly all of them such as are elsewhere interpolated and altered. As to the Versions, they are of little weight, and are elsewhere corrupted by similar interpretations: indeed, in cases of this kind, no Versions are good evidence for alterations, since the antient translators took great liberties. Here, however, they confirm the common reading; as do also the Greek Fathers and Commentators. Moreover, the reading adopted in Griesbach (namely by the omission of the words κανόνι τὸ ἄντο φορείν) leaves (I think) a solecism. If the Apostle had meant to express the sense which Griesb. and the other Critics suppose, he ought (I conceive) to have written, not τῷ ἄντο, but τοὺς; as in a similar passage at Gal. 6, 16. δοὺ τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχεῖον.

For these reasons I assent to the opinion of those more cautious Critics, Wolf, Wet., Math. and, I think, Nolan, that the common reading ought to be retained, and the words explained in the best manner we are able. Here, however, the interpreters seem to have been all on the wrong scent, and to have failed in seeing on what the difficulty hinges. It arose (I think) from excessive brevity. The Apostle appears to have had two cognate senses in his mind at once, and to have blended the two clauses into one.

The πληύ is ill rendered in our English version nevertheless. Nor can I quite approve of the veruntamen of the Vulg., or the however of Mackn. It is (I think) rightly said by Heinr. to be nearly equivalent to μόνον at 1, 26. (where see the note.) Rosenm. renders it dummodo; Schleus. tantummodo; and he adduces Acts 30, 23. With respect to the infinitive here, it is for the imperative, by the subaudition of δέ. (as Phot. remarks.) The sense, then, is: "Only (mind this) to walk by that degree of knowledge whereunto we have attained. That such is the meaning of δέ, is plain from the preceding verse.

Φθάνειν εἰς τίνα, signifies properly, "to be before hand with another in arriving at any place:" but this notion of anticipation is often lost; as here and at Matt. 12, 28. and Luke 11, 30. And yet it may be a more energetic term than ἕλθειν. The στοιχεῖον is, like περίπταρειν, used in the moral sense; as at Acts 21, 24. Rom. 4, 12. Gal. 5, 25. 6, 16. where see the note. Such then, is, I think, the sense which the Apostle meant primarily to express (and this is well rendered by Schleus., "cognitioni quâ in presenti algandis, convenienter vitam vestram instituite"): but he had also in mind (as I before observed) another sentiment, namely, τῷ ἄντο στοιχεῖον κανόνι τὸ ἄντο φορείν. These he has blended together, making the τῷ ἄντο serve for both; whereas had he kept them separate, he would have written thus: πληύ εἰς δ ἐφθάσασθε τοὺς στοιχεῖον τῷ ἄντο, φημι, στοιχεῖον κανόνι.

On the sense here of κανόνι, see the note on Gal. 6, 16. The phrase τὸ ἄντο φορείν, is synonymous with τὸ ἐν φορείν; and both are expressive of concord and unanimity. See Rom. 12, 16. 15, 5.
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2 Cor. 13, 11. and elsewhere. And so the Classical writers. This seems to have been added, to explain the preceding.

17. συμμιμηταί μου γίνεσθε. This admirable passage the Apostle concludes by proposing his own example to imitation (to which he frequently exhorts his churches; as infr. 4, 9. 1 Cor. 4, 16. 11. 1 Thess. 1, 6.), and the pernicious example of certain persons, warning them to avoid following. (Heinr.)

All the recent Critics are agreed that the compound is here used for the simple. But so little of pleonasm is there in the Apostle, and so sparing is he of words, that I can hardly think he would have thrown away a preposition in composition. I would therefore, with Grot., render: "Omnes pari studio me imitantini." The συν is used as in the συναθλούντες at 1, 27. As to the general sense conveyed in καὶ σκοπεῖτε—ήμως, it is obvious. Yet there is something in the terms which may cause hesitation. Theophyl. paraphrases thus: καὶ ὁσ πρὸς ἀρχέτην γλέποντες, πρὸς ἐκεῖνους ἁπότυποῦσθε καὶ ἄσπερ ἔχετε τύτου ἐμὲ ὑμᾶς καθεῖσθαι. The difficulty may best be removed by paraphrasing thus: "And mind, look at for imitation those that live so (as we do), and as ye have them for an example, so use them as such." By these the Apostle seems to have meant Timothy, Epaphroditus, and such like. As to the subject of the σκοπ. and the τυτ., I cannot think it, with Whitby, "the abandonment of Jewish prejudices," but, in a general way, an imitation of him both in Christian faith, and in those good works, which are the surest proofs of its sincerity and the fairest fruits of its efficacy. On τυτ. see the note on Acts 7, 44.

18. πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦν, &c. This is ill rendered in our common translation and Mackn.; "for many walk whom," &c. The antient and the best modern Commentators are agreed that there is here an ellipsis of κακῶς, or ἄλλως ἔπερ ἐγώ; and certainly this ought to be supplied in all versions meant for ordinary readers. Though, after all, perhaps there

3 c 2
is not so much an ellipse, as a beautiful apophasis, arising from delicacy. This might be expressed thus: *τινὲς τίς περιπέτευσι—τις, "Many walk—I need not say how." Now to show who those are to whom he alludes, the Apostle subjoins ὡς τῶν λεγομ., &c. By the many we need not understand many of the Philippians, but many of the Christians in general, especially those at Rome, whom probably the Apostle had chiefly in view.

18. ὡς—Χριστοῦ. Rosenm. would take λέγεις here in the sense appellare. But this the ἵνα will not permit, from which it appears that the common version said, or told, is correct. Τὸς ἐξῆς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. These are supposed by many eminent moderns to have been Judaizers (teachers, or others), who, from their adherence to circumcision and some other rites of the law, were not aware of the true nature and extent of the great sacrifice of the death of Christ, which made circumcision nugatory, and were therefore averse to suffering any persecution from the Jews on its account. How the doctrine of the cross of Christ and circumcision are opposed to each, has been fully shown in the notes on Gal. 5, 11, 6, 12 & 14. Such persons as these, however, were not only averse to all such doctrines as involved persecution, but, in a general way, to such as were opposed to sensuality and self-indulgence. Thus they were every where bitter enemies to Paul, as being the promulgator of doctrines too spiritual for their grovelling dispositions. These, then (namely, Judaizing Christians), were, I imagine, the persons chiefly intended: and yet I cannot but think that the above Commentators have done wrong in confining it to them. It should seem to have been meant also for some Gentile converts, who, from the remains of unsubdued corruption, were enemies to the cross of Christ, i.e. to all those pure and spiritual doctrines by which we are enjoined to crucify vicious inclinations, to conquer unruly appetites, and resist temptations to worldly gain.
19. ὁν ἰὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια—φρονοῦτε. The Apostle now particularly describes these persons, and, for a warning to others, shows the consequences of their conduct.

Τέλος is by Beza and Rosenm. explained pæna. But this is harsh; and still more so the sense which Heinr. assigns to the clause, "whose purpose is the destruction of Christianity." This sense cannot be elicited from the words, nor ought it, if it could; for the sensual worldly-minded persons in question probably did not intend the destruction of the religion they professed, but only wished to modify it to their own vicious course of life. The sense is plainly that assigned by the antients and almost all moderns, who take this as a brief and popular expression for "who will come to a bad end, whose conduct must terminate in their perdition." So Jude 13. "for whom is reserved the blindness of darkness for ever." See also Rom. 6, 21. 2 Cor. 11, 5. Gal. 6, 8.*

The Apostle then subjoins three distinguishing characteristicks of these wretched persons, namely, sensuality, uncleanness, and worldly-mindedness. Of these vices the first is expressed by a phrase which appears to be adajial. There is a similar expression in Rom. 16, 18. where see the note.†


† Several parallel passages are adduced by Grot., Wolf, Alberti, and Wets., the most apposite of which are the following. Liban Or. 467 c. τὴν Λαίδα ἀντὶ τοῦ Διάος λογιεῖσθε. Eurip. Cyclop. 335. ἄγω τινι θῶ, πλὴν ἐμοι, Θεόις δ' οὖ, καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ γαστρὶ γράφε δαιμονὶ ὧς, τοῦ πείν γε και φαγεῖν τοὺς ἡμέραν Δειν υὸς αὐθρώπους τοῖς σῶφροις. Eurip.: Νική με χρεία καὶ κακῶς ὀλοικέω ἔτοιπη, ἄφις τα πάντα γίνεται κακα. I had myself collected several such; but in most of them I have been anticipated. I will only add Pliny, L. 26, 8. Plurimum negotii humano generi alveus exhibit, cujus causa major pars mortalium vivit.
19. καὶ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ. An elegant expression, which is thus paraphrased by Origen: ἐφ' ὁσ' ἐδει αἰσχύνεσθαι, ἐκ τουτοίς οὐκ οἴη δοξάζεσθαι. Similar passages are cited by Raphel and Wets., as Polyb. 15. ἐφ' ὁσ' ἐχρῆν αἰσχύνεσθαι καὶ ὑπερβαλῆν, ἐκ τουτοίς ὁσ' καλοῖς σεμώνεσθαι καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν. Galen de Usu, part 6. ἐξειδήτην,—ἐφ' ὁσ' ἐχρῆν αὐτῶς αἰδεύσθαι, κομπὸν, ἀναγκαίως ἡγησάμην ἠξελέγξας τὸν λόγον, ἀπὸ τῆς πλεοῦσι οὐκ ἀπαίτησεν. Cicero in Verrem, 2, 47. On the nature of this αἰσχύνῃ Commentators are not agreed. The antients seem to have thought it no more than exegetical of the preceding, and Theoph. says, ἀναλγησίαν δεικνύει. Many have supposed it to refer to circumcision. But that were too frigid and jejun. I should prefer the former opinion, were I not inclined to suspect that it may have reference to venereal impurities, which there is reason to think the Gentile converts were too little careful to avoid.

The next words designate the third characteristick, worldly mindedness; for so, I think, the expression is to be understood. I cannot, with Pierce and others, think that this has reference to the rītes of the Mosaic Law, as being of an earthly nature. The ἐρωτεύεται is rendered by our English Translators mind. But that is too feeble a sense. It rather signifies, "give their minds to; are given up to; resign their thoughts and bestow their cares upon, to the neglect of heavenly things." So Col. 3, 2. τὰ ἀνω θρεπτὶ, μὴ τὰ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, where the word is well rendered in the English Version "set your affections on," &c. Here Wets. aptly cites (what I had myself noted down,) Homer, Od. I. 21, 85. ἕπνεον ἐγρυπνᾶν, ἐφημέρια ἐρωτεύεται. And Heinrichs cites from Pers.: "o mentes hominum curvæ et caelestium inanes!" I add Ἀeschyl. ap. Stob. 98. 2, τι γὰρ βροτεῖν ἐπερ' ἐφήμερα ἐρωτεύει.

20. ἡμῶν γὰρ τὸ πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει. The γὰρ is not (as Heinrichs says) merely transitive, but has reference to a clause omitted; q. d. which we Christians ought not to do; for our, &c. Whitby
supplies, “Imitate us, I say; for our;” &c. But this is too arbitrary. Doddr. and Mackn. render the γὰρ but; which cannot be admitted.

Πολιτεία almost all our English Translators render conversation, i.e. conduct, mode of life, for ἡν ἀναστροφή.* But the best Commentators take it to be synonymous with πολιτεία, and to denote citizenship. That the words are synonymous is proved by the numerous examples of Raphel, Wets., and Loesner; and the signification just mentioned is supported by the authority of Theophyl.: ἀντε τὰ ἀνώ δει ἡμᾶς Φρονεῖν, πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα ἡμῶν στενδεῖν, ἔνω καὶ πολιτείαν ἐτάχθημεν. Yet the former is equally supported by the usus loquendi, and by the context. Indeed those senses in some measure merge into each other.

Among the Classical illustrations of the Philologists are the following from Philo: ἐν οἰραμῷ πολιτεύμεθα. Anaxagoras, 2, 7. being asked what was his country, answered by pointing to heaven. Seneca Ep. 41. Homo majore sui parte illic est, unde descendit.† Such is the perpetual doctrine of the New Testament. See Col. 3, 2. Hebr. 11, 10. 12, 22 & 23. 13, 14.

After these words a clause is (as Heinr. remarks) to be supplied; q. d. “thither therefore our minds ought to be directed.”

20. εἴς ὁ καὶ σαφῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα Κ. Ἰ. Χ. The εἴς ὁ is for εἴς ὁν, scil. οἰρανῶν, by a common figure. The words have reference to the omitted clause, and suggest a reason why we should give our chief atten-

* Of this signification St. Thes. adduces an example from Chion: γενέθω τοῦτο το πολιτεύμα. To which I add D. Hal. 1. 369, 3, μὴ ἀκατερ γεμίζῃ τα κοινά πρὸ τῶν ἱδίων αἰρομένου πολιτεύματα. Dio Cass. 408, 52. περὶ τῶν κοινῶν αὑτοῦ πολιτεύματων λέγει. So also Gregor. ap. St. Thes. καὶ ἐπολιτεύετε ἐκαστὸς κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν κατὰ τῶν Ἐθνῶν κόμων.

† Hieracl. Carm. Pythag. p. 100. (cited and translated by Bulkle), “Providence watches the human soul, observing how it is conversant here.” And a little after he adds: “That being an heavenly plant, it cannot have its conversation upon earth.”
tion to heavenly things, namely, because we expect from thence the Saviour, who will richly reward all our patient endurance here. See 2 Tim. 4, 18.

21. ἐς μεταχειρισμὸν τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταυτότητος ἡμῶν. The Apostle, in describing the nature of the redemption to be bestowed by the Saviour, especially adverts to that which is (as we learn from 1 Cor. 15.) to be the commencement of the rewards he will bestow, and, as it were, a pledge for the rest. On this point the Apostle has, with great judgment, taken his stand, since it suggests a strong argument to resist temptations to sensuality and selfishness; namely, “Why should I take so much thought for this wretched and perishable body, and this paltry self, when by thus resisting this very body, will, by my Saviour, be changed into a body similar to his glorious body, and be susceptible of pleasures such as “mortal eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.” Such is the general sense; but to turn to the phraseology, ἀπεκδόμαι is a strong expression, signifying, “we anxiously expect.” Τῆς ταυτότητος is, by a Hebraism, for the cognate adjective; as τῆς ὑπὸς just after. Μεταχειρισμὸν, signifies to change the σχῆμα or form of any thing; as in 2 Cor. 11, 13 and 14. and 1 Cor. 4, 6. The word here is well explained by Theophyl.: τὸ αὐτὸ μὲν ἐνδύσεται ἀφάρσιον μεταχειρισμὸν γὰρ τῆς ἄνδρα θοράσει ἀλλαγὴν νόσου καὶ Theodoret: τὸ δὲ μεταχειρισμὸν, οὐκ ἐστὶ τῆς μετατομῆς τοῦ σχῆματος τεθεικός, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τῆς ἀλλαγῆς τῆς φόρας.

The words εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ are omitted in some five or six MSS., and are cancelled by Griesb. (as had been before directed by Grot., Mill, Bengel, Storr, and others), and not without countenance from critical principles, which, however, are of uncertain application in the New Testament. See the note supra ver. 16.

21. σύμμορφων, “of the same form and nature;” (see Rom. 8, 29.) though, as Theodoret says, αἱ κατὰ
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tην πωκτητά τῆς δόξας, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῆν ποιήματα. A change necessary previous to our admission; for, as the Apostle teaches, 1 Cor. 15, 25 and 26. "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

21. κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργείαν—τὰ πάντα. This most dignified passage is, as Theophyl. suggests, meant to remove unbelief; q. d. "For power he hath to subdue all things, and hath subdued, not even excepting death."* See 1 Cor. 15, 26. and Joh. 11, 25. Here we have, as Heinr. observes, an argument a minori ad majus. Theodoret well paraphrases thus: πάντα δὲ τιθῆς ἂτε δη δύναμιν ἀρρητον ἔχων, καὶ βασίλεα καὶ τὴν φόδον καὶ τὴν θάνατον καταπαθῶν, καὶ εἷς ἀδανασίαν τὰ θημέτερα σώματα μεταβάλλων, καὶ μασκευάζων ἄγαντας εἰς αὐτῶν ἀποβλέπειν.

CHAP. IV.

VERSE 1. ὢντε, ἀδελφοὶ μου ἁγαπητοί, &c. The division seems here made at a very wrong place; and Dodd. thinks there is no more reason for making this the beginning of a new chapter, than there would be for disjoining the last verse of 1 Cor. 15.

The ὢντε, Heinr. observes, refers not to the following, but to the preceding, and has a conclusive sense. And ἐπιστῆτοι he regards as synonymous with ἁγαπητοὶ. But it seems a stronger term, and is well rendered exoptati. Wets. compares Anthol.: τέκνα, πόθοι. And Rosenm., Virg. Nec dulces natos, exoptatumque parentem. Χάρα is, by an idiom found also in the Classical writers, put for the object

* It deserves to be remarked that Christ is here said to subdue all things to himself, by his own strong working, notwithstanding the same subjection of all things is ascribed to the Father, 1 Cor. 15, 25 Heb. 2, 8. Thus also Rom. 4, 17. Acts 26, 6. Eph. 1, 19. In like manner, Christ is said to raise himself from the dead, Joh. 2, 19. and to be raised by the Father, Rom. 4, 24. &c. The inference is plain. (Mackn. and Slade.)
of the joy, deliciae tuae. Στέφανος, "cause of reward." So frequently in the Old Testament; as Job. 19, 9. and Prov. 12, 4. "a virtuous woman is a crown to her husband." Wets. compares Herod. Vit. Hom. 31. ἀνδρὸς μὲν στέφανος τιμῶν, τύρανν ὡς ἀνδρός. And Heinr. Hor. Od. 1, 1. dulce decus meum. I add Lycurg. contra Leocr. p. 188. Tayl. στέφανον τῆς πατρίδος εἶναι τὰς ἐκείναν ψυχὰς. Theophyl., with great taste, illustrates the sort of climax which subsists in this verse.

The obσα has much meaning, namely, "thus as I have exhorted you." Expressions similar to the στήραν ἐν Κυρίῳ occur in 1 Cor. 15, 1. 16, 18. Gal. 5, 1. where see the notes.

2. εἰσοδίαν—Κυρίῳ. The persons here mentioned were (as appears from ver. 5.) females, and, as the Commentators think, Deaconesses, who preached the Gospel to persons of their own sex. Various conjectures (for they are no more) are indulged by the Commentators (as Mackn. and Heinr.) which are not worth detailing. All that we can gather from the words is, that they had disagreed. It would seem, too, from the addition ἐν Κυρίῳ, and from the use of τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆν a little before, 3, 16., that this disagreement was in doctrine, which, however, had probably led to other and less justifiable dissensions, which the Apostle here endeavours to compose.

3. καὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σε, σὺχνε γρίσσε. There are few points on which Critics are more agreed than on this, that for καὶ, καλ, which is found in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, is the true reading. I will only observe, that I remember several instances in the Classical writers of a similar error of the scribes, especially in Orpheus and Apollon. Rhod. This particle answers to the Hebr. נָא, from which indeed it seems derived. It also occurs in this sense in Philem. 20. and Ap. 22, 20.

'Ερωτῶ σε, "I entreat thee." A Latinism, from rogo. Σύχνε γρίσσε. On the exact sense of σύχνε Commentators are not agreed. Some think it is a
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proper name; but that may be regarded as merely a
decent way of shuffling off the difficulty; though in-
deed it is inconsistent with the epithet γυνικός.
Others, both antient and modern, think that the
Apostle is addressing his wife. But this is opposed
both by grammatical and other reasons. See Whitby.
Far more probable is the opinion that the term is
synonymous with σύγγονος and συστατικός supra 2,
Χ., applied to Epaphroditus, whom some indeed
think is here meant. But, as Heinr. observes, we
cannot suppose the Apostle would apostrophise the
letter-bearer. The term σύγγονος is rightly regarded
by Heinr. as denoting a closer connection than σύμ-
egγος and συστατικός. It here (I think with Els-
ner and others) denotes colleague in office, and I am
inclined to agree with those who suppose the Apost-
tle means the Bishop, or principal Presbyter of
Philippi, who was, as it were, his deputy and subordi-
nate colleague. And this is countenanced by the
epithet γυνικός, similar to which we have γυνικός
supra 2, 20. where see the note. See also the note
supra 1, 1. Dodd. thinks it probable that this
might be an officer of considerable authority and
dignity in the Church at Philippi, perhaps husband
to one of the pious women here mentioned.

Της. signifies genuine, faithful. So an Inscription
cited by Wets.: Μάριος ποῦνης τῇ ἱδιῇ συμβιβάζειν ἵπτερι
ξησάχη γυνικός καὶ συνθρόνιος μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

3. συλλαμβάνοντας αὐτῶν, “help and assist them;
strengthen their hands in their Evangelical labours,”
which so influential a person might very well do.
The Apostle seems also to hint that he should keep
peace between them.

The words following suggest the kind of assist-
ance to be rendered them. Αρίστες ἐν τῷ εκκλησίαρ
συμβλήσασιν με, “who laboured with me in propagat-
ing the Gospel.” On the nature of the συμβλήσις
Commentators are not agreed. As the Apostle so
strictly forbade women to preach, some have thought
the word might import a participation in the danger
mentioned at Acts 16, 19. But this is too harsh; nor is it necessary. We have only to suppose that the co-operation was of such a nature as not to include public preaching, but (as in the case of Priscilla, who is at Rom. 16, 13. called συνεφόρος μου) only refer to private exhortation, and evangelizing among those of their own sex; which, considering the seclusion of the women, required by the customs of Greek society, would be an important help. This, I think, the Apostle had chiefly in view. And so several antient Commentators: though they include the receiving and accommodating ministers and preachers, &c.

3. μετὰ καὶ Κληρικος, "and assisted also by the co-operation of Clemens." Who this Clemens was, is not certain. The antients say, it was Clemens Romanus, one of the primitive Fathers. This, however, the moderns reject: but not, I think, on sufficient grounds. Such a tradition, if it can be traced to an early period, is surely not unworthy of credit.

3. ἐν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βιβλίῳ ἐγώ, scil. αἰωνίω, ἐγὼ σὺν ὑμῖν, Ps. 69, 9, &c. Heinrichs observes that as the future life is represented under the image of a συλλεγμα (as a little before, 3, 20.), it is agreeable therefore to suppose (as usual) a catalogue of the citizen’s names, either natural or adopted (Luke 10, 20. Ap. 20, 15. 21, 27.), and from which the unworthy are erased (Apoc. 3, 5.).* Thus the names of the good are often represented as registered in Heaven. See Matt. 3, 5. But this by no means implies a certainty of salvation (nor, as Doddr. observes, does it appear that Paul had any particular revelation), but only that at that time the persons were on the list, from which (as is represented at Apoc. 3, 5.) the names of unworthy members might be erased. See the excellent note of Whitby.

4. χαίρετε—χαίρετε. A repetition of the injunc-

* So Targum Ezech. 13, 9. et in libro vitae æternæ, qui scriptus est justis domus Israelis, non scribentur.
tion at 3, 1., and here, from warmth of affection, reiterated. So the Latin vale, vale.

5. η ἐπιεικεία. The sense is, by some, supposed to be propriety or correctness of conduct. And this is a signification frequent in the Classical writers; but seldom found in the Scriptural ones, and not here opposite. It denotes (as the best Commentators are agreed) a general mildness and placidity of demeanour, both towards Christians and Heathens. It is equivalent to μετριότης and φιλανθρωπία. This signification is frequent both in the Sept. and New Testament. Rosenm. paraphrases "Id agite, ut omnes homines experiantur et sciant, quam libenter pacis et concordiæ causâ de jure vestro remittatis, quam sitis faciles in condonandis injuriis, quam omnia æqui bonique consulatis, et æquam in rebus arduis serveti mentem."

5. οι Κύριοι εγγοί.

Commentators are not agreed whether these words should be referred to the preceding, or the following. The former seems the most probable opinion; but, indeed, either may be admitted. If the latter be adopted, the words μετριον, &c. should not have been separated from them. 'Ο Κύριοι may denote either God, or the Lord Jesus. The former interpretation is preferred by most modern Commentators. And Rosenm. and Heinrichs think that by εγγοί, near, is meant near at hand for help; q. d. "Deus ubique vobis praebet auxilio." Ps. 34, 19. I cannot, however, but prefer the interpretation of the antients and early moderns, who refer the Κύριοι to Jesus Christ; q. d. "the Lord is at hand for judgment." Yet I am far from thinking, with some, that it signifies "the day of judgment is at hand," since the event proves that this could not be the sense; and, indeed, the interpretation has been ably refuted by Whitby, who, in such passages as the present (James 5, 9. 1 Pet. 4, 7. Heb. 10, 25.), observes some other advent must be supposed. "Now these expressions (argues he) are chiefly used in the Catholic Epistles, and the Epistles to the Hebrews, that is, in the Epistles directed to the Jewish Churches, who were no strangers to these phrases, and who were well acquainted with a tremendous Advent of the Lord to punish the rebellions and infidelity of that nation. See Joel 2, 1, 11 & 31. Zach. 14, 1 & 2. and Mal. 3, 2. 2dly. There is also frequent mention of this time and day in the New Testament, when the Lord would come to destroy the unbelieving Jews, and also of the nearness of that time; for the Baptist calls them to repentance from this very motive, that
the axe was then laid to the root of the tree, Matt. 3, 10. That axe was coming whose saw was in his hand, ver. 12. Our Saviour spends a whole Chapter in speaking  ὑμῖν ταύτα ταῦτα of that day, Matt. 24, 36., and of the coming of the Son of man to the destruction of that nation, ver. 37 & 38., of the coming of the Lord, ver. 42., of the age in which he would thus come, ver. 34., of the signs when his coming was γίγνεται near at hand, καὶ εἰς τὴν θύραν at the door (which are the very words both of St. Paul and of St. James), when there would be a τέλος, an end of all things belonging to the Jewish Temple and constitution, ver. 14. Now to this coming of the Lord, foretold by himself in the very expressions of the Prophet, and in the words used here by the Apostles in their writings to the Jewish converts, we may very well refer the words above cited, and if there be any other of like nature.” The learned Commentator then proceeds to show the fitness of the exhortations to meekness under those circumstances. Upon the whole, the interpretation is ably supported, and may be true; but there seems another advent of our Lord here alluded to (as in many other passages of Scripture, and perhaps that of James 5, 9.), namely, the hour of death, which is to every man the very same as the final advent of Christ and the day of judgment.

6. μὴ μεμονεῖτε. Here there is in our Common Version the same mistake as at 8, 19. The term employed is too feeble.  Μεμοῖ. always imports that anxious care which draws the soul contrary ways, as in Matt. 6, 25, 10, 19. Luke 10, 41, &c.

6. εὐχαριστεῖ. The ellipsis is variously supplied by Commentators. Some fix on  χαρίζω, or τίσω; others,  πράγματι. But both may be intended. The datives  πρὸς τὸν and  δέον depend upon an  εἰ to or σὺν understood. The latter is a stronger term than the former. See Eph, 6, 18. (and the note) 5, 24, Col. 3, 22.

6. μετὰ εὐχαριστίας, “with thankfulness,” i. e. for what God shall be pleased to grant; which implies an acquiescence in what he may see fit to withhold.  Αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωρίζεται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν. Here there seems to be a blending of the two phrases, “let your desires be made known,” and “your requests or petitions offered.” On so obvious a sense it is needless further to enlarge.

7. καὶ ἐπίθητο—Ἰησοῦ. These words suggest the high advantage of the temper just mentioned. The καὶ carries with it an  οὕτω, “by so doing.” The
words ἐιρήνη—Ἰησοῦ are rendered by Heinrichs, “eritis tranquillissimi felicissimique.” But this is surely an unjustifiable lowering of the sense. Εἰρήνη Θεοῦ is not (as Rosenm. says) a Hebraism for “peace the most tranquil,” but the peace which cometh from God (Rom. 1, 7.) is inspired by his religion; or “peace with God, obtained by Christ.” So Is. 26, 3. “Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee.” The reading ἐκ Χριστοῦ is plainly from emendation. So Eph. 5, 19. τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

7. ὑπερβαλλοντα πάντα νοῶν, “which surpasseth every imagination or conception of the mind of man.” On this sense of νοῶν see Schleus. Lex. in v. § 2. Φροωρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. A military metaphor. The words καρδίας, καὶ νοιματα, the recent Commentators say, are put for the man himself. But that is going too far. The sense seems to be this: “The peace thus obtained with God and from God will, as the strongest of all motives, keep your minds and hearts, notwithstanding all attacks, in tranquillity, agreeably to the admonition just before, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ must (I think) be referred to the whole of the sentence. Ἐν signifies by (like the Heb. ב), and shows how and by whom this is procured. Such, I conceive, is the sense. But many interpret differently. Most recent Commentators take the φροωρήσει to denote “will defend you against all temptations to desert the faith.” But this seems too formal, and not agreeable to the context. Others explain, will preserve you in a Christian frame of mind;” which is too vague; since the Apostle had especial reference to the μεριμν. just before. The passage of Isaiah above cited (which the Apostle seems to have had in mind) is the best commentary on this passage.

8. τὸ λοιμὸν—ταῦτα λογίζεσθε. The τὸ λιμὸν is, as Heinrichs observes, a formula properantis ad finem. So Theophyl.: ὥσ ἐπειγόμενοι, καὶ οὖνν κοινῇ εἰτὶ ἄχων πρὸς τὰ παρόντα, οὕτω φησίν. The Apostle
seems originally to have intended to conclude with this exhortation: but then changing his mind, added the rest as a sort of Coda, or postscript, at another sitting. In the interpretation of this affecting and impressive passage it is not necessary to press or refine so much on the terms as do some Commentators. Heinrichs has rightly observed that from ἀγάθος are brought forward the predicates of Christian virtue.

Ἀγάθος is well explained by the antient Commentators ἐνέγερον, truly virtuous. So the moderns explain it rectum, honestum; and they compare the line of Horace: Quid verum atque decens curo et rogo. Ἔσεσθαι, honesta, decora, decorum, venerable; in which sense the word is often used in the Classical writers. See a fine passage on the force of the term in Chrys. 4, 908, 15. It is explained by Theophyl., serious and grave, in contrast with the conduct of the worldly-minded. Δίκαιος and ἀγάθος require no explanation. The προσφιλέω is interpreted by some (as Doddr.) friendly; by others (as Mackn.) benevolent. But this seems dwelling too much on the etymology. I rather agree, with many recent Commentators (whose interpretation is confirmed by some antients), that it signifies amiable. So our Common Version, lovely. We may compare Sir. 20, 12. ὁ σοφὸς ἐν λόγῳ προσφιλέω τιμήσει. The ἐφημα is explained by some recent Commentators, as Storr and Schleus., as having reference to speaking well of others. But I see no reason to desert the interpretation of the antients and most moderns, "of good report." So the E.V. It must be observed that this is not a complete catalogue of virtues (for that the Apostle means to include others, appears from ver. 9. & ἐμπερεί, &c.), but merely specimens such as particularly adorn the Christian character (compare 1 Cor. 13, 5 seqq. 2 Pet. 1, 5 seqq.); and I cannot but think (though it has not been noticed by the Commentators) that by the last two particulars the Apostle intends to advert to two virtues in
which persons who possess the former are often deficient, preserving a starched, austere, morose, and sour demeanour, which renders religion any thing but amiable; and a being too little careful, πεμνειοσθαι καλα ἐνστιον πάντων ἀθραστον, Rom. 12, 17. (where see the note), 1 Thess. 5, 15.

8. ει τις ἀρετή καὶ ει τις ἔκανας, "If there be any virtue (in these things); if there be any thing which deserves praise." It is possible that after ει τις may be left to be understood an ἄλλο, "if there be any other virtue." Δεξιεσθε ταύτα, "think on those things; make them your study, so as to practise them." Schleus. well defines the term molior aliquid, alicui rei studio et operam do. And he compares μελεταω and the Heb. יִפְתַּל in Ps. 35, 4. 4, 41, 8: 52, 4. Prov. 16, 30. Mich. 2, 1. Zach. 8, 17. I would compare Soph. Antig. 1010. ταὐτ' ὁδ', τέκνων, φράσατο. His meaning is, however, more fully expressed by the πράσοστε in the next verse.

9. καὶ εἴμαθετε—πράσοστε. Here we have a repetition (though in stronger terms) of what was said at 8, 17. From pathos, some words nearly synonymous are accumulated. Εἴμαθετε and παρελάβετε may both be referred to catechetical and other oral instruction; and ἱκνοσάτε has nearly the same import: but in one or other of the two last there is especial reference to the present Epistle. Socr. Theophil. The εἴμαθεν ἐν ἐμοὶ refers to his personal example.

Ταύτα πράσοστε. He enjoins them to put in practice the religious precepts he had given them, and follow the example he had set them. The words τὰ θέατα—ὑμῶν are of the same import as those of ver. 7., where see the note.

10. ἔχαρην—φρονεῖν. The sense of this verse is somewhat obscure, partly from the brevity of expression, and partly from the dignified delicacy of the Apostle on such a subject; from inattention to which some Commentators have fallen into error.

Ἐν Κυπρίῳ Rosenm. renders propter Christum doc.

The general subject of the verse is plainly the present which the Philippians had sent, for the relief of his necessity: but on the details Commentators are not quite agreed. Some moderns, as Grot. and Hamm., would take the ἀνέβαλε in a Hiphil sense: q. d. "have made your cause to flourish." But for this use there is no authority, nor any countenance from the antients. The interpretation seems to have been adopted to avoid a difficulty in the construction, which may, however, be removed in a less violent manner. Both the antients and the best moderns have seen that there is at τὰ — φρονεῖ an ellipsis of κατὰ or εἰσ. The question, however, is, what is the sense of ἀνέβαλε. Some Commentators, as Schleus. and Jaspis, assign to it the following sense: "I am rejoiced that your affairs are in a flourishing state, so that ye can again take care of me." This is intended to remove the objection to the common interpretation, namely, that they had never grown cold in their good will to the Apostle, or their study to do him service. But I confess that the difficulty appears to me not so great as to need being removed by such a violent method: for the ἐντεῦτε seems, on that interpretation, not very apt: and as to ἄνεθ., the Classical passages cited are as favourable to one interpretation as to the other.

But the chief objection is, that so much sense as "ut iterum mei curam gerere possitis" cannot be elicited from an elliptical preposition. I therefore see no reason to abandon the common interpretation, which is supported by both the antients, and the most eminent moderns, namely: "ye have flourished, and are revived in your care of me." And though ἄνεθ., and the cognate terms are, in the Classical writers, used rather of personal and national prosperity, yet that is no rule for the Scriptural application. The common interpretation is also con-
firmed by Ez. 17, 24. "have dried up the green
tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish." Theophyl. explains: οὐς ἐὰν φυτᾶν βλαστησάντων, έσται ἔξησασάντων, καὶ αὖθις ἀναθάλλόντων. Καὶ ὅμεις, φησίν, ὅτεσ ἀνθρώποι ἐμαρτύνητε, ἦσαν ἀνεβάλητε. The ἱδῆ πότε, too, which, as the antients suggest, implies length of time, and hints a delicate reproof, confirms it. Others (as our English Translators) suppose an enallage for ἔχαρην διτὶ πότε ἀνέθελεν ἐν όμιν τὸ φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ; which may be admitted; though it is not very necessary. The sense is the same.

Φρονεῖν for φρονώσειν is not unfrequent.

The next words ἐφ' ὦ καὶ φρονεῖτε, ἡκαίρεωθε δὲ are well rendered in our Common Version, which is supported by the antients. The Apostle's usual delicacy causes some obscurity: but he evidently means to suggest the best excuse for them, by presuming that they had not had an opportunity of sending, or means; yet of power to contribute to the relieving the necessities of so moderate a person as Paul they can hardly be supposed destitute.

11. οὐχ διτὶ καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω, &c. There is a mixture of delicacy and dignity in these words, such as is rarely met with in the most finished compositions. They imply that he had been suffering under a decrease of his usual means of subsistence; yet that he had been endeavouring to reduce his desires to a level with his means, so as to be αὐτάρκης. The sense is: "I do not say this on account of any necessity or penury to which I have been reduced (for such I have not felt), since I have (happily) learnt in whatever circumstances I am, therein to acquiesce and accommodate myself thereto." The force of the οὐχ διτὶ is expressed by Theophyl. thus: οὐ διὰ τοῦτο μεμφομαι όμιν, οὐς ἐν ἐνδείᾳ αὐν, καὶ τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σκοπόν. The κατὰ signifies in reference to, on account of. At οἷς must be understood πράγμασι, circumstances.* Wets. paraphrases thus: "quo-

* Of the parallel passages cited by Wets., the most apposite are the following. Seneca de V. Beata 6. Beatus est presentibus,
cunque in statu res meæ sint, etiamsi pejore essent, quam nunc sunt in vinculis et paupertate." It is well remarked by Theophyl., that the ἑρωία plainly implies that this is a lesson of no easy acquirement.

Ἀὑτάρκης is used both of a thing sufficient for the purpose intended, and of a person who feels sufficiency, and is therefore content. So Sirach. 40, 18. ἀὑτάρκης ἑρωίδων γλυκαναθήται.

12. ὡδα δὲ ταξινομώθαι, ὡδα καὶ περιστείει. I see not why Rosenm. and Heinrichs should recognize in ταξινομώθαι a notion of contempt, or want of power and dignity; q. d. contemptu uti possam." It rather denotes being in lowly circumstances; as in Levit. 25, 39. ἐὰν δὲ ταξινομῆσαί ἐκεῖνος σου παρὰ σοὶ. See also Is. 58, 10. Prov. 18, 7. Sir. 18, 11. This sense, too, is frequent in the later Classical writers. See Schleus. Lex. in v. § 2. The interpretation is also confirmed by Theophyl., ἅλγων κεχρησθαί ὡδα, καὶ λίμων υπαψοῦειν καὶ ἐνδειαν. It is proper to notice the apodotical and antithetical cast of the sentence, of which some recent Commentators have much lowered the dignity, by making the corresponding terms synonymous, and the whole an example of a rhetorical figure. But the antithesis were occasioned by the high wrought state of the Apostle's feelings; and, if I mistake not, there is a climax: for μερίμναις καὶ χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πείρας are stronger terms than ὡδα, &c., in which there may be (as some say) an allusion to initiation into the Heathen mysteries. The third, καὶ περιστείειν καὶ υπερτείεσθαι is synonymous with the first. Heinr. thinks that ταξινομώθαι required ὑψώθαι. But this and some other criticisms on the passage are very tasteless; since the Apostle dictated this from the heart and did not intend a piece of fine writing. It is not necessary to press much on the περιστείειν and the

χορτίζονται. Sufficient it is to say that the Apostle used abundance, when he had it, so as not to abuse it to luxury, but to preserve the surplus for future necessity, and partly to bestow it in charity to the poor. The πείσαν is a strong term; but, from hints scattered in the Epistles, there is reason to think it literally applicable. With this phraseology I would compare Diog. Laert. 1, 68. Ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι ἀδικεῖσθαι.

The ἐν παντὶ and ἐν πάσι are explained, by Theophyl., ἐν παντὶ τῷ μικρῷ χρόνῳ, καὶ ἐν παντὶ πρᾶγματι, καὶ ἐν πάσι τοῖς παρεμβιτυσοι πειραμ ἐλαθον. I would compare Max. Tyr. D. 31, 6, 11, 110., where there is a similar pleonasm, namely πανταχοῦ καὶ ἐν ἄπνις.

13. πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδοικμομενι με Ἰησοῦ. The Apostle here shows how he had attained this power, namely, by the strength imparted by Christ. For ἐν Ἰησοῦ does not merely signify, “by the use of the doctrine of Christ (as Rosenm. explains),” but chiefly denotes the direct assistance of Christ and his Holy Spirit. This may be applied, mutatis mutandis, to the case of faithful Christians in every age.

14. πλὴν καλῶς—θλίψει. It is well observed, by Heinrichs, that the Apostle adds this, lest he should be thought, by the preceding ver. 11—13., to depreciate the gift, or the intentions of the donors. Πλὴν, however. Συγκοινωνισαντές μου τῇ θλίψει, i.e. literally, “partaking in my distress;” as Apost. 1, 9. συγκοινωνις ἐν τῇ θλίψει. But it must import to feel such a sympathy in the distress of another as prompts one to relieve him.

The syntax of the participle with συγκοινων, is a common Grecism. See Matth. Gr. Gr. and Viger. Id.

15. οὐδείς—Μακεδονιας. Here ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is put populariter for ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου εὐαγγελίζεσθαι; as in 2 Cor. 2, 12. Ὡτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, “when, after having founded many churches in Macedonia, I left it.” See Acts 17, 14 & 15.

15. οὐδείς μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώθησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως. The Apostle is not content with saying ἐκοινω., communicated, but adds the strong phrase εἰς
PHILippians, chap. iv.

λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως, which, I think, imports a mutual and regular reciprocation of gifts and receipts, in which, the Commentators have seen, there is an allusion to the ratio acceptorum et datorum among the Romans (see Facciol. Lex.), or tabulae accepti expensi. Schoettgen compares a similar phrase among the Hebrew merchants, דִּישׁ הַדְּרוֹמִים. Some refine too much on the δόσεως and λήψεως, as if the δοσ. were also applicable to Paul, since it is said, "if we send unto you our spiritual things, is it a great thing if we reap your carnal things?" But this seems harsh. It should rather appear that what is chiefly implied by the δοσ. and λησ. is, that there existed on record, as it were, an account entered into the book of God, who will, at some future day, remunerate the giver. The expression may also, as Crellius suggests, be meant as a limitation of the giving; q. d. "no church supplied me with any thing considerable enough to be entered down into an account book; if any thing was given, it was not worth noting or putting down."

16. ἐν Θεσσαλονίκη, for εἰς Θ., "at Thessalonica." Καὶ ἄταξ καὶ δίς. The Commentators take this to signify sēpius, pretty frequently; as in 1 Thess. 2, 18. Neh. 13, 20. 1 Macc. 3, 30. So the Latin semel atque iterum. And Wets. cites Herod. 2, 121. καὶ δίς καὶ τρὶς ἀναξαντι & 3, 48. "Yet I cannot think that the Apostle means the phrase to be taken in any other than its literal sense; * for, as Doddr. observes, it appears by 1 Thess. 2, 9. 2 Thess. 3, 7—9. that it was not to the liberality of the inhabitants of that city, but chiefly to the labour of his own hands that Paul owed his subsistence during his abode among them."

* I would compare Philostr. V. Ap. 3, 12. οὐχ ἄταξ ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν. Polyb. 3, 14, 1. ἐδωκεν αὐτῷ πολλὰ πρόβατα καὶ ἀνδρὶ πόδα δίς ποιο καὶ τρίς ἀγαγεῖν. Dionys. Hal. 525, 41. ἐνίοτε τὴν ἐκφανεῖν τῆς Θεοῦ, οὐχ ἄταξ καὶ δίς, where Sylberg renders, "idque semel atque iterum." But that is neglecting the negative, which is here necessary, since it is a litotes for sēpicule.
17. ὡς ὁτι ἐπιγγητῶ τὸ δῶμα. Οὐχ ὁτι always carries with it λέγω, either expressed or understood, q. d. "I say not this because I seek after, wish for (Acts 18, 7.) any gift." Ἀλλ' ἐπιγγητῶ—ὑμῶν. This is delicately and somewhat obscurely expressed. The sense is (as the best Commentators are agreed), "I feel pleasure in the gift, not so much on my own account as yours, considering the fruit that will redound from it in the praise of men, and the recompense of God." Εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν, "to your account." This is said in accommodation to the metaphor adopted just before.

18. ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα. Some Commentators, as Zanch, Grot., Schleus., and Heinrichs, take this to denote that he had received the whole sum remitted by Epaphroditus: so that it will be a kind of receipt or acknowledgment. But this seems not a little frigid; and very rarely does St. Paul, in his Epistles, advert to secular affairs. I see no reason to desert the interpretation of the antients, and most moderns, who regard ἀπέχω as put for ἔχω,* though a stronger term; q. d. as Rosenm. explains, "I have every thing; what I have received is sufficient for me; I desire no more." This sense, he rightly observes, is required by the words following περισσεύω and πεπληρώμαι, terms accumulated by the Apostle to show that he does not, by this giving of thanks, aim at drawing more from them.

18. καὶ περισσεύω πεπληρώμαι, i.e. simply, "I have enough and to spare, and want no more." Τα ἐπιγγητῶν subaud δῶματα. On the δόμῃ εἰσοδίας see the note on Eph. 5, 2. And on ὑσίαν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τ. Θ. see the note on Rom. 12, 1.

19. δὲ Ἐθος—'Ησσόω. The Future is here thought to be used for the Optative. Perhaps both senses may be conjoined. By πᾶσαν χρεῖαν is meant all

* Of which Wets. cites examples; as Arrian Epict. 3, 24. τὸ γὰρ εὐδαιμονοῦν ἀπέχειν δεῖ πάντα, καὶ θέλην πεπληρωμένη τινὶ εὑοκεῖαι. So Philem. 15. αἰῶνιν αὐτὸν ἀπέχει.
their necessity, spiritual and temporal. Of the phrase Wets. adduces many examples; as Thucydides 1, 70. ἢ δὲ ἄρα τοῦ καὶ τῆς σφαλίων, ἀντελλίσαντι ἀλλα, ἐπιλήφων ση τὴν χρείαν and Berachoth. fol. 16, and Hieros. Sicut dicitur homini, quando bos asinus ejus mortuus est: Deus impleat tibi defectuum. "Εν δὲ πλησίον may be taken either with πληγαῖον or with ἀνέμων. See Heinrichs.

19. κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον, "according to the abundance of power and omnipotence whereby, as Lord of heaven and earth, he can bestow what he will." "Εν Χριστῷ I. Rosenm. explains, per Christum Jesum, ut de norum omnium spiritualium, ita et vitæ æternae di torem et dispensatorem."

21. ἀδελφοί. Pierce thinks that from this distinction it is highly probable the ministers at Rome were called by the name of brethren.

22. μάλιστα δὲ οἱ εἰς τὴν Καίσαρος οἰκίας. Some think that by the οἱ εἰς τὴν Κ. οἰκίας are meant relations of Cæsar. (See Raphel.) But others, with more probability, suppose Cæsar's domestics and ministers, especially freed-men. See Joseph. Ant. 17, 5, 8. (cited by Krebs) and a passage of Philo cited by Loesner. The domus Cæsaris often occurs in the inscriptions, and the οἰκία Καίσαρος in the Greek Historians, as Dio Cass.