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INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OF THE PROVINCE OF GALATIA, AND OF THE TIME AND PLACE AT WHICH THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS WAS COMPOSED.

Galatia, or Gallogræcia,\textsuperscript{1} was a province of Asia Minor, bounded on the North by Paphlagonia, on the West by Phrygia, on the South by Lycasonia, and on the East by Pontus, and its most considerable cities were Pessinus, Tabium, Ancyra, and Gordium.

It took its name from the Gallic races of the Troomi, Tolistoboi, and Tectosages (Cæsar Bell. Gall. vi. 22), who first of all migrated to Greece, then were called in by Nicomedes of Bithynia to help him against his brother, and had the district named after them assigned them by Attalus for their residence. The leaders under whom they migrated are said to have been Leonorius and Lutarius (Lothar, Luther.) (See Memnon in Photii bibli. cod. 224; Polybius ii. 13; Livy xxxviii. 16; Pliny's Nat. Hist. v. 32, 42.)

Living among tribes all speaking Greek, these Gauls soon made the Greek language their own, yet St Jerome found that they, even in his time, had preserved their German tongue along with the former; "they spoke a dialect," says that Father in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, "like that spoken in the vicinity of Treves."\textsuperscript{2} In the year 188 a.c. Manlius conquered Ga-

\textsuperscript{1} See, as to the Geography and History of Galatia, the treatises of Hoffmann de Galatia antiquâ. Lips. 1726. Wernsdorf de republicâ Galatarum. Norimb. 1734. Schulze de Galatia. Francof. 1768. As to the Geography alone, see further Sickler's Ancient Geography, vol. ii. p. 375, ss., and Böttger's Beiträge, pt. 1st.

\textsuperscript{2} It may therefore be said that the Epistle to the Galatians is addressed to Germans, and it was the German Luther, who in this Apostolical Epistle again recognized and brought to light the substance of the Gospel.
latia (Livy xxxviii. 12), and Augustus made it a Roman province, A.C. 26. (Dio Cassius liii. 26.) As early as in the time of Augustus there resided many Jews in Galatia, to whom that Emperor granted a letter of protection, which has been preserved, under the name of "monumentum Ancyram," in a brazen inscription, which was let into the wall of the temple of Augustus at Ancyra. Now, in this province of Asia Minor, in which no doubt the Jews had early made many proselytes, the Gospel was disseminated by the apostle Paul in his second journey. (Acts xvi. 6.) But, very lately, the hypothesis has been set up, that it is not the inhabitants of Galatia proper who are to be taken for the Galatians to whom St Paul's Epistle was addressed, but those of Derbe and Lystra. That opinion was first maintained by Bishop Mynster of Copenhagen (in his smaller theological writings. Copenhagen, 1825, p. 58 E. ss.), by C. W. Niemeyer de tempore quo epistola ad Galatas conscripta sit, Haœ 1827, and by Dr Paulus of Heidelberg, in his exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, and afterwards within these few years learnedly and acutely defended, particularly by Ulrich in Stud. und Krit. for the year 1836, part 2, and Böttger in his Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Paulinischen Briefe, 1st and 3d parts. The hypothesis is not unimportant, so far as it affects the question of the date of the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians, as St Paul visited Lycaonia with the cities of Derbe and Lystra, before he arrived in Galatia proper. Accordingly, if the assumption that this Epistle was properly intended for Lycaonia, for the inhabitants of Derbe and Lystra, be correct, the composition of it can be put back to a period before the council of the apostles (Acts 15), which is not without weight for the explanation of the occurrences between St Paul and St Peter, Gal. ii. But Rückert, partly in his commentary on the Epistle of the Galatians, partly in an essay in his Magazine for the Exegesis and Theology of the New Testament, has so strikingly shown the unsatisfactoriness of that hypothesis, that we are at liberty to view it as completely refuted. The circumstances in favour of the notion that by the term αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ταλατίας (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 1), the churches of Lycaonia, and especially of Derbe and Lystra, are to be understood, are the following. According to the Roman division of provinces, all Asia Minor was divided into seven districts; Asia, in the more confined sense of the word, Phrygia, Bi-
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thyenia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, and Pontus. By this division the Roman province of Galatia certainly comprised Lycaonia also, along with Derbe and Lystra; but, according to Pliny at least (Hist. Nat. v. 27), only a part of Lycaonia, while another part of it seems to have belonged to Cilicia. (See Rückert, ubi supra, Magazine for Exegesis, p. 109, sq.). Consequently it is, no doubt, possible that St Paul used the word Galatia in the sense the Romans did in their division of Asia Minor into provinces, in which case a part of Lycaonia would have to be reckoned in. But this assumption is not probable, and for this reason; such originally arbitrary divisions into provinces, which, besides, very often changed among the Romans, are not usually so easily recognised in every-day language. Rückert justly remarks that even now-a-days districts, although they have been otherwise divided by their rulers, preserve their old names for centuries e.g., Alsace and the Breisgau. But in the Acts Lycaonia is always particularly specified (see Acts xiv. 6), which could not have happened if the Roman division into provinces had been followed, according to which no province of Lycaonia existed.1 If we consider, besides, how, in the passage Acts xvi. 6, in the report of St Paul’s journey from Cilicia to Macedon all through Asia Minor, the names of the provinces are placed, as the words are: δειλθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, it is clear that Galatia proper, and not Lycaonia, must be meant there. For, in order to go from Cilicia to Phrygia, one was forced to pass through Lycaonia; the words ought, therefore, to have been placed in an inverted order, thus: διὰ τὴν Γ. χώραν καὶ τὴν Φ. It may be added that Derbe and Lystra had already been particularly mentioned, xvi. 1. In Acts xviii. 32 we read, it is true, διερχόμενος τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, but those words admit of being so explained as to mean that St Paul, starting from Antioch, journeyed through Cilicia and Lycaonia (which are not named) first northwards to Galatia, then westwards to Phrygia.

The other circumstance which might seem to favour the exten-

1 The passage 2 Tim. iv. 10, is also against the assumption that in the New Testament Galatia is used in the sense of the Roman division of their provinces, for in it Galatia is put along with Dalmatia. But this latter was likewise a Roman province, being but a district in the province of the Roman or barbarian Illyria. (See Sickler’s auct. Geograph, part i. p. 461.)
sion of the meaning of the word Galatia is this. In the Acts copious details are given of the establishment of churches in Lycaonia. On the other hand, nothing is said of the labours of St Paul in Galatia; it is merely said, xvi. 6, xviii. 23, that St Paul had passed through Galatia. It may therefore seem more natural to allow the Epistle to the Galatians to have been directed to the well-known churches in Derbe and Lystra than to churches of whose origin and situation we know nothing at all in detail. But this argument is of no importance, for the Acts did not undertake to give accurate information as to what parts of the Roman empire St Paul founded churches in. Again, there is nowhere given any account of his journey to Crete, much less of the establishment of churches in that island. Therefore no conclusion can be drawn merely from the silence of the Acts as to the foundation of the Galatian churches. But, beyond that, there is, in Acts xvi. 6, an indirect allusion to St Paul’s activity in teaching in Galatia. For, as it is only said of Asia that it was forbidden the apostle by the Holy Ghost to preach the word there, St Luke seems to have meant that St Paul had laboured in Phrygia and Galatia. We agree, therefore, with Rückert in finding no satisfactory reason for giving up Galatia proper, and consequently imagine the churches to which St Paul wrote to have been most probably in the above-named chief towns of Galatia, as the apostles were always in the habit of choosing those as the scenes of their labours.

Passing from this subject to the investigation of the time and place of the composition of this Epistle, we find the greatest variety in the views of the learned on this point. It is true that several of them run into such extremes that we may at once exclude them from consideration, without subjecting them to a closer investigation. To that class belongs the opinion of Köhler and Schrader (of which we have already spoken in our general Introduction to St Paul’s Epistles, § 8), according to which the date of the Epistle to the Galatians is fixed at the very latest period of St Paul’s life, his second captivity at Rome. The arguments for this assumption (as, e.g., that in Gal. vi. 17 sufferings are mentioned which caused St Paul to expect death when he wrote to the Galatians) are so weak that they need no further refutation than they received above (ubi supra.)

The postscript ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης also refers the Epistle to the
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Galatians to the latter part of St Paul's life, but still not exactly to the second Roman captivity. Besides, it is certainly generally admitted that the subscriptions are the work of later, often of grossly ignorant, copiers. Equally to be rejected with this view, which refers our Epistle to too late a time, is another attributing it to too early a date. Marcion assumed that it was the earliest of all St Paul's Epistles. In later times Koppe and Keil, and, last of all, Böttger (ubi suprà), and Ulrich (Stud. 1836, part 2), favour the assumption that St Paul had written the Epistle to the Galatians the earliest of all. To make that probable, the above refuted hypothesis was used, viz. that the name Galatia in St Paul's Epistle included a part of Lycaonia; according to that one might fix the date of the establishment of the Galatian churches as early as the time alluded to in Acts xiv. 6, where stress is laid on the expression περίχωρος, which, however, cannot be referred to Lycaonia, but only to the cities of Derbe and Lystra; or else, in relation to Acts xi. 25, a journey of St Paul from Tarsus in Cilicia into the regions of Lycaonia and Galatia was quite arbitrarily assumed. This assumption could only be excused if there were in the Epistle itself evident signs of its having been composed so early as 51 A.D., to which year the latest defenders of that view refer it. But none such are found, and what are brought forward as such are quite untenable, as Rückert (in the Mag., P. 110, ss.) has well proved. For if it be said the passage Gal. ii. 13 presupposes that the Galatians knew Barnabas, and, as he, Barnabas, did not accompany the apostle on his second journey, there must have been an earlier journey, in which Barnabas did accompany him into Galatia,—it is quite clear that the acquaintance with Barnabas need not have been a personal one, and, even if one chose to assume that it was so, why Barnabas might have gone into Galatia by himself at a time to us unknown. Further, it is inferred from Acts xv. 30, where the confirming the brethren is given as the object of the second journey, that St Paul must have been in Galatia before, otherwise it could not be said he would confirm the brethren there. But the confirming the brethren in the faith did not exclude the further extension of the Gospel in regions where it had not yet been preached. Why, on this very journey St Paul came first to Macedonia, where, however, it is certain there were then no churches which he could confirm. It is therefore most
probable, as most of the modern critics admit, that St Paul wrote
our Epistle about a.d. 57 or 58, and, it may be presumed, from
Ephesus, while on his third missionary journey, shortly after his
second sojourn in Galatia (Gal i. 6, iv. 13), during which he had
already found existing the germs of those errors which he reproves.
For earlier the composition of the Epistle cannot be fixed, as
Gal. iv. 13 presupposes that St Paul had been twice with the Ga-
latians (see the exposition of that passage, whence it is evident
that it cannot be understood in any other way); later we cannot
put it, as the Epistle gives the impression of having been written
under the influence of a very near and immediate inspection of the
condition of the Galatian churches. That impression prevents me
from agreeing in Stein’s notion, according to which (Röhr’s Maga-
zin für Prediger. B. x., St. 1) the Epistle was not written from
Ephesus, but only later from Corinth, or even not until after his
departure from Corinth through Macedonia to Jerusalem, so that
the date of its composition would fall in the year 58 or the begin-
ning of 59. a.d. Rückert (on Gal. i. 9, iv. 12, ss. v. 3—21) has
clearly shown that the apostle, when he was in Galatia for the se-
cond time, found the germs of the corruptions there even then in
existence. It is therefore improbable that he should let much
time elapse before the writing of the Epistle, and on that ground
it is to be presumed that the composition took place during the
apostle’s sojourn at Ephesus, which lasted more than two years.
(Acts xix. 10.) The only circumstance which can excite any
doubt as to this view, otherwise perfectly satisfactory, is that which
has been put forward, especially by Ulrich, ubi supra, viz., that no
mention at all is made of the council of apostles and of its resolu-
tions (Acts xv.), where one would expect it. (Gal. ii.) This
gives rise to the wish to place the composition of the Epistle,
if possible, before the council, by which means the advantage would
be at the same time gained of being enabled more easily to inter-
pret St Peter’s behaviour. But difficulties and the removal of them
can be no arguments, per se, for giving currency, in purely his-
torical enquiries, to any other opinions than those which the
arguments before us safely warrant; least of all, when those op-
inions can be established only by such violent means as the change
of the number in Gal. ii. 1, which becomes requisite in the present
question. For the fourteen years mentioned there bring us neces-
sarily to the time after the meeting of the apostles, count them as you will; and the number itself is too firmly established on grounds of sound criticism to admit of any well-founded suspicion. However, what may be said, if not to the complete solution, at least to the smoothing down, of these difficulties, will be given in the exposition of chap. ii.

§ 2. OF THE OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

We have already, in the Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (see the remarks on x. 1, ss., xv. 1, ss., xxii. 17, ss.), considered the relation of the law of Moses to the power of the Gospel, which was continually making itself more and more felt, and we especially drew attention to the fact, that with respect to it various opinions developed themselves in the apostolical church. The most contracted view was that represented by the quondam strict Pharisees: they demanded that the observance of the Law by the Jewish Christians not only might be kept up as a pious custom, but must be adhered to, saying that the Law was intended by God as an eternal ordinance, and salvation was annexed to its outward fulfilment. All the apostles rejected this view at their meeting (Acts xv.), and required of the Gentiles entering the church of Christ only the observance of the commandments given to Noah; and even that not as means of salvation, but merely out of tenderness towards the Jews converted to Christianity, who could with difficulty wean themselves from certain observances, e.g. the prohibition to partake of blood, or of any animal killed by strangling. All the Jewish Christians, who stood upon the stricter requirements in regard to the observance of the Law even after those resolutions of the apostles, now entered more and more into opposition to the truth, and saw themselves at length forced to assume quite a sectarian form. A milder view of the Law was propounded by those who maintained that, with respect to those born Gentiles, the resolutions of the

1 The view of Baur, that there was a faction which had everywhere wanted to forbid Gentiles being received into the Christian Church, even if they took upon them the complete fulfilment of the law along with circumcision, entirely contradicts the testimonies of history. (See the details on that point in my Essay in the Stud. for 1838, pt. 4, p. 333.)
apostles ought to meet with attention, but that those born Jews would do well to continue to observe the Law, as the pious custom of their fathers, but without looking on that observance as a necessary means of salvation. This view was defended by Bishop James of Jerusalem, in particular, and probably most of the apostles professed it. Perhaps those that maintained this view considered, though it might be only vaguely, that the Jewish Christians were called to form a peculiar, and rather more elevated, circle in the church itself, which circle was surrounded by the more extensive one of the Gentile Christians, standing at a greater distance from the centre, who might be compared to the proselytes of the Gate. The most liberal view, lastly, was that made current by St Paul. He very rightly perceived in the Gospel the tendency to abrogate generally the Law in its outward forms, so that not only was the burden of the Law not to be laid on the Gentile Christians, but even Jewish Christians must be freed from it. With this conviction, however, St Paul in his wisdom kept aloof from the extreme to which Marcion went: he by no means tried to snatch in a violent manner the Law from the Jewish Christians as soon as possible, as if it were a sin to observe it as the pious custom of their fathers, but left the task of liberating the Jewish converts from it to the natural development of Christianity. But with regard to his own conduct he went to work in the following way. When he lived among the Gentiles, he abstained from the observance of the Law, and lived freely, as they were wont to do; among Jews, on the contrary, he kept the Law, that he might not give them offence. (See 1 Cor. ix. 20, 21.) Now, certain as it is that this free posture of mind in the apostle himself was absolutely the right one, yet it is easily to be understood how this conduct of his might be misinterpreted by the one-sided factions among whom he moved. As the Jewish Christians, who followed him, also acted in a similar manner, the Judaizing Christians maintained that he taught apostacy from the Law, and made the Jews themselves apostates, which was however in no-wise the fact, as St Paul carefully avoided everything that might directly operate to the abrogation of the law of Moses among the Jews. On the other hand, St Paul went too slowly to work for those Gentile Christians who were disposed to violent measures, and who afterwards were represented by the Marcionites: they would gladly have seen the observance of the Law forbidden as a
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sin, as indeed the church of Rome in later times touched upon such an extreme, when it forbade the observance of the Sabbath. St Paul therefore held with admirable wisdom the middle course between Gentile license and enmity to the Jews, and Jewish obstinacy and enmity to the Gentiles, and thus preserved the Church in the first great danger which grew up against her out of her own principles. ¹

Now it is the Epistle to the Galatians which affords us the opportunity of seeing how St Paul defends his principles against one party, the stiff Judaizers. That party had sent out its emissaries to the communities of Galatia, and had not only led the believers in that country into uncertainty as to the way of salvation preached to them by St Paul, by requiring of them circumcision and the complete observance of the Law, as necessary to salvation; but also excited suspicion as to the apostolical character of St Paul altogether. (See i. 1, 6, 7. iv. 17. v. 10. vi. 12, 13.) The influence of those men was the more dangerous the more plausible they could make their assertions. As the Old Testament was received as an inspired volume by the Christian church also, it could not but be easy for them to show by a literal interpretation, that the Law must be kept to the end of the world. The practice of St James and of other apostles, as also that of the church in Jerusalem, apparently coincided with that view, and the scarce-converted Galatians were naturally unable to perceive directly the more subtle difference between the apostolical doctrine and that of the bigoted Jewish Christians. Against St Paul himself they could with a show of probability bring the charge, that he did not rightly know what Christ had really taught; for he had never lived in His company, and had not, until Christ's death, received the Gospel from others. St Paul, therefore, could not avoid declaring himself openly against these Judaists, and putting the Christians of Galatia in possession of the right point of view for judging of their intrigues. And the apostle

¹ According to Gal. vi. 12, 13. it certainly seems as if the Judaists, who were so active in Galatia, were proselytes, who did not even keep the Law themselves, but only wanted to make the chiefs of the Judaists favourably inclined towards them by means of their zeal for the Law. However, that passage is surely more correctly understood, if one assumes that St Paul here rebukes the hypocrisy in which the Jewish Christians laid on others what they themselves did not touch with one of their fingers. (Matt. xxii. 4.) But at all events the passage shows that the Judaists in Galatia were dependents.
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carries out that purpose, in a masterly manner, in this our Epistle. It is therefore self-evident that this Epistle could only have been written, in the first place, to born Gentiles, who can at most be considered as proselytes of the Gate. Righteous proselytes (see Jahn's Antiquities), or even born Jews, may only be reckoned among the first readers, in so far as they had entirely abandoned the observance of the Law (which, however, will certainly have been the case with but very few), or at least laid no stress upon it for the attainment of salvation. The subject of the Epistle to the Galatians is, therefore, closely connected with that of the Epistle to the Romans, but the two works differ in the essence of their contents, viz., the setting forth the relation between the Law and the Gospel, in this way: the Epistle to the Romans sets it forth quite objectively, without any regard to the Judaizing false teachers, the Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, quite polemically with regard to that dangerous party; both Epistles are, therefore, complements to one another, and by their conjunction give the first complete picture of St Paul's system of doctrine. But, as has already been remarked on the Epistle to the Romans (Introd. sec. 5), the Epistle to the Galatians also has naturally its perpetual significance, since, even at this day, the very same things, which St Paul in this Epistle says against the obstinate adherence to the Jewish law, apply to the Catholic ceremonial and the Rationalistic system of morality, and their relation to the Gospel. The law in all imaginable forms, whether coarser or finer, is addressing itself continually with its demands to man, and his own unassisted power, whose weakness is unable to satisfy those forms; it can never, therefore, make saints of honest men, though it may sinners; of dishonest, or blind ones, it will make either hypocrites or presumptuous fools. Now, the operation of the Gospel is specifically different, for that demands nothing, but only gives and beseeches those to whom it is preached to receive with faith the gift of forgiveness of sins and of the new birth. These two spheres of existence, viz., of the Law and of faith, the Church must never allow to be mingled, and all attempts of that sort to mingle them will ever shatter themselves on the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, as it were on indestructible bulwarks.

1 Details on this point will be found in the above cited Dissertation. Stud. 1838, part 4.
§ 3. THE TRAIN OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Galatians (the authenticity of which has never been doubted, on account of its being thoroughly impressed with the spirit of St Paul, and the original composition of which in Greek has only been impugned by the well-known, but quite untenable, hypothesis of Bolten and Bertholdt, that all the writings of the New Testament were originally written in the Aramaic tongue,) naturally divides itself into three parts. The first part (chaps. i. and ii.) contains the relation of the history of St Paul. The second part (chap. iii. 1 to chap. v. 12) comprises an exposition of his doctrine. And the third and final one embraces practical observations (chap. v. 13 to chap. vi. 18.). The first part again may be subdivided into four paragraphs, of which the first contains the greeting (chap. i. 1—5); the second reproves the vacillation of the Galatians, and informs them how the apostle, without any teaching or vocation of men, had been set by the Lord Himself in the apostolical office; and from a persecutor of the Church had become her servant: it also touches upon his first travels, which show that he, in the first years after his conversion, was very little in company with the apostles (chap. i. 6—24.). Afterwards in the third paragraph, the apostle relates his important journey to Jerusalem, to the Council of the Apostles, and shows how he there had occasion to maintain his principles in controversy with the Jewish Christians, and how he and the chief apostles came to a friendly arrangement, to the purport that he should labour among the Gentiles, and they among the Jews; only that he should not forget the poor in Jerusalem (chap. ii. 1—10.).

Immediately on this follows, in the fourth paragraph, the remarkable account of what took place between him, Peter, and Barnabas, in Antioch; by which St Paul makes his readers observe, that he had dared, freely and openly, to avow his principles; yea, even to reprehend St Peter himself, on account of his wavering with regard to the connection of the Law with the Gospel; and that he therefore stood completely on a level with the Twelve in apostolical dignity. At the same time St Paul announces the theme of his Epistle, viz. that in the Gospel man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by faith in Christ; that therefore the Law
could not under the dominion of grace be again set up, without destroying the spirit of the Gospel; and that the Christian was, through the Law, dead to the Law, and had, as such, to live in the faith of the Son of God (chap. ii. 11—21.). In the second part St Paul appeals, first of all, in the fifth paragraph, to the experience of the Galatians; and calls upon them to confess how they had received the Holy Spirit, not through the Law, but purely through the preaching of the Gospel. They should not, therefore, on any account, forget, that the Scripture already ascribed righteousness to all men who through faith are Abraham's children. The Law, as such, could only work the curse, because it required absolute fulfilment, but Christ had redeemed us from the curse of the Law, to the end that we might receive, through faith, the promise of the Holy Spirit (chap. iii. 1—14.). In the sixth paragraph St Paul further illustrates the relation between the Law and the Gospel by the metaphor of a man's testament. As a human testament cannot be annulled, much less can the promise of God, which was given to Abraham and his seed. The Law coming in between the promise and the fulfilment, cannot therefore destroy the latter, but can only be intended to have the effect of preparing for it. It is a schoolmaster unto Christ, in whom the opposition between the divine and the human, which is still prominent in the Law, through the union of both, seems to be adjusted. Therefore all that was separate, as well Jew as Christian, is in Christ combined into a higher unity, in which state also the true adoption; and, with it, the freedom of the adult, is alone given. (Chap. iii. 15 to chap. iv. 7.).

Annexed to that, in the seventh paragraph, is the exhortation, not to sink down again from the higher spiritual footing they had attained, to the lower one and its weak observances. St Paul begs the Galatians to remember the time of their first love, in which they had given themselves entirely to him. Now, he must, as it were, bring them forth for the second time, in order that Christ might be formed in them. If they would but rightly understand that Law, to which they had addicted themselves, they would find his doctrine in it; that Sarah, Abraham's lawful wife, represents, with her son Isaac, the Church of the New Testament, which is the free one; Hagar, on the other hand, with her son Ishmael, the Law; now the latter must be thrust out in order that the former
may reign alone. Accordingly, they should not surely let themselves be deprived of the freedom with which Christ had made them free. (Chap. iv. 8 to chap. v. 1.). Finally, in the eighth paragraph, St Paul warns his readers not to allow themselves to be circumcised, as they would by that means return to the Old Testament footing. That in Christ neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, nor any thing else external, only faith, which worketh by love (chap. v. 2—12.).

In the third part, St Paul adds to the exhortation, to maintain their freedom, the further admonition, not to abuse this freedom. He begs his Galatians, in the 9th paragraph, to walk in the Spirit, and not to fulfil the lusts of the flesh. The walking, however, in the Spirit, must bring forth the fruits of the Holy Ghost, and crucify the flesh with its appetites. This principle the apostle applies to the special circumstances which just then existed among the Galatians (chap. v. 13. to chap. vi. 10.)

Finally, in the 10th paragraph, St Paul repeats, in short sentences, the lessons given in his Epistle, and then winds up with the entreaty not to lay up fresh troubles for him, the much-tried servant of God, and with his Christian benediction. (Chap. vi. 11—18.)

§ 4. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE.

Among the Fathers, St Chrysostom, Theodoret, Æcumenius, and Theophylact, have written on the Epistle to the Galatians, though the genius of the Easterns was far less adapted rightly to explain this Epistle than that of the Westerns. Among the latter, Pelagius is still mastered by the genius of Orientalism. St Jerome less so; but above all, St Augustine has left us in his Expositio Epistolæ ad Galatas a work, which, by the side of Calvin’s and Luther’s explanations of that Epistle, is still, with regard to the principal contents, namely, its communications as to the connection between the Law and the Gospel, uncommonly instructive and suggestive.

We have of Luther two works on our Epistle, a shorter one (Wittenberg, 1519), and a longer one (sod. loco, 1585). In him the polemical spirit against the church of Rome is, as we might expect, decidedly paramount, as likewise in the works of Bullinger (Zurich.
1549), Beza (Cambridge, 1642), Brenz (Tübingen, 1688), upon our Epistle.

In later times, this Epistle was commented on by Sebastian Schmid (Kiel, 1690), J. D. Michaelis (Goettingen, 1769), Zachariae (Goettingen, 1770), Koppe in his Commentary on the New Testament, (1st ed. Goettingen 1778, 3d edn., edited by Tychsen, Goettingen, 1823.) Semler Periphrasis epist. ad Gal. (Halle, 1779), Morus acroses in epist. ad Galatas edid., Eichstädt (Lips., 1795), Krause (Frankfort, 1788), Schilling (Lips., 1792), J. B. Carpzov (Helmstädt, 1794), Hensler (Leipzig, 1805), Borger (interpretatio epist. ad Galatas. Lugd. Bat., 1807), Winer (1st edn., 1821, 3rd edn., 1829), Flatt (Tübingen, 1828), Paulus (Heidelberg, 1831), Rückert (Leipzig, 1833), Usteri (Zurich, 1833), Matthies (Greifswald, 1833), Schott (Leipzig, 1834), Zschocke, illustrative paraphrase (Halle, 1834.) Further, the reader may compare Hermann's Essay on the three first chapters of our Epistle, in connection with Lücke's Review (in Ullmann's and Umbröit's Stud., for 1833, part 2), and the observations on it by Rückert and Usteri, in their commentaries on our Epistle. Also Fritzsch's Comment. de nonnullis Pauli ad Galatas epistolae locis. Rostochii, 1834, 4., which are included in opuscula Fritzschiorum, pag. 143, sqq.
EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

I.

PART FIRST.

(i. 1—ii. 21.)

§ 1. THE GREETING.

(i. 1—5.)

The very beginning of the Epistle to the Galatians introduces us to the peculiar state of things which prevailed in their churches, and which, as we saw in our introduction, caused the apostle to compose it. The Judaizing false teachers had impugned St Paul's apostolical authority, and represented him as subordinate to the twelve. This might really be done with a show of justice, as St Paul had not lived in the society of the Lord during His sojourn on earth, and stood alone beside the strictly defined body of the twelve. Therefore it was the more necessary to make the attempt completely to refute this assertion of his opponents which impaired his efficiency. He calls himself therefore here at the very beginning of the Epistle: ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἄπτ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κ. τ. λ., and shows in detail

1 1 Cor. xv, 9., where St Paul, under the influence of the painful feeling of his former estrangement from God, writes: οὐκ εἰμι ἵκων ζωῆς ἀπόστολος, διότι ἔλημεν τίνι ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, but also adds: χάριν τι δί Θεοῦ, εἰμι δὲ εἰμι, forms a remarkable parallel to this. In the Epistle to the Corinthians, St Paul attributes to himself only personal worthiness, which, however, did not prevent God from choosing him for the office of apostle.
in the first chapter, how he was just as independently called by the Lord as the twelve were, only for another purpose, namely, for the preaching among the Gentiles, while to the former the Jews were commended. (Chap. i. 15, 16. ii. 9, 10.) The name ἀπόστολος was, in the apostolical age, used not only of the twelve, but also of such teachers as were sent out by churches, or by single persons, as messengers; it only forms an antithesis with those teachers who did not travel about, who were permanently attached to a church, and, so far, is of similar meaning with the name εὐαγγελιστής. (Cf. Acts xiv. 4—14; Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. iv. 6—9, xii. 28, 29.) Such a human authorization of his apostolical call St Paul emphatically denies; he says he received his office neither from men, nor through any specially distinguished man. By men the false apostles, the blind leaders, are called; every genuine call to the office of teacher in the Church proceeds, even yet, from the Lord, but in most cases by far this divine call takes place through the medium of a man, as, e.g., Timothy, Titus, and other excellent teachers, were called by the Lord through St Paul. But this too St Paul denies of himself; as the twelve were, so he too was called both by and through the Lord, without any human intervention. Ἀπόστολος denotes the source, the origin, of the call, διὰ the intermediate agent, through which it is bestowed on the person chosen. Παρὰ might also have stood instead of ἀπόστολος [cf. i. 12], or ἀπόστολος; παρὰ, as also ἐρμῆς, are even used of persons in preference to ἀπόστολος, and that too where they are thought of as immediately acting of themselves. [Cf. Bernhardt's Syntax, page 255; Winier's Gram. pp. 349 and 354.] This difference, however, between ἀπόστολος and παρὰ is not always observed in the New Testament, as is directly shown in verse 3 by the formula of greeting, χάριν καὶ εἰρήνην ἀπόστολος, in which, however, God and Christ are undoubtedly to be considered as immediately acting of themselves. In the following words St Paul apparently pictured to himself the relation in such a way that he meant to write διὰ Χριστοῦ and ἀπόστολος Θεοῦ, and put διὰ alone for the sake of shortness; for we find that the prepositions are usually so distinguished in reference to the Father and the Son. [Cf. the remarks on Rom. xi. 36.] Now Christ, as the Son of God, in conjunction with the Father, is put in opposition to every thing human, in which sentence there is contained an indirect proof of the divine nature of Christ. But, as the name of the Lord was in full Ὑποστολός
Galatians i. 2—5.

ὁ Χριστὸς, and that of the Father Ὁ Ἐστὸς ὁ Πατὴρ, the omission of the articles (cf. ver. 3) is to be explained by the fusion of two ideas into one. Ὁ Ἐστὸς Πατὴρ, without article or genitive, is found also Phil. i. 3, ii. 10; 1 Peter i. 2; Ephes. vi. 23; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 14. Winer (Gram. p. 115) has not discriminated from the above passages those in which the genitive is added. The New Testament does not contain the formulas Ὁ Ἐστὸς νῦν, Ὁ Ἐστὸς πνεῦμα, which came later into use. The reference to the resurrection of Christ is meant to exalt God’s almighty power, of which St Paul’s conversion is a shining proof. Matthias wishes to refer, but less appropriately, this addition to the exalted position of Christ, because there was no particular occasion to magnify exactly that. (As to the ἐγείρειν ἐκ νεκρῶν see the Comm., vol. 1, on Matt. xxii. 29, 30.)

Ver. 2. That St Paul does not, as often happens elsewhere, mention particular names with his own, but adds the phrase οἱ σὺν ἐμοί πάντες δῆλοι, is certainly for the reason which has already been pointed out by St Jerome, Luther, and others, viz. that St Paul wishes to give the Galatians the impression that he had a large community on his side. One need not therefore take δῆλοι to mean merely apostolical fellow-labourers, though one must naturally think of them first. The plural εκκλησίαι shows that St Paul’s Epistle is to be viewed as an encyclical missive, which was addressed to the different churches in Galatia which had probably sprung up in those larger cities of the province which are named in the Introduction. The omission of all laudatory epithets is to be ascribed to the displeasure that St Paul felt against the Galatian community.

Vers. 3—5. In the well-known salutation (cf. on Rom. i. 7) St Paul then wishes his readers grace and peace, whereof they who were in danger of falling back under the Law and into the disquiet which the Law brings with it, were above all things in need. Those gifts proceed from God as the source of all good, and are through Christ bestowed on man. As in verse 1 ἀπὸ was wanting before God, so here διά is left out before the Son, merely for the sake of brevity. St Paul designates the work of the Redeemer as just that which was the urgent need of the Galatians. Their new sin of wavering and unbelief must be forgiven them through Christ, and they completely separated from the wicked world through whose influence
they had just been led astray. (Cf. on the vicarious satisfaction of Christ the remarks on Rom. iii. 25.—Περὶ is to be preferred to the ὑπὲρ of the Text rec. A.D.E.F.G. and other inferior critical authorities have it; Lachmann has also received it into the text. Surely ὑπὲρ was put instead of περὶ, in order to choose the more usual word. It besides points out the vicarious office more clearly than the more general word περὶ, which, it is to be added, is found also Rom. viii. 3, and often elsewhere. [Cf. in Comm. vol. 1 on Matt. xx. 28.] The Son of God’s giving himself up to death 

• [Ephes. v. 11; Titus ii. 14] was, we may add, not extorted or commanded by the will of the Father, but was a voluntary act of his own [John x. 18], yet one answering to the will of God, and therefore κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.—God is here called expressly πατὴρ ἡμῶν, inasmuch as he revealed himself as the Father of mankind in the mission of Christ as creating them anew in regeneration. Therefore also to Him belongs ultimately all the glory of the creation as of the redemption. (Cf. on the doxology at Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 31.) The phrase ἔξαρεῖσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰώνος ποιηροῦ for denoting the object of Christ’s work is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. The ἔξαρεῖσθαι [Acts vii. 10, xii. 11, xxiii. 27] = σώζειν, to withdraw from the influence of a destructive element. The meaning of the formula is therefore perfectly = σώζειν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτου. The ἐνεστῶς answers to the ὁστος [Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26], whilst ποιηρος is to be taken only exegetically. [Cf. on αἰών ὁστος in Comm. vol. 1 on Matt. xii. 32.] Whilst, therefore, the δόναι ἑαυτὸν refers to the reconciliation, the ἔξαρεῖσθαι refers to the redemption of those reconciled.)

§ 2. THE CALLING OF ST PAUL.

(i. 6—24.)

Without the least expression of love or sympathy, St Paul lets his excited feelings burst forth at once, and expresses his indignant wonder at the falling away of the Galatians. No doubt Rückert is

1 The active form ἔξαρεῖν is found Matt. v. 29, xviii. 9. The middle form means also in the New Testament the same as σκλαβίζω, Acts xxvi. 17.
completely right when he concludes from that that St Paul during his last visit must have already spoken to them of their backsliding, for, had nothing of the sort taken place, he would certainly, as is done in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, before rebuking them, have told them how he came into possession of the accounts of them. The οὕτω ταχέως, however, need by no means be referred to St Paul's last visit; it may rather be very aptly referred to their conversion, which ought to win over the man to the Christian element permanently. He therefore is still changed very quickly who relapses, even if after the course of several years. (Μετατίθεσθαι is "to change an opinion and tendency of mind," when the direction of the change is pointed out by εἰς. The present tense denotes the action as still continuing, as it were, only just arriving at completion. By that means the hope is excited of being able to stop the as yet incompleted action. The comparison of the word with ἔν, and an assumption of an allusion to the name Γάλατας, which St Jerome thinks is to be found here, is to be rejected as trifling.—The καλέσας is, of course, God only, not St Paul; the apostle certainly wished to convert no one to himself. The medium of the call is the χάρις Χριστοῦ; therefore ἐν = διὰ, or stands for the dative only, without, however, exactly taking ἐν for the mark of the dative. [Cf. Winer's Gram., p. 195.]

Ver. 7. The δ οὐκ ἐστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. is not without difficulty. The reference of δ to ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον is clearly quite unsuitable, as the idea: "which, however, is no other," would represent the guilt of the opponents as less, whereas St Paul is in the act of depicting it as very gross. The reference of δ to εὐαγγέλιον alone, in the sense: "which can, and must be, no other than it is," i. e. which one must not change arbitrarily, would require ἕτερον instead of ἄλλο, not to mention that it seems harsh, to separate εὐαγγέλιον from ἕτερον, and that the following εἰ μὴ does not suit then; for it is inadmissible to take it as = sed or attamen, for it only means nisi. (Cf. Winer's Gram. page 452. ss. Hartung's Partikellehre, vol. ii. page 118, ss.). The connecting εἰ μὴ, however, with θαυμάζω, which Schott has proposed, would

1 The omission of Χριστοῦ, in accordance with F.G. and several, especially Latin, Fathers, would not be advisable. The coupling of this genitive with καλεσάς is, however, clearly forbidden by the intervening ἐν χάρις, as also by the fact that St Paul never refers the κλῆσις to Christ, but always to the Father.
be totally unallowable, because of the indicative, which cannot possibly mean: "I should wonder at your early apostacy, if I had not known that you were led astray." Besides, according to this interpretation, the difficulty of the δ̄ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλο, which, according to it, must be enclosed in brackets, remains. Therefore the interpretation defended by Grotius, Winer, Rückert, alone recommends itself to us, according to which δ̄ is referred to all that has preceded, and the words δ̄ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἄλλο, εἰ μὴ κ. τ. λ. are strictly connected in the sense: "which (your apostacy) is nothing else, or consists in nothing else, than that you have allowed yourselves to be led astray." By this addition, then, it is St Paul's intention to soften the guilt of the Galatians, and to point to their false teachers as the real culprits. (The article stands before the participle quite according to rule (as in the phrase εἰσθαν ὦ τε λεγοντες), since the action is considered as one, which belongs only to definite persons, or by which the persons themselves are defined. [Cf. Matthiae's Gram. vol. ii. page 552.]) Winer's interpretation, as if the meaning were: εἰςιν ταράσσοντες οὐμᾶς καὶ ὤντοι εἰσίν ὰλχγοι, introduces a thought into the meaning which is not contained in the words.—Ταράσσειν = σαλεύειν, 2 Thess. ii. 2. "To effect a change in one's settled principles of faith, and that by open violent attacks, not by secret and artful insinuations." As to the antagonists here pointed out, see further details at v. 10—12, and vi. 12, 13.—On μεταστρέφειν, cf. Acts ii. 20; James iv. 9. Θέλοντες has the stress on it, as it stands in opposition to the unpremeditated μεταστρέφειν, which took place among the Galatians, who knew not what they did, when they followed those false teachers.)

Ver. 8. St Paul describes the Gospel as placed so completely above all subjectivity, that no created being can change its divine nature; not even St Paul (καὶ ἔδω ἡμεῖς), not even an angel. In the case of St Paul, apostacy was certainly imaginable, but not in the case of a god ἅ άγαλ; therefore one might suppose evil angels meant, unless the ἐξ οὐρανῶν were against it. It is most simple therefore to say, that St Paul, as in Rom. ix. 3, adduces an impossibility in order to express in the highest degree the inadmissibility of changing arbitrarily the gift of God. (In the παρ δ̄ the meaning of newness is clearly the nearest; those Judaists quite destroyed the nature of the Gospel, they made a new law out of it.
—Ἀνάθεμα, originally = ἀνάθημα, something devoted to the Gods, hung up in the temple. The latter form became later specially applied to this conception alone [Luke xxii. 5], and ἀνάθεμα acquired the meaning of laden with a curse, which all ancient nations considered and treated as devoted to the infernal gods, also as ἐπισκύρως sacer. In the formula ἀνάθεμα ἐστώ we must, therefore, not think of ecclesiastical excommunication simply, but that is only so far meant, as it presupposes divine reprobation. Accordingly ἀνάθεμα = ἐπισκύρως. Cf. on Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22.

Ver. 9. As a mere repetition of what has just been said, the προειρήκαμεν and the ἰδρύς is clearly too strong; the words can only be explained on the assumption of a previous expression of St Paul’s opinion on this subject during his first visit to the Galatians. Whereas therefore in verse 8 the καὶ ἐὰν represented the matter quite hypothetically, the εἰ applies the remark to the actual case.

Ver. 10. The connection of verse 10 with the preceding is not quite clear. One would have expected, after verses 8 and 9, and the strong asseverations that whoever preached otherwise than he did was accursed,—something like the following: “for what I teach is undoubtedly God’s word,” or: “I know for certain that this alone is the truth.”

Instead of that, St Paul states he seeks to please God and not man; but, if one takes this idea at its root, one recognizes that it contains exactly those ideas which, according to the context, one has a right to expect. For the very dictum, that he wishes to please God entirely, and not man, that he is entirely the servant of Christ, who is more than all men are, this very maxim is the pledge for his living union with God, and also for his illumination from above, which exalts his doctrines far above a mere subjective opinion. He gains, at the same time, by this turn of thought, the advantage of putting aside a reproach that the Judaists made him, and of retorting it on them. They upbraided him on account of his accommodating spirit, that he became to the Gentiles a Gentile, to the Jews a Jew, as if the grasping at human approbation was

1 Rückert’s supplement, “wonder not at this harsh speech. I can, in accordance with my divine call, say no otherwise,” is clearly too harsh.
the cause of it. The fact was exactly the reverse; this no doubt was the case with those Judaistic false teachers, who sought by the great number of their conversions to gain fame, without caring about the means by which they effected them. (Cf. Gal. vi. 13.) The ἀπρέσκω, like the following ἑρε, can only be referred to the time since St Paul's conversion; with that event the old man, which in him too brought with it the desire of pleasing men, was in him forthwith so thrust back, that the holy fire from the divine altar alone glowed in him, and dissipated all other love. (Πειθω ἀνθρώποις, Θεον cannot, as Luther and Michaelis wanted, be taken: res humanas, res divinas, suadeo, nor can κατά be supplied; it is here rather equal to placare, tranquillum reddere, as it certainly means at 1 John iii 9; Homer Il. a. 100; Eurip. Hipp. 1060. It is here = to ἀπρέσκευ, which follows.)

Vers. 11, 14. St Paul now endeavours, from here to chap. ii. 10, to trace historically this his immediate relation to God through Christ. He needed not to make any mention here of the great fact of the manifestation of the Lord, through which his conversion was effected, because he knew that this was sufficiently known to the Galatians; though he points in verses 15, 16, to that event.

His only concern was to make it clear how he had in nowise been instructed by the apostles, and become therefore spiritually dependent upon them, so that their authority was above his own. It might be said St Paul was baptized, though by the Christians in Damascus, we may suppose by Ananias (Acts ix. 18); indeed, according to the parallel passage (Acts xxii. 10), the Lord commanded him to go to Damascus, there to learn what he was to be commissioned to do. He seems therefore not to have received the Holy Ghost immediately on Christ's manifestation, but only on Ananias laying hands on him, "when there fell from his eyes as it were scales" (both bodily and spiritually), and at his baptism. But that very point, that St Paul did not receive the Holy Ghost from an apostle through the laying on of hands, but independently of them, whereas in other cases (according to Acts viii.) the apostles alone could impart the Holy Ghost—sets him free from them and their authority, and on a par with the body of the apostles. Added to this, St Paul, besides the first appearance at Damascus, saw the Lord repeatedly (cf. on Acts xxii. 17, xxiii. 11), and remained, as it were, in continued intercourse with Him, and received instructions
from Him direct, 1 Cor. 11, 23. St Paul therefore could with
perfect justice boast of the Gospel which he preached, as a something
entrusted to him immediately by God, without any human inter-
vention. (Ver. 11, γυμοσκεω is used by profane writers as = γενώσκω;
by the LXX. as = "to show or make known," [cf. Prov. xxii. 19;
Ezck. xlv. 23, with 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1.] Ταρ is certainly to be
preferred to δε, according to D. F. G., and other authorities: δε was
surely substituted, merely because γαρ stands five times in suc-
cession; but it often happens in St Paul that the same conjunction
comes five times, and even oftener, in succession. [Cf. c. g. Rom.
iv. 13, ss. v. 6, sq.] Καρ ανθρωπον can only be taken, as in 1
Cor. ix. 8, as = ανθρωπον, human, as to origin, essence, and
object, in contrast to the divine character of the Gospel. Rückert's
remark, that no one said that the Gospel was of human origin, and
that therefore, so taken, the apostolical dictum contains no antithesis
against which it could be directed, is of no importance; for,
even if the Judaists, whom St Paul contends with, did not say that
explicitly, still it was to be inferred from their conduct; for they
made of it what they wished.—Ver. 12, ουδε γαρ εγω is to be
taken: neque enim ego, i.e. "I, as little as the other apostles," not:
nam ne ego quidem, which would have been expressed by ουδε
εγω γαρ, or καλ γαρ ουδε εγω.—Before ειδιδακθην many good MSS.,
especially A.D.F.G., read ουδε for ουτε, which last Griesbach pre-
ferred, as also Winer (ad h. l. and Gram. p. 456.). Lachmann and
Rückert, on the other hand, read ουδε. The decision depends on
the distinction which one supposes between παρελαβον and ειδιδα-
κθην; Winer takes it as not specific, and cannot therefore be for
the strongly disjunctive particle. But it is more correct to assume,
with Lachmann and Rückert, a specific distinction, in which case
ουδε must be read. It is also especially in favour of that reading,
that one cannot join παρα ανθρωπον also with ειδιδακθην, with
which προσ is usually put, and thus ειδιακησαθαι forms an antithesis
with αποκαλυπτεθαι: the former denotes the gradual appropriation
of a thing, through reflection and exercise of the intellect; the
latter means intuitive perception, or instantaneous illumination
of the reason. (Cf. Matth. xi. 25, ss.)—In the δι αποκαλυψεως
'Iησου Χριστον scil. παρελαβον, Christ is to be understood as the
author, not as the object, of the Revelation; the latter is the
Gospel. The revelation of Himself by Christ stands here in op-
position to the communication of Himself through man; the other side, according to which Christ is also the revealed, is brought prominently forward in ver. 15.) Ver. 13, 14. In order to place the striking circumstances of his conversion in a clear light, St Paul reminds the Galatians first of his earlier relation to Christ, when he persecuted the church as a zealous Pharisee. He sets in opposition to the νῦν of his conversion the πότε of his life under the Law; the Galatians might have heard by report, or even through St Paul himself, what was necessary for them to know on that point.

The form Τουδαίομός is often found in the Apocrypha. Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 21, xiv. 38; 4 Macc. iv. 26.—Καθ’ ὑπερβολήν = σφόδρα or περισσοτέρως, ver. 14, 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 17. Πορθέω = πολυρέω, Acts ix. 21.—Ver. 14, προκοπτεῖν is generally used intransitively; with ὑπὲρ it is “to surpass.” [Luke ii. 52; 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9.]—Συνηλικώτης, equalis, is found nowhere in the New Testament except here. Ζηλώτης, Acts xxii. 20.—The form πατρικὸς is found only here, πατρῶς often occurs, e.g. Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14. The παραδόσεως comprise the genuine books of Moses along with the traditional Pharisaic dogmas; neither the one set nor the other alone.)

Ver. 15. As the whole has its period, in which the fulfilment of the Divine promises happen (Gal. iv. 4), so also has each individual. When that holy moment arrived for St Paul (on his journey to Damascus), God caused His eternal decree of election to reach him in time, by means of a call, in order to use him as an instrument for the propagation of the Gospel. (The εἰδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς answers to the οὖν τῷ, cf. Ps. xl. 14.—Δικαίωσεν = ἐκλέγεται. Cf. on Rom. ix. 1; Ephes. i. 4.—Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου = πόριν

This phrase is in meaning exactly parallel to the πρὸ κατα-
βολῆς κόσμου [Ephes. i. 4] i.e. “from all eternity.” The election by grace is, therefore, to be described as one in no wise earned by works. [Cf. on Rom. ix. 11.] The grace therefore refers as much to ἀφορίζεσθαι, as to καλέσθαι. Now here the Revelation of Christ appears as the result and effect of grace; therefore by the ἀπόκα-
λύσαι τῶν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἑμοί is to be understood not Christ’s appearance as such, but the same in connection with the collective effects of grace, so far as Christ was thereby made manifest to St Paul inwardly in his heart, as the eternal Son of God. As to the vision which St Paul had at Damascus, we must refer the
chief effects to the apostle's inner world; a mere physical seeing could not have produced such effects.\textsuperscript{1}

Ver. 16. The aim of this manifestation was certainly for St Paul a subjective one also, viz. his salvation, though this vanishes in his eyes in comparison with the immense objective end, necessarily combined with it. Salvation was given to the whole believing Gentile world together with him (cf. Acts ix. 15.). But it is Christ himself, not something about him, or merely the doctrine concerning him, which is the object of genuine preaching, therefore it is said: \textit{να εὐαγγελισμαί αὐτὸν.} The connecting εὐθέως with the foregoing, for which Rückert and Neander decide, against all the MSS., in order to obtain the meaning that St Paul had already preached in Arabia, is entirely inadmissible; for St Paul cannot, according to the course of his ideas, have meant to say, that he was called in order to preach immediately; but only that he was called for the object of the ministry generally, and that when he was aware of this he had given himself up forthwith to that object, without allowing himself to be decided by men. But it does not follow from \textit{that}, that he fulfilled in the very first years the Divine intention in calling him; he must rather have experienced the want of first feeling his way in the new element into which he had entered. The assumption of an inversion, so that εὐθέως \textit{οὐ} should be taken for \textit{οὐ εὐθέως} is still more unsuitable, for then it would follow that St Paul had \textit{afterwards} asked counsel of men, whereas he means to deny \textit{that} absolutely. But Schott thinks that εὐθέως cannot be joined with what follows without an ellipse, because that word by reason of its nature requires a positive proposition. It is best to supply \textit{προσέχων νῦν}, or the positive idea, which is directly after expressed negatively in what follows; "I treated not with flesh and blood," which must be restricted neither to St Paul himself, \textit{i.e.} to the questioning of his natural inclination, nor to the apostles, nor any other class of men, but is to be taken generally. "Obedient to God alone," St Paul means to say, "I excluded all human de-

\textsuperscript{1} It might appear striking, that St Paul does not mention Aunalias, who certainly baptized him (Acts ix. 18), and of whom, therefore, one might at first have thought that he had also instructed him. But, as Christ and the apostles were baptized by John the Baptist, without having received any instruction from him, which did not then take place at baptism, St Paul might naturally omit mentioning his baptism too, and the rather, that baptism no where supposes a reason for the dependence of the baptized on the baptizer.
liberation, as being subject to error." (\( \pi \rho \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \iota \delta \theta \mu = p r o - \\
\rho l y \) "to lay on in addition," as in Gal. ii. 6, in the phrase \( \pi \rho \sigma \alpha \nu \alpha - \\
ti \delta \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \tau i \), or, as in Gal. ii. 2, \( \alpha \nu \alpha \tau i \delta \varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \), it means: "to lay before one, propose to one, something for deliberation or decision." So, often, in Diodorus and Lucian. Some inferior MSS. only read here \( \pi \rho \alpha \alpha \nu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \mu \eta \).)

Ver. 17. But St Paul was especially concerned to show that he had always been without connection with the older apostles, because his Judaistic adversaries represented him as dependent upon them; therefore St Paul makes it a prominent point that he had, after his conversion, gone first to Arabia, and had thence returned to Damascus, and had therefore no connection with the apostles in Jerusalem. (Instead of \( \alpha \nu \eta \lambda \theta \nu \) B.D.E.F.G. and other critical authorities read \( \alpha \pi \nu \eta \lambda \theta \nu \), which is no doubt to be preferred, and indeed Lachmann has received it into the text; since \( \alpha \nu \eta \lambda \theta \nu \) was surely only put instead, because \( \alpha \pi \nu \eta \lambda \theta \nu \) follows again directly, and in ver. 18 \( \alpha \nu \eta \lambda \theta \nu \) is used of the journey to Jerusalem, like the more usual \( \alpha \nu \alpha \beta a i \nu e \nu = \tau \gamma \).—The phrase \( o i p r o \varepsilon m o o \alpha \nu \tau \sigma o \sigma o l o i \) points first to the earlier call of the twelve, but, second, sets St Paul also as an apostle, in the proper meaning of the term, by their side. \( O \nu \beta e \) is to be taken as a strictly negative particle, because the idea has the emphatic meaning that he saw no apostle at all.—In the parallel passages (Acts ix. 22, xxvi. 22, xi. 17) the subject is not a journey into Arabia; it is more likely that the first and second sojourns of St Paul in Damascus are there conjointly referred to. The words of our passage do not, however, permit us, as Usteri wishes, to assume that Damascus was reckoned in Arabia; 1 on the contrary, both plainly appear separate. The event, which is related 2 Cor. xi. 32, is, no doubt, to be referred to the time of the second sojourn at Damascus, for it assumes that St Paul had already preached the Gospel.

Verse 18. How the three years are to be apportioned cannot be laid down with any approach to certainty. 2 To me it appears most

1 As Damascus had not been named before, \( \tau \alpha l \iota \upsilon i o \tau \iota \rho \iota \alpha \iota \alpha i o \Delta \mu a \sigma \kappa o \sigma o v \) points unmistakably to the fact that St Paul assumed it as known that his call took place on a journey to Damascus.

2 Köhler’s and Schrader’s assumption that St Paul was but a few days in Arabia, is arbitrary; \( \chi i \rho r \rho \alpha \iota \iota \iota \iota \alpha \iota \) (Acts ix. 19) rather points to the short time that St Paul first passed in Damascus. It is true (Acts ix. 23), \( \chi i \rho r \rho \alpha i k a v a l \) points to a longer sojourn,
probable that St Paul passed the longest time in Arabia, because there he contemplated not teaching, but his own inward development. (See section 1 of the general introduction to St Paul's Epistles, and on Acts ix. 20, ss.) The ἐπετυχα can be reckoned only from the principal event, i.e. from St Paul's conversion. The most important point in this passage, however, is, that St Paul declares the object of this his first journey to Jerusalem was, to become acquainted with St Peter. This declaration does not contradict the accounts in Acts ix. 26, ss., xxii. 17, ss. The only question is, what had St Paul in view in making this acquaintance? He probably wished to come to some understanding with St Peter as to their future labours, which, according to ii. 6, ss., was at a later period more completely effected. For, as he, in the beginning, (see on Acts ix. 26, ss.) met with such great opposition in Jerusalem, he confined his stay to a few days, which fact he here brings forward as a proof that he could not have been instructed by the apostles. (Ἰστορεῖν means properly: "to become acquainted with by one's own perception, but it is, no doubt, usually applied to things only, seldom to persons. But Josephus too, B. Τ. vi. 1. 8. uses it of persons. It is not found again in the New Testament.—For Πέτρῳ A.B. and other MSS. read Κηφᾶν, as ii. 9. Lachmann receives it into the text; but the reading has surely no other foundation than that it was wished to turn aside the derogatory description which follows from St Peter, and to substitute some one else.—Whether ἐπεμενα πρὸς points to a dwelling with St Peter, or not, must be left undecided. The phrase ἡμέραι δεκαπεντή, it remains to be said, answers to the French quinze jours, a fortnight.

Vers. 19, 20. Here it seems, in the first place, striking that only St Peter and St James are named as the apostles whom St Paul saw in Jerusalem: as it is said (Acts ix. 27) of Barnabas: ἠγαγε αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, as if at that time all the apostles had been present. But nothing precludes us from supposing that St Luke takes the word "apostle" in a more extended sense, so that other distinguished teachers also were comprised in it. Besides, the whole description of St Luke is so much confined to generals, that but still not to years. The longer stay of St Paul in Arabia, omitted by St Luke, is, we may suppose, that passed between the times thus alluded to.
one clearly sees he was not accurately informed of the circumstances under which St Paul's first journey to Jerusalem took place; we must therefore in any case use the more accurate accounts of St Paul for the closer determining of the statements in the Acts. But in the next place, St James, our Lord's brother, appears to be reckoned among the twelve, whereas it is certain that here under the term apostles *they alone* are to be understood, and we saw at Matt. xiii. 55 that no one of our Lord's brothers (on account of John vii. 5) could be among the twelve, for which reason too, besides other grounds, the identification of our Lord's brother with James the Son of Alpheus is inadmissible. (See the further development of this point in the Introduction to the Epistle of St James.) The resource of taking εἷς μόνας as "that is to say, however, I certainly saw the non-apostle James," is not only ungrammatical (see on i. 7), but also needless, because our Lord's brother is in the following chapter, especially ver. 9, constantly numbered with the chief apostles. It is, surely, best to suppose that James, our Lord's brother, the Bishop of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, was, if not formally, still tacitly, on account of his extraordinary consideration and important personality, treated as an apostle, so that he, as it were, filled up the gap again.—The fact that St Paul was not in Jerusalem for three years, and even then only for a fortnight, and saw but two apostles, was important to him on account of his readers. He, therefore, confirms this communication of his with an oath, in order to remove certain possible doubts. (The passage serves, along with others, as Rom. i. 9, ix. 1, 1 Tim. ii. 7, for the elucidation of Matt. v. 34. It remains to be said that ἑνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ is not to be taken as a formal oath, just as ἁίρον also occurs not of oaths. The swearing lies in the thought, not in the phrase. It remains to be said that λέγω must be supplied, and that ἀράφω refers, it is true, to the whole account, but especially to the last remark.)

Vers. 21—24. St Paul further relates how he afterwards left Palestine altogether, and remained out of connexion with the believers there to such a degree, that they would not even have known him by sight; it had become known merely by report how he had been changed from a persecutor into a confessor of the faith. (Caesarea Philippi, which St Paul, according to Acts ix. 30, touched at, was out of Palestine.) The reason that St Paul adds this remark,
can, as Κεκουμένιος had already observed, be no other than to show the Galatians, who had been prepossessed against him by his Judaistic adversaries, how it was impossible he could have received any instruction from other Christians in Palestine, and how, therefore, his knowledge of the Gospel was a purely immediate one. See on St Paul’s journey to Cilicia Acts ix. 30. Κλοωμα we have already found at Rom. xv. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 10.—The ἐκκλησίαν ἐν Χριστῷ are opposed to the purely Jewish ἐκκλησίας.—On the enallage generis, ἄκοινοντες Ἰσαυ for ἄκοινονσαι, see Winer’s Gram. p. 327, sq.—Διώκειν need not he taken for διώξεις, the past time is expressed in the πότε. The participle is here used just as a substantive, see Winer’s Gram. page 100.—Ver. 24. St Paul does not claim praise for himself, but for God in him; ἐν ἑμοὶ = Ἡ. Luke x. 20, “in me as the object of divine glorification.”

§ 3. ST PAUL AT THE COUNCIL OF APOSTLES.

(ii. 1—10.)

St Paul now places fourteen years of free self-dependent labours in opposition to the fourteen days of his stay with St Peter (i. 18.). It was not until after the lapse of so long a space of time that St Paul revisited Jerusalem, the centre of the Jewish Christian views, whilst in Antioch a centre of Gentile Christian life was provisionally forming itself. But he gives a detailed account of this important visit, because during it his peculiar relation to the kingdom of God was recognised by the twelve themselves. But here in the first place the questions arise, how are the fourteen years to be reckoned, and what journey to Jerusalem does St Paul mean? The opinions of Köhler and Schrader, the former of whom supposes that the journey here meant is the one to Jerusalem alluded to Acts xviii. 22, while the latter goes so far as to suppose a journey thither to be supplied in Acts xix., and which he imagines to have been undertaken from Corinth, have been already sufficiently refuted by Schott, and may be here passed over as untenable per se.¹ They are meant merely to support the hypothesis already

¹ See, besides Schott’s work (Elucidation of some important points in St Paul’s life), also the Prolegomena to his Comm. on the Epistle to the Galatians, sec. 4.
refuted in the Introduction to this Epistle, but they only render this and other passages more difficult to explain, without affording any assistance. On the other hand, however, one may well hesitate as to whether one should here understand the journey touched on at Acts xi. 30, or that described in Acts xv., to the council of apostles. But this we may say, that the far greater number of the critics declare for the latter view, though Calvin, Eichhorn, Süßkind, and Paulus defend the former, Grotius, Bertholdt, Kuinoel, Keil, Ulrich, Büttger, do the same, even with the modification of reading τεσσάρων for δεκατεσσάρων. However, ingeniously as it has been sought to defend this conjecture (viz. from the original designation of the number by the letter Δ, which, it is then said, was read at one time for ten at another for four, and thus in the end to have brought about the fusion of both numbers), still it cannot meet with approval, for this reason, if for no other, viz. that it is not in any way supported, either by MSS. or any other critical authorities. But, if we weigh the reasons for the supposition of the second, and against the supposition of the third journey, they are chiefly the following: 1. It is St Paul's intention, according to the context of the whole passage, to reckon up all his journeys to Jerusalem; now, as he in i. 20 uses an oath as an argument that he is telling the truth, and in ii. 1 uses παρευρέω, in speaking of a fresh journey, it is to be inferred that St Paul will not have passed over the one referred to in Acts xi. 2. If the journey narrated ii. 1. is to be understood as the one undertaken to the council of apostles, which Acts xv. relates, mention would have been made of the decisions of that council; Peter himself too must, in that case, after the negotiations there as to the Gentile Christians, have retracted his opinion, which cannot be rendered probable. 3. St Paul would seem, after the council of apostles, to have abated in his anti-Jewish views; for, according to Acts xvi. 3, he would have circumcised Timothy himself, which would contradict his earlier conduct, see Gal. v. 2.

To begin with this last point, it is of no importance; for, that St Paul at one time declares whoever let himself be circumcised had lost Christ, and afterwards lets Timothy himself nevertheless be circumcised, forms no contradiction at all, since that first idea must

---

1 It is true that an appeal has been made to Eusebius's Chronicle, but here too the MSS. are altogether doubtful. See Schott in the Comm., page 314, note 6.
be understood in the sense merely, that he loses Christ who causes himself to be circumcised, in order thereby to win salvation; but that was not the object of Timothy's circumcision, it was rather that he might thereby become more fit to preach the Gospel among Jews and proselytes. But, on the other hand, the two first reasons are certainly of very great importance; for it really seems, from the great stress which St Paul (according to i. 20) lays on the journeys to Jerusalem, not to be supposed that he should have omitted one of those journeys in his narrative. Now, as the journey mentioned Acts xi. 30 is the next one in order of time, and Barnabas too accompanies him on it, as is mentioned here also,—further, as, according to Gal. ii. 2, a vision is said to have incited him to that journey, which might be referred to the narrative of Agabus (Acts xi. 28); the reference to the second journey seems very much to recommend itself. But, first of all, the collateral arguments have no force, for the vision, which St Paul here mentions, relates to a vision which he himself had, not others. And as to Barnabas accompanying him, the mention of it in our passage suits still better the description in the third journey in the Acts (xv. 2), according to which others besides Barnabas journeyed with St Paul, among whom Titus is here named. (Gal. ii. 1.) If we further consider that the whole description of the proceedings at this visit completely suits that which St Luke sketches (Acts xv.) of the council of apostles,—for the objection, that no mention is here made of the resolutions of the council, is easily avoided by assuming that St Paul had already imparted them to the Christians in Galatia, on his last visit thither, and could therefore suppose them to be known,—that further, the fourteen years reckoned from the conversion of St Paul, (not from the above-mentioned journey to Jerusalem), which mode of reckoning still remains the only probable one, would be too long a time, if we here understood the journey touched on at Acts xi. 30, as Paul at the epoch of the latter was below Barnabas in dignity, and was therefore in the very first years after his conversion, as Hessem has pertinently remarked; finally, the omission of the very important journey to the council of the apostles can be still less supposed than that of the earlier ones;—everything is plainly so

1 Hessem's life of St Paul, page 68. The putting Barnabas first in Acts xi. 30 points in all probability to the fact that on that mission he was the chief person.
much in favour of the third journey (Acts xv.) that the wish arises to be enabled to avoid that one objection, how St Paul could omit a journey to Jerusalem, since the stress is laid on the point that he mentions all of them. For we cannot here let ourselves be guided by the circumstance that St Peter's conduct, if he so behaved after the council, is hard to explain, because a dogmatical argument would thus be improperly mixed up with a purely historical question. Besides, how this conduct of St Peter can be explained without derogation to his apostolical character, we shall specially discuss further on. Now in this inquiry, into whether and how the difficulty as to how St Paul could pass over a journey can be avoided, we must first of all mention Schott's view, according to which the words διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν can be so understood that the second and third journeys together would be designated by them. For he proposes to translate: "in the course of fourteen years," and to understand πάλιν of the repetition of the journey more than once. (See his Prolegomena, page 308.) But we cannot consent to this mode of removing the difficulty; for it is undeniably true, that διὰ with numerals can mean "during, within," only the context here absolutely forbids us to make use of that meaning, and still more of the forced meaning given to πάλιν, as St Paul cannot intend to relate all that occurred within a space of time which is besides so long a one, but only when the journeys generally took place.

Were the meaning of those words as Schott gives it, the Galatians might say to St Paul: "Who knows how long you were with the apostles in the fourteen years, and how much you learnt of them?" The sinews of the whole series of proofs would thus have been cut. The διὰ here is no doubt to be taken in the sense of after, to which conclusion the ἐπετρα, too, decidedly leads. How it can have that sense Matthiæ shows in his Gram., vol. ii. pp. 13. 52. See Winer on this passage in the Comm. and in the Gram. p. 363, note. Here therefore we shall have no other resource than to say, St Paul must be looked upon as the first witness as to his own life; the question cannot be as to the object of a fraud per se, nor yet as to an error; it might rather be supposed, that there had been an oversight on the part of St Luke. But one need not necessarily assume even that, St Luke relates the journey, Acts xi. 30, so shortly, that it might be thought St Paul was sent indeed with Barnabas to Jerusalem, but found himself prevented by illness
or some other cause, from entering the city himself. It is true, Acts xii. 25 speaks again of the departure of St Paul from Jerusalem, which does not favour this assumption; at all events, we must imagine that St Luke in that case might not have been properly informed of this minor circumstance, that St Paul had not completely fulfilled the mission with Barnabas. In any case matters are so situated that we must, under all circumstances, here understand the journey to the apostolic council, though the way in which the accounts in the Acts can be reconciled with it must remain an open question.

Ver. 2. In order now to make the Galatian Christians observe that his movements were not arbitrary, but guided by a higher will, St Paul adds ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν. According to Acts xv. 2, St Luke, it is true, says nothing of a revelation, but, of course, on such inner occurrences, St Paul himself could alone be accurately informed. That phrase Hermann (in the above cited essay, Leipz. 1832, p. 6) has erroneously proposed to explain, explicationis causâ, i.e. for the sake of discussion and explanation of the doctrine of the Gospels; he thinks, if it had been meant to relate to a divine revelation, τῶν could not have been left out; but, as in the very first chapter mention had been made of the manifestations which had been made to him, St Paul might without any harshness write: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν only. Besides, ἀποκάλυψις has in the dialect of the New Testament the fixed signification, divine communication, revelation. But now St Paul names as his peculiar task in this journey, the wish to lay before the apostles his method of preaching among the Gentiles, in order to obtain their approval of it. But the question of how the Gospel was to be spread among the Gentiles, was the very one which was to be decided at the council (Acts xv.); our Epistle therefore agrees entirely with the report that St Luke gives. (On ἀνέθηταν see at i. 16. The submitting of his opinions to the Council involves here, according to the context, the examination of those opinions. It is clear from the foregoing that ἀνέθηται can only designate the apostles, not all the Christians in Jerusalem.—The phrase εἶδον ἔχων κηρύσσειν designates however here the method of propounding his doctrines, and the whole system of proceeding which the apostle had used, and still continued to use in the Gentile world.) But the last words of the verse are difficult...
true, the connecting δοκοῦσι μῆτνος in the sense: "especially, however, to those who might perchance think that I ran in vain," will surely scarcely recommend itself to any one now, for, apart from every thing else, ver. 6 makes it clear enough that οἱ δοκοῦτες has here another meaning; the phrase is meant, no doubt, to single out the most distinguished among the apostles, and to restrict to them peculiarly the examination of the question pro-
pounded. In the κατ᾽ ἰδίαν there is no occasion for anything local to be understood, it answers perfectly to our phrase, "especially, preferably." But the connection of μῆτνος κ. τ. λ. is not without difficulty. One stumbles, that is to say, at the forms τρέχω and ἐδραμοῦ, one expects the optative after μῆτνος. Fritzche proposed, therefore, to take this sentence by itself, and as a question: num frustra operam meam in evangelium insumo aut insumi? But this interpretation has no recommendation at all, and was even afterwards retracted by the proposer himself. Τρέχω is rather to be taken as the conjunctive present, which is construed with μῆτνος in the New Testament, but ἐδραμοῦ can be accounted for on the assumption that he subjoins his earlier labours oratione directa. (So Winer correctly in the Gram. p. 471.) The opinion of Usteri and Schott that, on account of ἐδραμοῦ, τρέχω must be the Indic. too, is erroneous; St Paul often combines different moods with the same particle, according to the change of idea. Thus particularly 1 Thess. iii. 5. (The full phrase δοκοῦτες εἶναι τί is found ii. 6; vi. 3. Plato also (Apol. Socr. c. 33) uses it. It is not to be denied that it has a subordinate idea of blame, as Gal. vi. 3 clearly proves; but it is not here to be referred to the apostles themselves, but to the Judaistic false teachers only, who abused the apostolical dignity for their own ends, inasmuch as they unjustifiably, and without the apostles’ permission, sheltered themselves under their authority. The case is the same with the phrase οἱ ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀπόστολον, 2 Cor. xi. 5. See the Comm. on that passage).

Ver. 3. As a proof that the apostles approved of his more liberal conduct towards the Gentiles, St Paul remarks that Titus, who accompanied him, was not forced to submit to circumcision, though of Greek descent. St Paul had Timothy circumcised voluntarily (Acts xvi. 3), but he would in no case have let himself be forced to it. (The ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ is to be explained by the intervening thought
resting in St Paul’s mind: “And the apostles also acknowledged my divine mission so fully, that not even Titus, who yet appeared before them uncircumcised, was forced to submit to circumcision.”

Vers. 4, 5. What follows is difficult, on account of the connection with the foregoing, and the construction of the whole sentence. The first words, it is true, would admit of being aptly joined with ἵππαρχάσθη, if the δὲ did not oppose it. This particle is in all the critical authorities, only St Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, conjecture that it might well be struck out. In the same way the construction of the sentence would be simple, if the οἷς οὐδὲ in verse 5 were wanting, the sense would then be: “Titus was not indeed forced to let himself be circumcised, but I yielded on account of the false brethren.” Now it is true that D. has this omission, and the words are wanting in some of the Latin Fathers; Tertullian even derives the reading with the negative from a corruption of the text by Marcion. These authorities induce Mill, Semler, Koppe, Griesbach, to strike out the οἷς οὐδὲ. But it is clear enough that this change is made merely to avoid the difficulty in the construction.

St Paul would, in fact, have been quite faithless to his principles if he had yielded to the false brethren; it would have been totally improper then to say πρὸς ὅραν εἰς ἔργαν, for he would according to that interpretation have altogether given way to the false teachers. We must, therefore, in any case suppose an irregularity in the construction here, which is the less to be wondered at, as sentences of that sort often occur in St Paul. The question now arises, how are we to account for the origin of the inaccurate construction? In verse 3 it is not said expressly that Titus was not circumcised at all, but only that he was not forced to it. One might therefore say, as Rückert has, that St Paul meant to proceed thus: “however, for the sake of the false brethren, he had indeed circumcised him, but voluntarily, without giving way to them.” But here all depended on the matter of fact; if St Paul circumcised Titus in the presence of these men he was obedient to their will. We must by all means suppose that Titus was not circumcised at all. But how then did St Paul come by the beginning: διὰ δὲ τοῦ ν. κ.τ.λ.? I explain it thus. Verse 3 has entirely the nature of a subordinate remark, the sentence might be separated parenthetically from verses 2 and 4. The δὲ is, there-
fore, to be brought into connection with the idea in verse 2, and the following seems to have been the course of ideas in St Paul's mind. "I went, it is true, to Jerusalem, in order to lay before the apostles my doctrine for examination; but on their account it was really by no means necessary for me to do so; Titus was not even so much as obliged to let himself be circumcised; but I saw myself moved to certain steps on account of the false brethren." St Paul, however, allows himself in the heat of composition to be led away from the construction he began with, and describes instead of it the disposition of the false teachers. To that view verses 6, ss. are also very well adapted, according to which St Paul again avers his relation to the apostles to be no inferior one. This hypothesis would be preferable to the mere supplying ἀνέβην or ἀνεθέμην, for which Zachariae, Storr, Rosenmüller, Borger, decided. But now, as to the description of the ψευδαδελφοί (2 Cor. xi. 26), St Paul calls them παρευσάκτους, because they had stolen (παραεύσηλθον) into the church with impure intention, i.e. without having the self-denial to give up as was necessary their old Pharisaic bias. They wanted to burthen and domineer over the Christians in the church, with the yoke of their ordinances, just as they had previously done with the Jews; and thus to render suspected the Christian ἐλευθερία from the law, which belonged to all believers, as δινές ἐν Χριστῷ. (Κατασκοπεῖν to get information with a bad design in order to betray it as a spy.) St Paul speaks in a similar way of these false teachers in other passages; especially 2 Cor. xi. To these pretensions, says St Paul, he had never for a moment given way (πρὸς ὅπαν, John v. 35; 1 Thes. ii. 17; Phil. ver. 15), in order to preserve for his own, for whose guidance aught he bore the responsibility, the truth of the Gospel, i.e. the Gospel in all its purity and genuineness. (Ver. 4. The form παραευσακτος is not found elsewhere, the verb occurs 2 Peter ii. 1.—For καταδουλώσωντας the active form is to be preferred with Lachmann, according to A.B. and other important authorities; it is probable the copyists put the middle form in the text as the to them more familiar one. The εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ Hermann has thus explained: "fratribus falsis ne horre quidem spatium Jesu obsequio segnior fui;" but St Paul never uses ὑποταγῇ of the relation to Christ. Eἰϰαμεν, as Winer has already justly observed, rather designates the action, as being performed but once; τῇ ὑπο-
ταγγ, on the other hand, is an expression for the state of mind from which the action proceeds: "I did not give way to them, as one obedient, or in obedience to them."

Ver. 6. Here, too, we find an endless number of interpretations, the great majority of which, however, are of such a quality that it would not repay us to go into an account of them. To name some, all those especially which here suppose aposi opeses or ellipses at ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκοῦντων, such as "I have heard, learnt, been apprised of, nothing," are quite inadmissible, inasmuch as here, in the 2d chap., St Paul's task is no longer that of proving that he had learnt nothing from the apostles, but to show that they acknowledged his labours as fully answering to the spirit of Christianity, which the words from ἐμοὶ γάρ to ver. 10 expressly perform. The γάρ, accordingly, by no means allows us to import a totally foreign sense into ver. 6. Besides, the δὲ in the beginning of ver. 6 induces us to suppose some how or other an antithesis to ver. 5. Now, according to this, it is no doubt the simplest way with Rückert to join "the οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει, without any parenthesis, with ἀπὸ τῶν δοκοῦντων, and to form the whole chain of ideas thus: "I have not given way for one moment to the false brethren, in order to preserve to you the Gospel undisturbed; but I do not trouble myself about the distinguished apostles in the matter, for they have laid no new burdens on me, they have, on the contrary, approved of my labours." On this point it can raise no scruples, that Paul uses the contemptuous phrase οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει of the chief apostles, for the invective in it relates not to them but the false teachers, who abused the authority of the apostles (see on ver. 2), but the construction of οὐδὲν διαφέρει with ἀπὸ might excite doubts; at least it is without precedent. As, however, the proposed interpretation of the passage is the only one that suits the whole context of the section, that obstacle cannot deter us from it. We may reasonably suppose that the apostle, when he began with ἀπὸ, had another phrase at first in his mind, and then somewhat inaccurately made οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει follow. Besides, ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν admits of no other interpretation than the one by which allusion is made to the near connection and the intercourse of the apostles with the Lord himself. Luther, Beza, Winer, Flatt, and others had already correctly understood it so. Finally, the words πρὸ-σωτόν Θεὸς ἀνθρώπον εἰς ναμβάνει are used to express the no-
thingness of all external distinctions in the sight of God, and therefore even of the outward intercourse with Christ; (which we must recollect Judas also had enjoyed), in comparison with the inward witness of the Spirit, which St Paul had in his favour. "The Spirit witnesseth that the Spirit is truth." 1 John v. 6.

Vers. 7—10. After this, St Paul subjoins the communication as to his position relative to the apostles, as it was settled at the council, by which the report of the Acts of the Apostles, chap. xv., is completed. The three chief apostles, James, Peter, and John, who are here represented as στῦλοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας (the foundation of which expression is the figure according to which the church is compared to a temple, 1 Cor. iii. 16; Ephes. ii. 21; Rev. iii. 12) not only laid no burden on St Paul (as the Judaists wished and hoped), that is to say, in relation to his labours in making proselytes, therefore to have the converts circumcised—St Paul looks in charity on their burden as his),—but they even concluded among themselves a sort of convention, as to the limits of their respective labours. The apostles were moved to that by their conviction of the great and blessed efficiency of St Paul in the Gentile world, on which he and Barnabas gave in their report (Acts xv. 12), which would not have been possible without the assistance of Divine grace. They saw clearly that St Paul was entrusted by the Lord with a like commission among the Gentiles as among the Jews St Peter was, (who, as the first, is named instead of all the apostles, just as St Paul is, instead of Barnabas and all those working with him.) For the avoidance of all dispute and jealousy they now share the departments, with the condition, that they (St Paul and the Gentile apostles in general) should remember the poor. How carefully St Paul strove to maintain this condition, all his epistles show; see especially 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 9; the probable causes of which striking clause are treated of on 1 Cor. xvi. 1. What seems above all to explain the circumstance, that the sending of alms was imposed as a duty on the Gentile Christians, is, that it seems to have been looked on as a substitute for the Jewish Temple tax, and as the expression of their dependance on the mother church at Jerusalem. We may add that it lies in the very nature of this agreement that it is not to be considered as absolute; however scrupulously St Paul conformed to it (see on Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 13), still he had no hesitation in
his joumies through Palestine to Jerusalem to preach before Jews also. Nay, even in the Gentile world, St Paul, according to the Acts, always offered the Gospel to the Jews first; a circumstance in which no one, before Baur with his false criticism, was able to find a contradiction of this agreement, and a proof of the Acts not being genuine. In later times as people became more and more convinced that the Jews in the mass rejected the Gospel, while the Gentiles embraced it, the agreement seems besides to have fallen tacitly into oblivion; at least we find that the apostles destined for the Jews, namely, St Peter and St John, leave Palestine towards the end of their lives, and devote their activity also entirely to the Gentiles. (On ἀποστασίας, which is here to be taken in its original meaning, "to lay upon in addition," see at i. 16.) Ver. 7. On the well-known construction, πεπίστευσαν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, see Winer's Gram., p. 205.—Ver. 8. St Paul often uses εὐαγγελίσων of the power of Divine grace, 1 Cor. xii. 6; Ephes. i. 11; Phil. ii. 15.—Ver. 9. The comparison of the apostles to pillars, has parallels in the Rabbinical language; thus Abraham is called ἀνακτόρ, pillar of the world.—As to Cephas, see on John i. 42.—On the phrase δεξίας ἁβώναι, see 1 Macc. xi. 50, 62, xiii. 50.—At ἵνα Ἰησοῦς we must supply εὐαγγελισάμεθα.—Ver. 10. On the repetition of αὐτῷ τοῦτο after ἵνα, see Winer's Gram. p. 159.)

§. 4. ST PAUL'S DISPUTE WITH ST PETER.

(i. 11—21.)

Ver. 11—13. So far now goes the communication as to the proceedings at the council of the apostles. There is subjoined to it, beginning at ver. 11, a remarkable report on a later occurrence, on which we have no information at all from any other source. St Paul reports here that St Peter (when remains uncertain) had come to Antioch, and had at first held communion with the Gentile Christians. Συνήσαθεν stands by synecdoche for "lived together with, cultivated intercourse generally with." See on Luke xv. 2; 1 Cor. v. 11; Acts x. 10, 11, iii. 15, 29.). But when certain persons came from St James, St Peter withdrew himself out of fear of the strict Jewish Christians. The other Jews (i.e. Jewish Chris-
tians) of the church at Antioch, who probably had also at first held with the Gentile Christians, had now also joined him (St Peter), and even Barnabas had been seduced from him (St Paul), through their influence. St Paul characterises his proceeding by the harsh expression ἐπόκρισιν, by which he means, that their actions were not in harmony with their knowledge; they allowed themselves, through fear of the hostility and accusations of heresy of the Judaists to be driven to act against their better convictions. Now this communication makes a painful impression, and one which excites all kinds of doubts. In the first infancy of Christ’s church, one is inclined to imagine all in blessed peace, without dispute or quarrel; but according to this report, St James, who yet (Acts xv. 13, ss.) was for St Paul, seems to have worked against him. We picture the apostles to ourselves as holy infallible men, on whose testimony the church reposes; here the rock St Peter and Barnabas, St Paul’s faithful companion, appear quite wavering, and that too in so highly important a point, after a solemn decision of the council. What then remains of the doctrine of the inspiration of the apostles, and of their being filled with the Holy Ghost? One comprehends accordingly that endeavours were made to put the time of the composition of this Epistle before the council, in order to soften down the startling part of St Peter’s proceedings; but we said in the Introduction that the historical facts do not admit of it, and then after all the gain is but small; in any case St Peter’s behaviour certainly occurred after the pouring out of the Holy Ghost, which was to lead him to all truth. By careful interpretation, however, the one astounding point, viz., that St James seems to have worked against St Paul, admits of avoidance. For, if those Judaistic emissaries are called in ver. 12, των ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, it is not asserted in those words that St James himself had sent them for the purpose of working against St Paul, but only that they came from St James’s church in Jerusalem, and appeared, though falsely, to have appealed to his authority. For, if the personal co-operation


2 On this point, see the remarks in the Comm. on Acts xv. 1, where the nearly related words, των ἢ ἤμων (xx. 24), are compared with this phrase, and it is shown that the apostles in their Epistle do yet disavow those very των.
and design of St James were meant, ἅπα would not have been put, but ἅπα or παρά. (See Winier’s Gram., p. 349.). But St Peter’s and Barnabas’s wavering conduct still remains; for, even if Κηφᾶς might be read instead of Πέρπος, still the assertion, to which some of the Fathers¹ had already had recourse, viz. that mention is here made not of the apostle of that name, but another Cephas, is totally inadmissible. We must therefore try to find out the truth as to this relation from intrinsic reasons. The communication of the Holy Ghost to the apostles had not the object of making them morally perfect, but only to raise them in their doctrine to infallible organs of the truth.² There is no more reason to scruple to suppose of the apostles, than of the prophets of the Old Testament, that they could err; St Paul himself confesses that the old man was still alive in him, that he must die daily, and needed a thorn in the flesh. Examples of a behaviour not quite perfect are also found; see e.g. Acts xv. 36, ss., xxiii. 3, ss., and the remarks on those passages in the Comm. But now the difficulty in this case seems to be increased by the fact that the error of St Peter and Barnabas occurred in so important a point, which is intimately connected with the system of the Christian doctrine; and indeed St Paul in his rebuke of St Peter, ii. 14, ss., opposes that system to him, and develops the doctrine of faith in opposition to that of works. But the circumstance that St Paul designates the conduct of St Peter and Barnabas as dissimulation, removes this-scruple, and it is just that harsh expression which affords us a considerable assistance to a milder interpretation of the passage as a whole. St Peter taught quite correctly, and had made no mistake in the resolutions of the council, he only acted weakly when he suffered himself to be intimidated. His error was therefore a purely personal one, by which his official character as an apostle is not in the least compromised. But it is a remarkable point with regard to his personal character, that he, the rock, could here be overcome by fear, as he was, formerly, in the denial of his Lord. (See on this point the remarks in the Comm. on John xviii. 15—18.)

It remains to be said, that the Antioch where this event took

¹ To name one, Clemens Alexandrinus, according to the evidence of Eusebius Church History, i. 12.
² See Steudel’s excellent development of the idea, that the infallibility of the apostles in their doctrine is to be viewed as quite independent of the degree of their personal perfection. Tübingen Zeitschrift for 1832, part 2nd.
place is not that in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14; xiv. 19), but the famous one in Cæcle-Syria, on the Orontes, which in the beginning (until Rome became more so) was the central point of Gentile-Christian life. (Ver. 11, Winer pertinently translates κατὰ πρόσωπον presens presenti, face to face. —Καταγνώσκω, to judge one, and that, too, generally unfavourably, hence to blame, punish. The passive form has here often been taken as: reprehensione dignus, reprehensurus, which sense however is not couched in it. It is simpler to translate it: "for blame or a complaint had fallen upon him," no doubt on the part of the Gentile-Christians, whose society he had shunned.—Ver. 12. ὑποστέλλω, clam se subducere (to withdraw one's self secretly); the open consequence of which was ἀφορίζων. —Ver. 13. συναναγίγεσθαι, aliquas exemplo abripi, is found again 2 Pet. iii. 17.)

Ver. 14. Now, after this, St Paul relates what he had said to St Peter, rebuking him in the face of the church (ἐμπροσθεν πάντων.) It is needless to say that we have here not exactly the ipsissima verba of this speech to St Peter (for which reason the question also as to where the oratio directa ends is an idle one, as we shall immediately see); on the contrary, St Paul has so modified them, that they might be at the same time a lesson to the Galatians as to the nature of the Gospel in relation to the law, but the later relative positions of the two great teachers to one another, and especially the expressions in 2 Pet. iii. 15, ss., are in favour of the opinion that St Peter allowed himself to be convinced by St Paul's representations. (Ὅρθοποδεῖν, rectis pedibus incedere, thence "to walk uprightly," = ἀκριβὸς περιπτατεῖν, Ephes. v. 15.—The phrase ἔθνικὸς ἐστί denotes the living without strictly observing the law of Moses.—The text. rec. reads τῇ, but πῶς is decidedly to be preferred, on the authority of A.B.C.D.E. The ἀναγκᾶζων is only a moral forcing through the influence of one's example. It remains to be said that the chain of argument has then only demonstrative force, if it be supposed, as we did, that St Peter still held fast his conviction of the freedom of Christians from the law. For otherwise he would have been able to answer, "I have changed my views on that point."

Vers. 15, 16. Whilst Calvin, Beza, Semler, Koppe, would have had ver. 14 alone considered as the question addressed to St Peter, others extended it down to ver. 16, others again to ver. 17. It is
surely most correct to consider the connection as continued down to ver. 21, but without being particular in looking on the words as spoken in that form. No doubt, however, in the beginning the special reference to St Peter stands out more prominently, and loses itself only by degrees in generalities. Thus the ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουνάδιος κ.τ.λ. could not possibly have been said of the Galatians in general, since the majority of them were of Gentile origin. In these first words, besides, St Paul informs the Judaists that the Jews had some advantage over the Gentiles. But it has been thought striking that St Paul admits the Jews are not ἀμαρτωλοί, as he in Rom. iii. 1 proves they too are under sin. It has been proposed to assume in these words an accommodation to the Jewish idea of the Gentiles, but St Paul would by that course have acted against his own interest, not to mention the intrinsic untruth, as he would have conceded them their principle. We must rather say that the οὐκ ἀμαρτωλοί is not meant to represent the Jews as without sin, but only as favoured above the Gentiles by the divine revelation which had been made them, and therefore, certainly, fallen into sin less grossly. The sinfulness of the Jews also is, certainly, set in a clear enough light by what follows, according to which faith in Christ can alone justify them also. A mistake was therefore altogether impossible. In the εἰδότες δὲ, St Paul appeals to the Christian conviction of St Peter, and all believers, that not ἔργα νόμου, but only πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ = εἰς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. iii. 22, can justify man; whence it follows that the scheme of the Judaists still as Christians to wish to win salvation by their observance of the law appears in all its perversity. For, continues St Paul, we received into us the faith in Christ for the very purpose of being justified through Him, and not by the works of the law, because none of them can be justified. Now, this representation completely answers both in substance and in form to the passage Rom. iii. 21, ss., to the explanation of which we refer, with regard both to special and general, as well here as for what follows. It is self-evident here too, especially, as there in Romans, that the law is to be understood not merely of the Jewish ceremonial law, to which it certainly, according to the historical connection, refers principally, but the same holds good of the law in every form; of the Roman Catholic sanctification as of the categorical imperative. The sinfulness of man's nature is, per se, in-
capable of complete fulfilment of the law, but such only is worth anything in the sight of the holy God. Christ the representative of the race has fulfilled it for all both by His life and death, and His work through faith becomes our work. (Ver. 15 φύσει denotes fleshly descent, as Rom. ii. 27.—Ver 16, The δὲ is wanting in the text. rec., and thus ver. 15 can be joined with ver. 16 in one sentence, but B.C.D.E.G.I. have it, and the omission is clearly more easily explained than the addition of it, so ver. 15 must be taken as a sentence by itself.—The καὶ ἡμεῖς, "we too," is to be explained: "We Jews also, who, though we have the law, have believed in Christ, thus confess that the law, as such, cannot justify." The concluding words, which are found also in Rom. iii. 20, διότι εἰ ἐργαν νόμου, κ. τ. λ. seem to be formed on the model of Psalm cxiii. 2, to which supposition their colouring, so strongly Hebrew, also leads.)

Ver. 17. To this idea, that the Jews also need faith in Christ, the reproof of the conduct of St Peter and of the Jewish Christians, is now annexed. That it is contained in ver. 17 is clearly shown by ver. 18, with its following γὰρ. But it is not quite clear how it is contained in ver. 17, for one might at first think one was obliged to take the words as if by them a warning was given against sinning after the experience of grace in Christ, in which sense one also usually takes the words, "to make Christ the minister of sin," i.e., a promoter of sin by abusing the doctrine of grace and forgiveness of sins. But how would this reference to sinning after experience of grace agree with the context here? This mode of taking the passage is decidedly to be rejected, the rather as the καὶ αὐτός, which answers to the καὶ ἡμεῖς in ver. 17, and to the ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαίων, is meaningless in it. The γυνεῖς δικαιωθήναι ἐν Χριστῷ, itself, is rather to be taken as an intimation of being sinful; St Paul, that is to say, setting that down as the conclusion he draws from the conduct of St Peter and the Judaists. According to this view the sentence might be paraphrased thus: "If you on the one hand believe in Christ and teach others to believe in Him, but then, on the other hand, act as if we too, who desire nothing but to be justified in Christ, should be found sinners if we observe not the law—you certainly act contradictorily; you pull down what you have yourselves built up." In order to bring the absurdity of this conduct still more plainly home to the conscience of the Galatian
Christians, he puts the question: ἀμαρτάνεις; ἀμαρτίας διάκονος; “Is, peradventure, Christ a promoter of sin? That cannot be!” For Christ, if the assertion of the Judaists were true, would be so far a promoter of sin, as He permitted the preaching of faith as a means of justification, whereas, in fact, justification must properly be sought for in the law, and Christ would thus point out a false way unto salvation. (In the ζητεῖν it is not an actual labouring and working which is signified, but only the striving to be and continue in the faith.—In the εὐρίσκεσθαι ἔκτη is included the being in a certain state, together with the being recognised in that state. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8; Mal. ii. 6. The interrogative ἀμαρτάνεις is found again only at Luke xviii. 8, therefore one might be tempted to read ἀμαρτάνεις without interrogation; but no critical authorities read so, and besides in St Paul μὴ γένοιτο ἔκτη is always found after a question. [Rom. iii. 6, 31, vi. 1, 15, xvii. 7, 13, xi. 1, 11; 1 Cor. vi. 15; Gal. iii. 21.] But according to the context ἀμαρτάνεις is here not num, but nonne. See Hermann ad Viger, page 823.)

Ver. 18. St Paul proceeds in his argument, “if I act so contradictorily as myself to build up again what I have destroyed, viz. the outward observance of the law, it is not Christ who has the blame, but I make myself a transgressor.” But here it is startling that St Paul speaks of a καταλύειν of the law, whereas in Matt. v. 17 Christ says he is not come to abolish the law but to fulfil it. But this contradiction lies in the letter only, not in the idea, for the πληρώσας, which Christ asserts of Himself, is just the καταλύειν of St Paul, who does not, either, wish inwardly, typically, and spiritually, to have the law dissolved, destroyed,—but it is only to be abrogated in the church as to its mere exterior. (The text. rec. reads συνιστήμη, for which, however, the best critics have set up, after A.B.C.D.F.G., the more unusual collateral form συμπαπάμα, which occurs in the same meaning: ostendo, declaro me, in 2 Cor. vi. 4, vii. 11.)

Vers. 19, 20. The following idea St Paul again connects by means of γὰρ with what precedes, in this sense: “the building up the destroyed law is very blameable, for the believer is in fact through the law dead to the law and lives now with Christ; if, therefore, he restores the law again that he might win salvation by it, that is as much as dying again in the new man in order to live in the old man.” (See Gal. v. 4.) For it is no doubt true that
the ἑγὼ denotes St Paul himself, not, however, in his individuality, but only as the representative of the faithful generally, as in Rom. vii. 9, ss. The ideas of living and dying (for which "being crucified with Christ" is but a stronger phrase, in order to point to the painful and shameful character of that death) are easily explained, and are very frequent in St Paul. (See particularly on Rom vi. 2, viii. 7, 9, ss.) In these words is described the process of being born again, the course of which is that the old sinful man dies, and the new one, who is created after God, becomes alive. Christ's death and life are the types of this inner life and death. The man who begins to live anew in the new birth is not the old I (cf. on Rom. vii. 9, ss.), but Christ in us. Though he that is born again still lives ἐν σαρκί, in human weakness and unseemliness, yet it is no longer τῆς σαρκός as in the old man, but τῷ Θεῷ, for God, and Divine ends. But this is obscure, how St Paul could say he was dead to the law through the law (διὰ νόμου), whereas it seems that it ought to have been put, he had died to sin through Christ or through faith. But St Paul understands the relation of the law to sin in such a way, that the former by commanding and forbidding has a power of provoking sinfulness to actual sin. The law makes sin become more sinful, i.e. makes it burst out in its whole nature and fearfulness, which are at first hidden from man himself. (See on Rom. v. 20, vii. 9, ss.). Therefore St Paul could well say νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, since he by the law understands it as some thing outward only; as the inner will of God—as the law written in the heart—it naturally continues to all eternity the normal law of man, but so that his will is in perfect concord with it. According to this acceptation, we may also explain how St Paul can even say: διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, for this idea only distinguishes the negative side from the positive, "through faith, through grace, I am dead to the law." For, as the law makes sin more and more sinful, it arouses in man the yearning after deliverance from it; sin becomes a burden to man, the feeling of sin excites the prayer: "wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" Rom. vii. 24, and with it enters the experience of deliverance itself. The further sin extends the nearer it approaches the moment of its destruction; through the law, by which it is heightened, it is also destroyed.

1 In Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12, there stands the still stronger phrase, "to be buried with Christ."
Thus the διὰ νόμου νόμος ἀπέθανον admits of being paraphrased thus: "In consequence of the experience of the inadequateness of the law to lead to true righteousness, as it rather brings sin to its complete development, I (believing in Christ) have given up connection with the law." If others, on the contrary, as Luther, Erasmus, Calovius, Bengel, choose to understand νόμος of faith, because it is called, Rom. iii. 27, νόμος πίστεως, it must be designated as a complete misconception. Νόμος alone can never denote faith. Theodoret and others would have understood by νόμος the prophecies concerning Christ, which stood for Christ Himself. But that too is forced. According to the exposition, Rom. viii. 9, ss., one can have no doubt at all as to the meaning of the words. But next as regards the life of Christ in us, for which this is a leading passage in St Paul's epistles, the rationalist view, viz. that there is nothing to be seen in it, but an eastern figure, no longer requires refutation; St Paul beyond all doubt—as the parallel expression of Christ's μετέω in the faithful, of his making his abode in their hearts (John xiv. 23) clearly show—wishes to assert a real indwelling of Christ in the soul, through the communication of His being. That too is now generally confessed; but, according to the Pantheistic tendency of the age, another extreme threatens us, viz. the opinion that St Paul asserts a vanishing of personality, an absorption into the universal ocean of deity, for which the οὐκέτι ἐγώ might seem to vouch; an expression, however, which is only meant to designate the old man. That St Paul is far enough removed from such Pantheism, is shown by the exegetical addition: ἐν πίστει ζωὴ τῷ νοὺν τοῦ Θεοῦ. But, besides this, he expressly designates Christ the Son of God, as the historical Christ, not as the mere Ισχα, Christ, that is to say, as Him, who loved mankind (the aorist denotes the reality in the decree of redemption), and, under the influence of that love, gave himself up unto death as a sacrifice for the sin of the world. This personality does not cease through Christ in us, nor even the life of faith (intuition belongs to the other world, 2 Cor. v. 7), but it is in that very abiding faith we receive Christ; if faith ceases, the indwelling of the Son of God ceases.

1 It is said not only, "I in them," but also, "they in me." (John xiv. 23, xvii. 18; Rev. iii. 20.) Since, therefore, Christ and God, and the Spirit in and with Him, dwells in the faithful, and builds them up into His one Temple, they not only preserve their personality, but receive it again in a higher form.
also. Faith, therefore, is *here again* taken as the spiritual receptivity for God and the divine workings of grace, not as the mere accepting certain doctrines as true, for that is merely a consequence of the living faith.

Ver. 21. Finally, St Paul closes this communication with the assurance *οὐχ ἀθέτω τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, a clause, which must be taken as a Litotes in the following sense: "I am, whilst expressing these ideas, so far from derogating from grace, that I rather establish it; for, if the fact were as my opponents will have it to be, viz. that righteousness can be attained through the law—Christ would have died in vain, and then there would have been no need of any other path of salvation than the law. (*Δωρεᾶν* = *δοκίμω*, *εἰκή*, without aim, fruitless. Cf. John xv. 25; Psa. xxxv. 7; Gal. iii. 4.).
II.

PART SECOND.

(iii. 1—v. 12.)

§ 5. OF THE CURSE OF THE LAW.

(iii. 1—14.)

Now, though the discourse from chap. ii. 14—21 is to be considered as addressed not merely to the apostle St Peter, but was so modified by St Paul, as to seem at the same time intended for the instruction of the Galatians (see the note on ii. 15); yet the epistle is not till now directed to its readers with a decided address. St Paul represents the rapid change of the Galatian Christians, considering the deep impression which they had received through his preaching of Christ, as an effect of enchantment, i.e. as an inexplicable and destructive operation of hostile powers. (Baσκαίνω is the usual word for “to bewitch, enchant, especially by the evil eye.” [Aelian anim. i. 35. Pliny H. N. vii. 2. Gellii Noct. Att. ix. 4.] It is commonly construed with a dat., seldom with the accus., e.g., Sirach xiv. 6.—For ἐβάσκανε there is also found the form ἐβάσκανεν, which is also pure Greek. [See Matthiae Gramm. i. 328.] The words τὴν ἀληθείαν μὴ πείθεσθαι are wanting in A.B.D.F.G., and are doubtless to be struck out as inserted in the text from v. 7.—The κατ' ὀφθαλμοῖς προεγράφη is meant to denote the lively and graphic setting forth of Christ and His work in St Paul's preaching. It is without reason that Beza, Grotius, and others, lay a stress on the preposition, and translate priūs, antehāc depictus est. Jesus is described as the crucified one,
because His death on the cross was the consummation of His work of redemption. It always, however, presupposes the resurrection which followed, as άνάστασις does the preceding death.—The έν άμων is not without obscurity: Ambrose, Luther, Brenz, Storr, take it as = έν ταῖς καρδίαις άμών, in a bad sense, q.d. "Christ, whom you have crucified in you, who, therefore, is dead, and dwells no more in you," clearly very inapty. The έν άμων is rather meant to represent the crucifixion of the Lord as having taken place among them. The omission of ος is to be accounted for by the heat of composition. We may add that έν άμων is wanting in such important critical authorities, viz. A.B.C., that Lachmann has ejected it from the text. However, the obscurity of the words does not make it probable they were added.)

Vers. 2, 3. St Paul now seeks to lead the Galatian Christians back into the right way by recalling to their minds their first experiences, the time of awakening grace, and of first love. But, instead of the subjective state of their minds, he mentions the objective cause of it, viz. the Holy Ghost, which came unto them through the preaching of faith, not through the anxious observance of the law. That being so, continues St Paul, it was a proof of folly to abandon the Spirit in whom they had begun the new life in Christ, and now to end in the flesh again, i.e. in the exterior observance of the law. The Judaists thought they could in and by the observance of the law retain the Holy Spirit; if by that observance is understood merely a pious custom, it is certainly possible, but the Judaists required it as a necessary condition for salvation, and, taken thus, it excludes the spirit of grace. No man can serve two masters! Man cannot live at the same time under the law and under grace! (Ver. 2. το πνεύμα is the specifically Christian spirit, the πνεύμα ἄγιον, which Christ first made accessible to mankind. (See on John vii. 39.).—That St Paul, in using the word πνεύμα, thought also of the extraordinary gifts of grace which he worked in the old church, is plainly shown by ver. 5.—'Ακοή πίστεως is not to be taken passively: "the hearing of faith," but actively: "the making the same heard, i.e. preaching," according to the analogy of the Heb. γινώσκω = κηρυγμα. [Comp. on John xii. 38, Rom. x. 17, with Isaiah liii. 1.] Ver. 3. 'Ενάρξεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖσθαι are opposed to each other in the same way also Phil. i. 6. Baza, Semler, and Paulus choose to find in ἐπι-
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τελειωθαι the meaning, "to perfect oneself, to attain to moral perfection;" but the antithesis with ἐνάρχεσθαι does not suit that view. Σάρξ and πνεῦμα are put together here in the same way that γράμμα and πνεῦμα are in Rom. ii. 29, as designations of the outward and the inward, the form and the essence.)

Ver 4. Like all newly-founded churches, the Galatians had been forced to endure much, both from Gentiles and Jews, in the way of insult and persecution; St Paul reminds them of it, with the question of whether they intend to endure all that without aim and result? For, if they fell away altogether from the faith and lost Christ, then it was all in vain. Homberg's interpretation, to which Koppe, Flatt, and Winer adhere, and according to which πάσχεων, as vox media, is taken to mean "to receive good," is inadmissible, for this reason, if for no other, that this use of the word is totally wanting in the New Testament. But St Paul adds further: εἰ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. This is taken by St Chrysostom and others, "if at least it is in vain, and you do not yet amend:" but in that case εἰκῇ would be expected (see Hermann ad Vigur. p. 834), and besides the καὶ does not suit well. Winer takes εἰ γε as quândocidem, sitquidem, see on 2 Cor. v. 2, so that the former question would be replied to: sitquidem frustra, i.e. puto equidem ista omnia vobis frustra contigisse." But even so the καὶ does not receive its full force, and it is clearly significant and completely warranted by criticism. It seems best with Rückert to take εἰ γε in the sense: "that is to say, if;" as Ephes. iii. 2, iv. 21, Coloss. i. 28, and καὶ for "yet," and to oppose the merely negative loss to a positive greater damage, viz. to the loss of salvation, in the sense: "if namely you have yet but suffered in vain, and nothing worse befalls you!"

Vers. 5, 6. Hereupon St Paul renews the question in ver. 2, but makes especially prominent, as regards the communication of the Holy Spirit, its most striking phenomenon, the ἐνάρξεις, the χαράγματα, which in the old church were conjoined with it. (See on 1 Cor. xii.) The natural answer to this question is "through faith;" and St Paul then proves this by Abraham's example, with an allusion to Genesis xv. 6. For the λογίζομαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην, and the making use of Abraham's antechristian life of faith, for the illustration of Christian faith, and its healing power, see the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. iv. 3—9. (Ver. 5. St Paul
uses χαρηγεῖν once only (2 Cor. ix. 10), but ἐπιχαρηγεῖν, larger-
ter suppeditate, often, as 2 Cor. ix. 10 [where both forms occur
side by side], Col. ii. 19.—Ἀναμένεις. stands by synecdoche for all
Charismata: elsewhere it denotes, in a special sense, a class of
Charismata. See on 1 Cor. xii. 10.—The ἐν ὑμῖν is not to be
taken: "among you," but as = ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν, as the spiritual
working is contemplated as an inward one.)

Vers. 7—9. The allusion to Abraham’s faith then moves St
Paul to elucidate to the Galatians the true conception of the chil-
dren of Abraham. The Judaists took it in a merely carnal and
outward sense, St Paul shows that it is to be taken in an inward
one. The true believers are the only true children of Abraham,
and partakers of the blessing with him, the father of the faithful.
The same ideas have already been spoken of on Rom. ii. 29, iv.
12; the idea in verse 8 is peculiar to that passage. By it St Paul
wishes to show how Abraham and his life, though it was before
Christ and His work, can be used for the illustration of the nature
of the life of faith, as commanded to the Gentiles also. This
can be done, inasmuch as before the eye of the omnipresent God the
future is as the present. The prophecy (Gen. xii, 3, xviii. 18)
God announced beforehand as his gracious decree, in the foresight
(and fore-resolve) that through faith in Christ the Gentiles also
should be justified. (Ver. 7. γεωργεῖς can be the Imperat. or the
Indic.; the former is probable, for St Paul clearly had not as yet
presupposed that the Galatians already acknowledged it, he is now
but exerting himself to convince them of it.—Ver. 8. ἡ γραφὴ
stands for the author of the Scriptures, viz. God, who worked by
means of human writers. The compound προενεπτειλέσθαι is not
found again in the New Testament. The text. rec. reads εὐλογη-
θήσονται, but ἐνεπλογθήσονται is to be preferred on the author-
ity of A.B.C.D.E.—The ἐν σοι = ἡμᾶς is explained by σὺν, which
follows.—Πιστὸς, according to the context, = πιστεῖτον. John
xx. 7; Col. i. 2.)

Ver. 10. From the blessing of faith St Paul is carried by the
antithesis to the curse of the law, to which all are subject who stand
on the ground of the law, and accordingly seek to attain righteous-
ness by works. The requirement of the law is this: that all the
commandments, without exception, be completely fulfilled, according
to Deut. xxvii. 26: "be that transgresses but one is guilty of the
whole law." Therefore blindness or hypocrisy alone can persuade itself that it has really fulfilled the law; the penitent man only perceives the more, the more earnestly he strives, how far he remains from the goal. This consciousness, without the grace of the forgiveness of sins, produces the feeling of the curse, of rejection by the holy and righteous God. The law, therefore, is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good, Rom. vii. 12, but on account of the existence of sin, even the good works curse and death. The Epistle to the Romans also contains the same thoughts, but the expression katápa, used of the law, is peculiar to this passage. (Katápa = ἡ τῶν, Gen. xlvii. 12; πᾶν, Mal. ii. 2. "Οὐ is to be read after γόρραπται γὰρ according to A.B.C.D.E.F.G. The quotation is, on the whole, according to the LXX., only the latter reads πᾶσαν ἀνθρωπος δοτικαι, and for γεγραμμένοις they have λόγοις. The phrase οὐκ ἐγγίκειν ἐν is also found in just the same way, Hebrews viii. 9.) To this it might be objected, but still there were pious and just men under the old covenant! These, according to St Paul's dictum, must have all been under the curse! In regard to the law they were so, but they also knew of Christ and his advent. The sacrifices of the Old Testament prefigured faith in Him; they found their peace therefore by faith in the future work of Christ, as we find ours in the same already completed; their fidelity and relative fulfilment of the law could alone give them no peace.

Vers. 11, 12. The train of argument drawn from the Old Testament, and proceeding step by step, is, of course, pursued with a view to the Judaists. He shows those defenders of the letter how they totally misapprehended the spirit of the Old Testament. Even as early as Hab. ii. 4, eternal life is adjudged to the just man through faith. On that passage we have already said what was necessary at Rom. i. 17. But the construction ὥστε ἐκ—δῆλον ὥστε is not to be taken with Homberg and Flatt as meaning, "since now no one is justified through the law, it is plain that, &c."—for a fresh argument is meant to follow, and therefore the words are to be connected in this way: "but that no one is justified by the law is plain from this, that, &c." St Paul shows, in ver. 12, that the law has however nothing to do with faith; taking the legal standing-point works are everything, for which Lev. xviii. 5 is cited. St Paul naturally, on this point, always contemplates the
law (not merely the ceremonial law, but also the moral law) in its external nature; with regard to its inner character it retains, as was noticed above, its importance for the state of faith as well. (Ver. 12. The clause δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πλεῖστως is striking, it should be: δὲ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πλεῖστως, but instead of the individual, the institution is put, to which the individual belongs. The αὐτὰ refers, according to the context in Lev. xviii. 5, to the separate commandments of the law. After αὐτὰ some MSS. have ἄνθρωπος, but it is omitted by A.B.C.D.F.G.

Ver. 13. Christ freed us from the curse of the law by taking upon Him what belonged to our race; in that is couched the admonition that if we wish to have a part in the blessing of Christ we must not return to the state under the law, and consequently under the curse which the law brings with it; but what is here called ἐξαγοράζω, which occurs again only at Gal. iv. 5, is elsewhere expressed by λατρέω, λύτρον διδόναι. The metaphor of the slavery of sin, from which Christ delivers, is the basis of the phrase. (See on the idea of the ἀπολύτρωσις the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. iii. 25.) The words γενόμενος ἐπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα denote the vicarious element in the work of Christ, which is treated of at Rom. v. 12, ss.; 2 Cor. v. 21. The ἐπὲρ therefore is here to be taken not in the sense of "on behalf of," but in that of "in our stead," as αὐτῷ Matt. xx. 28. Nearest in form to this passage is 2 Cor. v. 21, where it is said: τὸν μὴ γνώντα ἁμαρτίαν ἐπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε. As Christ in those words is called ἁμαρτία, so He is here called κατάρα, i.e. "bearer of the sin, of the curse;" He was treated as if He were the guilty one, the accursed one. Considered in and for Himself as the pure and holy one, Christ could be no object of the curse and of its consequence, punishment; but, as a member of the sinful human race, into which He had entered by putting on our human nature, and as its representative, its suffering was His suffering, and conversely, Christ's victory was the victory of humanity. As evidence of the fact that the curse, i.e. the punishment of sin, lay on Christ, St Paul appeals to our Lord's death on the cross, with an application of Deut. xxi. 23. In that passage, according to the context, there is no special allusion to Christ; it is only commanded in it, that those hanged (for the punishment of the cross was not practised among the Jews) should not remain hanging on
the tree all night; but, as a like shameful punishment fell upon 
our Lord, St Paul might justly apply those words to Him typically. 
It remains to be noticed that the words are freely cited from 
memory; in the LXX. they are as follows: *κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ Ἡ-
εού πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου.* (As to the grammatical connec-
tion of ver. 13, which stands entirely without any conjunction, it 
forms the antithesis to ver. 10. The *μὲν there*, and the *δὲ here*, 
are, however, left out, as in Col. iii. 4. The *κρεμάσθαι ἐπὶ ξύλον* 
answers to the Hebrew ṭ[b] b, Deut. v. 21, 22; Esther 
v. 14, vii. 10.)

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul designates as the object of Christ's 
sacrifice that by it the blessing of Abraham, of which mention was 
made in ver. 8, might come upon all nations, and that they might 
receive through faith in Him the promise of the Holy Ghost, which 
could not be attained through the law. The θην are, of course, 
not merely the Gentiles without the Jews, but both. In the ἐπαγ-
γελία πνεύματος the Spirit is to be understood as what was pro-
mised, so that in using the phrase passages like Joel iii. 1 were in 
the apostle's mind. The Holy Spirit, however, includes within 
Himself everything else worth wishing for. He is the author of the 
new birth, the creator of the new obedience, through which the be-
liever can serve God in spirit and in truth, and essentially fulfil 
the law, which is impossible without faith. (See on Rom. viii. 3.)

§ 6. ON THE RELATION OF THE LAW TO THE GOSPEL.

(iii. 15—iv. 7.)

Hitherto this Epistle has contained no ideas but such as we 
had already become acquainted with in the Epistle to the Romans; 
but in this section St Paul, that profound thinker, so rich in ideas, 
developes new and very remarkable views on the relation of the 
law to the Gospel, which gives this Epistle its peculiar importance. 
St Paul starts with the conception, touched on above, of God's 
promise to Abraham, and represents it as a bequest, as a Testa-
ment. He compares this *divine* Testament with a *human* one, 
and infers from that comparison that the attribute of the *latter*, 
viz. its irrevocable and unchangeable character, must surely neces-
sarily belong to the *former*. What is bequeathed in the testament must be handed over to the person to whom it is bequeathed, and to no other. Thus, too, the promise of God to Abraham and his seed cannot be cancelled by the law, which was promulgated later; it remains the inalienable right of the seed of Abraham, *i.e.* Christ. That is the train of thought in vers. 15 to 18. Let us now consider it in its details.

Ver. 15. St Paul was perfectly aware that the comparison of the divine promise with a human testament was not accurate in *all* points; he only means to speak *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. He brings prominently forward only *this* point, that a formally executed and confirmed will can be by no power cancelled or altered. (As to the phrase *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, see on Rom. iii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 8. "*Ομοι* is to be maintained in its original meaning, tamen, certè, and will be best referred with Rückert to *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, which precedes, in this sense: "I mean to speak only as a man; one certainly cannot abrogate a man's testament; how much less, then, can the divine testament be altered!" Winer supposes an hyperbaton, so that δινως would be put too early, whereas it should stand before *οὐδεὶς*: "a will, though only that of a man, can still not be abrogated."—*Διαθήκη* is "every settlement, disposition, by will;" that of a dying person is considered the most decided, thence "a testament." That St Paul thought of a will in the peculiar sense one is led to suppose, first, by *κεκυρωμένη*, which is meant to denote the confirmation, the formal judicial sanction, of the will [Hesychius and Phavorinus explain *κυρὼν* by *βεβαιω*]; and also by the idea of an inheritance, which pervades the whole of the following deduction, and which, Gal. v. 21, is designated as the kingdom of God. (Matt. v. 5.) *Διαθήκη* is used in just the same way, Heb. ix. 16, 17, with reference to the Gospel; but *there* the death of the testator is also made a prominent feature, which point is not touched on *here*.—As to *ἀπετέλει* see 1 Cor. i. 19.—*Επιδιατάσσονται*, insuper disponere, to make an ἐπιδιαθήκη, to annex codicils to the will. Frequent in Josephus. Here "to transform, change," in general.

Ver. 16. Now this is applied to Abraham. The promises were given to him and to his seed, therefore they can be fulfilled in him alone, and that, too, through the graciousness of Him who had promised them, not through the merits of any one. But St Paul uses
in his own way the mention of Abraham’s seed in the promises of the Old Testament.—He lays stress on the singular, saying that it is not τῶν σπέρματι, as if the prophecy related to many, but τῷ σπέρματι, as in relation to one, and that that one is Christ. It is easily understood how this passage has given much trouble to the interpreters, as σπέρμα (— γυνα) is, as is well known, used as a collective only. (On the various interpretations of the passage see especially Flatt’s excursus, p. 248, ss., and Tholuck’s Anzeiger for 1834, No. 32, ss.) Rückert declares his opinion shortly to be that St Paul has falsely interpreted the passage of the Old Testament, and has drawn inferences from it which are not and cannot be contained in it. In like manner, with regard to the arbitrary interpretation of the Old Testament on the part of the Jewish Rabbis, see Winer, Usteri, and Matthies. St Jerome, too, considered the argument very weak, but thought it was good enough for the stupid Galatians (iii. 1.)

The less we can accede to such an assertion, the more carefully must we weigh the difficulties. If we first of all consider the passages of the Old Testament which relate to the subject, we shall find them as follows: ἐνυλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, Gen. xxii. 18; καὶ δῶσω τῷ σπέρματί σου πάσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, καὶ εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, xxvi. 4; finally: καὶ ἐνυλογηθήσονται ἐν σοί πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου, xxviii. 14. Immediately before (xxviii. 13), however, we read also: δῶσω σοι τὴν γῆν καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου. But, as the last passages refer to Isaac and Jacob, we have only xxii. 18 to think of particularly, though the later prophecies are at bottom but a resumption of those relating to Abraham, and therefore could be taken in conjunction with that one by St Paul without any impropriety. The passage, Rom. iv. 13, shows, besides, that St Paul does not understand the reference to those promises quite literally; there it is said: ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ τῷ σπέρματί αὐτοῦ. Now, according to the words of our passage, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρήθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, the promises are to be represented as subservient to the advantage of Abraham and his

1 It is true the plural γυνα occurs 1 Sam. viii. 15, but in the meaning “grains of wheat.”
seed. But in the passages cited from Genesis the other side stands out prominently, viz. that in and through Abraham's seed all nations shall be blessed. Now this seems to suit the reference to Christ's person better than the former one, which leads one to think more of the mass of the descendants of Abraham. However, if one reflects that the blessing, which came through Christ, must also be understood as His own blessing, then no great difficulty would exist in this interpretation. St Paul refers to the Old Testament freely, without citing with literal accuracy. But the stress that St Paul lays on the singular still contains something very obscure. True, it is only by a few interpreters that Ἑρωτος is referred merely to the person of Jesus. If this were the case, then Ἰησους would be put. In general Ἑρωτος is rather understood of the faithful (1 Cor. xii. 12), the body of Christ as the true children of Abraham (Rom. iv. 11), and it is only left undecided, whether the faithful alone are to be understood by that word, or in conjunction with the person of the Saviour. But, of course, the latter only can be supposed; for the community of believers is called Christ, so far only as He lives in it, is its πληρωμα and its κεφαλη. In fact, ver. 28 decidedly favours this acceptation of Ἑρωτος, for there the faithful are described as one in Christ, and therefore as Abraham's seed. Vers. 17—19 are against it only in appearance, for there Christ can also be properly understood of Jesus as the founder of the Church of the Faithful, and therefore as including them in Himself. But, suitable as this interpretation may seem to the context, and the usual train of St Paul's ideas, the emphasis which St Paul lays on the singular is not explained by it; on the contrary, that point seems by it to be made more difficult of explanation, for, according to it, Christ certainly signifies neither more nor less than a multitude, namely Jesus with all believers in Him. This difficulty is only resolved by assuming that St Paul wishes to set Abraham's posterity, in a certain sense, in opposition to that posterity, in another sense, so that he speaks not of individuals, but of classes of individuals. As not all the children of Abraham's body were heirs of his blessing, but Isaac only, as is further developed (Gal. iv. 22, ss.), so also the merely bodily descendants of Abraham are not heirs of his promises, but only the Christ among them is that heir, whom the στοιχεῖα τῶν Ἰχρεια τῆς πίστεως Ἀβραάμ (Rom. iv. 12) form. This difference be-
tween the seed of Abraham according to the flesh and according to the spirit with respect to their relation to God's gracious promises, is what the stress laid on the singular is to point out. Now, if any one asks if that idea is purposely included in the singular σπέρμα by the author of Genesis, we shall certainly not be able to affirm it. But St Paul had, like all the writers in the New Testament, by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, full power to transcend the standing-point from which the writer consciously viewed the subject, and to unveil the innermost truth of the idea according to the meaning of Him that promises and prophecied.

Though, therefore, Jewish literati applied to a similar purpose passages in the Old Testament, the difference between the mode of proceeding in the apostles and that of the Rabbis is always this, that the learned Jews treated them merely with human caprice, whereby their acumen often degenerated into puerile conceits, while the apostles, guided by the Holy Ghost, always infallibly revealed the true meaning of the prophecying spirit (2 Peter i. 20, 21.)

Vers. 17, 18. From the metaphor of the Testament St Paul now deduces the following train of argument; the promise of inheritance made to any one by a Testament, by a solemn declaration of one's will, belongs to him merely through the gracious will of the testator, not through works proceeding from the heir; accordingly, the promise made to Abraham also can be fulfilled only through the grace of God; the law, coming in between the promise and its fulfilment, and requiring the active obedience of those to whom the fulfilment is given, can operate nothing towards the fulfilment, nor can it either make the promise invalid. What it can do, as is developed later, is merely this, to prepare the recipients for the reception of grace. The only difficulty which appears in these verses is in the numeral. The law seems to be dated τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη after Abraham, as, according to Exod. xii. 40, that number denotes the years that the Israelites passed in Egypt. (See as to a similar difficulty with regard to this number the observations in the Comm. on Acts vii. 6.) But in our passage mention is plainly made of the number only quite cursorily; St Paul, therefore, names the number of 430 years, which was well known to the Scriptures, which he could do the more easily as he does not give accurately the terminus a quo. But the era from which he
reckons is not so much connected with the person of Abraham himself, as with the promise; but the latter was, as we observed, given to the patriarchs Isaac and Jacob also, just as it was to Abraham; St Paul could, therefore, properly count from Jacob also and his entry into Egypt. (Vers. 17. τάντα δὲ λέγω, "I mean by that, I understand that so." See Rom. xv. 8.—The προεκκυρω-μένη refers to the relation of the promise to the law, the confirmation of the promise preceded the law, and that too by many a long year. So much later an event could not, therefore, invalidate the earlier one.

The εἰς Χριστὸν is to be taken: "To Christ," as the terminus ad quem. Καταργεῖν = ἀβετέω, ver. 15.—The ἐπαγγελία is considered as the inheritance set apart in the Testament for the seed of Abraham, which cannot be demanded in reliance on works of the law, but is a pure gift of grace, κεχώρισται ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας. Χαριζομαι is to be taken transitively, "to show oneself gracious;" it often = ἀφίμαι, as 2 Cor. ii. 7—10.—The οὐκ ἐτι in ver. 18 is not equal to οὐκ, but is to be taken as non amplius).

Ver. 19. But according to this exposition the opinion might force itself on the Jewish conscience, that the law seemed something superfluous, if everything depended on the promise and its fulfilment merely; but the Jew was wont to view the law as God's most glorious institution. St Paul feels, therefore, the need of developing the significance of the law more fully in what follows, and in such a way too, that though he does full justice to the institution of the law of Moses, he yet, at the same time, points out how it always bore the character of a transitory institution, the object of which was to prepare for the fulfilment of the promise in Christ. He sets it prominently forward as the first characteristic feature of the law, that it was given τῶν παραβάτων χάριν. The words might certainly mean, according to St Paul's mode of thinking and representation, "in order to call forth transgressions, to bring it about that the hidden nature of sin might make itself known in transgressions." (See on Rom. v. 20, vii. 10.) But this idea does not suit the context of our passage. St Paul merely wants to approach nearer to the ground taken up by the Jews, to resolve a difficulty in his previous exposition; but by that interpretation of the words he would add a new and greater difficulty
to the previous one. The words are no doubt here meant to signify: "The law is to repress gross outward transgressions, through the fear which it excites;" in which is couched at the same time an antithesis to the New Testament, viz. that it was quite incapable of effecting an inward transformation in man (ver. 21). The reading of the text. rec., προσετέθη, is so satisfactorily vouched for, that we prefer it with Lachmann. In the προς is very suitably expressed that the law was subsequently added to the promise, and thus its accessory nature is indicated. In Rom. v. 20, παρεισήλθε is used in a similar way of the law. The second point is touched on in the words: ἐκρυμος οὐ ἐλθη κ. τ. λ., which need, by no means, be put in brackets, but are immediately connected with the tout ensemble of the ideas. For in them is expressed the transitoriness of the dispensation of the law, which has meaning only until Christ. Τὸ σπέρμα ὅ ἐπήγγελται is, of course, Christ, but not, as was remarked on verse 17, the person of Jesus merely, but together with Him the church of believers, which forms His body; the meaning, therefore, is: until the newer and higher order of things introduced by Christ. (The reading ὅ for ὅ has such slight authority for it, that it has no claim to be received.) Thirdly, St. Paul calls the law διαταγέως δι᾿ ἄγγελον. That by this phrase we are to understand angels in the proper sense of the word, and not, e. g. men like Moses, Aaron, and the prophets, need not be said. But now the Old Testament says nothing of the presence and co-operation of the angels at the promulgation of the law. But in the passage, Deut. xxxiii. 2, the LXX. have already translated: ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ. In Rabbinical writings the same idea is often found. (See Jalkut Rubeni. p. 197, 3.). Josephus, too, is familiar with it (Ant. xv. 15, 3.), and the New Testament recognizes it here, and Acts vii. 53, Hebrews ii. 2, as correct. Of course, however, the appearance of the angels does not exclude the appearance of Jehovah, the former only accompanies the latter. The reading ἄγγελον, which C gives, proclaims itself at the first glance as a mere correction; probably the singular is meant to refer to the angel of the Covenant, of whom the Old Testament speaks, Mal. ii. 8; but, what makes the apostle here take note of that tradition of the ministry of the angels at the foundation of the dispensation of the old Covenant? He means by it, on the one hand, to set forth the glory of the law, but also,
on the other hand, the infinite pre-eminence of the New Testament, which was promulgated not by angels, but by the Son of God Himself. Fourthly, and finally, the law was διαταγές ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, i.e. of Moses, as indeed some MSS. of no importance read. Elsewhere, Christ also is called so (see 1 Tim. ii. 5; Hebrews ix. 15, xii. 24), of whom, however, no interpreter will think again in this place. The name μεσίτης was bestowed on Moses in consequence of the events related in Exod. xix. 16, Deut. v. 5; for the people, under a sense of their unworthiness, besought Moses to approach to the divine appearance, in these words, "go thou near, we are afraid!" He therefore stood between God and the people, and became in his person the means of conveying the law from God to man. The Rabbinical name for μεσίτης is ημιαζών. (See Buxtorf Lex. Talmud, et Rabb., page 1555. The passages relating to this point are collected by Schöttgen on this passage.) The object of this remark of St Paul's is now again to show how far the law stands below the New Testament; in the Old Testament, God and the people appear quite separated, Moses must act the mediator; in the New Testament the Godhead and manhood are united in an inseparable union in Christ. Accordingly we cannot either, according to the context of the whole passage, here understand the Metatros by the μεσίτης, which view Schmieder recommends in his learned essay. (Naumburg, 1826, quarto.) For what is true in this idea of the Metatros (see on John i. 1, page 34, 3d edn.), may be reduced to the doctrine of the λόγος; but we cannot suppose any allusion to that here, as the mention of his manifestation would set the promulgation of the law on an equality with the Gospel; whilst the contrary was in favour of the apostle's argument. (The ἐν χειρὶ answers to the τῆς. See Acts v. 12, vii. 35.)

Ver. 20. At this famous or notorious passage it cannot of course be our task to reckon up all the different interpretations which, if we reckon all the shades of opinion on this point, amount to hundreds; for, first of all, most of them are of such a sort, that they proclaim themselves at the very first glance as capricious and forced (as, e.g., that of Weigand in the work to be cited below, who for ἔνδος wants to read ἐνος in the sense annuus, so that the meaning would be: "the yearly mediator is no more," whereas ἐνος is not annuus, yearly, i.e. recurring every year, but only annotinus, hor-
notinus, "this year's;") and, 2ndly, it is not merely in separate excursus to the Comms. of Flatt, Winer, and others, that information is given on the various interpretations, but they are also collected and criticised in separate dissertations. We therefore confine ourselves to first communicating our view of the passage; and, secondly, pointing out some leading interpretations, whether connected with ours or departing from it. First of all, however, it is to be observed that (what is a rarity in the case of important and difficult passages) not one various reading occurs in this verse in all the manuscripts and critical authorities; that is a proof that the copyists were very careful in copying the passage, and, on account of its unimportant dogmatical contents, had not the slightest interest on either side to alter anything in it. Lücke's view, that ver. 20 is a mere gloss, appears, after this result of the critical auxiliaries, quite inadmissible; as to what relates further to the connection of ver. 20 with the preceding and succeeding ones, it plainly forms a collateral remark (caused by the words ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου), which, as such, if one pleases, may be enclosed in brackets. For the following question: ὅ σὸν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ; takes up the question of ver. 19, τί σὸν ὁ νόμος; with a new turn, and carries further the argument already begun. The meaning of the words, however, in ver. 20 itself cannot per se be difficult; indeed, the later interpreters Winer, Hermann, Schleiermacher, Usteri, Matthies, Rückert, are quite unanimous in their acceptance of the separate words; they only vary in their determination of the connection those words have with the course of the argument. For ὁ μεσίτης denotes the idea of the Mediator, every Mediator, as such; the ἐνὸς σὺκ ἐστὶ expresses that a mediator necessarily presupposes two; one cannot be represented by a mediator. There is no sufficient reason to supply μέ-ρους with ἐνὸς, it can be taken as masculine, which is to be preferred on account of the following εἰς. The second half of the verse: ὅ δὲ Θεὸς εἰς ἐστὶν, now explains further that God is only

1 Among them are Bonitus plurimorum de loco, Galat. iii. 20, sententiae examinatæ novaque ejus interpretatio tentata. Lips. 1800. Kellii programmata de varii interpretum de loco, Galat. iii. 20, sententias. Lips. 1800—1813. 7 Dissertations reprintied in Kellii Opuscula edid. Goldhorn. vol. 1.—Weigand ἐνὸς in nobilissimo Pauli effato (Galat. iii. 20), hanc genitivo, sed nominativo, casu esse positum, examinatis eliorum 243 interpretationem explicationibus, docere studuit. Erfordim. 1821. See, further, Schneckenburger's Beiträge, page 186, ss. Ullmann's Studien for 1883, part i. page 121, ss.
one party, and therefore the idea of a Mediator presupposes that there is yet a second party there, namely, the people; or, taken in a wider sense, mankind. According to this interpretation, the article needed not to be repeated before els, it certainly could have stood there, but it was not necessary. It is wanting in Luke xvii. 34, just as here, in a connexion completely parallel, although there an ὅ ἐφεσ follows also. (Cf. Winers Gram. p. 108.) Only one cannot translate: "God is the one party," but "God is one, or a single one," and consequently also only one party. The only real difficulty in this passage is then the question, what object St Paul has in making this remark. On account of the brevity of the words, and their merely subordinate position, we may be doubtful with regard to the answer to that question. To me, however, it is most probable that the idea in ver. 20 connects itself in St Paul's mind with the principal idea of his chain of argument thus. Ver. 19 was meant, it is true, to set forth the relative excellence of the law, but so, that its inferiority to the Gospel was also ever apparent. To make this inferiority observable is exactly St Paul's object in giving this elucidation of the idea of the Mediator. The mediation presupposes the being separate, one cannot be mediated for; since God is the one part, there must also have been a second too, mankind, who were separated from God. In the Gospel it is otherwise; in Christ, the representative of the church, all are one, all divisions and differences are in Him annihilated, as is developed in ver. 28. In opposition to that view, only this one argument might be adduced with any plausibility, viz. that St Paul does certainly, 1 Tim. ii. 5, call Christ Himself "Mediator," and ascribes to Him in other passages also a mediatorial work, as Ephes. ii. 14. But here there is chosen only a different mode of contemplation and representation, without its being necessary for us to suppose that St Paul had changed his original idea of Christ. Here, that is to say, he contemplates the Redeemer merely as to His person, how God and man are united in Him; and thus all Mediators appear superfluous. On the other hand, in other places he (St Paul) considers not Christ Himself, but His work, and, in regard to that, Christ Himself could be named Mediator, because He, through it, communicates by degrees to the faithful also the union with God already completed in His person. If we, after this, consider some other explanation of
the passage, we must, first of all, reject all those, which, as Steudel, Flatt, and others, in ver. 19 and 20, whether in the whole or only a part of the verses, have chosen to find the words of a Judaizing opponent. The various members of St Paul's argument are so closely knit together, that the slightest trace of foreign matter is no where to be discovered. Only the questions are naturally arranged with reference to the ground taken up by St Paul's Judaizing opponents. In the same manner, we reject, at the outset, all explanations, in which the simple meaning of the words is twisted, as, besides the already cited exposition of Weigand, is also the case with Bertholdt, who chooses to have ἐνὸς understood of Abraham (!), because he is called in Isaiah li. 2, ἡμεῖς; in the sense: "this Mediator (Moses) is, however, not Abraham's Mediator (but then τοῦ ἐνὸς must, at all events, have been put.) But God is the same who gave the Law and the promise." A closer consideration, however, is required by Schleiermacher's and Usteri's interpretation, which the latter (Comm. p. 121) gives as follows: "The Law was given on account of transgressions, with the help of angels, through a mediator. But a mediator relates not to one party merely, but always presupposes two parties. (The contract is binding on both parties; now, since the Jewish people have transgressed the Law, God cannot in relation to the Law fulfil His promises, but only His threatenings.) But God is one; where He has acted, without a mediator, alone for Himself, as in His announcement to Abraham, there too the fulfilment is independent of another party (and therefore, for example, of the circumstance, whether the Jews should fulfil the Law); promise and fulfilment are both His free gift. Is then the Law at variance with the promises? God forbid!" But I must assent to Winer's remarks against this acceptance of the passage. In it the radical idea of ver. 15—18 is carried on to the deduction following from ver. 19 forward; but that is inadmissible for this reason, that here, beginning from ver. 19 forth, the peculiar glory of the Law, as an independent divine institution, is considered. Further, the idea of the μεσίτης is totally different from that of the maker of a contract, of a διαθήκη, or of a συνθήκη, as Winer very judiciously remarks. Usteri's defence against Winer (ubi supra, p. 122) seems but little satisfactory. Only I can just as little assent to the independent explanation of Winer. For he expresses himself thus: non potest μεσίτης
cogitari qui sit unus partis; Deus est una tantummodo pars; itaque quænam est altera? Gens Israelitica. Jam si hoc sponte efficitur, legem mosaicam pertinere etiam ad Judæos hosque legistì observandæ adstrictos fusse. But this remark seems quite idle, since neither Jews nor Christians doubted that the Jews were bound to the observance of the Law. We can, therefore, feel ourselves satisfied by the first-proposed interpretation only, which allows their full force, as well to the separate words, as to the context, by which we must here let ourselves be especially guided. For Hermann's exposition: interventor non est unus (i.e. ubi interventor est, ibi duos minimum esse oportet), Deus autem unus est—ergò apud Deum cogitari non potest interventor, will scarcely have the power to recommend itself to any one, as the conclusion is clearly quite illogical, and the thought thoroughly unscriptural.

Ver. 21. St Paul now again takes up the question from ver. 19; and that too in such a way that he connects his discourse with the therein-mentioned attributes of the Law: "is, then, according to what has just been said, the Law against the promises of God, which were given to Abraham (ver. 16) ?" By no means, that would be the case only if it were designed to communicate new life to man; but that belongs not to the Law, which is merely given by God for a time, in order to restrain gross transgressions, and to prepare for Christ. (Cf. on the article before δυνάμενος, the passage i. 7, εἰσὶν οἱ ταράδσωντες.—The ζωοποιήσαμε presupposes, that the natural man is dead, and therefore incapable of fulfilling the Law. Cf. Rom. viii. 3.—For δυτως F.G. read ἀληθείᾳ, surely only as a gloss. In the words ἀν ἐκ νόμου ἂν there is found in the manuscripts a very great difference with regard to their collocation. The collocation ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἂν has A.B.C. for vouchers, and is justly preferred by Lachmann.)

Ver. 22. In bold words St Paul so represents the matter, as if God had purposely left all under sin, and had therefore not removed it through the Law in order to manifest His grace the more gloriously. We read the same idea Rom. xi. 32, συνέκλεισε ὁ Θεός τὸν πάντας εἰς ἀπείδειαν, ἵνα τὸν πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. We can lay no stress, with Calvin and others, on the neuter τὰ πάντα in this passage of Galatians, since in the second half mention is expressly made of the πιστεύοντες; the expression is only meant to denote the human race collectively, Gentiles as well as Jews. (Rom. i. 2.)
But "the Scripture" stands again here, as iii. 8, for God, the author of it, and of the Law in it. The metaphor of a prison lies at the root of the phrase σωκελείων ἐπε; God has left man in the power of his master, the Law could not free him from it, but could only work in him the feeling of bondage; God's grace alone could release him.—In this passage nothing can give rise to hesitation, except the circumstance that the σωκελείων seems to express a divine activity in relation to the sinful state of man. But the sinful state of man is here presupposed, it is only maintained that it pleased God, not to destroy again that state, but to leave man for a time in sin, and not to send deliverance, except through Christ. This abandonment of man to sin, however, had the object in view, of suffering the consciousness of the frightfulness of sin first to develop itself in mankind in all its force, for real deliverance can only attach itself to the yearning to be free from it. (The ἄλλα connects itself thus with ver. 21, "but it was not so, that righteousness might come through the Law: God has rather concluded all under sin.")

Ver. 23. Now the being concluded under sin is represented as a being kept and reserved until the time of the revelation of the dispensation of faith. But, instead of the above ἐπε ἄμαρτίαν, ἐπε νόμου stands now. This change explains itself by the circumstance, that St Paul represents the Law as the power which brings hidden sin to light, and thereby (home) to the conscience. Sin and the Law are, therefore, in his view correlatives. But it is remarkable that in verse 22 the discourse was of all mankind, even Gentiles, while the Law was given to the Jews only; for, that νόμος means here especially the institution of the Law, as Moses gave it, is clear from verses 10 and 21. Certainly, the whole of the apostle's chain of argument also tends especially to represent the relation of the two dispensations of the Old and New Covenants. However, all that holds good of the Law of Moses certainly also holds good, although in a less degree, of the natural law of the Gentile world (Rom. ii. 14, 15), and, according to the context, it must always be referred to this general human law along with the other. (As the πίστις is here described as one μέλλουσα ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, it must be understood of the faith revealed as an object, not of the subjective state of faith; for the latter was from
all time in individuals, even before Christ, as iii. 6 shows.—On the collocation of the concluding words see Rom. viii. 18.)

Vers. 24, 25. St Paul concludes then, after that, with the thought, that the destination of the Law was to lead unto Christ, that, therefore, with the coming in of Christ, and the dispensation of faith, its office ceased; which is only another representation of the contents of verse 19. Righteousness can never be attained by the Law, it comes only by faith. As St Paul here represents the Law as παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστὸν, so did the Fathers represent Philosophy for the Gentiles, which may be called a natural law, and, in fact, genuine philosophy exercised a similar educating influence on mankind as the Law of Moses did, though of course in a much narrower circle. But in the conception of the παιδαγωγὸς is couched not merely that of supervision, and restraining from what is injurious, but also that of bringing up and moulding. Man, as long as he lives under the Law, is afterwards (chap. iv. 1, ss.) compared with a minor, who requires education; with the coming in of Christ, man is considered grown up, of full age, and independent. And, as in the race, so also in the individual, regeneration, the entry of Christ into the inner world, is impossible without development unto consciousness; but without regeneration man evermore remains in a state of childhood.

Vers. 26, 27. Believers, therefore, can no longer be under the Law, because they are νιὼμ Θεοῦ, and that are they, because all those baptized have put on Christ. Baptism unto Christ is, therefore, here, according to its innermost idea, understood as the act of regeneration itself, in which the old man dies, the new man is born (Rom. vi. 3.) The Χριστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι is a description of what happens in the new birth. This expression, borrowed from passages in the Old Testament (Isa. lxii. 10), denotes the most intimate appropriation of Christ, so that in Ephes. iv. 21, Col. iii. 10, to put on the new man is used as = ἀνακαινοῦσθαι; and 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, ἀθανασίαν, ἀβαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι denotes the change of the mortal body into the immortal nature of corporeity. But with whomsoever Christ joins Himself, to him, He, the Son of God, also communicates the nature of a child of God. But St Paul names, in Rom. viii. 14, πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγερσθαι as the characteristic sign of the νιὼς Θεοῦ. Whilst, therefore, the slavishly-dis-
posed man under the Law strives to keep God's commands through fear alone, but in his heart loves sin, the child of God performs God's will through inward pleasure and joy, out of love to holiness. —In the conception νικός Θεοῦ (which name is substantially equivalent to τέκνα Θεός, only that the former expresses the idea of one conscious, grown up, more than the latter), two extremes are to be avoided. First, the one according to which the idea is deprived of everything distinctive, and is lowered to a merely figurative expression, as if every one were by nature a child of God, and received through Christ only the consciousness of it. But, secondly, the other is just as much to be avoided, viz. as if all men became through the new birth sons of God in the sense in which Christ Himself is so. The truth lies in the middle. Christ really communicates His very nature to man in the new birth, changes them into Himself, imparts to them somewhat of His divine nature; but just because man receives this higher life by communication only, whilst Christ possesses it originally and independently, man is never called νικός Θεός, in the sense that Christ is, who is and remains δομοφόρος. (See in the Comm. on Luke i. 35.)

Vers. 28, 29. With this elevation into children of God all the distinctions also which, while out of Christ, have any significance in a religious or political point of view, are levelled unto the faithful in their religious relations; they form a great living unity in Christ, i.e. one which Christ fills with His Spirit and life. The participation in this one holy living fellowship, the true σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, to whom the promises are given (vers. 15, 16), is also the only condition of participation in the divine inheritance. Thus the end is strictly connected with the beginning (ver. 15.) But in this passage it is, first of all, surprising that we have πάντας εἷς ἐστι, as we expect ὑπό, which is found, it is true, in F.G., but merely as a correction. We in fact find in the Gospels ὑπό εἶναι always (John x. 30, xvii. 11, 21.) But the masc. is surely chosen here with reference to ver. 16, where the one seed is called Christ, as 1 Cor. xii. 12; but it is not essentially different from ὑπό, for a merging of individualities is by no means meant to be expressed by the masc. But, in the second place, it seems erroneous to say that all distinctions are abolished by Christianity. True, the contrast of Jews and Gentiles is abolished as a religious distinction (and yet even that not absolutely; see the remarks on the parallel passage,
Col. iii. 11), but not the general human one of man and wife (i.e. of course, not in the physical but in the ethical relation, according to which the wife appears subordinate to the husband after as before), nor the political one of freedom and slavery. A revolutionary lust of liberty might think it had found in these words of the apostle a support of its frenzied projects. But the way in which St Paul himself in other places speaks on the subordination of the wife to the husband, of the servant to the master (1 Cor. xi. 7, ss.; Ephes. v. 22, ss.; Col. iii. 18; Ephes. vi. 5, ss.; Col. iii. 22, ss.), leaves not the slightest doubt but that St Paul, even in these contrasts, means the eye to rest on the religious-moral side of them only. It is only in the kingdom of God that all become one in Christ in every relation. (As to ἐν, Col. iii. 11, James i. 17, which the elder grammarians, and even Fritzsche, look on as contracted from ἐνεστί, but Winer with Buttmann take for the apostrophized ἐν, ἐνι,—see Winer's Gramm. page 76.)

Chap. iv. 1, 2. In what follows, down to ver. 7, St Paul carries out another subordinate idea, to which the mention of sonship and inheritance in what precedes leads him. For in a certain point of view it may be said that men, even before Christ, are children of God, not merely as created by God the Father, but also as being called to regeneration, and consequently furnished with the capacity for it.

But as, in outward life, the heir, while a minor, is on a par with the servant, though he is the lord of all (of the whole inheritance), so it is also in the spiritual; it was requisite for mankind first to become ripe in spirit, before Christ could come. As the heir, while a minor, is subject to tutors, so mankind, while of immature age, are under the Law, as a παιδαγωγός. This idea is very remarkable, inasmuch as there is plainly expressed in it, that man, even without and before Christ, therefore while yet in sin, was, however, always the master of all; it is true he is in a state of humiliation, but for all that his nobility still shines through. In the κύριος πάντων, namely, there probably lies a reference to the dominion over the earth bestowed on man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 5), which in Christ came fully to completion, and in the kingdom of God will be exercised by all believers. (Ver. 2, ἐπίτροπος is a guardian [Xen. Mem. i. 2, 40; Ælian v. H. iii. 26, xiii. 44], who supplies the place of the dead or absent father. Oικώ-
νομος, on the other hand, is the steward who has the management of the estate. Both expressions compose here the combined idea of conducting or leading by means of a power standing between God and man, namely, of a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστὸν. To consider these teachers of the minor as having especial reference to prophets or priests, is unsuitable; they merely represent the Law in general; we must not insist on the difference between the two expressions, nor on the plural's being used. The only meaning which might be claimed for the latter would be, that by it the Law of Moses, and the natural Law together, would be denoted.—Προθεσμία, tempus constituendum, a legal term, which occurs very often in the oratora.)

Vers. 3, 4. The apostle has certainly now the Jews principally in his mind in this comparison, so that τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου mean the institution of the Law of Moses; but, in a more extended sense, the idea holds good also of the Gentile world, which showed itself even better prepared than the Jews; not because it had just as good preparative means, but because it used the inferior ones more honestly. The πληρωμα τοῦ χρόνου (answering to the προθεσμία τοῦ πατρός in the metaphor, and therefore to be taken as an attainment of one's full age) is an historical event of universal importance for the human race; it is indeed the turning-point of the old and new time, so that Christ forms the centre of the history of the world, in which all the radii meet, to which all points before Him, and from which all proceeds after Him. The choice of this time is certainly an act of the divine decree, but no arbitrary one, rather one determined by the course of the development of the human race. The expression πληρωμα is to be explained by fancying or picturing to one's-self that a space of time is, as it were, filled up by the streaming in of time until the terminus ad quem; but then it is also at the same time intimated in it, that all the conditions, which were necessary for the coming in of the event of Christ's mission, were brought to completion. (See on the phrase πληρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3; Ephes. i. 9. It can by no means be referred, as συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος, to the latter days, to the end of the world; for, though the writers of the New Testament look on the latter days as come in with Christ's advent (see 1 Cor. x. 11), the relation to them does not lie in the πληρωμα τοῦ χρόνου or τῶν καιρῶν. If
this were the case, it would stand as in Tobit. xiv. 5: ἂν πληρωθῶσι καὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος.) But the ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, which answers to the ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους in the metaphor, is peculiar. For στοιχεῖον means elementum, in the two-fold meaning of original matter (2 Peter iii. 10), and first principles (Hebrews v. 12.) The Fathers adhered to the first meaning, and referred ἡμεῖς to the Gentiles, so that mention would be made of their worship of nature and the elements. "We served under the elements of the world" would mean "we were subject to the power of nature, which were embodied in the idols." But mention is not made here of the Gentiles especially, the ὑπὸ νόμον in verse 5, and the στοιχεῖα, to which the converted Gentiles fell back, according to verse 9, rather point plainly to the Law of Moses, to which also the phrase στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Col. ii. 8. 20 refers. Now, how the Old Testament in relation to the Gospel can be called στοιχεῖα, elementa, the first steps of religious life, is easily comprehended; but the addition κόσμου is puzzling. For the phrase has the collateral idea of the being fallen a prey to sin and corruption (1 John ii. 16.) But how can that be said of the Old Testament, as it surely still remains a divine institution, even if it be a subordinate one? It might be thought the genitive is not meant to designate the character of the στοιχεῖα, but their destination for the education of the world; but in that case the dative, or εἰς, must necessarily have been used. Or again, it might be supposed allowable to assume, that St Paul by that name does not mean to designate the Old Testament per se, but only the Rabbinical variously perverted mode of interpreting it, the so-called δευτερόωςεις of the Scribes, which went beyond the institutions of Moses. But, according to iv. 10, that is not the case. He designates the purely Mosaïcal institutions as ἀθενή καὶ πτωχά στοιχεῖα (ver. 9), just as in Heb. vii. 18 mention is made of something ἀθενής καὶ ἀνωφελής in the Law. However, these epithets seem yet milder than the addition τοῦ κόσμου. For the ἀθενής designates merely the character of the Law, according to which it imparts no higher power, and πτωχός its restricted nature, compared with the riches of the Gospel. Both are so ordered by God. But the addition τοῦ κόσμου points to something sinful. This mode of expression can only be explained by distinguishing two modes of interpreting the Old Testament, the outward and the inward, the
literal and the spiritual. The *inward* and *only true* one recognizes in its rites and ordinances the outward and visible signs of more profound ideas; *e.g.* in circumcision it sees the inward cleansing of the soul, the circumcision of the heart, &c.; if, therefore, it *does not* neglect the outward, yet it always takes it in connexion with the *inner idea*. The *outward* mode, on the contrary, stops short at the actions as such, without taking into consideration the idea which lies in them; it was thus the Judaizers interpreted it, and in this form the Old Testament appeared not merely as the beginning of the divine life, but as fallen a prey to the world, as more than poor and spiritless, viz. as incapable of amending and changing the heart. But we cannot consider it as a characteristic of the Old Testament itself that it contains the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, for, according to its inner idea, it is eternal, imperishable, and complete, as a work of the living God. (Matt. v. 17, 18.) Finding such expressions, one comprehends how so many could take offence at St Paul's labours!

Ver. 5. Now from this yoke Christ has redeemed man (iii. 13), that they through Him might receive the adoption of sons (iii. 20), *i.e.* forgiveness of sins, and strength unto a new life, iii. 14.—But in the description of Christ His earthly humility is (in the words *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς* (κόρης Ἰωάννης, Job xiv. 1), *γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον*) contrasted with the majesty which is denoted in the name ὁ νῦς τ. Θ.

The *former* phrase denotes the reality of Christ's incarnation, perhaps with a thus early reference to Docetic heresies; as the Son of God He was begotten of God, as man He was born of Mary. The *latter* represents Him as a true member of the Jewish nation, as also destined to fulfil the Law, as all Israelites were obliged to do, bearing *His* yoke also (Acts xv. 10; Gal. v. 1) like his fellow-men. But wherefore that addition? For the mere purpose of denoting the *humility* the *first* clause would have sufficed; besides, the ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ is so intimately connected with what follows, that the repetition of the ὑπὸ νόμον cannot possibly be accidental and void of meaning. It is highly probable that by it St Paul means to point to the complete, active, and passive, fulfilment of the Law by Christ, the culminating point of which was His death. By *His* perfect righteousness in life and death He redeemed the slaves of the Law, as by faith *His* righteousness becomes
their righteousness, His being their being; the Son of God by communicating Himself makes all men sons of God. (The reading ρηνώμενον has but slight authorities in its favour, and has surely its origin in the circumstance that it was wished to escape the double ρηνώμενον.—As to νοθεσία see on Rom. viii. 15.)

Vers. 6, 7. Now, as the faithful are children of God, God has sent the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, or poured it out, as it is called Rom. v. 5. Usteri writes on this passage, that one expects rather the converse, viz. “because God has sent us the Spirit, we are God’s children.” No doubt, the Spirit too, of itself, effects the regeneration of man, but the question here is of a higher form of the operation of the Spirit, which connects itself with the new birth, just as the communication of the Spirit at Pentecost supposes earlier and more general operations of the Spirit on the hearts of the apostles. Accordingly, it appears altogether unsuitable to take the ὅτι in the meaning that, and to consider as the sense of the verse, the suggestion to the readers of a proof of their adoption by God, proceeding from their own experience, as if it were written: “But, that ye are children of God proceeds from the circumstance that—.” This view Rückert has again defended, after St Chrysostom, Ambrose, Koppe, Morus, and Flatt. But the entire absence of any grounds for this supplement, if nothing else, renders it but little worthy of approbation. (The Holy Ghost is here designated as the Spirit of the Son, just because it is to be described as especially belonging to the νος Θεοῦ.—’Ἡμῶν, here quite unexpected, is preferable, being vouched for by A.C.D.F.G., to the ἴμων of the text. rec., which is only put for ἴμων on account of ὅτε.—The κράζων Αββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, is only meant to characterize the Holy Ghost as a truly child-like Spirit of love, which teaches to adore God as Father. As to the reasons for the application of the Hebrew form, see on Rom. viii. 15. With the assumption that the child-like lisp in the word was thought significant may be combined Winer's opinion, that well known prayers began with Abba, so that it might be paraphrased thus: “Who teaches us to pray in child-like mind and child-like form.”—Ver. 7. The transition of the discourse into the second person singular is meant to individualize the representation more; i.e. “each single one of my readers, of whom what has been said holds good.”—The κληρονόμος refers us back again to iii. 15, to the metaphor of the will.
—In the concluding words the readings differ very much. The usual reading is Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, A.B. read merely διὰ Θεοῦ, F.G. διὰ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ. Lachmann has, in accordance with his critical principles, preferred the reading διὰ Θεοῦ. Since Semler's time, however, most critics are justly of opinion that the difference in the readings is best explained by the assumption that originally καὶ θληρονόμος only stood; and that then the copyists, for the explanation of this somewhat bold-looking conclusion, added first one word, then another.)

§ 7. HAGAR AND SARAH TYPES OF THE LAW AND OF THE GOSPEL.

(iv. 8—v. 1.)

St Paul might now have here closed his dogmatical discussion, as the relation of the Law and the Gospel was completely developed; but his zeal feels as yet unsatisfied, he addresses himself anew to the Galatians, just as he did iii. 1, ss., reminds them of their former condition and their former experiences, and finally, iv. 21, ss., goes into yet another consideration of the great question from a completely different point of view. St Paul reminds them first (vers. 8, 9) of their former Gentile life, whence it appears that at least the greater number by far of the Galatian Christians were formerly Gentiles, who, however, might surely, as proselytes of righteousness, or of the Gate, have become acquainted with the Old Testament. The knowledge of the one true God, which came to them by Christianity, delivered them from that false faith. Now, St Paul proves from this contrasting of their earlier unconverted, and present converted, state, how contradictory, how unnatural, it would be, if they, who were delivered by Christ, should betake themselves to another form of slavery, namely to that under the yoke of the Law, the weak and beggarly rudiments of religious life. That thus the στοιχεῖα have no reference to Gentile idolatry is quite clear, for ver. 10 describes unmistakably the Jewish economy, to which the Galatians had turned back. (See at iv. 3.) In the εἰδότες, γνώσασθεντες, and γνωσθεντες we may add that a climax occurs; the first denotes the more merely-outward knowledge, that God is; the se-
cond denotes the inner essential knowledge in activity; and the third the passive knowledge of God in love, which state of mind is produced by God Himself. (See, as to the relation of the active and passive in knowledge, the remarks on the completely similar passage 1 Cor. viii. 3, where also all three expressions stand, as here, side by side.)

The knowing, without having previously been known of, God, *i.e.* penetrated, filled, by Him, is ever unsatisfactory, because it is, as such, without love; one knows God and divine things so far only as one loves them.

The interpretations *agniti a Deo,* or even *cognoscere facti, i.e.* à *Deo ad cognitionem sui adducti,* are quite inadmissible. See the remarks on the above-cited passage. (Verse 8. φῶς is wanting in MSS. of no importance only, but the text. rec. puts the negative before φῶς. A.B.C.D.E.F., however, see for the *later* collocation, which is, therefore, no doubt preferable. The meaning too suits better; for St Paul does not deny in *every* sense, that they are God's [see on 1 Cor. viii. 5], but only that they are so according to the φῶς, *i.e.* the true nature.—Ver. 9. The πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν is to be explained by the supposition, that the Galatian Christians had already, as proselytes, become acquainted with the Old Testament. The words πάλιν ἁνωθεν, which follow, are striking; they are pleonastic, but explicable on the supposition that the relapse is to be made as prominent as possible. For there is nowhere found any hint of an *earlier* relapse, so that this could have been the second. Similar pleonastic passages with πάλιν and ἁνωθεν or ἐκ δεύτερου are found, Wisdom xix. 6; Matt. xxvi. 42; Aristoph. Plut. v. 121; Xen. Anab. i. 10, 10. See Winer on this Passage.—As to θέλετε, see on i. 7; the freedom of action is expressed in that word.)

Ver. 10, 11. In what follows St Paul mentions particular Jewish customs, to the observance of which the Galatians had returned. It is striking that circumcision, on which, however, the Judaists laid the most stress, is wanting. This is not to be explained, as Rückert wishes, by the assumption that St Paul had intended to mention such customs only as were common to Jews and Gentiles; for certainly no relapse into heathenism was apprehended; neither is it explained by the assumption, that the Galatians, as proselytes, were already circumcised, and consequently could not relapse into
that error; v. 2 is against that: rather let us say the customs mentioned stand, by synecdoche, for all the customs. The ἕμεραι are, it may be supposed, the Sabbaths, μήνες, the new moons, καλποι, longer festival seasons, as Easter, Pentecost, the feast of the Tabernacles, which were celebrated for eight days successively, ἐναυτοί, in fine, the years of jubilee. The three first seasons are also quoted, Col. ii. 16. Besides, the solemnization in itself is not blamed; the old church, too, had already its festivals; but what was superstitious in it, i.e. the opinion, that it was necessary to salvation.

That is also intimated by παρατηρεῖοναι, superstitiosè observare, a word that elsewhere in the New Testament, both in the active and middle forms, means "to lie in ambush." See Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 7, xiv. 1, xx. 20. (Ver. 11. In the passage iii. 3, St Paul represented the belief and the sufferings of the Galatians, and here his labours with them, as vain. In ver. 19 he declares that the labour must be begun anew.—The construction μήτε κεκοπίακα expresses that what he fears has already happened, and had not yet to happen. In the φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς the figure attraction is to be observed, as it is taken out of the following clause. [See Winer, Gram. p. 483, and in the Comm. on this passage.] However, there is still the harshness in the phrase, that the word taken up out of its own clause is not the subject of the subordinate clause, as it usually is in other similar cases, and as is the case in the examples brought forward by Winer, ubi suprà. But this interpretation, in spite of its harshness, is yet to be preferred to Rückert's opinion, who chooses to take φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς: "I am alarmed for you," which is quite inadmissible, and besides very much increases the difficulty of interpreting the following μήτε κ. τ. λ. The thought, "I fear for you," would have required the mention of the loss which the Galatians themselves suffered, not St Paul.

Ver. 12. To give force to his exhortation, St Paul beseeches the Galatians to become as he was, since he had become as they were. To refer these words merely to the love between St Paul and the Galatians, as, besides Luther, Brenz, and Beza, Grotius too, Morus, and others, wish to do, so that the sense would be, "Love me as I love you," is plainly inadmissible, as the γινεσθαι ὡς expresses a more special idea, in which one can only imagine love acting as a
motive. The words in this passage are paralleled 1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1, where it is said: μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε. The γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγὼ can be taken only so, as to call upon the Galatians to place themselves in that freedom in which St Paul stood. But how can St Paul say, κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς; is ἔγενομεν to be supplied, or the future? As ὅτι precedes, the former only is allowable; the apostle grounds on his own conduct his exhortation to the Galatians to act thus also.

But what did that conduct consist in? St Paul had surely neither become a Gentile, according to the earlier position of the Galatians, nor a Jew, according to their present one. To me it is most probable that St Paul had in view his whole manner of proceeding in his preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles, in which he ever sought to place himself in the position in which he found his hearers at the time.

He now makes a somewhat similar claim on his hearers in respect to their relation to him: "as I always sought to look at matters from the same point of view as ye did, so do ye also now act in the same spirit towards me."—The words ἀδελφοὶ, δέομαι ὑμῶν, are best taken by themselves, without joining ἀδελφοὶ to ὑμεῖς, as some manuscripts do. But the concluding words, οὐδὲν με ἡδικήσατε, are still obscure through their brevity. True, the clause can excite no doubt in so far as the infidelity of the Galatians had certainly offended St Paul, for in that infidelity he saw no personal injury, but only an offence against the Lord. But the connection is not clear. We may supply with Winer, "I have, therefore, no reason to be angry with you, but I say and do all out of love to you." Rückert thinks the declaration of St Paul that they had not injured him, is meant to serve to call upon them not to draw back from him in fear. The simplest way of taking the words seems to be this: "You have in other cases done everything after my will, you certainly will do it in this case also." The decision remains still uncertain; but the following verses are in favour of assuming such a Litotes in these words.

Verses 13, 14. As in iii. 1, ss., St Paul again reminds the Galatians of the manner in which they had received him earlier, namely, as an angel of God, yea, as Christ Himself, i.e. with the greatest veneration and love (see 2 Cor. v. 20), and yet his appearance among them formed a striking contrast with the glory of his
preaching. St Paul appeared in Galatia in infirmity, and under temptations, but they did not despise the apostle on those accounts, but well knew how to recognize the precious kernel in the mean husk.

The chief question here is what is the ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκὸς, and the πειρασμὸς ἐν τῇ σαρκί. To think of persecutions alone we are forbidden not merely by the reiteration of σὰρξ;1 but also by the circumstance, that surely persecutions could not well have occurred immediately on his appearance in Galatia; they usually began only when the Gospel spread. To me, with Rückert, it seems alone correct to suppose bodily infirmity, and trials arising therefrom, are meant, so that this passage is parallel with 2 Cor. xii. 7, ss. We must not figure to ourselves St Paul as of giant colossal frame, but rather as weakly. See Tholuck’s remarks on this point in the Stud. for 1835, part ii. p. 364, ss. Next, the expression τὸ πρὸ-τερον,—from which it may be reasonably concluded that St Paul, when he wrote these words, had been twice already in Galatia,—is here to be noticed. See on this point Rückert’s remarks in the Magazine, p. 116, against Böttger’s arbitrary expositions. See his Beiträge, 3d part, p. 9. (Ver. 13 the διὰ is to be taken in the sense: “whilst under the circumstances,” as in διὰ νύκτα, διὰ χειμῶνα.—Verse 14. For πειρασμὸν μου, A.B.D.F.G. read ὑμῶν, which Lachmann has received, but the ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου following does not permit us to receive this reading, which rests probably on the error of a copyist. Semler, Winer, and Rückert choose to have μου also struck out, and both pronouns considered as spurious additions.)

Verse 15. Here the reading: τίς οὖν ᾧ κ.τ.λ. gives no very good sense, unless τίς be taken in the sense of πώςος. But now A.B.C.F.G. read ποῦ for τίς, and in A.C. ᾧ is also wanting, whilst F.G. have ᾧ. The latter reading is to be preferred with the later critics, so that the meaning is: “where is then the blessedness in which ye then were?” (Μακαρίσμος is found also Rom. iv. 6.) Only the ᾧ excites some doubt, as, on the assumption that ποῦ was the original reading, it is difficult to explain how ᾧ or ἧ could have come in. Now St Paul des-

1 See the parallel passage 1 Thess. ii. 2, where, however, σφέξ is wanting, and we are certainly to think of persecutions alone.
cribes his grief hyperbolically (εἰ δυνατόν) when he says, that they would willingly have sacrificed to him what was dearest to them. (See Hor. Sat. ii. 5. 35. Terent. Adelph. iv. 5. 67.)

Vers. 16, 17. In order to represent to the Galatians their change of mind as deserving of entire reprobation, St Paul further compares his conduct to that of the Judaists, to whom they had given themselves up. In St Paul there was a sincere, pure, zeal; he sought to win the souls of men for God; the Judaists too were zealous, but they sought to win the souls of men for themselves, in order to increase their party and acquire consideration. "Could I, therefore, have become your enemy (that is, hateful to you), because I work in truth, and (we must supply) can those be your friends?" Zeal St Paul certainly concedes to them, not a pure one, however (ζηλοῦσιν οὐ καλῶς) but a selfish one. (Ζηλοῦσιν τινά cannot here mean "to envy one," but "to busy one's-self about one, to seek zealously to win him over," 2 Cor. xi. 2, Ps. xxxvii. 1.) But what follows is not quite clear: ἄλλα (impotius) ἐκκλείσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, for that ὑμᾶς is to be read, instead of the ἡμᾶς of the text. rec., all the later critics agree. But to what does the action of the ἐκκλείσαι refer? "From the church," "from the Christian community," or "from me," might be supplied. But this all comes to the same thing in the end, for the true Christian community is only with the true apostles and their genuine doctrine. But that the separation from the person of St Paul is the most immediate reference is shown by the conclusion: ἦνα αὐτοῦς ζηλοῦτε, "instead of me, you shall join yourselves to them, make them the goal of your endeavours." But here the indicative after ἦνα, which is also found 1 Cor. iv. 6, raises a difficulty. Fritzsohe (on Matt. p. 837) proposed, for that reason, to take ἦνα in these passages as = "where;" "quo in statu, i.e., ubi a me estis abalienati, illos studiosè appetitis." But Winer justly rejects this as forced, and explains the unusual construction by the waning genius of the language, under the influence of which St Paul wrote, and which makes itself especially remarkable in a laxer use of the particles. (See Winer's Grm. p. 286.)

Ver. 18. Now St Paul, in order to show that he thinks the zeal of the Galatians in itself very praiseworthy, and certainly does not want to damp it, remarks, that zeal is good, when it arises in a good cause, and is persevering, not merely in his presence, but
also in his absence. (We may doubt whether the ζηλοῦσθαι is to be taken as passive or middle. Rückert chooses to take it decidedly as passive, therefore equal to "meet with ζηλος, to be pursued with zeal." But the context does not suit that view; if the ζηλοῦσιν υμᾶς came immediately before, it might be thought that St Paul proceeded: "It is good to be pursued with zeal," but, as ζηλοῦτε precedes, the discourse, in what follows, can also be of the zeal of the Galatians themselves only. Winer thinks he can claim for ζηλοῦσθαι the meaning "to be reciprocally zealous," but what follows will not suit that either, for the activity of the Galatians can alone be meant there. Therefore it seems to be put as perfectly = ζηλοῦν."

Ver. 19. Hereupon St Paul, in the overflow of his feeling, addresses the Galatians as his children, whom he has begotten as Father through the word of truth (James i. 18), and whom he (by giving another turn to the figure) bears on his heart as a mother, and brings to the birth with travail anew, until they entirely answer to their Christian character, i.e. until Christ has acquired a form in their hearts. It is self-evident that here the reference to the new man, Christ in us (Gal. ii. 20), is to be maintained: we are not to think of the mere communication of doctrine, of the completion of instruction; the only question is, how the ἀρχιτέκτονα, according to that idea of regeneration, is to be taken. For regeneration seems to be an act, which either is or is not; but here a continuous activity of travail is represented, which attains its end (μορφή Χριστοῦ) by degrees only. We may suppose now that this state appeared in such a light to St Paul, that the new life in man (the conception) begins, it is true, suddenly, but does not, except by degrees, form and fashion itself to a truly personal and conscious life: at first Christ works only in man by His power, but there proceeds from this energy a higher form of personality, the man lives also in Christ. St Paul here directs the Galatians, as to the aim of his labour in the Spirit, to this completion of the Christian life, which would secure them from such relapses as the one they threatened.

Vers. 20. In order to express to them his love as cordially as possible, St Paul further utters the wish to be with them, and to be able to lay before them more immediately the innermost feelings of his heart, by word of mouth, than writing admits of, for he was
in uncertainty and doubt on their account. (The ἡδελοῦ = ἡγεμό-
μην, Rom. ix. 3, or ἐσθολόμην, Acts xxv. 22.—Φανήν ἄλλαξαι
is commonly explained only of the form of instruction and cen-
sure, but that might surely have been adjusted by writing also
according to the circumstances. It is to be referred altogether and
specially to the voice, the nature and modulations of which are so
entirely dependent on the tone of mind.—'Ἀποροῦμαι is to be taken
as passive. "I am brought into embarrassment in regard to you."
I cannot at this distance communicate myself to you so entirely as
I could wish.)

Ver. 21—23. After this more personal and affectionate lecture
( ver. 12—20) St Paul returns to the form of demonstration, with a
resumption of vers. 9, 10. "Ye who, as I said above, wish to be
again under the Law, do ye not understand the Law? why, it
speaketh against you and for me!" And now St Paul argues from
the history of Abraham and of his sons. Ishmael was the son of
Hagar, who was a slave; Isaac was the son of Sarah, the free,
legitimate wife of Abraham; Ishmael was begotten according to na-
tural inclination alone and in the usual way (κατὰ σάρκα, Gen. xxi.
9, xiv. 19): Isaac, on the contrary, was born of the barren Sarah
when she was ninety, Abraham one hundred years old, in conseque-
ce of a divine promise (Gen. xv. 4, xvii. 16, xviii. 10) and by divine
power (Rom. iv. 19, ss.) (Ver. 21. B.D.E.F.G. read ἀναγινώσ-
κετε in lieu of ἀκούετε. But that seems to be merely a correction
by such copyists as translated ἀκούετε "hear ye not," and applied,
we may suppose, the hearing to the reading in the congregation.
But St Paul supposes the history to be known, for ἀκούετε is here
meant as "do ye not then understand what the Old Testament
relates?" after the analogy of ἴγνως Deut. xxviii. 49; Jer. v. 15.)

Vers. 24—26. St Paul now applies this history to the relation
of the Law to the Gospel, and thereby develops their character.
But, before we investigate this mode of proceeding of St Paul's with
this passage of the Old Testament itself more closely, let us first
consider the details of the interpretation which is given of the
history of Abraham. First, there is δὴ τινὰ ἐστὶν ἀλληγοροῦμενα,
i.e. this history means something else than in their mere literal
sense the words announce; they contain a deeper meaning.

Suidas interprets ἀλληγορία ἡ μεταφορά, ἄλλο λέγου τὸ γράμμα
καὶ ἄλλο τὸ νόημα. Hesychius: ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἄκουόμενον ὑπο-
deiknīōs. In the Fathers the words προφολογία, θεωρία, ἀναγορία, are also used in the same or a nearly-related sense;¹ but the result of the allegorical exposition is called ἵνανοια, the underlying meaning. The two women, Hagar and Sarah, continues St Paul, are two covenants which God has set up with man. (Διαθήκη cannot here retain the meaning of “Testament, promise of an inheritance,” because the latter is not applicable to the Law of Moses, it is here merely = γῆς.)² Hagar, the slave, means the one of these covenants, the Law, which was promulgated on Mount Sinai, and thence proceeded as from its centre. This Law is now, according to the comparison with Hagar, represented as a mother who communicates her status to her children; the slave can bear slaves alone. This is denoted by the addition εἰς δουλεύν γενόσα,³ sc. διαθήκη, and ver. 25 the δουλεύει μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. Sarah, on the other hand, the free woman, who therefore bears free children, represents the other covenant. The New Testament is, therefore, called μητρὶ ήμῶν, sc. πιστευόντων; all believers, therefore, bear likewise the character of the institution to which they belong. But, besides this parallel, St Paul further uses for denoting the two covenants the names: ἡ νῦν and ἡ ἀνω Ιερουσαλήμ. We are not to understand by that expression an antithesis between the low-lying part of the city of Jerusalem and the higher citadel of Zion, or between the old Salem in the time of Melchisedec (Gen. xiv. 18) and the later Jerusalem, as all later interpreters acknowledge: but the earthly Jerusalem, as type of the institution of the Law of Moses, which had its centre in that city and the temple in it, is opposed to the heavenly Jerusalem, as type of the institution of the New Testament. The expressions νῦν and ἀνω = therefore γῆνος and ἐπουράνιος, which last name occurs Heb. xii. 22, Apocal. xxi. 2. How far we are to understand this new Jerusalem as something real cannot be considered until we come to explain the Revelation, which gives a detailed description of the new or heavenly Jerusalem; it is here sufficient to think of it in general only as a type of the city of the Faithful, as

¹ See Tholuck’s first Supplement to the Comm. on the Epistle to the Hebrews, page 22, sq.
² See on διαθήκη, with the epitheta παλαια, πράτη, καθή, δευτέρα, νία, Matt. xxvi. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14; Heb. viii. 7, 8, ix. 15, xii. 24.
³ On γενών, applied to women, see Luke i. 13, 57.
the πολτευμα ἐν οὐρανωῖς (Phil. iii. 20), therefore of the kingdom of God, i.e. of the Church of Christ and of the Spirit working in it. Had St Paul understood nothing real by it, no comparison between the constitution under the New Covenant and the heavenly Jerusalem could have occurred. The Rabbis, too, who often use this representation, no doubt in consequence of passages in the Old Testament, like Isaiah liv. 11, 12, lx. 18, lxii. 6, Ezek. xlvi., understood something real by the term heavenly Jerusalem. (See the passages in the well-known writings of Schöttgen, Lightfoot, Bertholdt, and Winer, in the Comm. page 113. The closer consideration of the Rabbinical conceptions we also defer to the exposition of the Apocalypse.) Thus, then, we have remaining in the interpretation of the details only the words (in verse 25) τὸ γὰρ ΄Δαρ Σιωὰ δρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ 'Αραβλα, συντοιχεῖ τε κ. τ. ἀ., which clearly bear on the face of them the nature of a subordinate remark, of a merely parenthetical clause. Certainly, if it were preferable to read τὸ γὰρ Σιωὰ δρος ἐστὶν, which Lachmann, on the authority of C.F.G., has put in the text, every difficulty would vanish; but the context will by no means permit the reception of that reading, not to mention that A.D.E. vouch for the common reading, and the supposition is but too probable, that the proposed reading was only adopted to avoid the difficulty in the common one. For the γὰρ imperatively requires that something, which lays a foundation in some way for verse 24, should be introduced; but the mere remark that Sinai is a mountain of Arabia can prove nothing. According to the common reading, however, a sort of proof is couched in the words: "the word Ἡγαρ (τὸ, not ἡ), namely, means in Arabia the mountain Sinai." Now the word means in Arabic "a rock" (see Winer on this passage); Sinai might, therefore, well be so called by the natives, though decided proofs of it are wanting.¹ But, at all events, we must not think of any names of cities or nations having affinity with it, since all is to be referred to Mount Sinai. The proper etymology of the name Ἡγαρ is, however, it is well known, totally different; for it is to be derived from the root "to flee." (See Gesenius in the Lex. on this word.) Finally, it is said of Hagar, in the sense

¹ The famous chief city of Idumea, Petra, "The Rock City," is in Arabic: El-hagar.
pointed out, ςυντοιχιζαν τη νυν Ιερουσαλημ. Συντοιχιζαν is not found again in the New Testament; it means "to go together with one another, to go in a row," then "to coincide with, to be in concord with, to answer to." The Old Testament, therefore, is brought into comparison with, firstly, Sinai, and then Jerusalem; both correspond with one another, since both places may be considered as centres of the Old Testament life. (It remains to be said that the grammatical construction is not quite regular, for after μια με& in verse 24, ἑτέρα δὲ ought to have followed in verse 26; but St Paul lets the figure drop, as being self-evident, and directly names the thing compared.) We may now, after this, consider more closely St Paul's conduct in the allegorical treatment of this passage of the Old Testament. The general observations on the mode of treating the Old Testament in the New one, as has been already remarked on 1 Cor. x. 1, we defer until the exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring, by the way, to the already-cited first supplement of Tholuck to the said Epistle. For, if in this passage there occurred merely a common typical application, such as we have often already found occasion to mention, it would require no further consideration; but it has peculiarities, that are not found elsewhere in the New Testament. True, the typical application of Mount Sinai, as well as of the city of Jerusalem, has nothing extraordinary in any way; the places where the Law was promulgated, and where it found its abiding centre in the Temple, could be most fitly put for the institution of the Law itself. But the introduction of Sarah, and especially of Hagar, for such a purpose, seems surprising, because it appears as if every free woman and every bondwoman, who have descendants by one man, might with equal justice be referred to in just the same manner.

But this seeming difficulty vanishes if we consider that it is not the women per se who are here used as types, but Abraham's wives. According to the Scriptures, the typical character seems confined to some few chief persons, who are, as it were, central characters; to these Abraham especially belongs, as ancestor of the people of God; now what happens to him and about him admits of a prefigurative acceptance, and so do his wives and children, but by no means every wife and every child. The sacred writers in the illumination of the divine Spirit understood history, as it were, in
its deepest root, in its signatura; they looked into the heart of things, and thus beheld already formed, when as yet in the earliest germ, like fruit in the blossom, what was later to be developed. Without this spiritual glance, a similar mode of proceeding, that the Rabbis and enthusiasts of all descriptions used at all times, is only a means plausibly to impart a biblical sanction to the wildest productions of phrensy. Our time, therefore, as not being favoured with so intense an operation of the Spirit, cannot proceed independently in the adoption of types, but must adhere to those expressed and sanctioned in the Scriptures.

The most difficult point, however, in the present passage is certainly still the mention of the Arabic name of Sinai; can it be assumed that this point too has real inner truth, that between the Arabic name of Sinai, and the relation to the Law of the maid-servant of Abraham, bearing the same name, there exists a connection of cause and effect? Impartiality requires us to confess that such is not only not demonstrable, but is even improbable. True, the idea is not to be taken as if St Paul meant to say, "because Mount Sinai is called Hagar in Arabic, therefore Abraham's maid-servant must be a type of the Law," but only in this way: "because Abraham's maid-servant Hagar is a type of the Law, it is also to be considered as providential, that an identity of the name of Sinaï, where the Law was promulgated, with that of Hagar, exists; and that too precisely in the language of the descendants of Hagar's son."

But, even according to this milder turn, we can still see in the remark of St Paul, which is, besides, only cursorily introduced in a subordinate clause, merely an ingenious application of an accidental circumstance, which stands in no intimate connection with the chief line of argument grounded in deeper, inner, truth. St Paul might, during his longer sojourn in Arabia (see on i. 17), have become acquainted with the Arabic name of Sinaï, and feels himself induced to impart this information here by the way, in order to offer to the reader a certain connection, though a very slight one, between the maid-servant Hagar and Mount Sinaï.

Ver. 27. St Paul in what follows connects with the history of Abraham and his wife a prophetic passage, Is. liv. 1, in which now, it is true, mention is not expressly made of Sarah, but the community of the faithful, the true Israel, is addressed, and a joyful pro-
sperity promised it. But Sarah might aptly be taken as the type of this community as well as Abraham and Israel could. In fact, the barrenness of Sarah with the subsequent birth of Isaac could fitly be used in order to compare with them the long spiritual unfruitfulness of the people of Israel, and the subsequent fulness of spiritual blessing in Christ. With regard to the sense, Ps. cx. 3 is exactly similar. It remains to be said that St Paul here implicitly follows the LXX. (The ἀνατίθημι is explained by the phrase ἀνατίθημι ἄνωτέρω, which also occurs in profane writers [Aristoph. Nub. v. 963], rumpere vocem. [Virg. Æn. ii. 129.]—The πολλὰ μᾶλλον ἡ answers to the רָבִים נֵן)

Ver. 28, 29. The birth of Isaac, in consequence of the divine promise, is now compared, in the following verses, with the spiritual birth of the faithful; man after the flesh, on the contrary, stands parallel with Ishmael. Both flesh and spirit are contrary to one another. (Gal. v. 17.) That was shown even at that time, and now too the history of Isaac and Ishmael appears typical in this point of view also. The Scriptures have but slight indications of these contests between the brothers (Gen. xvi. 4, 12, xxi. 9), but the traditions of the Jews relate more about them.—The διάκειται refers here especially to the contrasts in the mass, not merely between the believers and unbelievers, but also between the pure and impure among the former.

Thus the Judaists showed themselves as carnal, whilst they so vehemently persecuted St Paul, the true spiritual man. But this expression has its verification also as regards the inward man in the individual, the old and the new man must be contrary to one another, and the former be thrust out unspARINGLY with might and main. St Paul's mode of viewing the relations of man from one central point is strikingly displayed in the many sides which the above reflection presents to us; the sacred writer stands in the innermost centre of life, and carries in his spirit all the radii united.

Ver. 30, 31. In this contest the spirit is to overcome, hence the command to drive out the bond woman and her son according to Gen. xxi. 10. Thus the apparent harshness and injustice of Abraham's conduct towards Hagar and Ishmael find, at the same time, their justification by this spiritual conception of the occurrence. Here too St Paul lets the idea of the inheritance appear again, and adjudges it to the children of the free woman alone. There is naturally couched in the deduction, ver. 31, ἀπαθεῖν, the ex-
hortation at the same time to behave in accordance with this position, and manfully to withstand the flesh. (In verse 31 the manuscripts greatly vary as to ἀρα; some add οὖν, others δὲ, to it, others again, instead of it, read ήμεῖς δὲ, others διό. Lachmann has, on the authority of B.D.E., preferred διό.)

Chap. v. 1. This discussion then closes with the exhortation, to maintain this liberty which had become theirs through Christ; we might therefore have supposed that the chapter should have closed with this verse. But, however simple the idea of the verse in general is, yet it is difficult to establish the text in detail with any certainty, on account of the many variations in the MSS. Lachmann has, on the authority of the MSS. A.B.C.D.E.F.G., omitted οὖν and ἦ after ἐλευθερία, and, on that of A.B.C.D., inserted the οὖν after στήκετε, so that the text runs: τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἐλευθέρωσεν στήκετε οὖν, καὶ μὴ πάλιν ζυγὸ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. But Rückert justly remarks in opposition, that the article τῇ seems unsuitable here, στήκετε too would stand here without any object. Since, now, the οὖν might so easily be merged in the ἡμᾶς, the latter, it seems, we must preserve in the text, although slighter evidence vouches for it: on the other hand, the οὖν ought, no doubt, to follow στήκετε. (As to ζυγὸ δουλείας cf. Acts xvi. 10.) Instead of it, Acts xvi. 28, there is βάρος.—The proper meaning of ἐνέχεσθαι is “to be fettered, bound,” then “to be laden, oppressed,” so that the sense is: “let not yourselves be again [see at iv. 9] laden with the yoke of bondage!”

§ 8. WARNING AGAINST APOSTACY.

(v. 2—12.)

To the preceding exhortation there is now pertinently annexed an earnest warning, as St Paul points out whither falling back to the Law leads; he declares this with his whole apostolical authority, and names himself, therefore, by name. “If you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing.” Now it is self-evident again here too, that that does not apply to the outward act of circumcision, but of circumcision with the idea of through it winning salvation; else St Paul would not himself have allowed Timothy to be circumcised. (Acts xvi. 3.). The view of the
Judaists had a totally different direction, as we find it expressed
Acts xvi. 1: ἐὰν μὴ περιτέμνῃσθε τῷ Θεῷ Μωϋσέως, οὐ δύνασθε
σωθῆναι. (The ιδε = ἴδε, is accented by Fritzsch as paroxytone,
by Griesbach as oxytone. This latter is the Attic pronunciation
according to the, grammarians, but the former is on that very
account to be preferred with Fritzsch, because in the later Greek
much that is not Attic prevails, which the copyists were tempted
to alter.)

Ver. 3. St Paul represents circumcision with great emphasis as
the bond of connection with the Law; therefore whoever lets him-
self be circumcised becomes a debtor for the whole Law (as baptism
joins to Christ); and, as man cannot at the same time serve two
masters, he thereby rends himself from the Gospel. But still all
this has force only on the supposition, that through circumcision
salvation is sought; if that is not the case, but circumcision is only
performed as a pious custom, or out of accommodation to Jewish
ideas, as in the case of Timothy, neither has it of course any such
consequences.

(Koppe erroneously wanted to take πάλιν in the sense of contra,
it relates to the vivâ voce decisions of St Paul in Galatia, for as
yet in his Epistle he had said nothing of the sort.)

Ver. 4. St Paul takes the allowing of one-self to be circumcised
as exactly identical with δικαιοσθαῖν ἐν νόμῳ, to seek justification
in the Law; but declares that the being separated from Christ is to
be fallen from Grace. (At Rom. vii. 6 it is said in just the same way:
κατηγορηθῆτε ἀπὸ νόμου. Theophylact aptly interprets: μηδεμίαν
κοινονίαν ἐχειν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. —The second clause is annexed
rhetorically as an asyndeton. In the ἐκπληττεῖν is couched the
allusion to a firm, secure position, which Grace affords, and which
those are fallen from who seek their justification in the Law. See
2 Pet. iii. 17; Sir. xxxiv. 7. On the form ἔξεπεσατε see Winer’s
Gram. p. 70.)

Vers. 5, 6. The following verses set the right way (viz. to
wait for righteousness from faith) in contrast to that erroneous
way. But if only a hope of righteousness and an ἀπεκδε-
χεσθαι of the same are here spoken of, whereas it is elsewhere rep-
resented as a present blessing immediately annexed to faith, it is
explained by the consideration that St Paul conceives of righteous-
ness as it is realized in man; righteousness regarded objectively in
Christ is complete, subjectively in man it remains an object of hope, because it does not appear completed here below. (See on Rom. iii. 21.) Matthies justly rejects Winer’s opinion, who in the phrase ἀπεκδέχονται ἔμπιστα sees something pleonastic. But it is unsuitable, when Matthies attributes to the word ἀπεκδέχονται the meaning, “to make one’s own, to lay hold on;” that meaning does not in general belong to ἀπεκδέχονται, and least of all in the dialect of the New Testament, according to which it always means “to wait for.” But since the ἔμπιστα is more closely defined as δικαιοσύνης, the connection with ἀπεκδέχονται can take place without any pleonasm. Certainly, one cannot say: ἔμπιστα ἀπεκδέχονται, “to wait for a hope,” but one may well say: “we wait for the hope of righteousness in the Spirit by faith, i.e. we cherish the expectation that faith will at some time (viz. at the divine judgment seat) be acknowledged as our righteousness.” Only expectation is the present, the hope of righteousness is the future. But this passage still remains peculiar, especially in St Paul, who commonly represents faith as the possession of righteousness. Further, as relates to the πνεύματι, it forms here the antithesis to σαρκί, the merely exterior nature, on which the hope of the Jews was grounded. All other distinctions (iii. 28), Jew or Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, have no force in Christ (and the sphere of life which partakes of His fulness, viz. the Church); there the whole question is of faith. But in order to preclude one’s understanding by πλείστος a mere historical assent, as the Jews used to do, δι’ ἀγάπης ἐνεργομένη is added. Love is here represented as most intimately united with faith, so that faith can through love express its workings, yet without ever identifying itself with it. That both can appear separate also and how, see at 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Now the operations of faith united with love are the ἐργα καλὰ or ἀγαθὰ, which must necessarily grow out of the believing heart as fruits of a good tree. St Paul always points to the foundation, and therefore attributes no importance to good works, per se; but St James (chap. ii.) looks conversely to the effects, and rather presupposes their cause. (Verse 6, at ἰσχύει we may supply eis σωτηρίαν.)

Vers. 7, 8. St Paul cannot as yet find any comfort as regards the

---

1 Cf. on both these and hope the notes on 1 Cor. xiii. 13, and on Rom. iii. 21.
errors of the Galatians, and his hopes of them thereby destroyed; be again apostrophizes them directly, and says: "Ye ran so stoutly, developed yourselves so well in Christianity, who has held you back from obedience to the truth?" (The text rec. reads ἐνέκοψε, but the MSS. are in favour of ἐνέκοψε in an overwhelming majority. See Rom. xv. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 10.)—It is well-known that after verbs of hindering μὴ follows with the infinitive.—The MSS. F.G. have between verses 7 and 8 the words: μηδενὶ πείθεσθε, which, however, are to be considered as a spurious addition.) "The readiness to be persuaded (which you evinced towards those who kept you back from the truth) came not of God, who hath called you," but rather from the Father of Lies.

(The form πείθομαι is only found a few times in Eustathius and in this passage. One might wish to refer that word in an active sense to the persuasive arts of St Paul's antagonists, but the play upon the word πείθεσθαι, preceding justly makes the later interpreters prefer the passive meaning.)

Vers. 9, 10. The discourse proceeds from ver. 7 onwards without any connection by particles; wherefore the separate sentences have in them something of indeterminateness with regard to the context. The metaphor of the ζύμη is, of course, to be taken here in a bad sense, for a principle of corruption. It is used otherwise, as is well known, Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 21. But whether the leaven is the doctrine or the persons of St Paul's adversaries, and the dough (φύραμα) the whole community or the disposition of individuals, may seem questionable. If one considers, however, that the doctrine is closely connected with the persons who preach it, and that the community consists of individuals whose state of feeling defines that of the body, it seems best to let the sentence remain in the vague terms in which the apostle gives it, and to permit its application in every way that has been pointed out. But still the antithesis of great and small is to be adhered to. One idea can poison the whole inner man; one mis-leader can disturb a whole community. (For ζυμοὶ D.E. read δολοὶ, which Valkenaer would prefer. Ζυμοὶ might, in fact, have been taken from 1 Cor. v. 6. But δολοὶ may certainly rather be an interpretation of ζυμοὶ, which gradually crept into the text.) Ver. 10, too, follows without any particle: "I have confidence in you in the Lord (i.e. so far as you are in Christ and rejoice in His help) that ye will
be none otherwise minded.” This idea might, per se, be just as well referred to something individual as generally; what follows, however, where the discourse is of the κρίμα of St Paul’s adversaries, permits us to take the idea with greater propriety as a general one, in this wise: “I am certain ye will not give yourselves up to any errors of doctrine, and thus the punishment of apostacy will not fall on you; but &c.” The singular ὁ ταράσσων, in connection with the διότι ἄν ἃ, obliges us to imagine some one of the false teachers in Galatia was especially dangerous, for, according to i. 7, iv. 17, v. 12, there were several of them. (Κρίμα is put as the cause for the effect — “punishment,” as it often is. See Acts xxiv. 25; Rom. ii. 2, 3, iii. 8, xiii. 2.)

Ver. 11. But now the transition from the punishment of his adversaries to his own preaching, and that too of circumcision, seems very obscure and arbitrary. “Why do I yet suffer persecution if I yet preach circumcision?” True, the first ἐτί before κηρύσσω is wanting in D.F.G., but it has certainly been omitted only because it seemed so difficult to explain. Had, then, St Paul ever preached circumcision (i.e. taught that circumcision must be undergone) that he could say εἰ περιτομὴν ἐτί κηρύσσω? we cannot refer it to his labours before his conversion, for κηρύσσω can never be used for that; and that St Paul should have required circumcision in the earlier time of his Christian labours is not to be supposed, because he appears firmly fixed in the same general views from the beginning. Therefore the passage can be only understood in such a manner that a reference is made in the περιτομὴν κηρύσσω to a charge on the part of his opponents, and that the ἐτί refers to the inferiority of these views as to circumcision, so that the meaning is this: “if I still stand on such a footing that I require circumcision, as some of my adversaries maintain, why, then, am I persecuted? In that case every cause for it is surely wanting!” So it had been already explained by St Chrysostom and most of the better interpreters. But the Judaists might find plausible motives for such charges in St Paul’s conduct, as he sometimes accommodated himself to the Jewish views, as, e.g., by the circumcision of Timothy. But what connection has that with what preceded? The train of ideas I suppose to be this: the mention of the divine κρίμα (ver. 10) leads him to the human judgment that is passed on him. He shows up that human judgment in its false-
hood, and *that*, too, in such a way that he at the same time intimates how easily he might evade it if he would sacrifice aught of divine truth; for it is only in that divine truth, in the offence, which the doctrine of the cross of Christ gives (σκάνδαλον σταυροῦ), *i.e.* the doctrine of salvation through faith alone in the atoning death of Christ, that the reason of the persecutions of him consists. (Cf. on σκάνδαλον 'σταυροῦ 1 Cor. i. 17, ss., 23, Phil. iii. 18, with Gal. vi. 12, 14. The ἀρα κατήγρηται "is then ceased" supposes the εἰ περιτομὴν κηρύσσω to be taken as true. The sentence ἀρα κ.τ.λ. is not to be understood with Knapp as a question, but with Griesbach, Lachmann, Rückert, as a conclusion).

Ver. 12. An imprecation of punishment against his opponents then concludes this part of the Epistle. These adversaries are here called ἀνάστατοντες (Acts xvii. 6, xxii. 38) ὑμᾶς, as, before, ταράσσοντες, inasmuch as they made the Galatian Christians waver in their faith. (The verb is derived from the form ἀνάστατος, "frightened, driven away.") But the δῆλον καὶ ἀποκόπτεσθαι is hard to explain. The δῆλον is certainly in the New Testament treated just as a particle, and construed regularly with the indicative, with the *future*, it is true, only here. (See Winer's Gram. page 277.) But what is the ἀποκόπτεσθαι to signify here? Many interpreters have, after the analogy of ἰπρετᾷ, thought of exclusion from communion with the Church, so that the Church would be considered as a body from which the individual as a limb might be cut off by excommunication. But the καὶ does not suit that view, and besides the word is never found so. The parallel passage of Phil. iii. 2 leads to another certainly somewhat curious idea. Ἀποκόπτεσθαι, namely, means "to be castrated, to be a eunuch." That word is put in juxtaposition with περιτομὴν, for which the Judaists were so zealous, by way of rebuke, in this sense: "may those friends of the περιτομὴ who so trouble you be not only circumcised but even castrated." Thus had the Fathers interpreted ever since St Chrysostom and St Augustine, and subsequently the best modern interpreters, following Grotius and Koppe. We recognise in this bitter sarcasm how exceedingly St Paul was excited against the endeavours of those literal interpreters, who everywhere clandestinely followed him and estranged from him his most faithful churches.
III.

PART THIRD.

(v. 13—vi. 18.)

§ 9. WARNING AGAINST THE ABUSE OF LIBERTY.

(v. 13—vi. 10.)

St Paul having now, in so detailed and impressive a way, maintained the freedom of believers from the Law in every sense of it, feels himself, by his knowledge of the human heart, impelled again to bring forward the other side of the subject. For, since the old man is still living in the believer, the danger of gradually growing lukewarm in the faith and negligent in respect of morals, is imminent. The at first living faith then sinks down to a mere historical assent, which is too powerless to restrain the lusts of the flesh; true spiritual freedom degenerates into an antinomian liberty of the flesh. St Paul, therefore, in what follows, warns his readers with most particular earnestness against this temptation, to which St Paul's doctrines were peculiarly exposed.

Ver. 13. St Paul starts from the most general view, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, i.e. “to freedom,” namely, in order to be in the possession of it (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 7), “only you are not to abuse it,” μόνον μὴ σο. τρέψετε, οὐ τρέψητε, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί. (See as to ἀφορμή, Rom. vii. 8, 11; 2 Cor. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 14. “An occasion, that is to say, to exhibit itself,—to become active in its nature.”) St Paul names the serving by love as an antithesis to the flesh. The former is self-denial, which promotes the happiness of others, as the latter seeks its own pleasure.

The δουλεύω ἄλληλοι relates naturally not only to assistance
in temporal matters, but also and especially to spiritual furtherance and help. (D.E.F.G. read τῇ ἀγάπῃ τοῦ πνεῦματος, but πνεῦμα seems to have been added only for the sake of the antithesis to σάρξ.)

Ver. 14. Now St Paul establishes the absolute perfection of love by representing it as the power which fulfils the Law, which idea was discussed supra, Matth. xix. 19; Rom. xiii. 9. But this verse is connected with the preceding one in this way, "the whole Law is fulfilled in the one word, love thy neighbour; if you, therefore, practise this love of your neighbour, you walk, in general, according to God’s will." The love of one’s neighbour is here named only in consequence of the context, the same, of course, holds good of the love of God, for love, in all its forms, is the same in its nature. (As to the putting ὁ πᾶς νόμος for πᾶς ὁ νόμος, see Winer’s Gram. p. 111.—Acts xx. 18, xxvii. 37, I Tim. i. 16, the same collocation is found. For ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ D.E.F.G. read ἐν ὀνόματι, and D.F.G. in what follows also omit ἐν τῷ. However, it is scarcely imaginable that St Paul should have called love ὀνόματι; no critic, therefore, has ventured to receive that reading into the text.—Δόγος = ἡ ὅραμα, commandment. For πληροῦσαι Marcion already read πεπληροῖται, as do also A.B.C., and Lachmann: in fact, the change into πληροῦσαι is much more conceivable. For they took πληροῦσαι in the sense "to fulfil, to keep," but it is here = Ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσαι, Rom. xiii. 9.—The text. rec. reads ἐαυτῷ, not σεαυτῷ, but the MSS. are decidedly for σεαυτῷ. However, in case no misunderstanding is to be apprehended, the pronoun of the third person can also stand where, taken strictly, that of the second would be required. See Winer’s Gram. p. 148.)

Ver. 15. Whilst prosperity is to be considered as the result of mutual love, want of it leads to destruction. The figure by which St Paul expresses this idea is taken from wild beasts, and therefore the δάκνειν, κατασθέλειν, and ἀναλοιχεῖαι are to be taken as a climax. We must here think neither of divine nor human punishments alone, but comprehensively of all the injuries which can befall one human being through another.

Vers. 16, 17. The exhortations to practise love receive in what follows their psychological foundation; the discourse makes a transition from the outer conflict to the inner one, and here shows the
root of the former, and the way to victory in it. St Paul describes, just as he did Rom. vii. 14, ss., the inward fight between flesh and spirit. This fight takes place not only in the awakened man but also in the regenerate one (see the remarks on the above passage), only that the latter is victorious whilst the former continually succumbs. Now this contrast between flesh and spirit is, however, so strong, that it admits of no compromise. The Holy Scriptures know no emancipation of the flesh; on the contrary, the old man is to be crucified, v. 24, and die, but the new man of the Spirit is to live and rule. Now it is singular that St Paul in this passage speaks not merely of an ἐπιθυμεῖν of the flesh against the spirit, but also, vice versa, of an ἐπιθυμεῖν of the spirit against the flesh. The soul arrives at the enjoyment of those holy aspirations of the spirit, of the blessed joy to serve God even in the strictest self-denial, only when it has served God a considerable time, and, as it were, proved its fidelity. At first one only feels the bitterness of the fight. (In ver. 16 there is couched in the ἐπιθυμεῖναν σαρκὸς ὠ μὴ τελέσῃ the withholding the surrender of the will. The existence of the ἐπιθυμεῖν man cannot destroy, but he can turn away from it in the will not to fulfil it; it is only the acquiescence of the will with the lust that is the actual sin which bringeth forth death [James i. 15.] It remains to be said that here the spirit in which the Christian is to walk is not the human spirit alone, but that spirit in its unity with the divine Spirit, which is poured out into the heart of the faithful.—In the ἵνα μὴ κ. τ. λ. the meaning of the thought as regards the purpose is expressed; the ultimate object of God in this fight is to withdraw man from slavery to his own will, and subject him to the requirements of the divine Spirit.)

Ver. 18. But now this fight is not by any means a work under the Law, as if the believer made his salvation dependent on his success in it, and fancied he could attain salvation himself by it; the man receives the Spirit only if he is not under the Law, if he through faith is become a child of God. (See on the πνεύματι ἄγεσθαι at Rom. viii. 14. In 2 Tim. iii. 6 the discourse is of ἄγεσθαι ἐπιθυμίας, which is the antithesis to it.)

Vers. 19—21. In a long series, to which afterwards (ver. 22) the series of the fruits of the Spirit answers, the fruits of the flesh, which declare themselves as such unmistakeably, not merely out-
wardly but also inwardly through the voice of conscience (even to 
heathens, who had none but natural religion), are now enumerated.
(Cf. on this point the analogous passages, Rom. i. 29, ss.; 2 Cor.
xii. 20, ss.; Ephes. v. 3, ss.) Without enquiring too minutely into
the particular members of the series, we can still distinguish three
classes of ἔργα σαρκός; first, sins of lust; then evil works, pro-
ceeding from envy and hatred; lastly, forms of riot. Μονόλεια is
wanting in A.B.C., and is, certainly, a later addition. Εἰδολολα-
τρεία is here to be reckoned among the sins of lust, inasmuch as
idolatry was often connected with immoral rites. In the same way
φαρμακεία cannot be taken as poison-mixing for murder, as further
on φόνοι are also enumerated especially. The expression is rather
to be understood in a special sense of love-incantations. To take
it, with Winer and others, as a form of idolatry seems to me inad-
missible, because in the whole catalogue carnal transgressions only
are named. The exhortation, it should be remembered, is ad-
dressed to Christians, as to whom a relapse into idolatry and its
magical rites was not to be feared. The rest of the words occur
also in the passages quoted, at which compare more particular ac-
counts as to their distinctions. As to ἐριθεία see at Rom. ii.
8.—Φθόνοι and φόνοι stand together in Rom. i. 29 as they do
here; here the latter word is wanting only in B. and several
Minuscules.—The concluding words, καὶ προλέγω ἑμῶν Κ. Τ. Λ.
comprise, in conclusion, the threat of punishment for those who give
themselves up to such works of the flesh. What is expressed ne-
gatively only, viz., that they do not inherit the kingdom of God,
is to be taken positively also, viz., that they fall into everlasting
destruction, become heirs of the kingdom of Satan. (Ver. 21."A is
not = ταίτα, but the relative is derived by attraction out of the
accus. of the object to πράσσοντες.—Προλέγω is found also 2 Cor.
xiii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 4. We must supply, "before it comes to that." The
προείπων refers to the past, that is to say, to the personal pre-
sence of St Paul in Galatia.—Here we see now that the object of
the inheritance, of which mention was made so often in the preced-
ing chapter, is the βασιλεία Θεοῦ. This expression is here to be
restricted neither to the outward kingdom of God alone nor to the
inner one alone, but is to be taken in the widest sense, as that order
of things in which God's will shall reign. (See the development
of the idea on Matt. iii. 2.)
Vers. 22, 23. Hereupon, to the works of the flesh St Paul opposes the outward signs of love as the fruit of the Spirit. The word καρπὸς points to the organic part of the development, which naturally and necessarily occasions these virtues to germinate from their root, the Spirit. Against these the Law is not, that is, it rather requires them; whoever, therefore, can exhibit them, is a δικαιος. Whether one takes κατὰ τῶν τουλίτων as masculine or neuter makes but little difference; but, as mention was not expressly made of persons in the foregoing, and the article is used, it seems fitter to take it as neuter. In any case, the δὲ at the beginning of verse 24 is not to be taken as adversative, but as continuative. (Ver. 22. πλατις is “truth, fidelity.” Matt. xxiii. 23; Rom. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 10.)—Lachmann, after A.B.C., writes πραΰτης.—At the end, D.E.F.G. add ἀρπελα, but this is, surely, added only in order to oppose the corresponding virtue to the above enumerated sins of lust.

Vers. 24, 25. Where the Spirit, and, with it, the virtues cited reign, there the flesh with its just now enumerated works is crucified; he, therefore, that lives in this Spirit, must also allow it influence on his whole life, that is couched in the πνεύματι καὶ στοιχεῖον. It is only remarkable here, that the act of crucifying (in which expression a typical conception of Christ and His work serves as the foundation, see on Rom. vi. 3) is designated as past, whilst there is, certainly, couched in the exhortations of St Paul that it is to be still continued. This is explained by the fact, that St Paul here puts the idea of a true Christian quite objectively; therefore also in its completeness; as such, the believer has entirely crucified the flesh. In the concrete actuality, on the contrary, the complete idea, and therefore too the crucifying of the old man, never appear completely realized. (The παθήματα are, as Rom. vii. 5, “sinful inclinations,” but the more passive ones, as envy, anger, whilst ἐπιθυμίαι denote the more active ones.)

Now the sixth chapter ought to have begun here (which Rückert erroneously denies), for v. 26 stands in strict connection with what follows down to vi. 5, and is separated from the foregoing by the exhortation making a transition from its entirely general character to the special. In the verses v. 26 down to vi. 5 the apostle had in view rather the teachers, in chap. vi. 6—10 rather the lay persons, in the Galatian Churches. But the whole section, from v. 26
to vi. 10, is addressed to those among the Galatians who had remained true to him, St Paul, and his form of doctrine. The exhortations to a milder judgment of the erring, the warnings against exalting themselves above others, attain to their full meaning on this supposition only. It was also in the very nature of the thing that St Paul approached the well-disposed especially, without distinguishing them, however, formally and openly from the others. In the second epistle to the Corinthians (see the Introd. sec. 4), a perfectly similar relation of its separate parts is found. It was in the nature of the thing that those who had remained faithful to him might easily be tempted to exalt themselves above those who had succumbed to the temptation; St Paul, therefore, as a faithful shepherd of their souls, directs the attention of his disciples to this point, and calls upon them, as true πνευματικοὶ, rather to help up those fallen, and to be careful themselves not to fall into temptations.

It is self-evident that St Paul could not possibly write to the mass of the communities which he at first had treated (see on iii. 1) as apostates. (Κενόδοξος, "desirous of vain glory," alludes here to the glory of having remained faithful in temptation.—Προκαλεσθαι, lacessere, "to stir up to the fight, or to strive," here, we may suppose, by setting forth in a triumphing way how the others should have acted. Θονεῖν is not merely "to envy," but also "to deny, or withhold from one out of envy." But towards the fallen envy usually shows itself in wishing they might not be able to rise up again from their fall. Instead of that conduct, the apostle exhorts them to exert themselves to raise, in the spirit of meekness, those who had been surprised by a fall.—In προλαμβάνεσθαι many interpreters have chosen to ascribe to the προ the meaning of unexpectedness; besides Erasmus, Calovius, and Schott, Rückert also considers it as not impossible, but, at all events, authentic examples for this acceptance are wanting. It seems most natural to leave to the preposition its usual meaning, antea, and to consider it so that by it the λαμβάνεσθαι is to be designated as taking place before the καταρτίζειν. The ἐν τινι παραπτώματι is explained most pertinently by supplying ὅν, as the error is not to be represented as a deed done but once, but as a lasting state. "If a man has been detected in such an error before, and remains in it continuously," as was exactly the case.
with the Galatians, who had been made to waver, "then do ye spiritually disposed help such a one to the right path in the spirit of meekness."—In the concluding words the second person of the singular again renders St Paul’s discourse more personal, as in iv. 7. But the first person [γινώμεθα, v. 26] is used in a spirit of forbearance, as thus St Paul includes himself along with them in the exhortation.)

Verse 2. St Paul further exhorts them, exactly as at v. 13, 14, mutually to bear one another’s necessities and burdens, so that each should consider himself as a member of the whole, and in that he sees the fulfilling of the law of Christ. He calls it νόμος Χριστοῦ, because the Redeemer especially recommends to them this indulgent love. The βάρη, which are here meant, are the ἀσθενείματα of the brethren (Rom. xv. 1), as Rückert correctly remarks on this passage. (The reading ἀναπτηρώσετε, which Lachmann has received into the text, and Rückert recommends, is surely only a correction of the copyists, to whom it seemed fit to represent the fulfilment of so difficult a task as a future one.)

Verses 3—5. The best motive to indulgence towards others is the sense of our own weakness; he that thinks he is something, i.e. to be free, as regards himself, of all βάρη, deceives himself. Hence the exhortation to self-examination, which teaches humility, while it shows that each has enough to bear in his own burden. Thus, while all bear the burden of all, the whole body is held together by the bond of love. (Verse 3. φρεναπατάω is not found again in the New Testament; it denotes an ἀπατή ἐν φρεσί, self-deception.—The substantive, however, is found Titus i. 10.—Verse 4. ἐργον ἑαυτοῦ here denotes the whole of the striving and working in the widest extent.—Καύχημα is the object of one’s boasting, as Rom. iv. 2. In the εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἑρεμοῦ, the εἰς can only be taken as "in relation to, in comparison with," so that the sense is: "He will only have occasion to boast in looking at himself, he will restrain himself from looking at others." The καύχημα ἕχει is, however, to be taken ironically, as ver. 5 shows. A radical self-examination makes one discover so much in one’s own heart, that there can be no question of boasting anywhere; one sees that one has also one’s own burden to bear, and judges therefore more indulgently the errors of others.)
Ver. 6. Hitherto St Paul seems to have thought especially of the teachers, or at least of these along with the lay-persons; he now addresses his discourse to the lay-persons alone, and calls upon them not to let the teachers starve, but to impart to them of all their earthly goods. This exhortation has, no doubt, its foundation in causes quite special, but which are not more intimately known to us. As to the duty of the lay-brethren to support in the body the dispensers of spiritual things, St Paul speaks in detail at 1 Cor. ix., on which the remarks in the Comm. may be compared. The reference of the ἄραθα to spiritual treasures we can only reject as totally misunderstood.

Vers. 7, 8. Such avarice is very seriously rebuked, and threatened with divine judgment. He that despiseth God's servants despiseth God Himself (Luke x. 16; John xii. 48), and then the punishment fails not. The labour of man in this life is compared with the sowing of seed, the judgment with the harvest. He that soweth avarice and withholds their own from God's servants, sows unto the flesh, and can only reap from it what it is able to produce, corruption, i.e. (according to the antithesis of ζωὴ αἰῶνιος), spiritual death. It remains to be said that in the σπελεοῦν it is implied that the man's activity is directed to a purpose, and considered as to its result, which activity decides his fate according as it has for its object the corruptible or the incorruptible. For the πνεῦμα is to be taken here in opposition to σὰρξ, merely to denote the incorruptible; it is not meant here to be denied, that even the spirit itself can become evil, and that even in spiritual activity sin may be found. (Verse 7. St Paul often uses the phrase μὴ πλανάσθε, see 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33, also James i. 16.—Μυκτηρίζεων is properly: suspensis naribus illudere. It is often found in the LXX., in the New Testament here only. We find the same metaphor of sowing in Prov. xxii. 8.)

Vers. 9, 10. In conclusion St Paul further reminds them, for encouragement to persist in a life of self-denial, of the certainty of a future reward at the divine judgment-seat. The point of view is here enlarged, extending beyond their teachers, to the love of the human race generally; but since man, in the limitations of his condition finds it necessary to restrict himself in the actual exercise of love, because his means do not suffice to help all, St Paul points especially to them who are of the household of faith. Thus there
is in that expression no restriction of love itself, but only a limitation of the practice of love on account of insufficient means. (For ἐκκακώμεν A.B D. read ἐγκακώμεν, and as the latter, in the other passages of the New Testament, in which the word occurs, is the best supported reading, it might deserve the preference. ἔκλύεσθαι = ἐγκακεῖν, and the participle here expresses the condition on which the reward is bestowed.—Καιρὸς ἰδίος here denotes the time appointed by God for the reward.—Verse 10. Ὄς καὶρῶν ἐχόμεν is "as long as we have time," ὁς = dum, quoad, as Luke xii. 58.—For ἐργασόμεθα Lachmann reads, on the authority of Codex A., ἐργασόμεθα, and takes the whole verse as a question: "Now, shall we, accordingly, do good?" Winer also is inclined to prefer this reading. But that one MS. surely affords it no sufficient authority. It remains to be said that it is in the nature of the thing that τὸ ἀγαθὸν, in conjunction with ἔγκλεισθαι, conveys the idea of usefulness. It is found exactly thus Ephes. iv. 28. The phrase οἰκεῖος πίστεως = οἰκεῖος Θεοῦ Ephes. ii. 19; the faithful are considered as one family.)

§ 10. CONCLUSION.

(vi. 11—18.)

The words ἵδετε, πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἐγραφα, admit of a double meaning: "with how great, i.e. shapeless, letters," and "how long a letter." The former explanation seems to be the nearer to the truth, because by it the original meaning of πηλίκος is preserved, and in the other the accusative πηλίκα γράμματα would be more suitable. Again, St Paul uses ἐπιστολὴ for "letter," not γράμματα. Γράμματα occurs only Acts xxi. 21 in the sense of "letter." Therefore, in early times, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome, in later days, Semler, Winer, Rückert, declared themselves for the former acceptance of the words. The ἵδετε also is then more accurately applied. But, on the other side, it is not to be disputed, that it is somewhat surprising to see St Paul all at once drawing attention to such an unimportant externality, as the shapelessness of his Greek letters was, especially as directly after, in verse 12, the same ideas, which oc-
ocupied him throughout the Epistle, are again brought forward. This argument, at least, inclines my decision to the side of the other interpretation, although, considered purely grammatically, it has fewer recommendations, and yet it is quite admissible too. For πη-λικος is used in later Greek as ἡπιος, (see Tholuck's Anz. for 1834, No. 32, p. 250, note), the dative with ἔγραψα is explained like the εἰπε λόγον Matth. viii. 8, Luke vii. 7, and ἱγράμματα in the sense of "letter" was, of course, known to St Paul, even if not familiar to him. The object of the whole remark, however, is, according to 2 Thess. ii. 2, compared with iii. 17, no other than to certify the genuineness of the Epistle; to which is here further added, that the circumstance is meant to make known to the Galatians the especial affection of St Paul towards them, that he has written the whole letter himself, not dictated it, as at other times.

Ver. 12. Recapitulating once more the contents of the letter briefly, St Paul places the falseness of his Judaistic adversaries in opposition to his pure endeavours. They preach circumcision out of fear of persecution, which was the lot of all those who based their salvation only on Christ's death on the cross, and seek to ingratiate themselves with their enemies by means of external compliances. (See on ii. 12, v. 11.) Of course, this did not hold good of all, any more than the hypocrisy rebuked in ver. 13; many of these Judaists were certainly also honest fanatics. We are here not to think of proselytes, who feared persecutions by the Jewish Christians, (see the Introd., sec. 2), but of Jews who held Christ for the Messiah, but at the same time pretended to observe the Law after the manner of the Pharisees. Only it may be doubtful whom we have to consider as the persecutors, whom those Judaists feared, who sought to seduce the Galatians to circumcision as a means of salvation. One might suppose that the Jews generally were meant; but the Jews, as such, were also adversaries of the Judaizing Christians; whoever held Jesus for the Messiah was to them an apostate, he might think of the Law what he would. We must here keep our point of view within the Church. The heads of the Judaistic party are to be looked upon as those whose persecution the Galatian false teachers feared. It follows, then, from that, that the active persons in Galatia were not the heads of the party themselves, but only dependent persons. (Ἐνπροσωπεῖν seems to be coined by the apostle himself, it is found nowhere else. How-
ever, Aristophanes has σεμνοντροσκεπεῖν [Nub. v. 363], and Cicero 
φαντοφροσκεπεῖν [ad Attic. vii. 20.] Our word means, first of all, 
"to be of handsome countenance;" then "to recommend one's self 
by beauty," "to insinuate one's self." But those things by which 
the Judaists recommended themselves are mere externals, ἐν σαρκί. 
—The dative τῷ σταυρῷ is to be taken as the dat. instrumenti: 
"the cross, i.e. the doctrine of salvation through Christ's death on 
the cross alone, is the cause of the persecution." See on v. 11.)

Ver. 13. A fresh rebuke relates to the hypocrisy of those men; 
they are not really concerned to maintain the observance of the 
Law, they only want to make a show with a great number of 
proselytes. The picture of the Pharisees, Matth. xxiii. 4, ss., is entirely 
similar, but neither that nor the one here can be extended to all the 
individuals of the sect. (The σαρκεία which they boast is here to be 
understood physically of the circumcised flesh. A bitter irony is 
couched in the thought; instead of seeking the souls of men, these 
literal interpreters boast of the flesh of those whom they have 
persuaded to let themselves be circumcised.)

Ver. 14. St Paul then opposes his pure endeavours to these 
dishonest proceedings: "I seek not glory in the sight of men, but 
find it only in the cross of Christ, i.e. the dying Saviour is the 
only object of my boasting, Him alone do I make of any account, 
men are of no account with me." St Paul can say this, because 
he knows that he (as to his sinful old man) is dead, that Christ, 
the pure, perfect new man, lives in him (ii. 20.). Where this 
living event of regeneration has not taken place, St Paul means to 
say, there that hollowness is unavoidable. The dying of the old 
man, which at the same time always supposes the birth of the new 
one, is here again, according to the typical acceptation of the death 
of Christ (ii. 21), called a being crucified, and in the δι' θεῷ, sc. 
σταυροῦ, is intimated, that the possibility of the regeneration is 
given by the death of Christ alone. The twofold turn of the idea ἐσ- 
ταύρωται ἐμοὶ κόσμος καγὼ κόσμος, is merely to express the complete 
dissolution of the ties between the believer and the world: 
"the world is as good as dead to me, it no longer contains any 
living power of attraction for me; and, vice versa, I also am dead 
to it." (The ἐμοὶ μη γένοιτο answers to the ἡμὶ τὶς, ἡμὶ τὶς, Gen. 
xxiv. 7; Jos. xxiv. 16.)

Ver. 15. In Christ, that is, in His body, the Church, the old sepa-
rating distinctions are no longer in force (see on iii. 28, v. 6); there all depends on the Καργή κτίσις, i.e. that the true regeneration follow, that Christ, the new man, be fully born in the heart. (See the details at 2 Cor. v. 17, and at Ephes. ii. 10.)

Ver. 16. St Paul then concludes the Epistle with invoking the blessings of peace and mercy (grace follows in ver. 18); this wish is, however, confined to those who follow the above rule (that circumcision is no longer of any force in Christ, but only the new birth), as those alone are the true people of God, the spiritual Israel, which the nation of the Israelites only prefigured. This restriction of the wish is, however, not to be taken as an invidious exclusion of the others; the affectionate apostle would gladly bless the whole world; but these others are by their inner state incapable of receiving the blessing, the organ for it is wanting in them; even if he had blessed them, still the blessing and the peace would have returned again to him that blessed (Matt. x. 13; John xvii. 9), because they would find no place in them. (Kαργή is here, as at Phil. iii. 16, a rule of faith; it is found in another sense, 2 Cor. x. 13.—The καὶ ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. is only to be taken as an explanation of the ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ, for those that walk according to the true rule are themselves the spiritual Israel of God, an antithesis to the mere Israel according to the flesh, Rom. ii. 29, ix. 6. For they strive and fight, as Jacob did formerly when he received the name of Israel. (Gen. xxxii. 24, ss.) It is striking here, that εἰρήνη stands before Ελέος, whereas it elsewhere (1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Jude ver. 1) follows, which also lies in the nature of the thing, since peace can only be the fruit of mercy. However, a design is scarcely to be sought in this collocation; St Paul meant, I suppose, at first to write εἰρήνη only, and then brought in the Ελέος, which was hard by and familiar to him, to which is joined finally in ver. 18 the χάρε, which elsewhere is wont to be named first.

Ver. 17. Finally, after his blessing on the faithful, there follows another hard parting blow for his audacious adversaries; St Paul reverts in just pride to his apostolic authority and his arduous labours in the service of the Lord, and demands that his labours be not increased by further burthens still. (Τοῦ λοιποῦ ὑμ. χρόνον, "henceforth," posthac, different from το λοιπον, "for the rest," 2 Cor. xiii. 11.—Στέγματα are marks which were burnt into the slaves, in order to know them when they ran away; also into such
as devoted themselves to the gods as their slaves. [See the passages which relate to this point in Winer in the Comm. on this passage.] The words might therefore mean, "I have entirely devoted myself to Christ," and have, therefore, only to execute His will. But the addition ἐν τῷ σώματι μου obliges us to understand the στίγματα of the wounds, which St Paul had received in his calling as apostle. See on 2 Cor. xi. 23, ss. These are actual vouchers for all that the apostle had had to endure in his apostolical service, —They are called στίγματα Ἰησοῦ, because they were received in His service, and in consequence of his labours for Him. What was meant to bring shame he bears as honourable scars.)

Ver. 18. The usual formula of wishing them grace at length closes the Epistle to the Galatians; for with the χάρις everything else is given at the same time. But St Paul wishes the χάρις μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, not merely μεθ' ὑμῶν, in order, as Rückert correctly remarks, once more to draw their attention to the necessity of the victory of the spirit over the flesh, however the latter may show itself, which victory is only possible through grace. (But see 2 Tim. iv. 22, where πνεῦμα stands also, without the possibility of such a reference taking place.)
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§ 1. THE FIRST READERS OF THE EPISTLE.

St Paul came, for the first time, to Ephesus, the famous capital of proconsular Asia, as he, after a year and a half's sojourn in Corinth, was concluding his second missionary journey, and was travelling thence to Jerusalem. However, on this occasion he only touched at Ephesus, and stayed but a few days there (Acts xviii. 19, 20.) Nevertheless, he even then formed connections, and was besought to pass a longer time there; but a vow compelled him to haste; he therefore soon took leave, though with the promise of returning thither for a longer visit. This promise St Paul very soon performed; after ending his journey, he left Jerusalem once more for his third missionary journey, and went through Galatia and Phrygia directly to Ephesus. Now, he found here so favourable a soil for the Gospel, that he remained here two years and three months, and founded a prosperous church. (Acts xix. 8, 10.) St Paul would probably have stopped there still longer had not the goldsmith Demetrius obliged him by a tumult to leave the city. Meanwhile, the Church in Ephesus had been sufficiently established. Judaism and Gentilism threatened it no more, but interior schisms through false teachers were imminent. When, therefore, St Paul in his last journey to Jerusalem passed through Miletus, he sent thither for the presbyters of the Ephesian Church, and took leave of them in a moving speech. (Acts xx. 17—38.) At a later time St John chose for himself Ephesus as a centre for his comprehensive labours in Asia Minor. Its effects were so considerable that a few decennia later Pliny was already obliged to write to Trajan that paganism appeared to be almost entirely lost in Upper Asia. (Plin. Ep. x. 97.)
Now to this important Church in Ephesus the second of the shorter Epistles of St Paul is, according to its superscription and title, addressed. But extrinsic and intrinsic reasons combine to excite doubt as to that destination of the Epistle. First, as to the *extrinsic* reasons; but little stress were to be laid on the fact, *per se*, that MSS. B. and 67 have not εν Ἑφέσῳ in the text (for the *former*, the Codex Vaticanus, has at least the words in the margin, and that too by the original hand, and in Codex 67 they are only wanting *ex emendatione*), but this want becomes important by its coincidence with other data. For Tertullian informs us in his controversy with Marcion (adv. Marc. v. 11): præterea hic et de aliâ epistolâ, quam nos ad Ephesios præscriptum habemus, haeretici (Marcion cum suis) verò ad Laodicenos; with which chapter xvii. of the same work is to be connected, where the words run: ecclesiae quidem veritate (*i.e.* according to mere ecclesiastical tradition) epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquanto interpolare (*i.e.* according to Tertullian's usual language merely *corrumpere*, be it *addendo* or *delendo*) gestit, quasi et in isto diligentiissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, quum ad omnes scripturam Apostolus, non ad quosdam. According to this, therefore, even in the time of Tertullian our Epistle was known as an Epistle to the Ephesians, only Marcion and his sect declared it to be addressed to the Laodiceans. Tertullian does not intimate what reading they found in the passage Ephes. i. 1, but it lies in the very nature of the thing that if they could not have read εν Ἑφέσῳ, if they considered the Epistle as addressed to the Laodiceans. Now, true as might have been, on the whole, Tertullian's charge against Marcion, that he had altered the text of the Scriptures, so far as he received them, yet it is not easy to see what could *here* have influenced him to the alteration. Elsewhere, that is to say, they were *dogmatical* reasons which determined him in his alterations; but *those* could find no application *here*. However, this notice of the African Father upon the Marcionite dealing with the Epistle becomes important only through the more accurate communication, which we owe to Basil. (Basil. M. cont. Eunom. operum, vol. i. p. 254, edit. Garnier.) For this Father gives us express information as to the state of the MSS., and that too of the *old* MSS., in the passage Ephes. i. 1.
He informs us the reading had been: τοῖς ἅγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, with the important addition: οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδείγματος, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἐνυπήκοαν. Therefore Basil grounds on tradition and his own inspection of old MSS. the conviction, that the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ were wanting in the exordium of our Epistle; the Father even uses this reading for a dogmatical argument, he finds in it that St Paul calls the Ephesians οὕτως, an intimation that they through the knowledge of faith were essentially united to Christ, the only real being. (Τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γυναικας ἡμώνεως τῷ ὡς δὲ ἐπιγνώσεως, οὕτως αὐτοῖς ἱδίαξον- τος ἑνόμασεν.) Through this accurate communication Tertullian’s reports as to the nature of the Marcionite text, as also the state of some of our MSS., certainly become very important. To these extrinsic arguments, which are calculated to excite doubts whether our Epistle is addressed to the Ephesians, there now come intrinsic ones also, by which these doubts are very much confirmed. That is to say, one would expect from the position of St Paul towards the Ephesian Church, that divers personal allusions to it and its members would be prominent features in the Epistle.

But such are altogether wanting; it is true, a hearty cordiality pervades the Epistle, but that is based merely on the common consciousness of faith, not on personal acquaintance and friendship. The circumstance, that St Paul had commissioned Tychicus, the bearer of the Epistle, to relate of him by word of mouth (vi. 21, 22), certainly in some measure explains a total want of greetings and personal intelligence; but still it is hard to think in the case of an Epistle of St Paul to a church in which he lived longer than two years, that he should have so spoken of their faith, as if he had only heard of it by report (i. 15), and that he leaves in doubt whether the readers had heard of the grace of God which had been given to him (iii. 2). Therefore, even apart from the extrinsic

---

1 In St Jerome’s Comm. on Ephes. i. 1, we also read: Paulus Ephesius essentiae vocabulo nuncupavit, but the Father himself finds fault with that interpretation; he remarks that: alii simpliciter vertunt, non ad eos qui sint, sed qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur. Böttger (Beit. part iii. p. 87) justly infers from the arbitrantur, that St Jerome also did not find the reading ἐν Ἐφεσῳ in MSS., but he only knew it as a conjecture. But I cannot accede to Böttger’s view (that originally there was no name of a town stood in the greeting, and therefore οὖσι is to be taken in a pregnant sense), for the reasons developed in what follows.
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reasons, the contents of our Epistle itself lead us to suppose a wider circle of readers, whose circumstances were not known to the apostle in the same degree as those of the Ephesians must have been; for, that St Paul means to address only those converted after his departure from Ephesus, who were therefore as yet unknown to him, is a totally inadmissible assumption, as nowhere is such a distinction among the Christians at Ephesus hinted at. One might think that this difficulty could only be resolved by assuming, that our Epistle is the one written to the Laodiceans, of which mention is made Col. iv. 16, as Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, and lately Holzhausen, have asserted. For St Paul did not know the Laodiceans personally, therefore the passages of our Epistle, which are surprising as addressed to the Ephesians, would seem quite well adapted to the Church in Laodicea. It was also obvious to seek in the similar assumption of the Marcionites an historical basis for this view, the rather that Marcion was of Asia-Minor descent, and therefore we might suppose his manuscripts to contain the purest text. But there are decisive reasons against this assumption. Had St Paul written at the same time to the Christians in Colosse and in Laodicea, he would not certainly have commissioned the Colossian Christians to make his greetings to the Laodiceans also (Col. iv. 15). Further, St Paul's wish, that the Laodiceans might read the Epistle to the Colossians, seems therefore to have but little motive, on the assumption, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is the one addressed to the Laodiceans, because this Epistle is of similar purport, in general, with that to the Colossians, and therefore the Laodiceans could have no particular interest, after the more detailed Epistle directed to them, in reading the shorter one also to the Colossians, which was calculated for particular circumstances. The Epistle mentioned Col. iv. 16 must rather be considered as lost, since, as will be immediately shown in detail, to the assumption of the Marcionites, that the Epistle to the Ephesians was intended for the Christians in Laodicea, no exclusive importance can be ascribed, since this circumstance admits of a simple explanation in another way, without supposing any corruption of the text. Accordingly, for the solution of the difficulty as to the destination of our Epistle only this one assumption can serve, viz. that the Epistle to the Ephesians was an encyclical one, i.e. that it was meant to circulate among a number
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of churches, and to be read out in their assemblies. For this supposition, which completely explains the character of the Epistle, the greater number, and the most eminent, of the modern critics have accordingly decided. However, it is still a question, even supposing the correctness of this general view, how the Ephesians were exactly situated with regard to this number of churches, for whom this Epistle was intended, and how we are to establish the original reading in the salutation. That is to say, the Epistle to the Ephesians can by no means be understood as an encyclical one in such a way, that in the number of the churches, for which it was especially intended, the Ephesian Church was not itself included; on the contrary, it must be regarded as the first church in that number, as the one to which the Epistle was given first of all by Tychicus that they might forward it to the others (vi. 21, 22). That appears from the fact, that in all the Fathers without exception, even in Basil, our Epistle is taken as an Epistle to the Ephesians. Marcion alone interpreted it as an Epistle to the Laodiceans, as we saw; but even in him it remained doubtful, whether he read ἐν Λαοδίκειᾳ in the salutation, or, as is more probable, had no name of a city at all in the text, just like Basil's MSS. That this variation of Marcion's does not express the general view of the ancient Church is irrefragably established by the fact, that, before Marcion, Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, mentions our Epistle as one addressed to the Ephesian Church. (Ignat. ad Ephes. cap. xii. in the shorter recension of these Epistles, which, according to the latest investigations, is to be considered as genuine.) This universal concord would be completely inexplicable, if the Epistle had not been especially addressed to the Church in Ephesus, much more if not at all to the same in conjunction with others. On the other hand, it is quite comprehensible (unless one chooses to suppose, that it was merely Col. iv. 16 that was the cause of this supposition), that, if our Epistle was not addressed, among others, to the Christians in Laodicea, along with others, it could be occasionally considered also as an Epistle to the Laodiceans (from which, however, the one mentioned Col. iv. 15 must still be supposed different), of which view a vestige seems to have remained among the Marcionites. Tertullian's charge of a designed corruption of the text is in this point clearly without any probable ground. Thus, then, there only remains further this one ques-
ution, how the original text in Ephes. i. 1, may have stood. According to the above-cited passage of Basil, the oldest MSS. known to him seem to have left out the ἐν Εφέσω, so that τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς were closely united; for he deduces from this passage, as we already remarked, that he supposes the readers to have been thus called ὅντες, because they stood in connection with Christ, the only real being (τῷ ὅντι). But this interpretation, as similar ones attempted in later times by Schneckenburger, Mat­thies, and Meyer (see Harless p. xlvii.), cannot possibly be re­commended. The analogy of the exordia of St Paul's Epistles is in favour of the name of the city, or province, in which the readers of them are, directly following the participle. But then, how shall the omission of the ἐν Εφέσω be explained, which took place in many old MSS.; and, on the other hand, if we uphold ἐν Εφέσω as the true reading, how could an encyclical Epistle be designated as addressed to the Ephesians merely, especially as our Epistle is addressed to Gentile Christians (ii. 11), whereas the Ephesian Church was composed of Gentile and Jewish Christians (Acts xix. 17, xx. 21.) To the latter point, however, but little importance is to be ascribed, because all the churches founded by St Paul were predominantly Gentile-Christian, and could not be otherwise from the mission which he undertook (Gal. ii. 9); even if there were individual Jews among them, still St Paul might properly keep the mass especially in view, and remind them of their former idolatry. For it must be supposed in the case of all the Epistles, and therefore here also, that St Paul wrote to whole churches, not to individuals of those churches, because he would by the latter course have himself dissolved their unity in faith and love. But there could scarcely have been any churches without some Jewish Christians. The two other arguments, however, the omission of the ἐν Εφέσω in some, and again the retention of those words in other, MSS., can surely be only explained, considering the encyclical destination of the Epistle, by the assumption, that either Tychicus was provided with several copies of the Epistle, and that in them the space for the proper city was left blank for filling up; or that copies of the Epistle were made in Ephesus for different places, and, as it was known to be an encyclical Epistle, the ἐν

1 The author of this hypothesis is Usher, the famous Archbishop of Armagh, in his Annal. Mundi ad ann. 64, p. 686.
INTRODUCTION.

'Εφέσιος was put, not in all, but only in the copies intended for Ephesus and its neighbourhood; but as Ephesus was the chief city of Asia, most copies naturally went out from it, which therefore spread that reading. The objection has been made (see Harless, p. xlv.) to this hypothesis (as to which it is immaterial whether it be received so, or modified otherwise), "that it transfers the usages of modern times to the ancient world," incorrectly, as it appears to me. Copies must have been taken, as much in olden time as in the present day, of an Epistle addressed to several churches, whether by the bearer himself, or by those to whom the Epistle came first; and that in these copies the name of the place either was wanting at first, or was afterwards left out by the copyists, who knew the encyclical destination of the Epistle, seems also to be entirely analogous to the state of things at all times. This supposition therefore of Usher, Hug, and others, has ever seemed to me the most suitable solution of the difficulty, and, if we reject it, we see ourselves obliged to leave the difficulty unsolved.

§ 2. OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE.

Whereas our Epistle maintained the character of an apostolical writing, as well throughout the early Church as in the later ages, without any dispute, the critics of our days have attempted to cast doubts on the correctness of this tradition. Schleiermacher expressed himself doubtful as to the origin of our Epistle, but his particular reasons have not as yet been published. De Wette also (Introd. p. 221, ss.) is just as doubtful, but confesses that the reasons did not as yet suffice for rejecting it. Meanwhile one cannot apprehend that plausible reasons will fail the sharp-sighted hypercriticism of other theologians,¹ in order to reject this Epistle also, along with other ones, as not St Paul's. Let us examine cursorily, since the publication of those reasons for the non-genuineness of this Epistle has not yet followed, what may be considered as arousing suspicion. Historical arguments of the sort are entirely wanting, with the exception of the one, which (§ 1) was adduced as to its destination. But uncertainty as to the first readers of an

¹ According to Baur in his work against Rothe, St Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians, are alone to be considered as decidedly genuine; all the others are not genuine, or else more or less suspicious.
Epistle can only then excite suspicion as to the declared author, if some other important points come in addition. Such the interior constitution of the Epistle is said to suggest. De Wette (ubi supra p. 229) expresses himself on those points in the following fashion: "In the Epistle to the Ephesians the style seems strange when compared with that of others of St Paul's Epistles, as it is altogether too loose (that sounds as if looseness were, in general, a characteristic of St Paul's mode of representation), overladen with parentheses and subordinate sentences, disjointed, rich in words, but poor in new ideas, and varying in particulars, a variation which may also be remarked in a great part of his conceptions, opinions, and mode of teaching. Certainly, these reasons are not sufficient for rejecting the Epistle, which contains so much which is worthy of St Paul, and scarcely to be expected of an imitator, and which Epistle antiquity has always acknowledged as genuine." The arguments here cited as arousing suspicion are, however, of such a description that very little, if any, stress is to be laid on them. That is to say, as to the remarks, first of all, on the form of our Epistle, it is true that ἀπαξ λεγόμενα occur in it; but it has been long ago remarked that, considering the small extent of St Paul's Epistles all together, such must occur in each. The exposition in it is also very rich and full; but, when De Wette sees in it mere "copia verborum, without new ideas," that is, as Harless (Introd. sec. 3) has shown in detail, an entirely unfounded charge; the richness of style, the fullness of the sentences, is rather to be referred to the thronging ideas, which sought for expression at the same time in St Paul's mind. As to the matter, in the second place, many variations in "conceptions, opinions, and doctrine" are said to occur in the Epistle to the Ephesians. But this assertion too comes to nothing substantial. Thus De Wette remarks among others, that the dæmonological conceptions in our Epistle are unusual, for which assertion the words ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος (ii. 2), τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (vi. 12) are quoted. But, since the idea of evil spirits occurs in all St Paul's Epistles, it cannot possibly be said with any reason that there are here deviations from the genuine Pauline dæmonology, just because a subordinate trait is here brought out prominently, which we, accidentally, do not find elsewhere. Such are to be looked upon as mere ἀπαξ νοούμενα, and these have
per se just as little force of demonstration in them as the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, unless they appear in conjunction with decisive arguments. The only thing now that might be looked upon as such is the relation of our Epistle to the Epistle to the Colossians; this requires, therefore, a nearer investigation.

That between the Epistle to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians a great affinity exists was known long ago, but the conviction was that the composition of both Epistles at the same time, and under like circumstances, was quite sufficient to account for it. But in later times it has been attempted to dispute that, because the affinity is so great that at bottom the Epistle to the Ephesians “appears only a copious amplification of the Epistle to the Colossians, and is wanting in everything distinctive as to aim and object.” (See De Wette, ubi supra, p. 223.) That is to say, the more decided character of the Epistle to the Colossians is taken to prove its originality at the expense of the Epistle to the Ephesians. (Ibid., p. 230, note a.) Now, as an argument for this pretended quality of the Epistle to the Ephesians, De Wette gives us (p. 224—228) a comparison of the two Epistles (in which all those passages even which contain like words only are set down as parallel passages), careless whether the connexion in which they occur is the same or a totally different one. Harless (p. lxix.) has already shown in detail how very differently the comparison of the two Epistles appears, if one pays attention to the connexion and tendency of them. With all the concord between them there still exists an independent character in them both. That is to say, whilst the Epistle to the Colossians has a very decided polemical reference, as an heretical party, which is characterized by peculiar features, is combated in it, such is totally wanting in the Epistle to the Ephesians. True, some passages are found which at first sight appear to have a polemical tendency (see iv. 3, 4, 14, 20, 21; v. 6); but, on a more accurate consideration, even in these passages

---

1 Of what nature the other pretended variations are which De Wette says he has remarked, is plain from the fact that he reckons among them the exposition of Ps. lxxvi. 19, the allegory of the Church and marriage (iv. 8, 28, v. 18); passages which certainly, according to 1 Cor. x., Gal. iv., seem quite in St Paul’s style. But the exhortations in iv. 28, v. 18, De Wette finds gross (!) Whence this prudery comes I know not how to explain.

2 The separate parallels will, in every case, meet with a closer examination in the exposition, and so we do not go into them more closely here.
all *properly* polemic allusion disappears, and the Epistle stands, as
a warning, it is true, against possible errors, but, on the whole, as
merely a lively effusion of the heart, full of faith and joy, by which
the readers are meant to be strengthened in the faith, encouraged
to the practice of love, and stirred up to patience in hope.
Schneckenburger's assumption that (Intro. p. 135, ss.) our Epistle
relates to the theosophic system, which had spread in Asia Minor,
is, at all events, completely inadmissible. Why should that po-
lemical reference be so veiled *here* when it is so openly expressed
in the Epistle to the Colossians? The only thing in the Epistle
to the Ephesians which must be considered as having a special re-
gard to the circumstances of the first readers is the manner in
which St Paul speaks of his knowledge of Christianity (iii. 4), and
especially of the position of the Gentiles towards the Jews with
reference to the Gospel (see ii. 2, ss., ii. 11—22, iii. 6, ss.), ac-
dcording to which our Epistle seems to have a greater affinity to those
written to the Galatians and Romans than to that written to the
Colossians. If one compares with those copious and impressive
representations as to the right of the Gentiles to an immediate en-
trance into the kingdom of God the exhortations to concord which
(iv. 1, ss.) are annexed to them, it surely cannot be denied that St
Paul must have entertained the apprehension that Jewish Chris-
tians might at some future time distract the minds of the converts
in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, just as had already happened in
the neighbouring Galatia. That is to say, there is no certain trace
in the Epistle to the Ephesians (see the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 14)
that false teachers of this bias had already gained influence. St
Paul's intention seems to have been merely to counteract betimes
their possible and probable *future* influence. But the matter has
quite another aspect in Colossæ, where the apostle's polemics com-
batt with all their force a false doctrine which had already obtained
circulation. However, when Mayerhoff (on Coloss. p. 143, ss.) finds
another controversy in the Epistle to the Ephesians, he confounds
a *positive* representation with a *negative*. True, every proposition
contains also a reference to its opposite, but, if that opposite is
nowhere openly prominent, there can be no question as to polemi-
cal tendency. Had St Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians com-
bated an actually existing error, he would have been obliged not
merely to set forth the truth in addresses to the Gentile Christians,
but also to describe their errors with a clear reference to the mistaken Jewish Christians; but of that not a trace is found. Even supposing, therefore, that in passages like Ephes. i., 20—23, just as in Col. i. 15, ss., there floated before St Paul’s mind a reply to false teachers, who, like those of Colosœ, denied the divine dignity of Christ and put angel-princes on a level with Him, we should never be justified in supposing such a reply to exist in the Epistle to the Ephesians, except with a view to the possibility that such false teachers might come from the neighbouring Colosœ to Ephesus also, but not as if such views had already been disseminated there when St Paul wrote to Ephesus. St Paul’s melancholy prophecies as to the false teachers to be expected in Ephesus (Acts xx. 29, ss.) were not realized until the time of the composition of the Epistles to Timothy and of the first Epistle of St John. But, besides this, the remaining entirely general contents of our Epistle are communicated so completely in St Paul’s language and form of exposition, that, were the Epistle not genuine, it must yet be supposed the author had not merely formed his style on St Paul’s, but written out St Paul exactly word for word. But, had any one undertaken anything of the sort, he would, in all probability, have imported into the Epistle above all open polemical tendencies, and not have obliterated those which are expressed in the Epistle to the Colossians, since the attempts at forgery were usually required to serve the purpose of adding apostolical authority to the personal bias that was to be rendered current. What we are to think of such hypotheses, derived from intrinsic reasons and set up without any support from extrinsic arguments, is especially shown in this case by the circumstance that Mayerhoff asserts the originality of the Epistle to the Ephesians and spuriousness of that to the Colossians with the same confidence and decision with which De Wette conversely maintains the originality of the Epistle to the Colossians, and the derivation therefrom of that to the Ephesians. (See Mayerhoff’s work, “The Epistle to the Colossians examined, with especial regard to the three pastoral Epistles,” Berlin 1838, p. 105, ss.) And, in fact, if this assertion of Mayerhoff’s was not just as arbitrary, in the absence of all other decisive reasons, it would have, at least, this advantage over the totally untenable and per se empty one of De Wette’s, that there would be a reasonable foundation for the fiction, viz. the insertion of the polemical element in the Epistle,
whereas, according to De Wette's view, that element must have been even purposely left out, by which omission the work seems wholly aimless. Accordingly, we shall be justified in saying, that nothing at all can be discovered in our Epistle which could afford reasonable grounds for a suspicion of its genuineness.

§ 3. TIME AND PLACE OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

This enquiry cannot be carried on with reference to the Epistle to the Ephesians alone, as St Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, which are closely connected with one another, must necessarily be referred to the same time as our Epistle, on account of the near affinity of the former of them with our Epistle, and of the very similar circumstances under which they were composed. Nay, the very same thing holds good of the Epistle to the Philippians also, as Böttger (Beitr. part 2nd, p. 60) has already correctly remarked: "It will ever be a fruitless labour to attempt to separate the Epistle to the Philippians by any considerable space of time from those to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon," which Schulz, Schott, De Wette, and Schneckenburger have attempted, more or less decidedly, to do. (See the passages in point in Böttger, ubi sup.) Thus two questions arise for us to solve, first, when these four Epistles were composed, i.e. during what captivity, whether during the one at Rome, or that at Cæsarea (for these two alone can be named as the dates of their composition with any appearance of truth); and secondly, in what order do they stand with regard to each other?

In relation to that first question, a general agreement had been already come to in deciding for the captivity at Rome, which St Luke reports at the end of Acts, while Schulz (Stud. for 1829, part 3d, p. 612, ss.), Schott (Isag. in N. T., p. 272, ss.), De Wette (Introd. p. 254), Schneckenburger (Beitr. p. 143, ss.), and especially Böttger (Beitr. part 2), recommended with great acumen the other view, viz. that they might have been composed in Cæsarea. For that these Epistles were all written during one captivity is clear from the open declarations in the same (Ephes. iii. 1, 13, iv. 1, vi. 19, ss., Phil. i. 7, 12, 14, sq., ii. 17, ss., Col. i. 24, iv. 3, 7, Philem. ver. 9.) But now we know of only the two great capti-
vities of St Paul in Rome and Caesarea; to one of these, therefore, the composition of the four Epistles must be referred. For the circumstance, that we find the same persons mentioned as companions of St Paul in all four of them, which cannot possibly be supposed of both captivities, does not permit a partition of the Epistles between the two. These persons are Timothy (Phil. i. 1, Col. i. 1, Philem. ver. 1), Epaphras (Col. i. 7, iv. 12, Philem. ver. 23), Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus, Justus, Demas, Lucas (Col. iv. 10, 14, Philem. ver. 24), Tychicus (Ephes. vi. 21, sq., Col. iv. 7), Onesimus (Col. iv. 9, Philem. ver. 10.) The only thing which strikes one here is, that in the Epistle to the Ephesians no mention is made of Timothy. The supposition that he is not named because he was a stranger to the readers (see Harless, p. lxii.), seems improbable to me, because Timothy, according to Acts xx. 4, was with St Paul in Asia, and on this visit no doubt also visited the churches, to which our Epistle is addressed. But, if we consider that the Epistle to the Ephesians contains, on the whole, but few personal references, and, besides, that St Paul often sent off one or the other of his companions on this or that business; it may be supposed that the composition of the Epistle to the Ephesians happened just during such an absence of Timothy. In no case can the non-mention of Timothy in Ephesians become an argument which would justify us in referring this Epistle to another time than the three others, as all arguments are silentio are of so precarious a nature.

But now, whether we shall decide for the captivity at Rome, as the date of the composition of these four Epistles of St Paul, or for that at Caesarea, of which mention is made Acts xxiii. 23—26, 32, is certainly a difficult question, especially after Böttger (ubi. sup. p. 48, ss.) has tried to prove that the oikia Kaisaros and the πρατόρων (Phil. i. 13, iv. 22), from which it was formerly thought that one could safely deduce the composition of the Epistles in Rome, can also be understood of the Palace of Herod in Caesarea (Acts xxiii. 35), in which St Paul was a prisoner, and of the domestics in it. Now it is true this view seems to me improbable, as St Paul would scarcely have called this Palace of the Βασιλεὺς Herod oikia Kaisaros; but let us pass over this argument, since we shall never be able to make out for certain which building St Paul

1 See the details in the Comm. on the passages Phil. i. 18, iv. 22.
means in the Epistle to the Philippians, because there were imperial palaces in many places. Now, among all which is brought forward by Böttger for Cæsarea on the one side, and on the other side by Graul\(^1\) for Rome, we find so little that is really decisive, that it is difficult to declare one's self with full confidence for the one or the other view. Böttger's chief reason against Rome is, that St Paul was there but a few days in captivity. But this rests on an erroneous interpretation of the conclusion of the Acts, on which see the Comm. The Epistles contain, collectively, no historical arguments sufficiently decided to justify us in drawing from them any conclusions as to the time and place of their composition. What may be gathered from any notices of frames of mind, and similar uncertain, because purely subjective, circumstances, can of course make no claim at all to the force of demonstration. I can find only this one decisive circumstance in favour of the captivity at Rome, viz. that St Paul writes, Ephes. vi. 19, 20, he had, though a prisoner, still the opportunity of proclaiming the Gospel.—That is imaginable from the nature of his captivity in Rome (see the remarks in the Comm. on Acts xxviii. 16, 30), but not in the case of that in Cæsarea, where St Paul was formally shut up in the prison.

According to Acts xxvii. 2, Aristarchus, as well as Lucas, were also with St Paul in Rome; we find both again Col. iv. 10, Philem. ver. 24, whereas it is not known to us that they were companions of St Paul in Cæsarea. For these reasons, therefore, in conjunction with the circumstance that the phrase oikia Kalavpos always leads us to think, at least in the first place, of the imperial palace at Rome, I decide, with the majority of the later critics and commentators, for the composition of the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon, in that first captivity of St Paul at Rome, with the mention of which St Luke closes the Acts.

But now in what order were the four Epistles themselves composed? The mild captivity in which St Paul was held in Rome (Acts xxviii. 30), lasted at least two years; which Epistles did he write first in this space of time, and which last? In the first place, as regards the Epistle to Philemon, which Onesimus conveyed, it is to be supposed from Col. iv. 7 to 9, that it was written and sent

---

1 Graul Dissertatio de Schultii et Schottii sententia cet, Lips. 1836. 8.
off at the same time with the Epistle to the Colossians, which Tychicus brought. For both Tychicus and Onesimus, according to the passage cited, begin their journey from Rome to Colosse together, and at the same time. But Harless (p. lix.) has decided the question, whether the Epistle to the Ephesians may have been composed before or after these two, by the correct interpretation of Ephes. vi. 21, compared with Coloss. iv. 7. That is to say, in the former passage the words: ἵνα δὲ εἴδητε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατʾ ἐμέ can only be explained by assuming a reference to the similar declaration, Col. iv. 7; according to that, the Epistle to the Ephesians was written after the two to the Colossians and Philemon. The space of time, however, between the composition of those two and that of the Epistle to the Ephesians, can scarcely have amounted to more than a few days or weeks at most, as Tychicus brought the Epistle to the Ephesians as well as that to the Colossians. Now the repetition of so long a journey, as that from Rome to Asia Minor, was, in the first place, in itself improbable; and, secondly, the near affinity of the Epistles to one another requires the composition of them to be placed at the same time. Therefore, the only question which remains now, is, how the Epistle to the Philippians stands, with respect to the date of its composition, in relation to that of the three other ones, which, as well with regard to the places of their destination, as also to the time of their composition, fall very nearly together. Now, there are no open and clear declarations in the Epistle to the Philippians to enable us to answer this question satisfactorily; we shall be obliged to confine ourselves to mere probability. However, from Phil. i. 12, ss., ii. 26, ss., that Epistle seems to belong to the latter part of St Paul’s captivity at Rome, whereas the three other Epistles might belong to the earlier period of the same. For the passages cited presuppose that St Paul had passed a long time in Rome, and could already remark the effects of his preaching. (See De Wette’s Introd. p. 232.) Further, the announcement Phil. ii. 24, that he will come to them ταχέως, seems to intimate a prospect of his captivity soon coming to an end, whereas Phil. ver. 22 certainly expresses only a more distant hope of such an event.
§ 4. THE CHAIN OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Ephesians rejects all specialities, which lies in the very nature of an encyclical epistle. It only treats of general Christian ideas and relations in a dogmatical and ethical point of view. Accordingly, this Epistle may be divided into two parts; in the former (i. 1—iii. 21) the dogmatical element prevails; in the latter (iv. 1—vi. 24) the ethical element. The former part contains three sections; the first of which (i. 1—14), after the salutation, contains a thanksgiving to God for the work of salvation established in Christ, and the eternal election of man for salvation in Him; the second (i. 15—ii. 10) contains St Paul's special thanks for the faith of the readers, and the prayer, that God would by His Holy Spirit advance them in this their state, and make them, who were dead in sin, alive with Christ, that they may, as created anew in Christ Jesus, bring forth fruit in good works. Finally, the third section (ii. 11—iii. 21) sets the former state of the readers (before their conversion) in heathenism in contrast with the succeeding one in regeneration, and makes it especially prominent, that the separation between Jews and Gentiles was through Christ abolished, and a unity of mankind established. This unity St Paul compares to a temple of God, into which all believers are built up on the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Now St Paul sets himself forth as him, to whom the grace had been granted of accomplishing this call of the Gentile world to be the people of God through his ministry; he therefore beseeches his readers on their part not to become weary in the fight, which faith in Christ has for its indispensable consequence in this sinful world, and to think of the glory, which is prepared in Christ for them that overcome.

In the second part (iv. 1—vi. 24) we distinguish four sections. The ethical exhortations in the fourth section (iv. 1—16) open with calling upon the readers to preserve the unity of the faith with humility, to avoid all divisions, and to that end to recognize the distinctions which were established by God in the church, which is compared with the human body. In the fifth section there is annexed to the above the exhortation to walk no longer after the manner of the Gentiles, but to be renewed in spirit, and to put on the new man; which is afterwards applied to the several moral re-
lations, in so far as they have reference to men generally (iv. 17—v. 20.) The sixth section makes a transition to the special relations of life, and treats, first of all, in detail the matrimonial relations, which are so important, in connection with which the relation of Christ to the Church, as a type of matrimony, is set forth. There is further annexed to the above a contemplation of the relation between parents and children; and, finally, of that between masters and servants (v. 21—vi. 9.) In the seventh and last section the exposition again returns from the special to the general; St Paul describes the faithful as soldiers called upon to fight for truth and righteousness on account of the opposing kingdom of darkness, and depicts the armour which they must use in it. For all the details respecting himself St Paul refers his readers to the bearer of the Epistle, Tychicus, and then concludes with the usual benediction (vi. 10—24.)

§. 5. LIST OF THE COMMENTATORS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE

EPHESIANS.

The Epistle to the Ephesians has been specially commented on by Schütz (Lips., 1778. 8.) ; by Cramer (translation, with Introd. and notes, Kiel, 1782. 4.) ; by Müller (Heidelberg, 1793. 8.) ; by Flatt (published by Kling, Tübingen, 1828.) The last few years have produced no less than five new commentaries on our Epistle, four of which appeared in the year 1834 ; viz., the Commentaries of Holzhausen (Hanover, 1833) ; of Meyer (Berlin, 1834) ; of Matthies (Gripswald, 1834) ; of Rückert (Lips., 1834) ; and of Harless (Erlangen, 1834.) The last-named excellent work of my respected colleague has rendered the other modern works on our Epistle almost superfluous. (See the general criticism of all the modern commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians in Tholuck's Anzeiger for 1838, Nos. 34, ss.)
EXPOSITION
OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

I.
PART FIRST.

i. 1.—iii. 21.

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR SALVATION IN CHRIST.

(i. 1—14.)

After what has been already remarked in the Introduction to this Epistle (§ 1.) as to τοὺς ἀγίους τοὺς ὁσίους ἐν Ἑφέσῳ, the salutation (vers. 1, 2) contains nothing which has not been already sufficiently discussed in the prefaces to the earlier Epistles. The name of Timothy, which is found in the prefaces to the cotemporaneous Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians, is wanting, however, in this one, therefore we do not know to whom St Paul dictated it. The Epistle itself begins (ver. 3) with a thanksgiving to God for the blessings in Christ. Though St Paul is, of course, also grateful to God for every bodily blessing in earthly things, still he had no occasion here to put forward that side of the picture, he simply thanks God here for the spiritual blessing in heavenly things. (On the phrase, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, see the notes on Matth. xxii. 31, 32, 2 Cor. i. 4. If the meaning were intended to be only: "Praised be God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ," the words would run: εὐλογητὸς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ κ. τ. λ. But in this connection the genitive also must be referred to ὁ Θεὸς. Besides
this phrase, which occurs in this passage (and which is also found in St Paul at Rom. xv. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Col. i. 3), the apostle uses the following ones as well: ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ (1 Cor. xv. 24), ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ephes. i. 17), ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ephes. iii. 14), ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ (Ephes. v. 20), and Θεὸς πατὴρ (Gal. i. 1, 4; Ephes. vi. 23; Phil. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 14), in which the reference of the conceptions of "God" and of the Father to the Son is always to be maintained. Now, had St Paul wished to make both conceptions: "The God of Jesus Christ," and "the Father of Jesus Christ," prominent and strictly separate, the article would certainly have been necessarily repeated before πατὴρ (see Winer's Gram. p. 121, 5); but there was no reason for so rigorous a separation, and therefore, since, besides this, Θεὸς and πατὴρ are of the same gender, the article might properly be left out, without weakening the reference of the genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ to the first substantive.—The two meanings of εὐλογεῖν in the language of the New Testament, viz. "to praise," and "to bless," appear here side by side. The Hebrew γὰρ combines both meanings in just the same way.—The εὐλογία πνευματική here denotes the effects of God's grace through the Holy Spirit obtained by us by means of Christ's work, in every form of His efficacy, as well in its moral relations as also in respect to the extraordinary gift of grace bestowed on the Church.—The ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is difficult, for the concluding words, ἐν Χριστῷ, are not connected with the former, but with the εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς, so that Christ appears as the element, in which the blessed exist, and through whose mission and work they have received the blessing. Τὰ ἐπουράνια can be understood of heavenly gifts only, or of the heavenly places. In the former case it would stand parallel with εὐλογία πνευματική, and then the article surprises us; St Paul would have written ἐν ἐπουρανίοις merely. Besides, τὰ ἐπουράνια always means in St Paul absolutely "Heaven, the heavenly world;" see Ephes. i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12.—We shall, therefore, be obliged to keep to this meaning here also, and that too in the following sense: the spiritual blessing which is in heaven, and therefore bears with it a heavenly nature. But this certainly may be reduced in meaning to the conception: "Heavenly gifts."
VER. 4. This divine energy, so full of blessing, is then more accurately characterized by the declaration that God hath chosen the faithful before the foundation of the world with the view that they may be holy and blameless before His eyes. This ἐκλογὴ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (see on Matt. xxv. 34) cannot be used in order to derive from it the pre-existence of souls, as Origenes in the olden times of Christianity, and Benecke in the latest times, were of opinion. The phrase πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (see at Matt. xiii. 35; Luke xi. 50; John xvii. 14) denotes, in fact, eternity in a metaphysical sense, not time before the creation of the world, which seems to be the nearest meaning of the words, but timelessness (i.e. non-subjection to the conditions of time.) It is equal to the ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, to the πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων (Ephes. iii. 9, 11), or to the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (2 Thess. ii. 13.) But in the ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς the real individual existence of the faithful before the creation in the divine mind is by no means expressed, but merely the timeless act of volition on the part of God who beholds the future as present. On the other hand, it is undeniable that in the ἐκλεγέναι is couched a reference to others not chosen, and that therefore the discourse here is of a prædestinatio sanctorum, but without asserting at the same time with that a reprobatio impiorum or a gratia irresistibilis. (See the remarks on Rom. ix. 1.) By the addition ἐν αὐτῷ, i.e. Χριστῷ, the ἐκλογὴ is more accurately defined. God sees in His election by grace man in Christ, so that, as Adam was the representative of natural humanity, so Christ is the representative of spiritual humanity. (By the καθὼς ver. 4 is united as an explanation to ver. 3, “praised be God, who hath blessed us, as He indeed hath chosen us, i.e., since He has chosen us.” See 1 Cor. i. 6.) The object of the election is, however, that men should be holy and unspotted. (In Col. i. 22 ἀνέγκλητος also stands along with both expressions.) It remains to be said that it is self-evident from what follows that this is no self-elaborated holiness and blamelessness attained by our own righteousness, but Christ's holiness, which is imputed to faith, but manifests itself likewise in the believer, though only as the result of the experience of grace as a real state.

VER. 5. The connection of the ἐν ἀγάπῃ with ἐξελέξατο has the collocation too decidedly against it. But one may be uncertain whether ἐν ἀγάπῃ should be taken to be joined with what precedes
or what succeeds. The idea, "to be holy and unspotted in love," would not in itself be improper, since love, as the inmost root of the disposition, determines holiness itself. Neither can anything be objected to the conjunction ἄμωμος ἐν ἀγάπῃ, for designating pure love; at 2 Peter iii. 14 we read ἀσπιλοὶ καὶ ἄμομητοι ἐν εἰρήνῃ, Jude ver. 24 ἄμωμος ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. But, firstly, the documents of critical value speak decidedly for the connection with what follows, as well as the circumstance that St Paul generally uses ἄγιος καὶ ἄμωμος without any addition. (See Ephes. v. 27; Col. i. 22.) The ἐν ἀγάπῃ προορίσας ἡμᾶς, therefore, connects itself with the ἐξελέξατο as a stricter definition; God's election manifested itself in the gracious predestination to adoption, i.e., God predestined us for children of God. (As to the προορίζων, also, which appears in ver. 11, joined to κατὰ πρόθεσιν, and as to the νικοθεία, as also as to the ἐκλογή, what was needful has been already observed at Rom. viii. 15, ix. 1.) Since the possibility of the νικοθεία is entirely brought about through Christ's atonement, the addition διὰ 'Ησυχοῦ Χριστοῦ explains itself, but the εἰς αὐτὸν is difficult, though it might be, with Lachmann and Harless, worthy to be preferred to the αὐτὸν of Griesbach's text, as the latter surely arose merely from the wish to mark more decidedly the reference to the Father. No other reason, surely, can be assumed for this addition, εἰς αὐτὸν, than the design of St Paul to designate Christ as Him who leads man to God, through whom man comes to the Father, according to the words in St John, "No one cometh to the Father but through me;" so that we might paraphrase the sentence thus: "God has in love predestinated us unto adoption, that we might through Jesus come to Him and be led back to Him out of our lost state, in accordance with His gracious will." From the annexed κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ one might think it possible to deduce something against the connexion of ἐν ἀγάπῃ with προορίσας. That is to say, as in εὐδοκία the conception of love and benevolence is couched, not that of the mere decree (see Harless on this passage), εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος seems exactly = ἀγάπῃ. But, whilst in ἀγάπῃ the proper essence of God is designated as love, εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος makes the benevolence of the individual act of the will in the election and predestination of the faithful prominent, so that there can be no question of a tautology.
Ver. 6. The praise of God’s grace, to which man was meant to be incited by that gift itself, and with which St Paul had set out in ver. 3, is then brought forward as the object of this benevolent divine will. It is not necessary to explain the addition of δόξα τῆς χάριτος, which serves to strengthen the expression, by supposing it = χάρις ἐνδοξος, or by reducing it to a Hebraism. (See the pertinent remarks on this passage in Harless.) In what immediately follows (vers. 12, 14), we read again εἰς ἐπαυνον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ without χάριτος. (See on the idea of the χάρις, i.e. the unmerited expression of God’s love towards His creatures, the remarks on Rom. iii. 21. χάρις is never used of Christ and the Holy Ghost. So far the form of St Paul’s sentences proceeds regularly; but after εν ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν, as far as ver. 14, the writer’s discourse proceeds entirely by means of relatives, which link themselves to the substantive which stands last, and thus form, as it were, a coronet of isolated sentences, without any regular periods. Similar passages are found Col. i. 9—20; 1 Pet. i. 3—12; and in our Epistle, at i. 20, ss., which directly follows, a similar circle of propositions occurs, which are all united by καί. But the separate propositions themselves, which are thus connected with one another by relatives, all issue quite naturally from one another, following the association of ideas, so that this mode of exposition only shows St Paul’s fullness of ideas, which thronged forward, without allowing him time to range the isolated propositions into periods. This style of writing without periods, arising from such exuberance of ideas, extends into the fourth chapter of our Epistle: it shows itself, however, here most strikingly. As to the words εν ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς, the reading ἧς has, it is true, important vouchers for it, especially A. and G., and accordingly Lachmann has received it into the text. But the overwhelming number of the manuscripts for εν ἧς, and the facility of the alteration, on account of the preceding χάριτος, cause the latter reading to be preferred. Now the grace of God is described in the words: εν ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς as the means by which He has made man acceptable to Himself; and, indeed, as it was said in verse 4 εν αὐτῷ, so here it is εν τῷ ἡγαμημόνῃ, by which, as the gloss υἱὸς αὐτοῦ in D.E.F.G. correctly explains, Christ is meant to be designated, as He, the archetype of holiness, is κατ’ ἔξοχόν the object of God’s love, and through Himself first makes everything worthy of God’s love. Ver. 7 clearly
shows that the χαριτῶς relates to the work of Christ, in whom God views the elect. The use of the aorist ἐχαριτωσε is, therefore, not to be explained by the assumption, that St Paul means to say, "God had already made him (St Paul himself), with his believing cotemporaries, acceptable to Himself, because they were inwardly stoned for, and had appropriated grace," this proposition, on the contrary, holds good of all future generations also; St Paul utters the ἥμεις in the name of all believers to all eternity. As in ver. 4 ἐξελέξατο denotes the timeless decree of redemption, so here ἐχαριτωσε denotes the objective fact of the same, which holds good, not merely for those then living, but also for all mankind. God has in Christ, once for all, had mercy on mankind, received them into favour, and made them acceptable to Himself. But the ἐν cannot be changed into διά; Christ is rather, as has been already remarked on ver. 4, to be understood as being the real representative of mankind, in whom all exist after the new man,—Christ in us, as they exist in Adam after the old man. (The form χαριτῶς is found in the New Testament but once more, Luke i. 28; elsewhere it occurs also Sir. ix. 8, xviii. 17, and in Symmachus, Ps. xviii. 28. In profane Greek writers it is not found except in very late writers, as Libanius.)

Ver. 7. Now, as regards Christ, St Paul brings redemption through His blood into prominence, and designates it more closely as ἀφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων. In the words ἐν ὧν ἔχωμεν Christ is considered as the living fountain of redemption; that is to say, although it was actually effected by His death, still it, in His intercession (see at Rom. viii. 34), works on incessantly as a living power. His work is inseparable from His person; we have not redemption in His work without His person, but in His person, with which His work forms a living unity. As to the idea of the ἀπολύτρωσις and the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, they have already been treated of at length on Rom. iii. 25. The epexegetic τὴν ἀφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων only requires a remark here. The phrase, which is often found in the Gospels and the Acts, occurs in St Paul here only, and in Col. i. 14 the synonymous ἀφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. In Rom. iii. 25 πάρεσις ἁμαρτημάτων means something quite different, see the Comm. on that passage. In the Epistle to the Hebrews ix. 22, x. 18, ἀφεσις is found alone. Now the phrase denotes, according to its literal sense, forgiveness of sins, i.e. of their
guilt, therefore the effect of the atonement \( (καταλλαγὴ) \) for man. Too much stress is not to be laid on the form \( παραπτώματα, ἀμαρτίας \), for not merely sinful deeds, but also sinful conditions, innate sinfulness, are considered as pardoned. \( Τὰ παραπτώματα \) denotes rather everything sinful, absolutely, in whatever form it may present itself. Since, now, \( ἀπολύτρωσις \) and \( καταλλαγὴ \) are only designations of the same idea, taken from different points of view (see at Rom. iii. 25), and \( ἀφεσις τῶν παραπτωμάτων \) explains more nearly and defines the \( ἀπολύτρωσις \), the result is, that by this phrase the negative side of Christ's work is here meant to be especially designated, according to which sinful man is considered as pardoned by God for the sake of Christ's merits. But the appropriation of this forgiveness of sins cannot be regarded as a fact, unless the transformation of the man proceeds from it as its consequence.

Ver. 8. In the forgiveness of sins established through Christ St Paul sees again the riches of grace, which He has caused to abound towards man. But it is a question here, whether the \( ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει \) is to be joined to \( ἐπερίσσεσέν \), or to \( γνώρισέ \). We must let ourselves be guided in our decision on that point by the fact, that neither \( πᾶσα σοφία, \) nor \( φρονίσης, \) nor \( φρόνιμος, \) can fitly be said of God. The joining it with \( γνώρισάς \) is, therefore, inadmissible, because, according to it, both words must necessarily be referred to God. It is true, Grotius, Baumgarten, and others, have chosen to refer the \( ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει \) to God, even when joining it with \( ἐπερίσσεσέ \); but, besides the above-cited general reason, the comparison with Col. i. 9, where the \( ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῷ \) must be referred to man, should have deterred them from that interpretation. Therefore, the proposition in ver. 8 is to be paraphrased thus: \( ἢς ἐπερίσσεσέν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει περιπατῶμεν. \) But the definition of the words \( σοφία, \) \( φρονίσης, \) and \( σύνεσις \) (Col. i. 9), which bears some affinity to the latter, and which we will here consider at the same time with the two former, is not without difficulty. \( Σοφία, \) which is re-

1 Harless remarks very justly that one may say indeed, "God has wisdom," or "in Him is all wisdom," but not, "He does anything in all wisdom," because God possesses all attributes absolutely. But the phrase "all wisdom" is here relative, as it must be thus paraphrased: "All the wisdom which, under existing circumstances, is imaginable, which one can suppose, in men."
lated nearest to γνώσις, seems in the language of the New Testament to be the result of the rightly applied νοῦς, *i.e.* of the faculty by which we perceive the Eternal. But, whilst γνώσις has only the reference to knowledge, there is constantly couched in σοφία a reference to the practical application of knowledge, as in the Hebrew יִסְכָּר, whilst the γνώσις answers to the Hebrew יִסְכָּר. On the other hand, φρόνησις and σύνεσις are expressions of the rightly-applied φρένες, *i.e.* of the understanding. They answer to our German expressions "klugheit" and "verstand" (anglicè, "prudence" and "understanding"). Both words have also a reference to the practical, like σοφία, but with the difference, that in the last expression the practical aim is directed more to great and comprehensive relations, φρόνησις and σύνεσις, on the contrary, relate to special and individual cases. As wisdom takes earthly relations in their totality, and thus knows how to estimate them in their reference to the eternal, there can be no false application of wisdom; false wisdom is only *seeming* wisdom, wisdom is always rightly applied. Prudence, on the contrary, can, just because it has to do with individual cases, be, it is true, entirely what it is, viz., a sagacious use of present circumstances, and yet be applied to ungodly ends. Therefore St Paul, at Col. i. 9, pertinently adds: ἐν συνεσεὶ πνευματικῇ, in order to distinguish real prudence, which is applied to spiritual ends, from the φρόνησις σαρκική of τοῦ κόσμου, of which the Scriptures say that the children of the world distinguish themselves by it more than the children of light. (Luke xvi. 8, οἱ νοῦς τοῦ ἁπλοῦ τοῦτον φρονιμικότερον ἀνεπ τοῦ νοῦς νιών τοῦ φωτός εἰς.) But there seems to be no further distinction between σύνεσις and φρόνησις than this, that σύνεσις denotes more the power of the understanding, φρόνησις more the application of that power. It may be said, God has implanted the νοῦς in the spirit, as the σύνεσις in the soul, but not the φρόνησις (as neither did He implant γνώσις and σοφία in the νοῦς), because the latter depends on the faithful application of the power of the σύνε-

---

1 We have spoken already on 1 Cor. xii. 8 of σοφία and γνώσις, but as of charismata, which cannot be meant here (see on ver. 17), not as of natural faculties, which can be cultivated even without the influences of the Holy Ghost, or excited through them. But certainly the divine Spirit ever attaches Himself to the human spirit, whence the like names for the certainly related, but yet different, gifts. There cannot be, from the nature of the thing, a χάρισμα of the φρόνησις, or of the σύνεσις, because these are faculties of the ψυχή.
σις. But from this relation between them it is comprehensible that they can be used quite synonymously, just as our words, "verstand" and "klugheit." (Compare on this point my essay de nature humanae Trichotomiâ in my Opusc. Theol. p. 158, sq. I still perfectly approve of the definition given there, γνώσις ἐν τῷ νοτ, πίστις ἐν τῇ καρδιᾳ, only I should like to modify the proposition: σοφία ἐν ταῖς φρεσίν to the extent of saying, that the σοφία also belongs to the department of the νοῦς, as complement of the γνώσις.)

Ver. 9. The rich manifestation of divine grace is further more accurately defined by the γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τῷ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος κ.τ.λ. By this connection with the ἔπερασαςευς it will be clear enough, that the γνωρίσας is not to be understood of a mere exterior making known, but of such a making known, by which he, to whom anything is revealed, receives at the same time the essence of the thing, here of the mystery of the divine will. For that the μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος is here Christ's becoming man, and the work of redemption which depended on it, is clearly shown by what follows. This was known as about to happen through the prophecies of the Old Testament from even Adam downwards, but the aorist (γνωρίσας) points to something actual, and, as such, is the realization of the prophecies presented to us; by this that mystery was first made really known, which even the angels desired to look into (1 Peter i. 12.) It remains to be said, that we find here θέλημα and εὐδοκία separate, whereas in ver. 5 they were fused into one idea. Κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ joins itself to γνωρίσας, and denotes the γνωρίσας itself as an act of divine benevolence; on account of the following ἦν προέθετο, εὐδοκία is to be taken as = to "gracious decree," because προέθετο is not adapted to express the "grace and favour of God," as permanent conditions; on the other hand, τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ denotes more closely the mystery of which mention is here made, as a voluntary act proceeding from the depths of the divine being. As such, as an act of the divine will, which has its ultimate basis in the being of God Himself, Christ's manifestation and work is, and constantly remains, a μυστήριον, whilst, in other points of view, considered in its appearance, it is an actual revelation, consequently is also presented as a subject of knowledge. St Paul, again connecting what follows to the εὐδοκία by a relative, proceeds to give a more accurate account of God's gracious
decree. In every case (whether one here again, as is most suitable, with Laeumann and Harless, read ἐν αὐτῷ, or even ἐν αὐτῷ) the πρόθεσις εἰς αὐτῷ can only refer to God and His intentions, and not to Christ, since, in what immediately follows (ver. 11), the πρόθεσις refers back to πρόθεσις. If by ἐν αὐτῷ it were meant to be expressed that God's purpose realized itself in the person of Christ and in His work, it would have found its place at the close of the proposition, in this way: εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν ἐν αὐτῷ. But as regards the conception of the οἰκονομία, it depends on the context how the general meaning "administration, disposition, arrangement," is to be applied. In the passages 1 Cor. ix. 17 (compared with iv. 1) and Col. i. 25 οἰκονομία denotes the apostolical office. Here, according to the context, it refers to the dispensation of the grace of God in Christ, and the word οἰκονομία for "incarnation" is quite familiar to the Fathers, perhaps with an application of this passage. (See Suiceri Thesaur. Eccles. s. v.) But the εἰς denotes the object towards which God's πρόθεσις is directed. This object is, finally, with regard to time, more nearly defined by the addition τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν. One expects, perhaps, ἐν πληρώματι τῶν καιρῶν, the connection of the genitive οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος denotes the dispensation of God in Christ, but regarded as one that belongs to the πληρώμα τῶν καιρῶν. On this phrase itself see the remarks on Gal. iv. 4, where πληρώμα τοῦ χρόνου stands parallel to it. There is couched in it, per se, no reference to the ἡμέρα ἔσχατη, (although it is true that the apostles looked on the time of the second advent of the Messiah as, at the same time, the τέλη τῶν αἰώνων); there is, rather, couched in the πληρώμα merely a reference to a pre-established term, up to which the time is considered as being fulfilled.

Ver. 10. The ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is named as the ultimate aim of the mysterious divine decree. In these words the first thing we have to consider is the definition of the term ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν. In the passage, Rom. xiii. 9, we had the word in the meaning, "to comprise under a κεφάλαιον, i.e. to comprehend, sum up, under a radical idea." Since the question here is concerning a gathering together under the person of Christ, the word can only be referred to the idea of κεφάλη, to which the composition of the word certainly does not lead first. Christ, that is to say, appears to be described as He, in whom, as the
head, God has gathered together everything, so that He governs all as Lord and Regent of the world. The conception of the τὰ πάντα is divided as to its meaning by what follows: τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. According to this, the ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι would appear as the result of the: ἐδόθη Χριστῷ πάσα ἡ ζωὴ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς (Matt. xxviii. 18, compared with Matt xi. 27); and in St Paul of the: πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (1 Cor. xv. 26, with reference to Ps. viii. 7.) The passage would seem, according to this, to have no especial difficulties; the neuter τὰ πάντα, τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ. τ. λ. might be left in all their indefiniteness, and we might understand by it not merely persons, but those together with all other forms of the creation, in one word, the creation as a whole, which Christ rules by His power.

Evil itself, with its representatives, must carry out Christ's almighty will, it too is, although repugnant, gathered in under Christ as κεφαλή. But, for several reasons, we are not satisfied with this mode of taking the passage. Firstly, St Paul uses the metaphor, according to which Christ is represented as the κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος, not so that the universe is the σῶμα, but so that under it the Church is understood (see Ephes. i. 22, iv. 15, v. 23; Col. i. 18, ii. 19). We should be obliged, therefore, to say even that ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι is here, without any reference to the metaphor of the σῶμα, to be taken merely in the meaning, "to gather together as a ruler," for which Col. ii. 10, the only passage in which κεφαλή seems to have a wider reference than merely to the Church, might be quoted. But the whole context also in our passage seems not to suit that view. The μυστήριον, of the operation of which St Paul here speaks, is surely nothing but redemption through Christ, which therefore appears, here also, to be necessarily prominent in the ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, as the aim of the μυστήριον. The parallel passage Col. i. 20, where ἄποκαταλλάξαι stands in a like connection, and the διὰ αὐτοῦ is, besides, more nearly defined by διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ,—raises this supposition to certainty. The meaning of the apostle must, therefore, here also, be taken thus, that God, through Christ's atonement, has gathered together all things, whether in heaven or on earth, in Him as the head, i.e. knit them together into living harmonious unity, in opposition to the present state of dissension and enmity, which is expressed in
Col. i. 20 by ἔφημοταιονας, which Bähr erroneously separates from ἀποκαταλλάξει. True, the same critic (on Col. i. 20) has chosen to explain the ἀποκαταλλάξει by the word in our passage, instead of, conversely, our ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, by that; but it has already been remarked, in opposition to that, on several hands, and especially, last of all, by Harless, that the more general expression may certainly be explained by the more special one, but not the more special one by the more general one. Now, if we consider more nearly that idea, which the apostle intends us to recognize in this passage, it cannot be disputed that in it the ἀποκατάστασις τῶν πάντων seems to be again favoured, a view which St Paul in general, as has been already remarked on Rom. xi. 32, 1 Cor. xv. 24, ss., Gal. iii. 22, says more to support than the other writers of the New Testament. (See, however, in contrast to these passages, 2 Thess. i. 9, and the remarks thereon in my Comm.) For, even putting the τὰ τὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς quite out of sight, the words ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα—τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, alone, seem to express the conversion of all men; for to confine the conception of the πᾶντα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς to those on earth, who are elected to salvation according to God's gracious election, seems altogether arbitrary; according to the words, all, without exception, are here spoken of. But, if one also takes the τὰ τὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς in addition, it is very easy to understand how the defenders of the restoration could understand the passage so that they conceived τὰ πάντα of the universe, and τὰ τὲ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of the two halves of the universe, the spiritual and the material world, in such a way, that in both halves all beings, therefore also the evil spirits, along with their Prince, the Devil, (which St Paul at Ephes. vi. 12 places in the celestial world, as being spirits), would be at some time converted through the might of the atonement, and gathered together under Christ as the head. The various ways which the interpreters have struck into, in order to evade this explanation, are but little satisfactory. Some propose to understand the τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς of those who died

1 The Rabbins distinguish between a familia quae suprà, and one quæ infrà, est. See Wetstein on this passage.

2 It is especially Origen, who first openly announced and spread this interpretation. That Father, besides this, assumed, altogether arbitrarily, that Christ had suffered several times in the different spheres of the universe, for the redemption of their respective inhabitants.
in the hope of salvation, who were converted and atoned for by Christ; thus Beza, Calixtus, Suicer, Wolf, and others.—Others, as Schöttgen, Ernesti, and several others, proposed to understand the Jews by those in heaven, the Gentiles by those on earth. According to Schleiermacher (in the essay on Col. i. 16, ss., of which we shall speak further on that passage), τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is meant here to denote "all matters relating to God's service, and the dispositions of mind thereto relating," τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, on the other hand, "all that belongs to earthly kingdoms, to civil order, and legal conditions."

Others, again, understood the good angels by τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; so Calvin thought, who, without any proof, set up the assertion, that by Christ's atonement the good angels are established in purity, so that they can no more fall away; and Chrysostom, Anselm, Calovius, who understood our passage so, that they referred this to an enmity of the good angels against men who had become wicked, which Christ had put an end to. Finally, Bähr, Tholuck, Böhmer, and others, also refer this to the good angels, but in this way, that the enmity, which was appeased, is not to be sought in them, but in man, so that, thus, only a restoration of peace between two divided parties, of which one alone bears the guilt, is asserted. Against each of these interpretations, however, so much that is well-founded may be objected (as may be seen in detail in Harless in his Comm. ad h. 1.), that we can adopt no one of them. The generality of the τὰ πάντα, and the division of this whole, which is kept just as general in expression, τὰ τε ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, are sufficient to preclude us from thinking of anything individual, whether in heaven or on earth; on the contrary, we are, no doubt, to conceive not of personal conscious beings alone, though of them especially, but of the whole κτίσις, even the unconscious part of it), which St Paul in Rom. viii. 17, ss., expressly designates as having part in the redemption through Christ; and, to be sure, we have to refer this κτίσις not merely to the earth, but also to the celestial world. The reconciliation through Christ is, therefore, to St Paul a fact, the workings of which pervade the universe, which affects the conscious, and the unconscious, parts of the creation equally, whether or not they be themselves touched by sin, which latter is the case in the world of good angels. Most of the interpretations quoted
contain, therefore, elements of truth, they fail principally from the circumstance, that they make these one-sided elements pass for the whole. Now Harless, too, wishes in this passage to maintain a reference to the totality in its relation to the work of redemption. "Everything," says he, page 52, "whether in heaven or on earth, has a share in that fact."

In Col. i. 20 Harless finds a Zeugma, because ἀποκαταλλάξας relates especially to τὰ ἐν τῆς γῆς, "and yet," continues he, "it cannot be called a Zeugmatic connection, as undoubtedly also what is in heaven is reconciled with the rest, in that it is included with the rest in the final development of the work of reconciliation, which delivers the whole creation." St Paul, therefore, does not mean to speak, "as if there were an actual need of redemption in heaven, or as if heaven were only used as a figure of speech, but he is to be taken as expressing himself so, because the Lord and Creator of the whole body, of which heaven and earth are members, has restored the whole body in the restoration of the one body, and the greatest significance of redemption consists in this, that it is not merely a restoration of the life of this earth, but a restoration of the harmony of the universe." But now, by this interpretation, he leaves unresolved the principal difficulty, viz., how St Paul could ever say that all have a share in the redemption, that it is a restoration of the harmony of the universe, if he shared the common view, according to which the numberless armies of angels who fell, along with the by far greatest part of mankind (Matt. vii. 13, 14), are eternally damned, and therefore shut out from the harmony of the universe. The defenders of "universal restoration" understand "the harmony of the universe" exactly and seriously according to their literal meaning, and seem, according to that, to be here in the right. Certainly, if taken in their isolation, the two passages, Ephes. i. 10, Col. i. 20, cannot be explained otherwise. But the interpreter has the task not merely of explaining separate passages, but also of elucidating the separate passages from the general tenor of the ideas of the writer to whom they belong, and again to throw light on the ideas of the individual writer (of course without encroaching on his individuality), in connection with the expressions of the primitive Christian doctrine in all the writers of the New Testament. According to this, it may certainly be affirmed that St Paul is the writer
in the New Testament who touches on the doctrine of eternal damnation most rarely, most permits it to remain in the background, and contains most of the expressions, which, considered per se, seem to teach a "general restoration;" at the same time, we cannot say he teaches that doctrine decidedly; partly, because he no where enunciates it outright, but always in such a way only that one is led to it by inference; partly, because the other writers of the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels our Lord Himself, maintained the contrary so unequivocally. Now, as regards our two passages (Ephes. i. 10 and Col. i. 20), it might be the most simple plan to make the meaning we obtain from them harmonize with the general doctrinal type of the Scriptures, by putting prominently forward in the infinitives ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαι, ἀποκαταλάβα, God's purpose, which, in the establishment of that redemption, which is furnished with infinite power, tends to the restoration of universal harmony, and to the recovery of all that was lost, so that the sense would be the same as in the passages 1 Tim. i. 4, 6. "God will have all men to be saved, He has given Himself a ransom for all." But now that, through the unfaithfulness and wickedness of man, this purpose is not fulfilled, and that many men are not benefited by it, is a subject that the apostle does not feel himself called upon to put forward. It cannot be objected to this, that surely God in His omniscience foreknows that the fallen angels would not be converted, for he knows that just as well of men, who continue in unbelief; but an application of the divine grace, which reaches its highest climax in Christ and His work, to the evil spirits, must, according to God's universal compassion, which excludes nothing, necessarily in every case be supposed, although this very grace, in consequence of their continued resistance, effects the very opposite of reconciliation, viz., the utmost obduracy. (Lachmann reads ἐπὶ (for ἐν) τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, in which he follows B.D.E. But the connection of ἐπὶ with οὐρανοῖς is so entirely unusual, and unsuitable per se, that one can scarcely take the reading for anything more than a抄ist's error.)

Ver. 11. The sentence is concluded by ἐν αὐτῷ, with a retrospect to ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, on one side, but the words also make a transition to what follows with ἐν δὲ καὶ. But here the question is, first of all, whether ἐκλήθησαν or ἐκληρωθησαν should be read.
A. D. E. F. G. and the Itala (Italic version) are in favour of
the reading ἐκληρῴθημεν, which therefore Lachmann also has re-
ceived into the text, and, indeed, according to his principles,
was obliged to do so. But the rarity of the word and the difficulty
in explaining it speak for ἐκληρῴθημεν, though it is less supported
by critical authorities. The origin of ἐκληρῴθημεν in an explanatory
gloss, which was written in the margin on ἐκληρῴθημεν, is very
simply brought about; the reading ἐκληρ钬θημεν, on the contrary,
in case it is not genuine, is not to be explained in any way with
regard to its origin. Now there is, doubtless, couched in the word
κληρ钬σθαι, as most and the best interpreters acknowledge, a refer-
tence to the Old Testament phrase οἶνος θεὸς (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, 29.) To this we
are also led especially by the parallel passage Col. i. 12, by which
we must certainly be very greatly guided in the interpretation of
our expression, since both were written at one time and out of one
circle of ideas. The κληρ钬σθαι, therefore, here denoted the reali-
zation in time of the ἐκλογὴ ἐν Χριστῷ, which was treated of
above. But the προορισθὲν ταπανὰ πρόθεσιν has a reference to
God's eternal decree (see on vers. 5, 9), which, as a decree of the
Almighty (τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦσος), necessarily includes its rea-
lization also. The prædestinatio sanctorum, as we defined it on
Rom. ix. 1, is again quite unmistakeably couched in this passage.
It might seem, however, as if the τὰ πάντα led further to a repro-
batio impiorum also. But the definition κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ
θελ钬ματος αἰνῶν excludes that. Evil, as such, is against God's
will; it is only in giving it a concrete shape that God's hand is mani-
fest in regard to it, but in regard to the form of evil we cannot
hesitate, as has been already detailed in the Comm. on Rom. ix. 1,
to recognise the Almighty's influence on evil. (The connexion of
βουλὴ with τοῦ θελ钬ματος is so to be explained that the divine will,
in an active sense, is represented as showing itself in distinct
actions; θελ钬μα is therefore the more general, βουλὴ the more
special.)

Ver. 12. As in ver. 5 so here again too the praise of the divine
glory is set forth as the object of the calling of men; but whereas
hitherto the ὑμεῖς in comprehensive generality denoted "all believe-
ers and elect," without reference to their origin, here it appears in
opposition to ὑμεῖς in ver. 13. That St Paul by this word does
not mean to designate merely himself and his immediate companions, in opposition to the readers of the Epistle, is unmistakably shown by the definition τοὺς προηλπίκοτας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. But in the προελπίζειν there can be found merely a reference to the position of the Jews in opposition to the Gentiles. Whilst in the history of the people of Israel from their very beginning a constant reference to the coming of the Messiah may be traced, the Gentiles lived without this hope. It was only when they heard the preaching of Christ, who had then already appeared, that they received the first knowledge of Him. The details of the relative position of the Gentiles to the Jews, and their fusion into a higher unity in the Church of Christ, occupy St Paul afterwards (ii. 11, ss.) But the most difficult question here is whether the participle τοὺς προηλπίκοτας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ is merely an opposition to ἡμᾶς, or the predicate of the proposition εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς κ. τ. λ. The former is the most usual mode of taking it, but it is convincingly proved by Harless that the other acceptation deserves the preference, for, since mention has already been made above, vers. 5 and 9, of the προορίζειν and the πρόθεσιν in general, it would be strange to see those ideas repeated here just in the same way. On the other hand, the connection presents itself in an entirely different way if we take the passage thus: "prédestined, that we to the praise of His glory should be those who already before hand hoped in Christ." The only thing which might be objected to this acceptation, which recommends itself otherwise in every respect, is, as appears to me, that according to it the ἐν δὲ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν προορισθέντες, in the former sentence, must, according to St Paul's meaning, denote the Jews alone, in which case there would be no transition to them intimated; whereas, in the other version of the construction, the transition from the general meaning of the ἡμεῖς to the special one appears somewhat more strongly marked in the τοὺς προηλπικότας. However, this remark can be no decisive argument against that acceptation, because the transition to the special meaning of the ἡμεῖς is, at all events, a gradual one.

Ver. 13. From the opposition of Jews and Gentiles, the latter of whom are here denoted by ὑμεῖς, and the connection of vers. 11 and 12, the leading idea ἐκληρώθητε can be supplied to the ἐν δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς only from ver. 11. To the Jews, as the first called, the Gentiles are added, but only by their hearing the preaching of
the word of truth, whereas the former had previously learnt to hope through the predictions of the Prophets. After this, it seems unnecessary to inclose with Griesbach the proposition ἀκούσαντες—σωτηρίας ὑμῶν in brackets, and indeed Lachmann has rightly cancelled them. For in the ἐν ὃ καὶ πιστεύσαντες the previous ἐν ὃ καὶ ὑμῶν is not merely resumed, but the idea is carried out materially farther; that is to say, the πιστεύω, together with the ἀφρογείησαι τῷ πνεύματι ἄγιῳ, is joined to the ἀκούειν. (See, as to the use of the ἀφρογείησαι = βεβαιοῦν, "to confirm, corroborate," the remarks on John iii. 33, vi. 27, 2 Cor. i. 22.)

The Holy Ghost, who is here designated as πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, inasmuch as He had been already promised mankind through the prophecies of the Old Testament [Joel iii. 1, Zach. xii. 10], is the Author of the sealing of the Faithful.)

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul closes these introductory words, and also the series of propositions which are linked together by means of relatives, beginning with ver. 6, with the more accurate characterization of the Holy Ghost as an earnest of the inheritance which awaits the Faithful. St Paul calls the Spirit ἀρραβών in 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, also. (See the Comm. on those passages.) But here it is at the same time more accurately declared of what He is the earnest, viz. of the πληροφορία. That by it St Paul understands final salvation, and especially the kingdom of God, has been already remarked on Gal. v. 21. (See also Ephes. v. 5.) Then the believer becomes entirely an element of the spiritual life, of which what he receives here from the Spirit is only the foretaste; then will the earthly sphere be covered by the Spirit as by waves of the sea. The two concluding propositions beginning with εἰς, and standing parallel with one another, point to the ultimate aim of all spiritual activity, to the final redemption of the people of the possession, and to the praise of the glory of God. (Cf. vers. 5, 12.) That ἀπολύτρωσις here does not denote the beginning of the new life, as in ver. 7, is clear from the context; it is the final, complete redemption, not only of the individual, but also of the whole, just as the word occurs at Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, also. But it is best to take the addition τῆς περιποίησεως passively, and to assume that the abstract is put for the concrete, περιποίησις for περιποιηθέντες. There is couched, no doubt, in the choice of that word a reference to the Old Testament denomination of the people
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of Israel רַעֲמָה. See Exod. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Peter ii. 9. (The ὁς in the beginning of ver. 14 must not be referred to Christ, it refers to πνεύμα ἅγιον. The masculine only stands with reference to the following ἀρπασθών, and also, we may suppose, as in John xiv. 26 [on which see the remarks in the Comm.], because the Holy Spirit is regarded as a person.)

§ 2. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE READERS.

(i. 15—ii. 10.)

Vers. 15, 16. Whilst the section from ver. 3 to ver. 14 was properly only an effusion of love annexing itself to the usual prayer of thanksgiving at the beginning of the Epistle, St Paul only comes now to the formal commencement of the Epistle, as the parallel passage, Col. i. 3, 4, 9, shows. He expresses himself, however, as to the faith and love of his readers in such a way, that we see he did not know many of them personally. (See Introd. sec. 1.) To attribute to the ἀκούειν the meaning "to know one's self, to know by one's own contemplation," is, of course, quite inadmissible. Col. i. 4 shows that ἀκούειν is rather opposed to one's own knowledge, for St Paul had certainly not been in Colossæ. Faith and love are, we may add, named here as the two chief utterances of religious life, to which hope is further joined at 1 Thess. i. 2, 3. Otherwise the beginnings of the Epistles in 1 Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, 2 Thess. i. 2, 3, are just like that of this Epistle. (In ver. 15 the καγώ is to be referred to the prayer of all other believers, whom St Paul supposes to exist, "as all thank, so do I also thank."—We might expect in the first proposition, τὴν καθ' ὅμοιον πίστιν, a repetition of the article before ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, as we find it in τὴν ἐκάστην τὴν εἰκ. See on this point Harless, p. 84. Similar instances are found Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. vii. 7; Col. i. 4. Love is here only shortly described as φίλαδελφία, but with true brotherly love, general love of man is also necessarily given. See 2 Peter i. 7.)

Ver. 17. Now the theme of the prayer for the readers is, that God may vouchsafe them the spirit of wisdom and of revelation, i.e. that God may call forth among them the highest and noblest fruits of the Spirit. As just before (ver. 14), the discourse was of the
Faithful being sealed with the Holy Ghost of promise, and possessing Him as an earnest of the future inheritance; so here the ἵνα δοθῇ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα cannot be so understood as if the Spirit was to be given to them altogether for the very first time, but only, that the Spirit might work in them in a peculiar and deeper way. Therefore, when the σοφία is again named here (as in ver. 8), it seems to be used of the Charisma of wisdom, which we could not suppose at ver. 8, for this reason, if for no other, that there is not, and cannot be, a Charisma of the φρονησις. (See on 1 Cor. xii. 8.) But both words, σοφία and φρονησις, are put together in ver. 8 in such a way, that either both or neither must be understood of a charismatical efficiency of the Spirit. But here πνεῦμα σοφίας seems, like λόγος σοφίας, 1 Cor. xii. 8, to stand for the Charisma. St Paul, therefore, distinguishes the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, as they are even now active in the Church, which rouse, heighten, and sanctify all men's powers, from the particular charismatical efficiency of the same, which had scope in the earliest times only of the Church. (Πνεῦμα occurs directly for Charismata in 1 Cor. xiv. 12 also.) This interpretation of the ἵνα δοθῇ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας is also the only way of explaining the difficult use of καὶ, scil. πνεῦμα ἀποκαλύφεως, which otherwise cannot be expounded at all satisfactorily. For the Charisma of ἀποκάλυψις is here, as at 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26, the capacity for receiving revelations, therefore for being a prophet. If we, on the contrary, choose to take ἀποκάλυψις here in the entirely general meaning, "Revelation of God to man," the following collocation of the words would be necessarily required: δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἀποκάλυψιν πνεύματος σοφίας. To resort to hendiadys can plainly not mitigate the harshness of that collocation.

Harless thinks Rom. xi. 29 most like our passage; no doubt the εἰληφώς, which occurs further on in that passage, contains the basis of the χαρίσματα, but the ἀποκάλυψις here does not so contain the basis of the σοφία; on the contrary, according to this interpretation, a definition is added to the πνεῦμα by the ἀποκάλυψις. That this can be thus brought in afterwards can certainly not be established by any example ("ἶνα with the following δοθῇ is not to be taken τελικῶς, but to be explained by the later less forcible use of the particle after words of commanding, begging, &c. See Winer's Gramm. p. 310.—As to the ὁ Θεός τοῦ κυρίου
see on ver. 3.—The addition πατηρ τῆς δόξης is explained, as to the sense, by the fact that the Charismata named in what follows are just operations of the divine δόξα; but the form is unusual. We find in Acts vii. 2 the phrase ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης, which is found Ps. xxix. 3, also, in the LXX. for the Hebrew רֹאשׁ. On the other hand, there is found Ps. xxiv. 7 ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης for the Hebrew רֹאשׁ, but our phrase ὁ πατηρ τῆς δόξης is without analogy. The assumption of a hendiadys, according to which it would be equal to ὁ πατηρ ἐνδοξος, is not very probable; there is no intention here of adding a laudatory epithet of God, but of expressing that the δόξα proceeds from God, that He is the source of it. It is therefore fittest to take πατηρ here in the more extended sense of auctor, fons, just as 2 Cor. i. 3, πατηρ τῶν οἰκτιμων stands. In like manner, at John viii. 44, the devil is called ὁ πατηρ τοῦ ψευδος, because lies proceed from him.

The assumption of the Fathers, to which Bengel also assents, that δόξα is here a name of Christ, requires no refutation, since scarcely any one else will approve of it.

Ver. 18. After the reference of the πνεύμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως to the gifts of wisdom and prophecy, the ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ cannot, of course, be joined with what precedes, (as those are wont to suppose, who will take ver. 17 to allude only to the general working of the Spirit), but to what follows, so that the meaning of the words is this: “that He may give you spiritual gifts of wisdom and of revelation, eyes enlightened with the knowledge of Him.” Now it is evident from the collocation, that the latter phrase is meant to denote nothing different or higher, along with the gifts of wisdom and Revelation, (for, were that so, then καὶ would not be wanting), but that the subjective state of him, in whom the gifts of wisdom and revelation are operative, is described by it. The following deduction, viz., εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς, τὸς ἐοτιν κ.τ.λ., just contains the special enumeration of the different ways in which the gifts of wisdom and revelation diffuse light in the inner man. For in the φωτίζεσθαι here is couched a reference to the Spirit, as the principle of light (see on John i. 4, 9), which enlightens man’s soul (see Ps. xiii. 4.) Only the connection of the ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ is questionable as to the sense. It has been proposed to take ἐν in the meaning of εἰς, and then to fix the
sense thus: "may God give you enlightened eyes, that you may come to the knowledge of Him." But, apart from the inadmissible interchange of the propositions εν and εἰς, this sense does not suit the context here, because surely the knowledge of God is to be presupposed in the readers as believers in Christ (ver. 15.) (See on John xvii. 3.) We ought rather to take εν ἐπηνωτέων αὐτῶν as designating the already existing state of the readers, on which spiritual enlightenment, as a higher step of the inner life, is to be grounded. The sense of the words would then have to be taken thus: "may God give you (possessing as ye do the knowledge of God) enlightened eyes, proceeding from that knowledge." This acceptance of the words is also favoured by the parallel passage Col. i. 9, which is again to be compared here, and where in the words ἡ πληρωθήτε τῷ ἐπηνωσι τοῦ θελήματος αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ σκέψει πνευματικῇ the knowledge of God (which is only more accurately defined as the knowledge of His will in the work of redemption) is presupposed in the same way, and an increase of wisdom is besought of God as proceeding from that knowledge; so that the words are to be paraphrased thus: ἢνα πληρωθήτε τῷ επηνωσι—εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐν σοφίᾳ. But the phrase ὅθεν μοι τῆς καρδίας forms the chief difficulty in ver. 18, for it seems to be directly opposed to all biblical physiology. That is to say, the metaphor of the eye leads us necessarily to the perceptive faculty, and that this is really meant here the following εἰς τὸ εἰδέαν ὑμᾶς shows; καρδία, on the contrary, denotes, like ἰδοὺ, the department of the ψυχή which is concerned with feeling and desire. (See Opusc. Theol. p. 159.) The reading of the text. rec. διανοιὰς would certainly remove the difficulty completely, but it is clear enough that it is a mere correction of the difficult word καρδίας (perhaps caused by the ἐσκοπισμένοι τῇ διανοιᾷ, iv. 18), and therefore cannot be approved. How, if διανοιὰς stood originally in the text, could καρδίας have been written instead of it? Now, if we look into the idiom of the New Testament, analogies are by no means wanting by which this unusual connection may be explained. Thus we read in John xii. 40, νοεῖ καρδίᾳ, where διανοιαῖ would have been expected also, and mention is often made in the Old and New Testaments of the thoughts of the heart. (See Matt. xv, 19; Luke xxiv. 38; Heb. iv. 12.) We are not in such passages to suppose a careless confusion of the faculties of thinking and feel-
ing, nor a synecdoche, according to which ἄρδελα stands for the whole man, but these modes of expression are to be explained as follows. (See at Luke ii. 35 in the Comm.) The Scriptures speak of a thinking, or of thoughts, of the heart, when they mean to express emphatically that man has yielded to these thoughts with his inward inclination, has made them acts of his personality. If this is not the case, if they are mere passages of thought, into which the inclination has not entered, they appear as the mere thoughts of the head, if I may so express myself. Thus, too, the phrase "enlightened eyes of the heart" is not the same as "enlightened eyes of the νοῦς;" on the contrary, the former expresses more; presupposing the enlightenment of the νοῦς, it at the same time expresses the gaining over of the innermost inclination to the enlightening principle. Balaam, e.g., shows that a high degree of spiritual enlightenment can be united with a turning away of the heart from the enlightening principle; St Paul does not mean to speak of such a one, but of that enlightenment which makes the innermost core of the personality inclined to it, and which fills with its light both spirit and soul in all their faculties.—Now the εἰδέναι τις εστὶν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. stands out as the result of this operation of grace, which has been obtained from God by prayer. Now, that there is no question here of a merely external intellectual acquaintance with the objects named apart from himself, is self-evident, for man can attain that without a special operation of grace; such a knowledge is rather meant, which is, at the same time, an actual experience, so that he who hopes already bears in himself (in the germ at least) the future and the eternal. Thus, too, the γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις in the Scriptures is to be taken as an essential knowledge, as such a knowledge as makes the man actual possessor and receiver of what he knows. (See on John xvii. 3.) I may add that I can not, with Böhmer and Harless, set up the distinction of a more, and a less, accurate knowledge between the two forms γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις; for, even if it is true, that in words compounded with ἐπὶ the meaning of the simple word usually appears strengthened, yet we do not find in the dialect of the New Testament, and especially of St Paul, this rule applied in the cases of γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις. In that very place, in which mention is made of the most exalted
form of knowledge, the Charismatic,—γνώσις, not ἐπιγνώσις, is
(See 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8.)

Ver. 19. The object as to which the Spirit is to enlighten the
readers of the Epistle is a single one, in which, however, all that
is worthy to be known is comprised, viz. the glory to come, the
kingdom of God, in its completeness. St Paul treats of this one
object under three heads. In the first, τίς ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως
ἀντων, hope cannot be taken as a subjective state, on account of
the τίς, for the question here cannot be of the degree of the sub-
jective state of hope, as an object of the exalted knowledge, but
only of the magnitude of the object of the hope itself. Τίς is here,
as in the following passages, —ποταπός. The sense is, therefore,
"that you may know how exalted the object of the hope is, which
your calling of God holds out to you." Understood of the subjective
state, the words could only be translated thus: "That ye may
know of what nature the state of hope is, which your calling of
God brings forth in you." According to that, the τίς must have
given to it another meaning here than in the two other clauses;
besides, it certainly requires no special operation of grace to know
of what nature the subjective hope is, but it is really required to
know the true object of the hope, viz. the still hidden kingdom of
God, to which believers are called. The very general phrase, ἐλπὶς
τῆς κλήσεως, is then denoted in the second article as the κληρονο-
μολα, to which the faithful have a claim after their adoption as chil-
dren (ver. 5), and the earnest of which is the spirit which God has
given them (ver. 14.) Its magnitude is expressed by the words τίς
ὁ πλούτος τῆς δόξης (Col. i. 27); this glory is incomprehensible
to the natural man, the enlightened eyes of the heart alone can
conceive it. (See on 1 Cor. ii. 9.) The connexion of the ἐν
τοῖς ἀγίους is uncertain. Koppe and Winer (Gram. p. 129) want
to join it with τίς soil. ἐστι: "how great in the saints the riches
of the glory of the inheritance is." But Harless has shown, with
the most cogent arguments, this connexion to be quite inadmissi-
ble; if this were to be the meaning of the words, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις
must have been put before, viz. before πλούτος, and by this con-
nexion the stress is laid on ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, while, according to
the context, it must be laid on πλούτος. According to the parallel
passages, Numbers xviii. 23, Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18, ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις
can be connected only with κληρονομία, and ἐν can only be taken
in the sense of “among,” ἐν μέσῳ. It is to be supposed that the
same idea floated before St Paul’s mind, that is expressed in the
Gospels by the formula “to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and
Jacob,” viz. the union of the faithful with all the saints of the Old
Testament in the kingdom of God.—As the third article of the
more exalted knowledge, which has been brought about by the
Holy Ghost, is named, in fine: τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς
dινάμεως αὐτοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς τῶν πιστεύοντας. Judging from the
reference to the ἐλπίς, and the κληρονομία, the magnitude of the
divine power, to the knowledge of which God’s Spirit leads, is also
to be specially referred to the future revelation to the Faithful,
whilst they are prepared for the kingdom of God, which is the in-
heritance. This power of God, which perfects the Faithful, works,
it is true, even here below, in them, and is in its operation on earth
a pledge for their future perfection, but it will not be manifested
in its full magnitude until the end of the development of all things
through the resurrection of the dead, and their putting on the σῶμα
πνευματικόν. (We find ὑπερβάλλω in the New Testament, as
also ὑπερβαλλόντως, ὑπερβολή, in St Paul alone. See 2 Cor. iii.
10, ix. 14; Ephes. ii. 7, iii. 19.)

Ver. 20. St Paul exalts the work of God in Christ, His resur-
rection from the dead, as the highest expression of the divine
power, as is usually the case in the New Testament; in accordance
with this power (κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ.) God works also on the
Faithful (εἰς τῶν πιστεύοντας). According to this connexion, it
cannot well be doubtful, that the overwhelming magnitude of the
power, of which mention was made just before, is to be specially
referred, according to St Paul’s meaning, to the general resurrec-
tion of all believers from the dead, with which the kingdom of God,
the sacred object of Christian hope, is revealed in its glory. The
resurrection of the body is, that is to say, the most exalted mani-
festation of God as of the power and of the true ζωή in man ac-
cording to the Scriptural mode of viewing and representing truth.
In favour of this we may quote also the passage ii. 1, in connexion
with ver. 5, which is united immediately with our passage, as all that
comes between is nothing but a series of subordinate ideas, which
have Christ’s praise and glory for their object. The comparison of
Col. ii. 12, which passage is certainly nearly connected with ours,
might mislead us with regard to the here proposed connection of
the κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ.τ.λ., "in accordance with the energy" &c.,
so that thereby the ἰσχύιος αὐτῆς κ.τ.λ. is more nearly de-
fined, an interpretation which everything favours. For there it is ἐν
φό (Χριστῷ) καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πιστεύως τῆς ἐνέργειας τοῦ
Θεοῦ, τοῦ ἐγείρατος αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Here πιστεῖς τῆς ἐνέ-
ρειας τοῦ Θεοῦ is, no doubt, "the faith which God effects, which
He has called forth by His operation." According to that, one
might (as Bühr takes it to be necessary) think it needful to connect
here too τοὺς πιστεύοντας with κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, "who believe
by means of the operation of God," i.e. who have attained to the
faith through God's power. But it is clear that we must not
stretch the application of the parallel passages so far as thereby to
prejudice the context now before us, though, no doubt, if these pas-
sages are borrowed from Coloss., they must be most particularly
attended to with respect to this Epistle. Here, according to the
following ἡν ἐνέργησε, it cannot be at all doubtful, that by κατὰ
τὴν ἐνέργειαν a more accurate definition of the ἰσχύιος αὐτῆς τῆς
δυνάμεως is to be conveyed. (The construction κατὰ τὴν
ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ has analogies in passages
like Ephes. vi. 10, Job xxii. 23. A purposeless heaping up of sy-
nonyms can by no means be assumed in it. The ἐνέργεια is, in the
first place, the actual utterance of power; this word, therefore,
stands out quite clearly and distinctly from the two others. Κρά-
tos and ἰσχύς are certainly more closely connected. But both are
distinguished according to Harless's supposition, so that ἰσχύς de-
notes power in itself, or strength, and κράτος the relation of the
former to what is without—might, the prevailing over another.
Calvin says, in like manner, robur est quasi radix, potentia autem
arbore, efficacia fructus.) Now, hitherto the construction has been
perfectly natural from ver. 15; but after the ἐγείρασ αὑτῶν ἐκ νεκ-
ρῶν St Paul lets a series of propositions follow (vers. 20—23)
which, all of them, relate to the person of Christ, and His glory,
and are only connected with one another by καὶ, as we above (vers.
6—14) found a series of propositions connected merely by relatives.
It is not till ii. 1 that St Paul again takes up the idea in ver. 19,
but lets it drop again immediately, in order to deduce some sub-
ordinate ideas connected by relatives in vers. 2, 3; it is not until
ii. 4, ss., that he finally stops at the leading idea, in order to con-
clude it in ver. 7. This description of style makes us infer a great commotion in St Paul's soul when he wrote, and which did not permit him to attain to any regular ordering of his thoughts, but compelled him to pour them out, as it were, in a stream.

Vers. 20—23. This passage is a leading one for St Paul's doctrine concerning Christ. It receives its complement from other important passages, from which the knowledge of St Paul's doctrine of Christ, which he elsewhere generally supposes to be known, admits of being gathered, particularly from Col. i. 14—19. For, whereas in Coloss. Christ is conceived of rather according to His eternal, timeless, existence, as the Word which was in the beginning, as St John expresses himself, we here find the Saviour represented pre-eminently according to His humanity, and that too in its exaltation by His ascension into heaven, and His sitting at the right hand of God, as Ruler of the World. In this reference to Christ's human nature, the Epistle to the Philippians is the complement to our passage, for though that Epistle (ii. 9—11) describes Christ's exaltation just as it is here, yet immediately before (ii. 6—8) His humiliation is depicted after its degree. The entire Christology of St Paul is therefore comprised in the three passages Ephes. i. 20—23, Col. i. 14—19, Phil. ii. 6—11. In order to avoid repetitions, we once for all, as to what is here omitted in respect of the doctrine of Christ, refer to the explanations of Phil. ii. 6—11, and Col. i. 14—19. To the resurrection of Christ from the dead St Paul annexes, first of all, (ver. 20) His sitting at the right hand of God in the heavenly world, which presupposes His ascension. As sitting at the right hand of God (see as to the καθίζων ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ the Comm. on Matt. xxvi. 62—66, and as to ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις at Ephes. i. 3, compared with Heb. viii. 1), however, Christ, as participating in the divine government of the world, is more exalted than every created and therefore derived power. The expressions ἑπεράνω (which is here the same as ὑπέρ, see also iv. 10, and Heb. vii. 26, ix. 5) πᾶσις ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος of course denote, in an especial manner, heavenly powers, without any argument being here afforded for understanding good or bad angels alone.1 Christ is surely only meant (as 1 Cor. xv. 24, where also

---

1 That the expressions can denote bad angels also, the passages Ephes. vi. 12, Col. ii. 15, on which see the Comm., show. The reason why these expressions are used here,
ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, and δύναμις, stand together) to be designated generally as the Ruler of all Rulers, without reference to their moral condition. In Col. i. 16 the following four words stand together in a like way, θρόνοι, κυριώτητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαις, also without distinction between good and bad angels. But, as in Col. i. 16, so here too the accumulation of synonyms, which are to denote powers or dominions, seems to denote not merely heavenly powers, but also all which declares itself as a power or dominion. Thence it follows of itself that it cannot be more accurately pointed out how the individual expressions relate to different classes of angels; that among the angels also there is supremacy and subordination, as among earthly creatures, is clear, but how they are distinguished cannot be shown.

The Rabbinical dreams as to the classes of angels are just as capricious and contradictory among themselves as those of the Gnostics and Mystics. (See on that point Harless, ad. h. 1.) How very generally St Paul conceives the idea of the dominion is especially shown by the addition καὶ παντὸς δύναμιν κ.τ.λ., in which by δύναμι every personal entity, and, with reference to what precedes, every personality in whatsoever way ruling, is denoted. We do not see, therefore, with what reason after this the rulers of the earth should be excepted. We can, therefore, only say with Chrysostom: ἀρχή ἐστι δυνάμεων τινων ὑμᾶς ἀσημα καὶ οὐ γραφέναι. The abstract forms, ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, κ.τ.λ. are also, no doubt, meant to serve the purpose of keeping the idea of power as undefined and general as possible. Therefore Meyer's hypothesis (ad. h. 1.), according to which δυναμεῖς is taken to have an allusion to the Hebrew מָלָע, and to denote armies of angels, is altogether inadmissible. In the sense of armies of angels the ἀρχαί, the ἐξουσίαι, κ.τ.λ. belong rather to the δυναμεῖς, but here they are distinguished from them. One cannot with any certainty point to even a climax or an anticlimax in the words.—The concluding words of ver. 21, finally: δύναμις ὁμολογοῦν οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνὶ τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι, would bring the question, whether we ought here to suppose earthly powers also meant, to a decision, if we might understand the αἰῶν μέλλου of the heavenly world,

as also in Col. i. 16, is, we may suppose, to direct attention to the overestimation of the angel-world by many false teachers, not, it is true, actually existing at Ephesus, but possible at some future time. See the Introd. sec. 2.
and the αἰών οὗτος of the earthly one, as Meyer proposes. But we never find the phrases in the New Testament in this sense, but always in the well-known one which has been already developed at Matt. xii. 32, according to which αἰών οὗτος means the terrestrial order of things, in which sin predominates, αἰὼν μέλλων the holy order of the world founded by Christ, which then can be taken as either merely interiorly realized or exteriorly also at the same time, just as βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ admits of such a twofold acceptance. (See the Comm. on Matt. iii. 2.) The words, therefore, only admit of being so taken that the future is in them opposed to the present; "Christ is above whatever name can not only now but also in future be named." In the same way ἀγγελος and ἄρχαλ are set by the side of ἐνεστώτα καὶ μέλλοντα in Rom. viii. 38. Afterwards, in verse 22, Christ, exalted above all, is more closely described in His relation to what is subject unto Him; for it is self-evident that, if the greater, the ruling, is subject to Christ, the inferior must be so still more. In the πάντα ὑπέταξε, therefore, the reference to the immediately-preceding ἄρχαλ, ἡξουσία, κτλ. is not merely to be maintained, but to be extended to the whole of the creation. On this account alone there can be no question of a tautology with what precedes; on the contrary, the πάντα ὑπέταξε stands out as the necessary result of the καθεύθεν εν δεξιᾷ ὑπεράποι πάσης ἄρχης κτλ. But from the connexion of the πάντα ὑπέταξε with the following ἔσωκε κεφαλὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, and a comparison of the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xv. 25, sq. (where the allusion to the passages of the Old Testament, Ps. viii. 7, cx. 1, appears more clearly), a further especial reference seems to be necessary for our passage, as regards the phrase πάντα ὑπέταξε κτλ. That is to say, as the Head of the Church, Christ is, of course, also its ruler, but, at the same time, it clearly cannot be said the members of the Church are laid at Christ's feet; St Paul rather makes the relation of the Redeemer to the Church appear quite distinct. According to that, the first proposition of ver. 22: καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποδὸς αὐτοῦ, might be taken to refer specially to all that strives against Christ, and is held down by His ascendancy (among which the part of the creation devoid of consciousness also is especially to be reckoned, see Phil. iii. 21), whereas the second proposition: καὶ αὐτῶν ἔσωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ refers to Christ's relation to those who have
given themselves up to Him in love, and have thereby become His property. The annexed ἐν τῇ πάντῃ only defines more closely the κεφαλὴ; the apostles and prophets also were in a certain sense heads of the Church, but Christ was κεφαλὴ ἐν τῇ πάντῃ. (Rückert wishes to uphold διδόναι here in the proper meaning: "God has given Christ to the Church as a Head over all." But, according to iv. 11, it seems here also more suitable to take διδόναι, according to the Hebrew יְנַע, = τιθέναι, so that it has the meaning "to set over, to arrange according to a divine decree.")

In ver. 23, finally, the Church is, in continuation of the metaphor of the Head, represented as Christ's σῶμα (see on 1 Cor. xii. 12), which is not merely guided by the Head, but also filled with its life, wherefore the Church itself is called Christ. But, before we enter on the explanation of the extremely obscure words (both in themselves and in the connexion of our passage): τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρωμένου, we must first premise an enquiry into the custom of the language in respect of the word πλήρωμα. It has been attempted to find in that word a polemical allusion to Gnostic false teachers, as St Paul combats them in the Epistle to the Colossians; thus, among the moderns, especially Meyer and Bähr. That is to say, the later Gnostics, especially Valentine and his school, designated by πλήρωμα the whole fulness of life of the kingdom of light, in opposition to the κένωμα; now St Paul is supposed, on the contrary, to have represented Christ as the true Pleroma. (See Neander’s Hist. of the Christian Church, vol. i. part 2, p. 466, ss.) But, first of all, it cannot be shown that this use of the word already existed among the heretics of the apostolical age, and then there was surely couched in this appellation πλήρωμα itself nothing at all blameable, but only in the manner in which the false teachers conceived of the kingdom of light itself, and in opposition to the κένωμα; the mere use of the word could not refute any portion of that doctrine; and, finally, we find in the passages of Ephesians and Colossians, in which πλήρωμα occurs (Ephes. iii. 19, iv. 13, Col. i. 19, ii. 9), as Harless has already remarked ad h.l., no intimation whatever, that anything polemical is couched in the word; the converse might rather seem the more probable, viz., that the Gnostics had borrowed the word from the apostolical vocabulary to express their ideas. But neither can we recognize a parallel between the πλήρωμα and the
well-known Rabbinical-cabalistical term ἁπάντωσις. This last word, that is to say, denotes especially (see Buxtorf lex. Talm. p. 2394) a visible form of the Divine, or, conversely, the Divinity, in so far as He makes Himself known to men in any visible form. (See on John i. 1.) This original meaning might by degrees be confounded in the minds of men, and Schechinah stand directly for God, but still it always meant the Son of God, the revealer of the Father, with whom the Holy Ghost was considered as one. But πλήρωμα is quite different, when it is used of God; it denotes neither a form of revelation employed by God, nor God Himself as the revealer, but only the infinite fulness of life, the manifold powers which the divine essence comprises, and so God as the Infinite One. A reference to the filling of the world by God is not per se couched in the expression, but the fulness of God in Himself is alone declared in it. If we consider the word πλήρωμα in general more closely, we find that the two forms of the classical language, πλήρωσις and πλήρωμα, are in the New Testament comprised in the latter one. Πλήρωσις is the act of filling, πλήρωμα the state of being filled, and the substance which fills. But even in classic writers both words are respectively interchanged. (See Passow in voce.) Now in the dialect of the New Testament both meanings occur in the case of πλήρωμα, the form πλήρωσις is never found. Thus at Rom. xiii. 10, in the words πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου ἢ ἀγάπης, the word = πλήρωσις, “love operates the observance of the Law.” On the other hand, in Mark viii. 20, στραφήναι πληρώματα is “the filling of the baskets, what fills them,” as πλήρωμα πόλεως, “the inhabitants of a town.” Thus πλήρωμα can in our passage, and wherever it refers to God, either be only “God’s filling act,” or “the state of being filled.” So at Col. ii. 9, it is πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος, by which the Divinity Himself is meant to be designated (without reference to the world), inasmuch as He is filled with infinite powers. That passage elucidates the word πλήρωμα in Col. i. 19, where πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in like manner can only be, “the Divine state of fulness, the Divinity in so far as He is filled with infinite powers.” Accordingly, in our passage the words: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι πληρομένου, might be translated conformably to St Paul’s style of writing: “the divine fulness of Him, who filleth all in all,” so that Christ would be described in them as He in whom πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς
Θεότητος κατοικεῖ, and who, as such, is able to fill the universe in all its forms with His powers. But this, per se admissible, interpretation of the words fails when we come to the grammatical connection; τὸ πλήρωμα forms an apposition to σῶμα, a retrospective reference of it to Christ is quite inadmissible. For, if it were proposed to make it depend on the ἔδωκε in the sense, “God made Him to be the fulness of Him that filleth all in all,” that sense would be directly opposed to St Paul’s tenets, as Christ possesses the fulness of the Godhead not through an act of will of the Father, but by the necessity of His nature. It is only what is predicated of His human nature, as the setting Him to be Head of the Church, that can be referred to acts of the divine will. If we, therefore, understand τὸ πλήρωμα of the Church, insomuch as Christ, who fills all, fills it also, we find another stumbling-block in the participle πληρωμένου, which it seems must be taken passively. The interpretation of Chrysostom, of Theophylact, of Anselm, of Thomas Aquinas, of Beza, of Calvin, according to which τὸ πλήρωμα is to be understood of the Church in so far as it is complementum, the complement of the κεφαλὴ, by which the body is made complete, has everything against it so entirely that no serious mention of it can be made. For πλήρωμα can certainly mean “complement,” but there only, where mention is made, as in Rom. xi. 12, of a defect (ηττημα), which is filled up, made good. And besides, surely Christ is never called the head in such a way that the Church forms the complement of it, and that thus He without the Church would be a mere head without any body, but so that He, inseparably united with the body of the Church, fills it with His spirit, and therefore is one with it, needs no complement. But as to πληρούμενος it is certainly true πληροῦσθαι occurs elsewhere only as a passive, for which reason Chrysostom, Theophylact, Jerome, wanted to have it taken so here too; but the τὰ πάντα ἐν πάσι by no means permits it, as Harless has convincingly shown, and Winer (Gramm., p. 235) acknowledges; wherefore it only remains to recognise here a solecism in the use of πληροῦσθαι in the middle form with an active meaning. After that, nothing more stands in the way of the referring these words to the Church, as the body of our Lord; it is called, “the fulness of Him who filleth all in all,” in order to bring its high dignity prominently out, and set it in contrast to everything else. Christ is exalted above
all power and might, all adversaries God hath put under His feet, but
the Church is His body, He fills it with His holy element of life.

Chap. ii. 1. What has already been shortly observed above, with
respect to the construction of this verse and its connection with
what precedes and what follows, must here, in the next place, find
a more extended demonstration. We must, above all, separate the
purely grammatical connection from the connection of the ideas,
which here do not run quite parallel; according as the attention
was fixed on the one or the other alone, different interpretations
were arrived at, which could not satisfy per se, but still had some
truth in them. True, the connecting the acc. καὶ ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.
with the immediately preceding πληροῦμενον, (which Calovius and
Koppe recommended), or with ἐπέταξε at the beginning of ver. 22,
sufficiently refutes itself, and can make no pretensions to correct-
ness. On the other hand, the attempts to connect ii. 1 with ver.
19, as also those which bring ii. 1 into connection with ii. 4, 5,
have both something in their favour, and what is true in both must
be taken together. That is to say, it is true the acc. καὶ ὑμᾶς
δυνάμεις νεκρῶς κ.τ.λ. connects itself with ver. 19, not by the
grammatical coherence of propositions, but certainly by the con-
nection of the ideas. For, beginning with ver. 15, the latter was
as follows: "I pray God that He may give you spiritual gifts of
wisdom and revelation, the eyes of your heart being enlightened
in the knowledge of Him, to understand how great is the hope of
the divine call, and the riches of the glory of His inheritance in
the saints, and the greatness of His power to us-ward who believe."
But with the words κατὰ τὴν ἐνεργείαν κ.τ.λ. St Paul departs
from the direct address to his readers, and occupies himself with
what God has done in Christ. So far as the δύναμις of God in
Christ is the measure of the greatness of the effect of His power
towards the faithful, (who, according to ii. 5, 6, are partakers in all
that God does in Christ), this digression has, to be sure, nothing
heterogeneous in it; but still it certainly carries us away from the
immediate train of ideas. In ii. 1, on the other hand, St Paul
again takes up the chain of ideas, which he had pursued down to i.
19, in its leading connection, only with the difference that instead
of the previous ἡμεῖς he again says ὑμεῖς, as in i. 13, thus making
the reference to the Gentile Christians prominent, though ἡμεῖς
recurs directly at verse 5, after the reference touched on in verses
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2, 3 has been discussed. If, therefore, according to this, ii. 1 is connected with i. 19 by the principal train of ideas, we find on the other hand no rhetorical connection at all with this verse, but St Paul permits himself to be determined by the propositions in verses 20, 23, καὶ ἐκάθισε—καὶ ὑπέταξε—καὶ ἔδωκε, (which, conformably with the principal train of ideas, form subordinate clauses only), to proceed with the principal idea also in that form of proposition; we can only, therefore, at καὶ ύμᾶς κ.τ.λ. supply Ὁ θεός, with which συνεξωσποίησε (ii. 5), as the chief verb, is connected. But, as the subject of the principal verb had become uncertain through the introduction of subordinate remarks again in ii. 2, 3, St Paul repeats it (ii. 4), resuming with δέ the thread of his discourse, and so does not regularly continue the discourse, which he had begun at ii. 1, till verse 5, when he pursues it down to ii. 7.

St Paul here (ii. 1—5) begins by depicting man in general (ver. 5), but first of all (ver. 2) the Gentiles, among whom sin had manifested itself in the most startling forms (see Rom. i.), as dead, but afterwards as quickened and raised up by God together with Christ. The reason of his doing so is the typical interpretation of the events of Christ's life, which often appears in the New Testament, and especially in St Paul. (See the remarks on Rom. vi. 1, ss.) There seem accordingly, as has been already observed, to be good reasons for the preceding digression concerning the person of Christ (i. 20—23.) Men are of course here called deceased through transgressions, inasmuch as the higher life of the spirit is vanished; though alive physically man is dead spiritually, ζων τέθηκε, 1 Tim. v. 6. (The plural αἱμαρτίαι of course denotes also utterances of sin, not, however, decidedly sinful acts, as παραπτώματα, but rather inward sinful movements of the soul in desires and words. The article before the two words is to be taken: the transgressions, the sin, which you are conscious of having committed. In the parallel passage, Col. ii. 13, νεκροί, we may add, is construed not with the dative alone, but with εν παραπτώματι. Here sin is conceived as that which kills, but in the Epistle to the Colossians as the element in which the deadness of the natural man shows itself continually.)

Ver. 2. After this St Paul with the words εν αἷς ποτε περιπατήσατε κ.τ.λ. begins a new digression, which describes the state of sinfulness before conversion more accurately, but at the same time
as one that has passed away. This state is described by the phrase
περιπατεῖν as a continued and permanent one (see Rom. vi. 4; 2
Cor. iv. 2) in opposition to single isolated transgressions, and that
too as a walking in accordance not with the heavenly world, with
the kingdom of God, but with the spirit of this world. Both phrases:
κόσμος ὁ ὅτος, and αἰών ὁ ὅτος, are, it is well known, often found in
the New Testament dialect, but the conjunction of both phrases, κατὰ
τὸν αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, in this passage is singular. We
cannot suppose a reference to the Gnostic use of the word, for this
reason, St Paul here characterizes no special error, and therefore
not the doctrine of the Αἰώνοι, but describes the position of the
Gentiles quite generally. Rückert's idea that the pronoun is to
be joined with αἰὼν in this way: κατὰ τὸν αἰὼν τοῦτον τοῦ κόσ-
μου, can make no claim to be received, besides that the combina-
tion αἰὼν ὁ ὅτος τοῦ κόσμου is also quite unusual. However, one
might, perhaps, starting from the generally received meaning of αἰὼν,
"time," take the phrase in the sense of "course of time, tendency
of the age," unless one with Harless, according to the original
meaning of the word in Homer and Pindar, vital power, more ac-
curately decides on its meaning, to the effect that it does not mean
the abstract idea "time" at all, but "the movement and development
in time," according to which sense "Genius, spirit of the age," is
more satisfactory. But what was at first expressed impersonally
is now in what follows conceived personally. As he, that lives in
accordance with the heavenly world, walks κατὰ Θεόν, so he, who
lives in accordance with the αἰὼν τοῦ κόσμου τοῦτον, walks κατὰ
τὸν διάβολον. But the being determined or governed by the Devil
is expressed at the same time in this accordance, for he knows how
to lead men in accordance with his wishes through his influence.
St Paul describes in his peculiar way the prince of darkness as ἄρχων
τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος. The name ἄρχων, used of the Devil, is, it
is true, by no means surprising, and, to name one author, in St
John he is often called so. (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11.) But, to
go no further, the definition of τῆς ἐξουσίας is obscure, for the geni-
tive cannot, as might at first sight be thought, be taken as an appo-
station, quæ est potestas, or cuæ est potestas, but must express
the object of the dominion. Neither can we by any means sup-
pose a reference to Gnostic false doctrines, as they prevailed among
the Colossians, because, as has been already observed in the Intro-
duction, this Epistle is quite free from polemics, nor can it even be shown that ἔξωσια was in use as a Gnostic terminus technicus, least of all in the age of the apostles. According to Col. i. 13 (ἔξωσια τοῦ σκότους), and Ephes. vi. 12, where evil spirits are called κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους, ἔξωσια here is surely nothing more than the power of darkness in general, the kingdom of evil spirits conceived as a unity which Satan governs. But the most obscure of all is the 2d genitive τοῦ ἀέρος, which has much employed the interpreters, and has in some cases called forth the most startling views. The connection of ἔξωσια τοῦ ἀέρος is not to be taken as if a predicate of ἔξωσια were to be expressed by it, as if the evil spirits were of an airy nature, as Chrysostom, Grotius, Cornelius à lapide, Calixtus, and others, have fancied. The two last indeed added the definition, that the evil spirits caused storms, and other meteoric phenomena disastrous to man. St Paul considers demons as spiritual beings (vi. 12), not material ones, however refined, which they would be if they were airy beings. The genitive τοῦ ἀέρος denotes not their substantial nature, but the region of their sojourn, the place of their activity; in that all the better interpreters are unanimous. We can also at once repudiate the purely figurative or metaphorical acceptation of the phrase, as being worthy of no more accurate investigation. Thus Calvin and Beza insisted on finding in it a figurative designation of the great danger, which evil spirits prepared for man, as if, for instance, they hovered in the air over their heads. Thomas Aquinas, Erasmus, and others, insisted, on the contrary, on the air being taken metonymically, continens pro contento, for the earth itself surrounded by it. The supposition of Harless is very probable, that the reading of the MSS. F.G., of the Vulgate, and of several Fathers, ἄέρος τούτου, rests on that interpretation, which would accordingly be very ancient. But the acceptation of the phrase which recommends itself at first sight seems to be the one according to which ἄηρ is taken as synonymous with σκότος. The evil spirits are very commonly represented in biblical phraseology as belonging to the element of darkness, and it is likewise undoubted that ἄηρ, i.e. "the lower cloudy region," is used in the classics as synonymous with darkness. (See Homer, Iliad, v. 776, xii. 240, xvii. 646; Hesiod, Theog. vv. 119, 252; Wisdom, xvii. 9. That the meaning does not occur again in the Old Testament should not surprise us, as ἄηρ
occurs altogether only at 1 Thess. iv. 17 besides. But the use of
that meaning for the elucidation of this passage is, according to
Harless' remark, made inadmissible by the circumstance that ἀνόητος
never means "darkness" but in a physical sense, never in the figu-
rative one "spiritual obscurity," for which σκότος always stands,
as the opposite of φῶς. We are, therefore, obliged to go back to
the proper meaning of ἀνόητος. But now, that St Paul should have
assigned the atmospheric air as an abode for the evil angels has
both something striking in itself and seems to contradict other pas-
sages, as, e.g., Ephes. vi. 12, where they are described as existing
ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. The reference to platonizing and gnosticiz-
ing ideas, which place evil spirits in the region of the air, is here
inadmissible, because those philosophemes could scarcely be known
to the apostle, and he would not have used them as such even if
they had been. He had but one source of knowledge, illumina-
tion by the Holy Ghost. Whatever in his communications coin-
cides with views of other nations or other schools St Paul has not
borrowed from the latter, but the rays of truth which are to be
found in those views appear connected, indeed, with his statement,
but independent of that divine illumination which filled the apostle
himself. The parallel passages which have been quoted from
Jewish writers seem of more importance, because among the people
of Israel, even where the Old Testament is silent, opinions may
have been transmitted by tradition even from the age of the
prophets which find a corroboration in the New Testament, and
especially because St Paul had, as a born Jew and a scholar of the
Rabbis, from his early youth forward imbibed the opinions of Jewish
sages, and, as it were, breathed in their spiritual atmosphere. But
the Holy Spirit filling St Paul enabled him, even in this Jewish
sphere of ideas, to separate with accuracy truth and error, there-
fore he never took up an idea merely because it was of Jewish
origin and had been familiar to him from childhood, but whatever
Jewish opinions known to him he held fast and made use of, those
he held fast because the Spirit in him guaranteed them. But now
we must add that, after the careful inquiry that Harless (pp. 154-6)
has instituted into the Rabbinical passages on which the assertion
that the Jews supposed the evil spirits lived in the air is founded in
general,—these passages are by no means adapted to prove that as
a prevailing opinion among the people. On the contrary, there
appears in this respect such an obscurity, such a confusion, and such
gross superstition, in the Rabbinical writings, that the above-named
interpreter justly considers "such quagmires" quite unfit to enable
any one to extract anything from them for the elucidation of our
passage. We therefore confine ourselves to divine revelation, and
seek to determine the meaning of the words, ἐξουσία τοῦ ἀέρος, by
the intimations contained in that revelation itself, in the following
way. According to Job i. 6, Satan, too, appears along with the ἀθώ
plainly in heaven. In like manner at Ephes. vi. 12,
compared with iii. 10, the angels, good and bad, are represented as
to be found ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, which, according to Ephes. ii. 6, is
equivalent to ἐν τῷ ὀὐρανῷ. As spiritual beings they are sepa-
rated from the earth, the material world, and assigned to the heav-
ely world, as the spiritual one. If the words are not expressly ἐν
tοῖς ὀὐρανοῖς the cause is to be sought for in the circumstance that
ὀὐρανοῖς is not a mere covering of the spiritual world, but also of
the holy and blessed region, the abode of God. Still in St Luke
x. 18, Rev. xii. 8, 9, 12, the Devil also is represented as to be
found ἐν ὀυρανῷ, and as not degraded to the earth till after his
subjugation, though, no doubt, the figurative colouring in these
passages is not to be overlooked. Now, if we compare the only
other passage in the New Testament in which ἄηρ occurs, viz., 1
Thess. iv. 17, it appears that (see the Comm. on that passage) εἰς
ἀέρα is put there for εἰς ὀυρανοῦ, as the contemplation by the
senses of the ἀπάθετοι εἰς ἀέρα is expressed by the phrase εἰς
ἀέρα. In a like manner we find in St Matthew vi. 26 the phrase
ὀὐρανοὺς used; the birds are there called "the birds of heaven,"
because they seem to the view of sense to fly in heaven. Accord-
ingly, we believe we are fully justified in understanding ἄηρ in our
passage not of the atmospheric air, but of the higher regions gen-
erally, which we are wont to call heaven. St Paul here chose for
the idea that phrase instead of ἐπουρανίοις, with the object, perhaps,
of characterizing by it the powers, to which the readers of the Epistle
had been subject before their conversion, as not earthly ones, it is
ture, but certainly not heavenly ones either. But, further, the con-
cluding words also of this difficult second verse: τοῦ πνεύματος,
κ.τ.λ., require a close investigation. The supposition of Flatt
that τοῦ πνεύματος is equivalent to κατὰ τὸν ἀρχοντα, conse-
quently for κατὰ τὸ πνεύμα, as also the opinion of several of the
Fathers that τοῦ δέρων τοῦ πνεύματος are to be connected in the sense of πνεύματος ἄρχοντα, need no refutation. Rückert will have it that St Paul has departed from the construction; but that hypothesis becomes unnecessary as soon as a suitable plan of construction can be pointed out. Such a one arises if we put τοῦ πνεύματος as equivalent to τῆς ἐξουσίας, and make both genitives depend on κατὰ τῶν ἄρχοντα. That is to say, while the objective power of (the) evil (one), the kingdom of darkness, is denoted by ἐξουσία, πνεῦμα relates to the subjective side of the same, to the spirit of evil working in the souls of men. That proceeds from the Devil and the evil spirits, and has, therefore, the spiritual nature which they themselves bear within them; but of course it is only the created spirit. The efficacy of this evil principle begets in the children of the ἀπελθεία the παραπτώματα and ἀμαρτίαι, of which mention was made in ver. 1. As now in those words the state of sinners is described quite generally, leaving out of sight their relation to redemption, we have no reason to interpret the ἀπελθεία of unbelief in the Gospel: the expression denotes disobedience in general, which is the essence of sin, in whatever form it may show itself. But the νῦν is not to be understood as if the Spirit worked thus in the children of unbelief then only when St Paul wrote; on the contrary, it continually works in the very same way; St Paul rather means by the νῦν to set earthly conditions in general in opposition to the αἰῶν μέλλων of the kingdom of God, and by that means to make the working of the Devil appear as confined, in contradistinction to the eternal divine working of the Holy Ghost. Meyer's acceptation of the νῦν, "which even now, when the Gospel is working so powerfully counter to it, still continues to reign in the children of unbelief," is justified by nothing in the context. On the contrary, the opposition with ποτὲ gives the νῦν clearly enough its reference to the state of man without Christ, i.e. the αἰῶν ὁδός. (See Col. iii. 7.)

Ver. 3. Whereas vers. 1 and 2 were addressed to the Gentile Christians, St Paul in verse 3 makes a transition to the Jewish Christians, and says the same of them. Before their conversion (ποτὲ) they too walked among the children of disobedience in the wicked lusts of the flesh. In the same way, in the second chapter of Romans, the state of the Jews is placed in a parallel line with that of the Gentiles described in Rom. i. Let us add that in the ἀνασ-
ἐφεσεθαι ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς, just as in the περιπατεῖν κατὰ of ver. 2, the enduring mode (plan, direction) of life is described in opposition to isolated sinful acts. From the evil lusts proceeds the accomplishing of the desires of the flesh, and of sinful thoughts. Although it is well known that in St Paul's usual language, as I have already shown on Rom. vii. 14, σὰρξ denotes not sensuality or fleshly lust alone, but the whole God-averted tendency of man and of the ψυχή, yet St Paul ascribes no διάνοια to the σάρξ. The collocation of the words is therefore very suitably chosen; τῆς σαρκὸς could not have stood after διάνοιαν. The θελήματα σαρκὸς stand in relation to the above-mentioned ἐπιθυμίαις as the single actual lusts, which are formed according to circumstances out of the state of concepissentia, but διάνοια denotes sinful thoughts, which have no sensual desire for their basis. As διάνοια here, so in Matt. xv. 19 διαλογισμὸς, but with the addition πονηρός, is used of sinful thoughts; but in Luke xi. 17 διανόημα by itself denotes wicked thoughts. If any one, however, should conclude from this description that all Jewish Christians, and consequently all the apostles likewise, had actually committed the grossest carnal sins, he would be very much mistaken. St Paul contemplates the inner sinful aberrations as already actually sins before God, entirely according to the spirit of the sermon on the Mount. But now at length by the ὡς καὶ ὁ λουτρόν, which has a retrospective reference to verse 2, St Paul comprises the whole picture of the sinfulness of men in the sentence: ἡμεῖς (scil. ποτὲ, before our conversion unto Christ) τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, or, as Lachmann after A.D.E.F.G. reads, φύσει τέκνα ὀργῆς, but which looks more like a correction to facilitate the understanding of the passage, than like the original reading. Now, that in these words the expression ὀργῆ, which is put absolutely, is the divine anger, cannot be doubtful, whether by itself, or after the parallel passage Col. iii. 6. But as to the reality of that anger we have already at Matt. xviii. 34, 35. John iii. 35, 36, expressed ourselves at sufficient length. Certainly in God anger is no passion (so far as the expression is anthropopathic), but the real displeasure of God's holiness at what is evil. Now men as sinners are the objects of this divine displeasure, ἰ.e. τέκνα ὀργῆς. For the context must determine the sort of dependence which is always expressed by ὡς or τέκνον. The interpretation
of τέκνον by ἄξιος, which Calvin, Grotius, and other interpreters defend, does not lie uppermost in the word, but is only a derivative one; the object of the divine anger is, under all circumstances, such a one as deserves punishment. But the φύσει is here in a dogmatic point of view extremely important for the doctrine of original sin; that is to say, if ἦμεν τέκνα ὄργης stood alone, one might think that every single person had by his individual fault alone made himself the object of the divine anger, as the Pelagian-rationalistic mode of interpretation is wont to maintain. That view, now, of man’s sinful nature, as produced in every individual by personal guilt, is refuted by φύσει. It is true there have been many subtleties introduced in the interpretation of it (see Harless on this passage, pp. 171, ss.), but φύσις cannot, without forcing the meaning of the word, be understood as anything else than the Latin natura, of the original, innate, in opposition to what has been acquired by practice. True, a thing may by custom become φύσις, but the habitual always forms a contrast with what is φύσει. Now, that St Paul does not mean the idea of the original, innate, to be here taken as if created by God, cannot certainly be deduced from this passage itself, but we see from the chief passage (Rom. v. 12, ss.) on the doctrine of original sin that St Paul derives the sinful nature, born in all individuals without exception, from the original sin of the founder of the race; this passage, therefore, receives from that chief passage its natural supplement. Accordingly, by the dogmatic connection in the doctrine of St Paul, φύσει obtains here the meaning “birth in sin,” which it, of course, cannot have of itself, and thus forms the antithesis to χάριτι, verse 5. That is to say, the being by nature children of wrath rests on the transmission of sin by bodily propagation, which has continued from the time of Adam forth; what, therefore, men are by nature, they are by birth in sin. What may with the most plausibility be said against that interpretation is, that in what preceded (ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις—ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα κ. τ. λ.) the discourse was of the doing of sin, and not of the state of sinfulfulness, which seems not to suit φύσει, which follows. Thus said most of the rationalist interpreters since Grotius. But, after a little more accurate consideration of the context of verse 3, one easily perceives that this objection to the above-given interpretation is totally unfounded. For, whilst in the ἦμεις πάντες
ἀνεστράφημεν κ. τ. λ. the actual state of the walking in sin is detailed, and in the ποιοῦντες κ. τ. λ. the actual bursting forth of it into individual actual sins, both are pointed out in the concluding words in their ultimate foundation, viz. in the inborn sinfulness of each individual through his connection with Adam. It is true this remark was not absolutely necessary here; the train of ideas on the whole would remain uninjured, even if the concluding clause καὶ ἡμεῖς—λοιπον were wanting; but St Paul appears, according to the judicious remark of Harless, to have wished by that means to place in a clear point of view the contrast between the state of sin and the calling of the people of Israel. St Paul would not have represented the Jews, as God's people standing under the guidance of Jehovah, in the same way as the Gentiles are described in verse 2, as being under the power of Satan; yet they walked as Adam's sinful descendants in like manner after the wretched lusts of the flesh, that is, because they were not obedient to the Law and the exhortations to a holy walking arising from the same.

Ver. 4. But now the connection had been made doubtful by this long and important digression. St Paul could not resume the discourse with the accusative from verse 1 alone, since the subject above all must have escaped the reader, because it had not been named since i. 17; he therefore begins with ὅ δὲ Ὁσίος, adds some definitions to characterize His compassion, and then in ver. 5 again takes up the words from ver. 1. Only, whereas he there said ἡμᾶς, he here writes ἡμᾶς, as it had been proved in the exposition in ver. 3 that there is no difference between Gentiles and Jews, as to their relation to redemption, i.e. that they both need it in an equally high degree. The divine love is, however, here represented especially as ἑλεος, because the discourse is of its exhibition to mankind, who have been made unhappy by sin. But in the aorist ἡγάπησε ἡμᾶς is couched the reference to the actual expression of God's love in Christ as to the highest form of exhibition of love (John iii. 16.)

Ver. 5, 6. Now here St Paul carries out in its separate points of view the typical interpretation of the life of Christ, which he had already touched on at ii. 1, and for which the representation of our Lord's life in i. 19, ss. was to prepare us. As Christ was dead, but was made alive by God's power, and awakened and set on God's throne, so has God with Christ made alive, awakened, and trans-
ferred to the heavenly world mankind dead through their sins. The repetition of the καὶ before the three verbs is explained by the vivacity of the picture, and the endeavour to place the climax in the strongest light, but the form of the aorist in all three verbs is striking, especially as their purport seems to be future as yet, which the συνεκάθισε shows above all; for how could it be said of the readers then living that God had transplanted them with Christ into the heavenly world? True, it is quite correct to say that, as the συξώστως and συνεγέρσω are here to be understood not of the physical awakening from the dead, but of the making alive of the spiritual being, so too the συγκαθίσει denotes, in a typical way alone, the inner heavenly consciousness of the faithful, not a local raising into heaven; and, accordingly, the Protestant interpreters maintain that everything here named is to be looked on as already actually operated in the readers of the Epistle. But St Paul’s intention is clearly not to represent these parallels with the events of Christ’s life as only brought to pass merely in the first readers of the Epistle, but to designate them as also valid for all who should in future believe in Christ. According to that, then, it must, at all events, be granted that St Paul, in the style of prophetic representation, describes the future as already realized. But even that does not suffice to exhaust St Paul’s idea. If we compare Rom. viii. 30 (see the Comm. on that passage), it is clear that St Paul conceives at once as completed all in Christ’s labours after his word τελέσθαι σαρκά! which is gradually realized in men’s hearts according to the progress of the gradual development of the history of the world. What happened to Him, as the second Adam, the representative of the race, has actually once for all happened for the benefit of all. The above used phrase, that Christ’s life is typically conceived by St Paul, is therefore not to be understood either, as if there were formed according to a divine rule, independently of Christ and His person, a development in believers analogous to His fate; but rather Christ is the real type for every form of life among the saints unto the end, so that how they live is only the development of what had been already given in the germ in Him, and had been transplanted out of Him into their nature. The supplying of an ἐν before τῷ Χριστῷ, which is found in some MSS., is therefore totally unsuitable; the dative depends on the σὺν in the compound verbs, and is to be understood entirely in its own meaning, since
Christ, as the universal man, bore all men in Him, and completed all in Him. The parallel passage in Col. ii. 13, in which συν is expressly repeated, is also in favour of that construction. The only thing that is surprising in this interpretation is, that at the end of ver. 6 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ occurs, and the ἐν is there genuine beyond a doubt. But that addition is surely meant only to serve the end of showing that συγκαθίζεωσ is here used in a figurative sense, as has been already remarked. But in saying that we do not say that a real partaking of the faithful in the sitting of Christ in heaven on God's throne will not take place; it is asserted at Rev. iii. 21, in the strongest terms, and it also follows from the nature of the thing, that what is of a heavenly nature belongs to the heavenly world. But in this passage it refers, because of the figurative συνεγετοις and συνεγείρεως, merely to the inner world, and the arousing of the heavenly consciousness, whereas elsewhere Christ's bodily resurrection, and whatever is connected with it, is also treated as a real type of ours. The distinction made between συνεγετοις and συνεγείρεως deserves also to be more closely investigated. Although both words, as we said before, can here be taken only figuratively, yet they are borrowed from the process of physical resurrection, and must, therefore, have their meaning in the same. Now, in the prophetic description (Ezech. xxxvii.) there is also a plain distinction drawn between a moving, a becoming alive, of the dead bones, and an actual resurrection; the same distinction is pointed to in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, according to which passage the bodies of the saints move indeed simultaneously with Christ's death, but do not awake and go forth from the graves till after His resurrection. Even, therefore, if the resurrection itself is an act, it yet presupposes in the process of the gradual ζωοποιεῖσθαι a preparation advancing step by step. In the middle of the deduction, there appears in ver. 5 the parenthetical ejaculation χάριτί εστε σεσώμενοι, by which St Paul impresses the great thought, which filled his life, on the hearts of his readers, viz., that neither works, nor any merit whatever, but God's undeserved grace, is the sole ground of our salvation, which is further carried out in ver. 8. In the parallel passage too (Col. ii. 13) this idea attaches itself to the συνεζωοποίησε, in the words χαριζόμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα. (At the addition in ver. 5, χάριτι εστε σεσώμενοι, various readings are found; to name some, D.E.F.G. read όυ τῇ χάριτι, inferior critical authorities
also add γὰρ or δέ. But all these readings owe their origin to the copyists misunderstanding the nature of the short exclamation arising from the excited feelings of St Paul, and their supposing they must connect it grammatically somehow or other, principally with reference to ver. 8.—As to the ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίων, see at Ephes. i. 3.)

Ver. 7. At length St Paul closes this long collection of propositions, reaching from i. 15 to this verse, with the idea that it was God’s intention, by the work in Christ, to make known the abundant riches of His goodness; just as it was expressed in i. 6, xii. 14, εἰς ἐπαυνοῦ δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, as the ultimate object of the whole creation, and of all its forms. This manifestation of the richness of the divine grace, however, St Paul places ἐν τοῖς αἰώνιοι τοῖς ἐπερχόμενοι. The participle ἐπερχόμενοι, quod imminet, instat, (Luke xxii. 26, James v. 1), is found united with αἰών nowhere else in the New Testament.—Apart from the context οἱ αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι could mean only “the coming generations,” in opposition to the living ones, to whom St Paul addressed his Epistle. But it has been already remarked on vers. 5, 6, that St Paul there already thought of those also who should live later; he would have Christ’s benefits referred not merely to the one generation then living, but to all the races of men. Therefore οἱ αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι can only be taken as = the usual term αἰὼν μελλόν, so that the sense of the 7th verse is this: “that God in the future order of things, i.e. in the kingdom of God (in which the glory of the faithful, which is hidden here below, will be made visible to all), may manifest His superabundant richness of grace.”

—The concluding words of ver. 7, ἐν χριστότητι ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, are to be taken as a more accurate definition of the more general word χάρις; the connection of the ἐν κ.τ.λ. with ἐπερβαλλοῦσα is unsuitable, because the participle belongs quite objectively to πλοῦτος. (The neuter form of πλοῦτος is with Lachmann and Harless, on the authority of MSS. A.B.D.F.G., to be preferred as the rarer one, here, as at Ephes. iii. 8, 16, Phil. iv. 19, Col. ii. 2.)

Vers. 8, 9. The greatness of the Divine goodness in the work of redemption St Paul finds especially in the circumstance, that the σωτηρία is solely effected (as causa efficient) through the grace of God (see ver. 5), and on the part of man only faith is required (as
the conditio sine quâ non; thereby redemption appears as the sole work of God, to whom alone therefore all praise also belongs for the same. The idea, at first positively expressed, is again repeated negatively, in order to impress it the more emphatically, οὐκ ἔστε σεσωμένοι. Since, therefore, here every work, and consequently every merit on the part of man, is excluded, faith (πίστις) itself too is denied meritoriousness; faith too, like everything good in man, is δόρυν Θεοῦ, that all self-glorifying may ever be annihilated, and all glory be preserved unto God. (See the details as to χάρις, πίστις, ἔργα, at Rom. iii. 21, 2 Cor. iii. 5.)

Ver. 10. Now, that everything in the path of salvation is thus referred to God's working, which man on his part has only to accept with faith, is based on the nature of the process of regeneration. It is like a new creation, the regenerate are God's πνεῖμα, κτίσμα, κτίσις (see at 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15), created in Christ Jesus. The ἔστε is again not to be taken as = through, but to be understood as in vers. 5, 6: Christ, as the representative of the race, bears in Himself all who are His in the faith. But the aim of this inner divine creation is more closely determined by ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἄγαθοῖς, i.e. unto good works, that they may bring forth good works. However little, therefore, salvation proceeds ἐξ ἔργων, it does not, for all that, exclude good works, i.e. works which proceed from a heart in which dwells faith active through love (see Gal. v. 6); on the contrary, the fruits of faith are supposed to proceed from the new birth, as inevitable consequences. God wills it that we should walk in those fruits, by which again, as vers. 2, 3, the consistent being and living in good works is to be understood, because faith and love afford an inexhaustible source for them. The only difficulty in ver. 10 is the connection οἷς προτείλμασεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. The question is whether οἷς is here to be taken as a pure dative: "for which God has prepared us," or as by attraction for ἀ, in the sense: "which God has prepared that we might walk in them." Against the first interpretation it might be said that it is unsuitable to represent the persons as prepared for the works, since, on the contrary, the latter depend on the former. Moreover, one expects in that case ἡμᾶς after προτείλμασεν as a matter of course. In the second acception of the words, for which we decide, it might certainly in like manner seem strange,
that God is said to have prepared the works, since those are surely deeds of man; but the idea of preparation is not to be understood as if by it man’s free-will were excluded, but only in this way, that the circumstances and conditions, under which it becomes possible for men to accomplish good works, are ordered by God. (Προετοιμάζειν [see Rom. ix. 28] differs from προορίζειν and προτίθεναι only by pointing to a working of the divine eternal will, which relates more to details.)

§ 3. OF THE UNITY OF ALL BELIEVERS IN CHRIST.

(ii. 11—iii. 21.)

To this description of the grace of God in Christ St Paul in what follows annexes very fitly a reminiscence of the former desolate state of his readers. In order to attain to a full appreciation of the greatness of God’s benefits in Christ, man must remember his condition when he was without them. Now, when St Paul had said that they had once been heathens, he had said everything to designate the wretchedness and spiritual desolation of his readers. (This ποτὲ forms, as in vers. 2, 3, an antithesis with the nunc in ver. 13, and contrasts the time before their conversion with that after it.) That is to say, the name ἑθνῆ, answering to the Heb. ἄνδρα, denotes, both in the Old and the New Testament dialects, the idea of all estrangement from God, and blindness. In order more strongly to mark the contemptuousness of the expression, St Paul further adds, in a parenthetical clause, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς. (See as to ἀκροβυστία and περιτομῆ, which abstracts are used for the concretes ἀκροβυστίον and περιτομητήλος, the Comm. on Rom. ii. 26, iii. 30, iv. 9, 10.) But it is a question how, in ver. 11, the additions of ἐν σαρκί to τὰ ἑθνη and ἐν σαρκί χειροποιήτου to περιτομῆς are to be understood. The latter might produce the impression that bodily circumcision, as such, is meant to be undervalued in comparison with the spiritual one (see on Rom. ii. 28, 29); but that cannot be supposed from the whole context. That is to say, St Paul means to show that the Gentiles were really inferior compared with the Jews, as ver. 2 shows; but the latter had received the circumcision in the flesh (ἐν
σαρκί) as a divine institution, which was to distinguish them from the Gentiles; St Paul cannot, therefore, possibly mean to undervalue that. Nevertheless, the words ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου unmistakably bear a colour of blame, but which is not to be referred to the symbol of circumcision in itself, but to the want of honesty of the Jews, in not suffering themselves to be led by the outward symbol ordained by God to that inward purification which it was to typify.—Accordingly, the words included in parentheses are to be thus paraphrased: "Ye, who are called uncircumcised by the so-called circumcision performed in the flesh, which, however, merely as such (i.e. without, along with the outward circumcision, being also circumcised in the heart), has certainly no right to look down contemptuously on you." Accordingly then it also follows that the phrase τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ does not form, as might be thought, an antithesis with τὰ ἔθνη ἐν πνεύματι, to designate better and worse, noble-minded and ignoble-minded, Gentiles; but that ἐν σαρκὶ is to denote the want (common to all Gentiles without exception) of a symbol of the covenant in the flesh; then, too, by the reference of the passage to the Gentiles as such, is explained the article before ἔθνη.

Ver. 12. To that topic is annexed a more accurate description of the state of the Gentiles. St Paul considers, in his grand style of viewing matters, his first readers as the representatives of Gentilism, and of the Gentile age of the world in general, therefore the following picture, with which Col. i. 21, Ephes. iv. 18, 19, are to be united also, is a representation of the Gentilism of all ages and of all its forms. It is always χωρίς Χριστοῦ, and therefore χωρίς σωτηρίας. Here Ἰησοῦ also, or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, could not have stood, as might have been thought, for the Jews too were without Jesus; Χριστὸς denotes the Messiah as an idea, of the appearance of whom the Jews had received the prophecies; as indeed these are described in what immediately follows as wanting to the Gentiles. But the phrase χωρίς Χριστοῦ is in so far significant as the prophecies among the Jews are not to be viewed as mere abstract assurances of something future, but as real promises, in and with which the germ of what was promised was already present in the people. Christ already dwelt, as the eternal word of the Father, in the people of Israel by means of an ἐπιδημία νοητῇ, before the ἐπιδημία αἰσθητῇ, which commenced with Jesus' becoming man.
That indwelling of Christ’s in Israel in His Godhead was wanting in Gentilism, thence its infinite distance, even in its noblest forms, from what the people of God included.—The condition of being abandoned of God is more accurately designated by the ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ κ.τ.λ., to which the parallel passage Col. i. 21 further adds καὶ ἐχθρὸι τῆς διανοίας (= ἐν τῷ νοτ) ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῦ ποιηρῶν, that is, living in works known to be evil, and thereby standing in a spiritual enmity against God. God’s people had a peculiar, politico-religious constitution, ordained by God, which was a prefiguration of the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. This regulated state of the Theocracy, which must have immensely promoted the development of the life of faith, is here designated by the word πολιτεία, which we became acquainted with in Acts xxii. 28, in the sense of privileges of a citizen, civitas Romana. Now, as St Paul denies the Gentiles any participation in this πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, he certainly denies also their privileges of citizens in the same, which belonged to every Jew by birth alone; but on account of the connection with τοῦ Ἰσραήλ we cannot here ascribe to the word exactly the meaning of “privileges of a citizen.” (See Harless’ remarks on this passage.) But in the word ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι seems to be couched not merely that the Gentiles have no part in the kingdom of Israel, but that the participation in it was taken from them. No doubt that is couched in the form of the word, but not as if they had previously had a share in the kingdom of God, and had lost it, but as if God, by the restriction of His peculiar operations of grace to Israel, had expressly excluded the Gentile world, but only in order first to let the fire acquire plenty of power by concentration in one place, and then to diffuse it over all the nations of the earth. (Ἀπηλλοτριῶν is found elsewhere in the New Testament only at Ephes. iv. 18; Col. i. 21. Josephus often uses it. It is also found in Sirach xi. 35, 3 Macc. i. 3, as also in the LXX. for τῆς, Ps. lviii. 3, and τῆς, Job xxi. 29, Jerem. xix. 4. The clause ἐνοι τῶν διαθησάτω τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, which some unimportant MSS. endeavoured to make easier to their comprehension by means of the corrections τῶν ἐπαγγελίατων τῆς διαθήκης οτ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν διαθησάτων, is to be viewed as a further exegesis of the χωρίς Ἡρῴδου. It appears, in fact, as if it would have been sufficient to say: ἐνοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, i.e. far from the promise of the Messiah, which composed the central point
of all the prophecies of the Old Testament; for the attempted connection of τῆς ἐπαγγελίας with ἔλπίς μὴ ἔχωσε is inadmissible, because then the collocation τῆς τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἔλπις would be requisite. However, the plural τῶν διαθηκῶν would still only then have anything surprising in it, if it denoted the Old and New Testaments, but, according to Rom. ix. 4, by that word are understood the covenants of God with the fathers of the Jewish people, for which view the passages Wisdom of Solomon xviii. 22, Sirach xliv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 15, also speak. Those covenants are here called διαθηκαὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας because the promise of the Messiah was the support of those covenants.—At such a distance from the divine institutions the Gentiles are therefore ἔλπις μὴ ἔχωσε, i.e. not only without the hope of the Messiah, but in general wanting all real hope, and therefore also ἀθεος, i.e. Godless, without actual connection with the living God. The addition ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, i.e. in this wicked world, gives a point to the idea, inasmuch as it is to be paraphrased by: "in this wicked world, in which one has such urgent need of a sure hope, of a firm hold on the living God." But it might be thought that St. Paul, by this interpretation, fell into contradiction of Rom. i. 19, where the heathens are ascribed τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, and of the historical matter of fact, that individual heathens elevated themselves to a purer knowledge of God, throwing superstition aside; but that is not the case. True, one must not try to solve the apparent contradiction by saying that St Paul here speaks merely of the particular Gentiles living in spiritual blindness; but that such single individuals, who arrived at a purer knowledge of God, as Socrates, Plato, and others, had properly ceased to be heathens, for we have remarked already, on the phrase τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί, that τὰ ἔθνη ἐν πνεύματι ought not to be distinguished from them by a tacit contrast; St Paul speaks of the whole of the Gentile world, i.e. of all mankind except the Jews; he divides the human race into Israel and non-Israel. On the contrary, we can solve that apparent contradiction in this way only. No natural knowledge of God, as we find such in non-Jewish thinkers and sages, however valuable it may be considered in itself, can be compared with the knowledge of God which was spread in the bosom of God's people, because it was not the result of true divine enlightenment and of God's communicating Himself in the inner man, but the product of mere re-
election on the existence of the distant Deity, from the contemplation of nature, and from conscience. But God can there alone be truly understood, where he communicates Himself beforehand to the person understanding Him. Oυδεὶς έγνωκε τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς δείγματα ἐκ μὸν αὐτοῦ. (Compare on 1 Cor. viii. 3.) The Gentle knowledge of God, so far as it deserves that name, could not therefore but exhibit itself as rather negative and formal than positive, and the knowledge of Socrates, that he knew nothing, is an adequate expression for it. But the less the Jews used their great privileges as they ought, the more guilty they became before God, and the more did those heathens put them to the blush, who in their ἄθεότης with their weak light were more faithful than the Jews with their clear blaze of revelation.

Ver. 13. To the description of the Gentile estrangement from God is then further annexed the picture of the state of the converted. In it all live ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, i.e. in communion with Jesus of Nazareth, in whom the idea of the Messiah was realized. St Paul here expresses the altered state of the Gentile world by ἐγενήθη, in opposition to the preceding μακράν ἐλαίοι. That is only a resumption of the previous ἀπαλλοτριώθησαν τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. In God's people God was present in the Shechinah of the temple, the Jews were therefore near him; the Gentiles, on the contrary, were far from him, inasmuch as they were not allowed to approach the temple. (See on vers. 17, 18.) The act of coming near, and consequently the state of the ἐλαίοι ἐν Χριστῷ, is represented as at length brought about ἐν τῷ ἀἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The shedding of His blood, and the atonement earned thereby, ended the separation among mankind, which God had ordained till the completion of Christ's work, and enabled the Gentiles to unite themselves to the community of Christ just as immediately as the Jews were allowed. (Cf. ii. 18.)

Vers. 14, 15. For Christ produces such an effect by His nature; He Himself is our peace. In that idea there is couched not merely that Christ institutes peace, that He is the εἰρηνοσῶς, but that He Himself in His essence is peace, and that he alone has peace who lives in Him and His element. Where discord dwells inwardly, there outwardly too peace is only mock peace. Thus Christ is called, as early as Isaiah ix. 6, ἀρχων εἰρήνης. Therefore in the name εἰρήνη ἡμῶν by θείος are to be
understood not the Jews alone, but St Paul here speaks from the point of view of the whole human race, in which all distinctions are smoothed down. (See on Gal. iii. 28.) Christ manifests Himself as our peace—both inwardly and outwardly; here St Paul, no doubt, on account of the special need of his first readers, makes the latter side amply prominent. Christ abolishes the division of mankind into Jews and non-Jews, He makes both halves one. The neuter τὰ ἀμφότερα St Paul himself (verses 15, 16) interprets by τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφότερους, i.e. Jews and non-Jews. Both form a unity in their relation to Christ (John x. 16), one flock under one shepherd. This uniting efficiency of Christ's is still more closely described by St Paul in the explanatory words: καὶ λύσας τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ. The idea of the μεσότοιχου τοῦ φραγμοῦ is further explained by τὴν ἕξθραν, and the whole train of thought is more accurately determined by the final words, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αἵτω τῶν νόμων τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας. True, it has been proposed to connect τὴν ἕξθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αἵτω, and even Lachmann has accepted that punctuation, but no suitable meaning at all admits of being obtained from that mode of taking the context, for the interpretation of Bugenhagen, Schultess, and others, according to which ἕξθρα ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αἵτω is taken to mean, "enmity in His people, in the corporeal relatives of Christ" (as σαρξ is used Rom. xi. 14), refutes itself sufficiently by itself. It is only in the above-given connection of the words that the writer's exposition proceeds step by step elucidating itself. Now, first of all as to the form of the phrase λύειν τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, it is clear that λύειν here, as at John ii. 19, has the meaning of "to dissolve, destroy, and therefore remove." Μεσότοιχον, paries intergerinus or intermedium, denotes a party-wall, a partition-wall; Phavorinus interprets it: τὸ διάφραγμα. It is very rare in profane writers, yet Athenæus has it, Lib. vii. p. 281. Ed. Casaubon. The combination μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ is meant, however, to render the barrier prominent, as the means of separation, "the barrier which forms and is meant to form the hedge, the separating medium." One is naturally at once reminded by this idea immediately of the Law, which produced the separation between those who were under theocratic government and those who were not under it, by expressly declaring the Gentiles unclean, and forbidding all communication with them on the part of the Jews. In the
Rabbis, therefore, the Law is called יֶבֶר or וֶזֶבֶר, *sepes, sepimentum,* and the Masoreh again יָזֶבֶר. (See Buxtorf lex. talm. p. 1447.) The investigations as to what sort of barrier St Paul meant seem idle; if, however, it is to be supposed that he in using the universally intelligible figure had something *special* in his mind, it is most reasonable to understand the wall which divided the fore-court of the Gentiles from the precincts of the inner temple, and thus was a symbol of their separation from the covenants of promise. The presupposed reference of the *μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ* to the Law seems, however, to have a doubt cast on it by the exegetical τὴν ἔχθραν. Erasmus, Cornelius à Lapide, and Rückert, choose here to think of the reciprocal enmity between Jews and Gentiles. But if τὴν ἔχθραν is to be something different from *μεσότοιχον, καὶ* would not be wanting; if it is to explain the previous phrase, the idea, "the party-wall is enmity," seems unfitting; the ἔχθρα may well be a consequence of the separating medium, but not the separating medium itself. Besides, St Paul himself surely gives the explanation immediately by the following τῶν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν καταργήσας, which stands exactly parallel to the *μεσότοιχον λύσας.* The ἔχθρα can and must be here taken as an effect of the Law. But the question is, *what effect?* Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Æcumenius, to whom Harless has given in his adhesion, understand by the ἔχθρα the enmity of the Jews and Gentiles together against God, which arises through the operation of the Law in that it makes sin abound. (Rom. v. 20, vii. 13, viii. 3; Gal. iii. 10.) The last-named interpreter defends this acceptance by laying emphasis on the *καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξη—τῷ Θεῷ,* which follows in ver. 16, and which he will have to be understood of the inward reconciliation through Christ, and therefore of the abolishment of guilt and enmity against God, in opposition to the merely outward union of Jews and Gentiles. According to this, as Harless interprets the passage, the two members of the clause expressive of purpose are intended to correspond to the two members of the principal sentence; that is to say, the *first* member of the *subordinate* sentence, ὅπως down to εἰρήνην, to the *first* member of the *principal* sentence, ὁ ποιήσας down to ἐν, and the *second* member of the *subordinate* sentence, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ down to ἐν αὐτῷ, to the *second* member of the *principal* sentence, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον down to
καταργήσας. Thus, then, St Paul spoke not merely of the amalgamation of the Jews and Gentiles into one through Christ, but also of the abolishment of the enmity of the sinful world against God through the atonement. But just this twofold object, which must be supposed according to this interpretation, is not found in St Paul's exposition. The ἀποκαταλλάσσειν (verse 16) is by the addition τοῦ ἀμφότερος ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι referred to the relation between Jews and Gentiles, just as the preceding κτίζεω τοῦ δύο. In vers. 17—22 one sees as clearly as possible that this relation continues the chief subject of the Epistle in what follows, just as from vers. 11—15 it forms the central point of the argument. One is therefore at a loss to say wherein the justification is to consist for introducing along with this idea, which forms the basis of the whole exposition from verse 11 to verse 22, another idea in verses 15, 16 merely, and that too the perfectly general one, that God has reconciled both Gentiles and Jews with Himself through Christ. This idea must have seemed to St Paul the more completely superfluous here, that he had treated of it in chapter i. already. But it is here irrelevant also, in as much as the making the inward reconciliation with the outward amalgamation of Jews and Gentiles prominent must have excited the notion, that the latter was only just an outward one, as if it was separated from the inner atoning operation of Christ. But that is not St Paul's meaning at all; rather, Christ, inasmuch as He is the reconciler of man to God, and therefore their peace, is also in and by those very relations He that abolishes the separation between Gentiles and Jews. Therefore St Paul could not possibly hit on the idea of placing the inward reconciliation side by side with the outward amalgamation, because to him the amalgamation is no mere outward one. Then there comes, in addition to the above, this farther fact, that nowhere it is said, either in St Paul or in the whole New Testament, that "the effect of the Law is enmity against God." Certainly there is found that "it works wrath or a curse," but never "enmity."—Finally, on the assumption that τὴν ἔχθραν denotes the enmity of both, of the Jews and of the Gentiles, against God, we must also assume that St Paul in speaking of the Law thought of the law of the Gentiles also, written in their hearts. But the succeeding phrases do not at all suit that view, and one cannot find a passage
in the whole of the New Testament which declares this law, too, of the conscience to operate wrath or a curse. If, therefore, we must reject this reference of the ἐχθρα to the enmity of both, of Jews and Gentiles, against God, nothing remains but, with most of the interpreters, to refer it to the object which is spoken of both before and after in these verses, to the relation of the Law to those under theocratic government and those not. The bitter enmity between the two was the result of the Law, of the separating hedge. As, therefore, the latter was through Christ and the completion of His work taken away, so was the reciprocal enmity of the Jews and Gentiles taken away, objectively immediately, subjectively so far as they receive Christ in the faith; Christ was their peace in this relation also. Thus we rigorously maintain the closest connection of this whole passage; that is to say, the following ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. now describes the operation of the λίνη more accurately, and interprets authentically for us the μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, which caused the ἐχθρα between Jews and Gentiles. And such an interpretation was necessary, because those words might have been misunderstood. For it might seem as if the idea λίνη το μεσότοιχον, from its relation to the Law, stood in antagonism with the declarations of the Lord at Matt. v. 17, 18, where the abolition of the Law is expressly disavowed. St Paul cannot intend to utter the antinomian error that Christ had abolished (καταργήσας) the Law in general, both in its moral and ceremonial parts, in every relation, but only that the Law had obtained through Christ a totally different position, and so far was made inoperative in a certain relation. This relation, which through Christ is changed in reference to the Law, St Paul designates by the phrase νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν and the addition ἐν δόγμασι. The word ἐντολή denotes the expression of the νόμος for the individual case, therefore the unity of the Law comprises a multitude of ἐντολαί. It cannot be supposed that the ceremonial ordinances alone are here so called, the moral commandments of the νόμος are also to be taken as ἐντολαί; but St Paul names the Law here ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, in order to contrast it in the dividedness of its precepts with the oneness of the spirit (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, ver. 18) which reigns in the Gospel. Whereas the Law says, do this, do that, do not this, do not that, the Gospel has but the one commandment of love, and even that not in the form of a commandment, but as an
operation of grace. Certainly this holds good, also, of the law of the Gentiles written in their hearts. This, too, declares itself in a multitude of separate exhortations and warnings; but we need not mention that ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν cannot possibly be referred to this inner law also. If it were still doubtful, the ἐν δόγμαι which follows would, at all events, make the reference to the universal moral Law impossible.

But certainly the interpretation of this expression again is very uncertain. It is true, the reference of the δόγματα to Christian precepts, which, besides the Fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ὑσυμενίουσις, also Grotius, Bengel, Fritzsche, Winer,¹ and others, defend, seems inadmissible, because δόγμα elsewhere occurs only in the sense of "imperial decree, edict," in the New Testament, as Luke ii. 1, Acts xvii. 7, in the Septuagint, Daniel ii. 15. The meaning "dogma, Christian precept," is not found either in the earliest Fathers. We may suppose it was first formed when philosophers entered the Christian Church and transferred to Christ the custom of their dialect to call the precepts of the philosophers δόγματα. However, that is not decisive against that acceptance of the word in this passage, for, even if it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament in the meaning "dogma," it might have it though, just here and in Col. ii. 14, as it was used of the doctrines of philosophical schools. But here that meaning neither suits the context, nor does the idea then agree with the system of doctrine elsewhere used by the sacred writers. We nowhere find that it is taught in the New Testament that Christ had by His precepts made the Law of no effect; it is constantly said by His death, by His blood. Well, then, here too ἐν τῷ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ is to be connected with καταργήσας, so that by it the means is expressed by which Christ operates the abrogation of the Law; it denotes the giving up of His flesh, and therefore = ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (ver. 13), or διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ (ver. 16.) But now it is by no means to be perceived how afterwards ἐν δόγμαι also is possibly to be connected with καταργῆσας, so that it means, "He made the Law of no effect through His doctrines." In any case it should have been ἐν τοῦ δόγμαι αὐτοῦ, if St Paul meant it to be understood so. Therefore other interpreters (to name some, Ambrose, Calvin, Beza,

¹ Winer has proposed this view in the third edition of his Grammar, but has given it up in the fourth (p. 196, ss.)
Calovius, Wolf, Michaelis, Storr, and, among the later ones, Koppe, Flatt, Theile, Rückert) join ἐν δόγμαι with τῶν νόμων τῶν ἐντολῶν, which precedes. But Winer (Gramm. p. 196, ss.) and Harless have already correctly observed, in opposition to that view, that the article must necessarily have then been repeated. If ἐν δόγμαι were meant to contain a more accurate definition for the νόμος, it must have been τῶν ἐν δόγμαι; if, on the other hand, the definition was meant to refer to ἐντολῶν, τῶν ἐν δόγμαι should have stood. Besides, one cannot well avoid tautology so; "the law of the commandments in ordinances" says idem per idem. Nothing remains, therefore, but with Harless (in favour of whose interpretation Wines, too, declares ubi supra) to join indeed ἐν δόγμαι with καταργήσας, but not to refer it to Christian precepts, but to the commanding form in which the Law of the Old Testament appears, and to consider that form as the part of the Law abolished by Christ, so that the sense of the words is this: "Christ has, by giving up His flesh, put the Law, which declared itself in a multitude of precepts in relation to the commanding form of its ordinances, out of operation, and earned for man in lieu of it the one spirit of love."

Ver. 16. To the above is further annexed the description of the design of the Lord in this abolishment of the separating hedge of the Law, which divided mankind into itself, into Israel and non-Israel, into God's people and not God's people, into man and wife. (For, as under the New Testament Christ has a relation [to the Church] as the man to the wife [see v. 23, ss.]; so is, under the Old Testament, Israel as the man related to the heathen world as to the wife.) But the ἐνα admits of no immediate connection with the chief verb of the previous sentence, αὐτῶς γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, for in it Christ's essence is described, not His operation; the particle of intention connects itself with the participles ποιήσας, λύσας, καταργήσας, which are parallel to one another. The description of Christ as personally our peace is again resumed in the ποιών εἰρήνην, for which ποιήσας could not have stood here; for which reason also the εἰρηνοτούχας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 20, stands parallel in fact, it is true, but not in phrase, with this passage. The two national masses, Jews and non-Jews, are, however, represented as greater individuals; thence τοὺς δύο, τοὺς ἀμφότεροι. Indeed, those united
through Christ, who in verse 14 were represented as \( \epsilon\nu = \epsilon\nu\sigma\tau\eta\), are here called \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\varsigma \ \Delta\nu\theta\rho\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\)\). As, therefore, the separate individuals in the nation coalesce into a higher personality, so do nations in the totality of the race coalesce into one man; of that isolating contemplation of mankind, according to which it forms a sum of absolutely separate individualities, which are placed only \textit{side by side}, and of which each stands and falls by itself,—the Scriptures know nothing. The human race is in Christ a living unity, filled and borne by one Spirit. (See the Comm. on Gal. iii. 21, 28.) However the phrase \( \kappa\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\omicron\epsilon\varsigma \ \kappa.\ \tau. \ \lambda.\) shows that St Paul does not use \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\varsigma \ \Delta\nu\theta\rho\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) as a mere personification. According to the phrase \( \kappa\tau\omega\sigma\theta\omicron\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\) \( \epsilon\nu \ \chi\rho\iota\omicron\tau\omicron\) \( \iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\) in verse 10, \textit{here} too the \( \epsilon\nu \ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\omicron\epsilon\varsigma\) is not to be referred to Christ’s death, as if it were \( = \ \epsilon\nu \ \tau\eta \ \sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota \ \alpha\iota\tau\omicron\omicron\) in verse 15, but St Paul represents in it Christ Himself as the true one universal man, the representative of the race, in whom the two separated halves have returned to a perfect unity. As Adam is the one old man, in whom and through whom all the individuals of the race receive the old man, so is Christ the one new man, in whom and through whom all receive the new man, made after God in righteousness and holiness. (See the obs. in the Comm. on Rom. v. 12, ss.) Accordingly it is clear that the \( \tau\alpha \ \Delta\mu\phi\omicron\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\ \epsilon\nu \ \tau\omicron\omicron\epsilon\iota\nu\), the \( \kappa\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \delta\iota\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \epsilon\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\varsigma \ \Delta\nu\theta\rho\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\), is not to be something merely outward, a purely negative removal of the separating medium, but something really inward; the process of Christ’s life was the actual creation of this one new man. But now the question arises, how, after this, is the second half of the subordinate clause \( \epsilon\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\xi\gamma \ \kappa.\ \tau. \ \lambda.\) to be taken, without merging in the former half? If we with Harless conceive the union which Christ effected between those under and those not under theocratic government as an \textit{outward} one only, there certainly results here an \textit{advance}, inasmuch as those at first \textit{outwardly} united are afterwards by the cross, \textit{i.e.} by the death of the Son of God on the cross, also \textit{inwardly} reconciled with God. But this hypothesis, that the union of Israel and non-Israel is to be conceived as a merely outward one, can only be purchased at the expense of the idea in the preceding words. We must, therefore, look about us for another acceptation of the \( \epsilon\nu\ \alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\xi\gamma\), in relation to the preceding \( \epsilon\nu\ \kappa\tau\iota\sigma\gamma\). First of all it is decided
that the words τοὺς ἄμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι scil. ὑπάρχοντας are to be closely connected. The one body forms the antithesis to the former separateness in the dual state, and σώμα denotes, as is usual in the language of St Paul (Rom. xii. 5, πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἐσμέν ἐν Χριστῷ, 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13, εἰς ἐν σώμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν, Ephes. iv. 12, 16, v. 23; Col. i. 18, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15), the Church as Christ's body, which He fills with His life. The ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in our passage is parallel with the ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι in verse 18; Jews and Gentiles are in spiritual unity in one body. (See at iv. 4.) As the individual is divided into σώμα and πνεῦμα, so also does the united Christ of the Church (1 Cor. xii. 12) bear in Himself σώμα and πνεῦμα. (In the same way also in Col. iii. 15 it is said ἐκκλησία ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι.) The referring the words to the atoning death of Christ, as if they were ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, verse 15, is unsuitable in every respect. In the first place, the διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ already expresses that idea; for to take those words as a subordinate definition to ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι in the sense, "by means of the giving up of His one body, that is to say through the cross," is altogether opposed to St Paul's usual style. It is self-evident that the giving up of the body took place through the death on the cross, and so St Paul in using σταυρωθεῖ constant almost supposes the body as what was put to death by the cross. But then in this acceptance of the ἐν σώματι the addition of ἐν ἐνὶ is unsuitable. That Christ's body was One has no relation to the atonement at all, but, on the contrary, the previous duality of the Jews and the Gentiles is very properly placed in opposition to the unity of both in the body of the Church, whereby too the close juxtaposition of τοὺς ἄμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι is alone satisfactorily explained. Finally, it is but little likely that St Paul should have expressed the same idea five times in vers. 15 and 16, and that the phrases: ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἐνυμῷ, ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι, διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, and ἐν αὐτῷ, which are so different, mean exactly the same thing. True, a similar heaping up is found in Col. i. 22 in the words: ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, but brought together however on one point, not as a repetition in the same proposition in different places.

But now as to the question, already touched on, of how ἴνα ἀποκαταλλάξῃ is connected with the preceding ἴνα κτίσῃ, we
must not, as we have already remarked, in accordance with the correct definition of the κτιζεω εν εαυτω εις δυα καινοι ανθρωποι, in the ἀποκαταλλάσσειν see anything specifically different from what we see in the κτιζεω; on the contrary, the first half of the clause expressing intention is to receive from the second only its more accurate definition. The sense of the words would accordingly have to be paraphrased in the following way: "That He might in Himself make the two into one new man, and at the same time also reconcile (which the κτιζεω necessarily involves) not the Jews merely, but both Jews and Gentiles, united in the one body of the Church, to God through the cross, killing the enmity between them through Himself, (i.e. through the giving Himself up unto death), i.e. removing it, annihilating it." (The double compound ἀποκαταλλάσσειν is found, besides our passage, also Col. i. 20, 21. Elsewhere καταλλάσσω is always put. In profane authors the form strengthened by ἀπό, and found here and in the Epistle to the Colossians, has the meaning "to reconcile again." St Paul, on the contrary, uses it indifferently with καταλλάσσω.)

Ver. 17, 18. To the representation of the work of Christ itself is annexed in these verses the mention of the announcement of that work to man. The clause καὶ ἔλθων ειπρεγέλισατο can by grammatical connection only be joined with ver. 14, αὕτως γὰρ ἐστιν κ. τ. λ.; but, as the intermediate ideas do not discover the nature of a parenthetical clause, ἔλθων cannot be referred to Christ's becoming man, and to His teaching before His death, because mention had already been made before of that death, as the means to abolish the divided condition of mankind; it is rather to be understood of Christ's being come in His Spirit. (See John xiv. 18.) Before the completion of His work by His death, Christ was not our peace, His teaching before His death was only a prophesying as to Himself, the true publication of the Gospel did not begin till the pouring out of the Spirit. Before the completion of His work, so little did the Lord view those under, and those not under theocratic government as one, that He even said to His disciples, Matt. x. 5, 6, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not," and to the woman of Canaan, "I am not sent but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24.) The διδι' αὑτωθ ἐχομεν κ. τ. λ. also necessarily supposes Christ's
work as already completed; for δι' αὐτοῦ means διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, and the προσαγωγὴ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα supposes the νικήσεως (i. 5) which first imparts the experience of salvation. The ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνί πνεύματι, which answers to the ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνί σώματι above, ver. 16, shows, as does also what follows (ver. 19, ss.), that St Paul still continues to have the leading idea in his mind, namely, the difference between Jews and non-Jews which had been abolished by Christ. (In ver. 17 B.D.F.G. read εἰρήνην repeated before τοῦ ἐγγύς, a reading which Lachmann has justly received into the text.—Ver. 18. As to προσαγωγή see Rom. v. 2.—From the idea of the μακραν is obtained of itself that of access, of the being permitted to approach; if one wishes to suppose further a special reference, the only admissible one is that borrowed from the Temple, which the Gentiles were not allowed to approach. —Ἔν ἐνί πνεύματι is, of course, not “through one spirit, but united in one spirit,” thus forming an unity of spiritual life, in which the former distinctions are abolished. Comp. Gal. iii. 28.)

Vers. 19, 20. After this, St Paul then introduces the close of this chain of ideas, by representing, with a retrospect to the picture of the Gentile world in ver. 12, this state of estrangement as now removed from among his readers; like the Christian Israelites, they too, the Gentile Christians, are members in the πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, yea, stones in the building of the Temple, which the Church of Christ represents. (Ver. 19. As to ἀρα see on Rom. vii. 23.—Whilst ξένοι and συμπολίται τῶν ἀγίων correspond to each other, πάροικοι and οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ are opposed to each other. The two former words are sufficiently explained by ver. 12. The form συμπολίτης is not found again in the New Testament; the grammarians designate it as not Greek. [See Phrynichus, Lobeck’s Edn. p. 172.] However, Josephus uses the word, Antiq. xix. 2. 2. But the second antithesis gives rise to a difficulty, because πάροικοι does not seem to suit this connection. It usually means an emigrant, i.e. one who is allowed to live in a city or land, but has no right of citizenship, connected therefore with ξένοι, as indeed it occurs Acts vii. 6, 29, 1 Peter ii. 11, along with ξένος. But that meaning does not suit here as an antithesis to οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. This phrase points to the image of a family of God (Gal. vi. 10) to which the idea of a Father naturally leads; in this family the Jews are conceived as the proper inmates, and the Gentiles as
next neighbours, or as Meier expresses himself, as vagrants (Beissessen, manants, Fr.) who are, it is true, in the great house of God along with the Jews, but do not properly belong to the family.) The figure, according to which all believers together are conceived as a temple, the corner-stone of which is Christ, whose foundations are the apostles and prophets, often occurs in the Scriptures. Each individual is called a temple (1 Cor. vi. 19), and again all together also form a ναός Θεοῦ (1 Cor. iii. 16.) The figure is most completely carried out in 1 Peter ii. 4, ss. There Christ is called λίθος ζῶν, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένος, παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸς, ἐντιμος. The individual believers, who are built upon Christ (ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι, see 1 Cor. iii. 10), also bear the name λίθου ζώντως, and the whole building of the Temple is designated an οἶκος πνευματικός. The basis of this figurative representation is formed by the typical conception of the stone Temple in Jerusalem, which was not arbitrarily built on that exact plan, but after patterns from a higher world (Exod. xxv. 8, 9.) The only difficulty in our passage is caused by the remark that the apostles and the prophets form the θεμέλιος, which again is to be conceived as reposing upon Christ, as the proper foundation and corner-stone. For in other passages, to name one, Rev. xxi. 14, the twelve apostles alone form the δώδεκα θεμελίων of the Church. It is a question, first of all, are we here to think of the prophets of the Old Testament or of those of the New Testament? Everything is in favour of the latter. Not merely the circumstance, that the prophets are named after the apostles, but also the absence of the article, which makes apostles and prophets appear most intimately united, and the nature of the case; the prophets of the Old Testament cannot well be called foundations of the Temple, which grows out of Christ (ver. 21.) But how can the prophets of the New Testament be set on a par with the apostles in relation to the foundation of the Church? Inasmuch as the Holy Ghost, which fills them both, is the real element which lays that foundation; whilst Christ is called the corner-stone in His person, the apostles and prophets are called the foundation, not in relation to their persons, but in regard to their doctrine and the Holy Ghost, which accompanied it, taken together. It is otherwise in Revelations; that there stress is laid on the number 12 is connected with the whole description of the new Jerusalem in that passage, and can therefore exercise no influence
over our passage, otherwise neither could St Paul, as not being comprised in the number 12, be reckoned among the founders of the Church. (Ver. 20. ἄκρογωνιαῖος is found again in 1 Peter ii. 6. It stands for the Hebrew כְּפַלָּה γωνίας, Is. xxviii. 16; Ps. cxviii. 22; Matt xxi. 42.)

Vers. 21, 22. As the building of the Church rests on Christ as the corner-stone, so it also increases continually in Him, i.e., in the fellowship of all the members of the Church with Christ in their introduction into Him. Both verses express substantially the same idea, for the second ἐν φὶ must not be connected with ναὸς, but with κύριος, and is consequently parallel with the first ἐν φὶ. But ver. 22 again in the καὶ ὑμεῖς renders the reference to the Gentile Christians expressly prominent, as necessary parts for the completion of the building of the Church. But the concluding words of ver. 24, εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι, define more accurately the idea of the ναὸς ἁγίου ἐν κυρίῳ. Indeed this addition ἐν κυρίῳ is produced by the image which St Paul made use of in ver. 20; as it has this meaning to designate the ναὸς ἁγίου as a spiritual community: ἐν κυρίῳ has nothing at all pneumatic in it either, though ἐν φὶ went before, for that ἐν φὶ only defines the participle συναρμολογομένης. But the κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι describes still more expressly the nature of this spiritual community, which is built up in Christ with Gentiles and Jews. The Church is in it described as the lodging, in which God Himself takes up His abode (see 2 Cor. vi. 16, ss.), and that too permanently, inasmuch as it is of a spiritual nature, in opposition to the κατοικητήριον γῆς, from which the whole simile is borrowed. (Ver. 21. The ἦ after πᾶσα is wanting in

B.D.E.G., it is, therefore, no doubt, to be struck out. Only πᾶσα ἁρμονία must not be rendered "every building," since mention is made here of the one Temple only, but "the whole building." In the Greek of later times πᾶσα often has the meaning totus even without the article. [See generally on the use of πᾶσα Winer's Gramm. p. 110, and Harless on this passage.]—Συναρμολογία is found again only at iv. 16. It = συμβιβάζεως, and refers to the firmness of the building, in which the different personalities and opinions [iv. 10] are put together. The form αὐξανως, instead of the usual αὔξανος, is found nowhere else in the New Testament but Col. ii. 19.—Ver. 22. On account of ἐν φὶ, which precedes, the
ἐν πνεύματι cannot be connected with συνοικοδομεῖος, but only with the collective idea κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Harless chooses to take ἐν πνεύματι "in the Holy Ghost;" but against that acceptance are: 1, the preceding ἐν φόροι, i.e. ἐν κυρίῳ; 2, the τοῦ Θεοῦ. St Paul certainly says χαρά, ἀγάπη, ἐν πνεύματι, but he does not, and cannot, say: Θεὸς ἐν πνεύματι, because the Spirit itself is God. Εἶν πνεύματι forms here the antithesis with ἐν σαρκί, with a glance at the νᾶος χειροποιητός.

Chap. iii. 1. To this description of the glory of the Church St Paul meant now to add only a prayer, in which he beseeches God to realize in his readers all that belongs to the idea of the Church, in order with it to close entirely this general part of his Epistle; but he allows himself by the liveliness of his feelings to be once more led into a discussion, so that he does not till ver. 14 again resume the discourse begun in ver. 1. Certainly there has been no want of attempts to avoid the assumption of an Anatolthon in ver. 1, by proposing to make ver. 1 an independent proposition, by supplying the verb which is wanting. Some MSS., to name some, D.E., supply προσβείω, which may be supposed to have come into the text from vi. 20, others κακαίχημαι, perhaps after Phil. ii. 16. Most of the interpreters, who are against the ἀνακόλουθος, content themselves with the supplying of εἰμί. But, to make no mention of the difficulty, which the τοῦτον χάριν causes on this assumption, the article must then necessarily have been wanting before δέσμως. But, if we are to suppose a digression in ver. 2, St Paul cannot possibly take up the discourse again in ver. 8, or ver. 13, or even iv. 1, as many have been pleased to think, but only, as all the better later interpreters assume, in ver. 14, where the τοῦτον χάριν expressly marks the resumption of the discourse. Thus the thanksgiving prayer in ver. 14 ss. is brought into connection with the description of the Church in ii. 19 ss., in the glory of which the Gentiles also have a share, and the τοῦτον χάριν appears, therefore, in well-founded connection. But St Paul makes mention of his bonds here in order, we may suppose, to allow the glory just described to appear in stronger contrast with the then existing state of the Church, and especially to make the Gentiles observe, by what sacrifices on his part their entrance into the Church had been purchased. Considered in and for itself, one might here take the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἔννοιον "for your sake, i.e. because I have preached
to the Gentiles." But if one compares verse 13, and especially the decisive parallel passage Col. i. 24, it results that here too the words are to be taken "for your benefit:" in what sense this is more particularly to be understood will be found determined at Col. i. 24 more in detail. (We find at iv. 1 ὁ δέσμος ἐν κυρίῳ for ὁ δέσμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. The genitive here is to be taken as a designation of the active cause, "whom Christ and His cause have made a prisoner, and that too unto salvation for you, the Gentiles, i.e. for the whole body of Gentiles,” as in Philem., verse 13, δεσμῷ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου denote bonds, which the Gospel has brought with it.)

Vers. 2, 3. The expression which follows, and with which the digression extending to verse 13 begins, shows the uncertainty of St Paul as to whether all his readers were acquainted with him personally. By it is explained the naming his name in verse 1, and the picture of his then existing state, and that very uncertainty was also the occasion for St Paul in what follows to expatiated on his position with regard to the Gospel and on the comprehension of the latter, again with reference to the main point of the calling of the Gentiles for the kingdom of God, before the chief thread of his discourse is again taken up. St Paul does not name his apostolic office in general, but the dispensation of the grace of God, that to him was made known the mystery of the redemption by immediate revelation and with special reference to the Gentiles, as that, with regard to which he shows himself uncertain in respect to his readers’ knowledge of it. The subordinate clause δικαίως ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ. defines, that is to say, the idea of the chief clause εἶδε ηκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τ. Θ. κ.τ.λ. more accurately. (Verse 2. See on εἶδε and its relation to εἶπεν. the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. viii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 3; Gal. iii. 4. Εἶδε here contains the idea of pre-supposition in itself: "that is to say, if you, as I may suppose, have heard."—On οἰκονομία see on i. 10. It cannot here, as at i Cor. ix. 17, Col. i. 25, mean "the apostolical office," as people have let themselves be misled into thinking here also by the latter parallel passage; on the contrary, the reference to the office here is couched in the χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, as the addition τῆς δοξείας μου εἰς ἡμᾶς shows, while Col. i. 25 relates to οἰκονομία. The οἰκονομία here denotes only the way
how the office came into St Paul's hands, viz., κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.
In verse 7 κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ. stands together just in the same way, and in verse 8 St Paul himself explains the grace of his apostolical call to preach to the Gentiles.—In the εἰς ὑμᾶς the special reference to the Gentiles is again pointed to, for whom St Paul was especially called.—Verse 3. The ἀποκάλυψις relates, of course, to the occurrence at Damascus, Acts ix.—Instead of the reading of the text. rec. ἐγνώρισε, which was surely put in the text only on account of the ἐγνωρίσθη which follows in verse 5, we must read ἐγνωρίσθη on the authority of A.B.C.D.F.G., and with all the better critics and interpreters.)

Ver. 4. In a subordinate clause, which, however, need not be, with Griesbach, exactly put in brackets, St Paul appeals, with respect to the mystery of Christ, which is imparted to him by revelation, to his own earlier communications to them, from which they might understand his knowledge in the mystery of Christ. This idea has something very striking in it, inasmuch as St Paul seems by it to set up his readers as judges over him; they are to judge of his knowledge in the Gospel from his communications to them; it seems that they, on the contrary, would first of all be obliged to learn from him what the mystery of Christ is. But St Paul, as believers, imagines them in his own mind as endowed with the Holy Ghost, and through Him with the gift of the διάκρισις πνευμάτων, and thus the idea is meant to express this alone: "the Spirit in you will testify unto you that my representation of the Gospel is the true one." But St Paul would certainly not have made that remark, had there not been persons, who denied him the true σύνεσις ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and of whom it was to be supposed that they would sooner or later also appear against him in the churches to whom this Epistle is addressed. (As to καθός see i. 4.—The referring the προεγραψα to an earlier Epistle is quite inadmissible; the expression is only to be referred to the previous declarations of St Paul in this very Epistle. In using it St Paul is scarcely thinking of any particular passage, he has the Epistle up to that point before his eyes, and it was already enough to make his readers conscious of the apostolical spirit which animated him.—Πρὸς δ' "according to that, in consequence of that." The ἀναγινώσκοντες forbids us to think of any vivē voce expositions.
whatever; it is to be referred immediately to the public reading of
the Epistle in the congregations.—The σῶνες is here the gnosis in
its more defined, as it were, scientific, form. See the remarks on i. 8.)

Ver. 5. St Paul does not mean in the words which follow to
explain why he calls this decree of God a μυστήριον, which is
Meyer’s opinion, but to place the apostolical form of revelation as
the higher one in comparison with all previous ones. The decree
of God in Christ is called a μυστήριον only inasmuch as it cannot
be perceived by human power, but only by means of divine reve-
lation. Stress must, therefore, be laid on the ὦς νῦν ἀπεκάλυφθη, to
which an οἷς οὗτος ἐγνωρίσθη, as an antithesis, is to be un-
derstood. (The δ is connected with the μυστήριον immediately
preceding, not with that in verse 3, which would be requi-
site if a parenthesis were supposed. Τίοι τῶν ἁγίων is a
general designation of men as such; St Paul certainly thought
especially of the Prophets of the Old Testament, but he seems
designedly to conceive the idea in quite a general way; “the mys-
tery has not been made known to men in general, wherever they
may have been and whenever they may have lived, as it is now
revealed to the Prophets.” Ὑπεδά denotes here age, generation.
The ἐν is rejected by the MSS. with an overwhelming majority.
The dative is usual in definitions of time.—See Winer’s Gramm. p.
194. On the juxtaposition of ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται see on ii.
20. The αὐτῶν here added, which refers to God, is certainly ge-
nuine, since the omission of it is easily explained by ii. 20. But
it is undoubtedly singular, that St Paul here calls the apostles, and
consequently himself along with them, “holy apostles.” Certainly
it is carried too far, when De Wette finds in that a mark of the non-
apostolical origin of the Epistle; but still the expression is unusual.
I explain it to myself by the fact of St Paul’s here conceiving the
apostles and prophets as a corporation [see iv. 11], and gives them
as such, therefore, in their official character, the predicate ἄγιος,
just as he calls the faithful, considered as a body, ἄγιοι, or ἡγιασ-
μένοι, but never an individual, ἄγιος, &c. The connection of ἄγιος
with ἐν πνεύματι, which Meier proposes, has no recommendation at
all; ἐν πνεύματι is undoubtedly to be taken as a closer definition of
ἀπεκαλύφθη.)

Ver. 6. The circumstance in which St Paul now finds the pro-
gress in the revelation of the mystery of Christ, as it was im-
parted to the apostles and prophets, is once more the calling of the Gentiles along with the Jews through the Gospel. But now that certainly seems to have been already clearly taught in the Old Testament also (see Isaiah lv. 5, lx. 3, ss. 10 ss.; Jerem. iii. 16, sq.), and therefore everything specific in the revelation in the New Testament to be lost! But in the Old Testament just that point, which was the decisive one in regard to the question as to the relation of the Gentiles to the Church, and which St Paul had to defend against the Jewish Christians, was not discussed; the Gentiles were, it is true, represented in the Old Testament as called to the kingdom of the Messiah, but without any clear information on the point that they would enter it immediately, not through the medium of circumcision and of the ceremonial law. The universal character of Christianity was first completed by enlightenment on that decisive point. The apostles officially recognized that great truth under the illumination of the Holy Ghost (Acts 15); but St Paul was called more than the rest to translate it into life, and to defend it against all gainsayers. (The infinitive εἰρήνευ connects itself with what precedes as denoting not the design, but only the explanation, "that is to say that the Gentiles are to be, &c."—We have already had συγκληρονόμος, i. 14. Χύσσωμος we may suppose was invented by St Paul himself; it is found in ecclesiastical writers alone, who certainly borrowed the word from St Paul's Epistles. Συμμέτοχος is found also in v. 7.—There is no climax couched in the words; it rather seems as if the former expression was only more accurately defined by the two latter ones; however, the repetition of the σὺν is meant to put the leading idea in a clear light.—Lachmann has erased the αὐτῶν before ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ on the authority of A.B.C.D. Only, one does not perceive who would have added it if it were originally wanting in the text, whilst we can understand how it might easily have been blotted out by抄ists.)

Vers. 7, 8. The apostle represents himself, then, as a servant of this Gospel, according to the grace bestowed on him to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but designates himself in his humility, in spite of the grandeur of his call, as the least of all the saints; therefore not merely of the holy apostles but of all the saints, with reference to his former persecution of the Church of the Lord before his conversion. (Ver. 7. Compare Col. i. 23, 25 as a parallel passage.—As to δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος see on ver. 2. Ver. 8 explains
more in detail what the χάρις consists in, viz. in the authority to preach the Gospel among the Gentiles.—Τῇς δοθέασις is, after Griesbach and Lachmann, to be justly preferred to the reading of the text. rec. τὴν δοθέασαν, as the χάρις, not the δωρεά, denotes the office.—On the combination ενέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως, see i. 19. The mention of the power of God is founded on the circumstance that St Paul sees in his change of heart from a foe to a friend of Christ an act of omnipotence. Calvin had already taken it so quite correctly, saying on this passage: domini est homines nihil extollere; hæc est potentie ejus efficacia, ex nihil o grande aliquid efficere.—Ver. 8. The designation of himself by St Paul as ἔλαχιστότερος πάντων ἀνίκων is no false modesty. He was even well aware on the other hand [1 Cor. xv. 9, 10] that he had laboured more than they all, but that he ascribed to the grace of God alone, himself he knew only in his wretchedness.—On the comparative form of the superlative see Winer’s Gramm., p. 67, and Wetstein, ad h. l.—Ἀνεξίχνιαστος is found again at Rom. xi. 33.—On τὸ πλοῦτος see at ii. 7.)

Ver. 9. But St Paul’s task as the preacher of the Gospel is further also to enlighten all men as to the preparation of the mystery of redemption which was hidden in God from eternity and revealed in Christ. The καὶ φωτίσας πάντας cannot, as Meier will have it, form merely a more accurate definition of the ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖσιν εἰσαγγελίασασθαι, which precedes, but is a fresh idea. True, St Paul has first of all the task of preaching among the Gentiles, but afterwards also the one of enlightening all men on the mystery of Christ, and be therefore, according to the testimony of the Acts, really always offered the Gospel to the Jews first. Of course, however, the φωτίσας πάντας is to be understood not of the actual result, but of the tendency of the office, so that what St Paul himself could not execute remained for his successors to do. Further, here is no occasion in the idea of the οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου to assert also the reference to the calling of the Gentiles to the kingdom of God, to which acceptance it may be supposed the reading κοινωνία owes its origin. In vers. 18, 19, St Paul himself explains the expression τίς ἡ οἰκονομία. It is to denote merely the riches of the divine grace which are revealed in the ordinance of redemption through Christ. This mystery, however, is designated as hidden in God from eternity in order to contrast the present in
the νῦν, as the time of the revelation, with the past. But the object of the addition, τὸ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι, is the most difficult thing to point out in this passage. For that the reading διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is wanting in all the better MSS., is not genuine, may be considered just as decidedly certain as the interpretation of the words of the physical not of the spiritual creation of the new birth, in conformity with the striking remarks of Harless ad. h. l. Usteri and Meier have again recommended the latter acceptance of the words in addition to Calvin, Calixtus, and others. But both the aorist of the participle and the τὰ πάντα require the reference of the words to the creation generally. But for what purpose does St Paul here exalt the creative energy of God? In order, we may suppose, to make it observed that the institution of the redemption in Christ Himself is a creative act of God, and could emanate from Him only who has made all things; the Creator alone could also be the Redeemer. (On φατίζειν see at i. 18. A.B.C.D.E.F.G. and other important critical authorities read οἰκονομία, so that there can be no question whatever as to the decision for it and against κοινωνία.—In addition to ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν ἔνδοξῃ, Gen. vi. 4, F.G. read also καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν. But this addition is quite incongruous, for it points to the historical development of mankind, but St Paul intends, as the ἐν τῷ Θεῷ shows, to speak of the metaphysical eternity, of the decree of redemption, as God conceived it in His eternal being, which is called πρόβεσις τῶν διώνων in the following verse.)

Ver. 10. The following idea is clear, it is true, when taken literally, but it contains a difficulty, partly in itself, partly in the connection of the passage. "The infinite wisdom of God," says St Paul ("which reveals itself in the Gospel—the mystery of redemption), is through the Church (as the theatre of His working) made known to the angels in heaven." According to this St Paul supposes the angels capable of an increase of their knowledge. We have no reason, on this occasion, to think of good angels only or bad angels only. St Paul speaks quite generally. All higher beings receive by means of the Church a deeper insight into God's wisdom. We found in the Gospels that sympathy with what goes on in the Church is attributed to the angels; to name one case, joy at the penitence of sinners (Luke xv. 10). St Paul says further, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, "we are become a spectacle to
the angels" (iv. 9); but here only is the discourse of an increase of
their insight into God's wisdom through the Church and the events in
her. An echo of it is also found in 1 Pet. i. 12 in the words, εἰς &
ἐπιθυμουσιν ἄγγελοι παρακώπα. This idea now is difficult to con-
ceive, since, as we cannot imagine in the angels any propagation,
so neither can we imagine any development, nor, therefore, in gen-
eral, any history. The earth, along with man, the bearer of her
consciousness, appears, according to this idea of the apostle, again
as the centre of God's workings, as the Golgotha of the universe.
The universe takes part in the occurrences on her, not merely in the
contemplation of them, but also in the actual reaction of them.
The increase of knowledge in the angels is to be conceived as at
the same time a change of their position; all that is in heaven and
on earth is reconciled through Christ. (Ephes. i. 10; Col. i. 20.)
The particular thing, however, which is now first (νῦν), i.e. after
the revelation of the hidden decree of God, made known to them,
as πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, is the wonderful way of God in
the pardon of the sinner, through the settlement in him of the anta-
gonism between justice and grace. But how comes St Paul upon
this idea here in this connection? St Paul wishes to contrast the
grandeur of his call with his personal nothingness, and therefore
pursues the theme of his labours through all its stages. "First of
all," says he, "he has to preach among the Gentiles, then to en-
lighten all men as to the mystery, and both in order to make
known the infinite wisdom of God even to the angels in heaven."
(Νῦν is wanting in L.G., but it certainly is necessary to the con-
text; it forms the antithesis to the eternal hiddeness of the divine
decree.—As to ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see on i. 3, 20.—Πολυποί-
κιλος is, it may be supposed, coined by St Paul himself, for it is
not found again in Greek. It means properly multiformis, mani-
fold, manifomed, polymorphous; as a predicate of God's wisdom
it denotes the various forms in which it manifests itself.)

Vers. 11, 12. In conclusion, St Paul refers the wisdom of God,
which is now made manifest to the angels, to the eternal decree of
redemption (see on i. 5, 10), which He conceived in Christ, in
whom through faith Christians have joy and access to God. (In
verse 11 πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων is "the purpose determined on in
eternity," as Jude ver. 6, κρίνεις μεγαλὴς ἡμέρας, "judgment that
will take place on the great day."—Further, the ἐπολήσεων ἐν
Χριστός is necessarily to be referred to the historical realization of God's decree through Christ's sufferings and death, not to the inner act of the divine will. For, in the first place, the aorist leads to that interpretation, and secondly, the form of the name; Christ Jesus constantly designates, without exception, the Word become flesh.—Afterwards, ver. 12 gives the consequence of the decree being carried out; παρῆγαθα denotes the aspect of the state of faith as regards the world, and προσαγωγή the one that regards God [see ii. 18].—The accumulation of substantives has given occasion to various readings. F.G. read τὴν προσαγωγὴν εἰς τὴν παρῆγαθαν, D. reads ἐν τῷ ἐλευθερωθήναι for ἐν τῇ πεποιθήσει. But the common text deserves the preference on the testimony of all critical authorities. Πεποιθήσεις (see 2 Cor. i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2) is certainly closely related to παρῆγαθα. It here defines the προσαγωγὴ more accurately as a coming near unto God, which proceeds in a trustful tone of mind. On the other hand, διὰ τῆς πάπτεως αὑτοῦ denotes the means by which both παρῆγαθα and προσαγωγὴ are alone possible. The genitive αὑτοῦ relates to Christ; see on this construction in lieu of εἰς αὐτὸν the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. iii. 26.)

Ver. 13. The idea which follows at length concludes the long digression which has been going on from verse 2 forth; we may add that it is treated so generally that many interpretations of it are possible, and have been proposed. Θεὸν or ὑμᾶς may be supplied at αὐτοῦμα, or again ἐμέ or ὑμᾶς at ἐκκακεῖν. With Harless I prefer the supplying αὐτοῦμα Θεὸν μὴ ἐκκακεῖν ἐμέ, because it is only so that the ἐν receives its proper meaning, and διὰ too by this interpretation is best connected with the preceding idea. That is to say, I suppose that St Paul had spoken in what precedes of his great task, with which is fitly connected: "for the reason that so great a charge has been entrusted to me I beseech God that I may not faint in my tribulations for you." But the ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν I connect, on account of the analogy of iii. 1 and Col. i. 24 (on which see more particulars), with θλίψει μοι, not with αὐτοῦμα. The last words of the verse, ἤτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν, again admit of a double reference also; that is to say, the ἤτις, attracted by the δόξα, which follows, can be joined to θλίψεις, or to the μὴ ἐκκακεῖν. I prefer the latter, because it could be asserted only in a forced way that St Paul's tribulations were a glory of the Gentile
Christians. On the other hand, the idea: "my indefatigable endurance of all dangers, the approving of my faith in tribulations, that is your glory," is very suitable.

Vers. 14, 15. Here now St Paul resumes with τούτου χάριν the course of ideas from ver. 1, and utters the prayer for his readers, which should come in immediately after ii. 22. The bending of the knees is mentioned Acts xx. 46 as a symbol of devotion and humiliation before God. But the designation of the Father by the addition εὐ κ. τ. λ. is peculiar here; for the words τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ here are decidedly not genuine, according to A.B.C., and indeed Lachmann has on that account justly erased them. The proposition εὐ κ. τ. λ. is therefore immediately connected with πατέρα, by which means the reference to Christ is excluded, or rather God is designated in the most general sense as Father, i.e. as Creator of all beings. According to the special reference of the prayer to the Gentile Christians (ver. 1), the clause declares expressly that God is the Father of the Gentiles also, not of the Jews alone. The meaning of the clause εὐ κ. τ. λ. is entirely determined by the acceptation of the word πατρία, for the formula ὄνομάζεσθαι ἐκ τινός cannot be translated otherwise than: "to receive the name from something," and not as = εἶναι "to be," much less "to be made." Now πατρία is found again in the New Testament only at Luke ii. 4, Acts iii. 25, in the sense of φυλή, "family, the whole of those who are descended from one πατήρ." But the idea, "every family in heaven and on earth," has something unsuitable in it. That is to say, the reference to heaven can only extend to the world of angels, in regard to which, however, there can be no question of a φυλή, because no propagation takes place in it. Grotius, Wetstein, and Holzhausen, thought they could solve that difficulty by availing themselves of the Rabbinical idea, according to which the Jews are represented as the earthly, the angels as the heavenly, family of God. (See Buxtorf. lexic. talm. p. 1753. The Rabbis had received the word also.) But surely in this Epistle St Paul is precisely occupied with proving that Jews and Gentiles are equals; it is therefore utterly improbable that he would here pay any attention to that particular representation. And besides, then the article too would necessarily have had to be repeated before ἐν οὕρανοις and ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Just as little admissible is another interpretation, according
to which πατριὰ is taken in the sense of "fatherhood," πατρότης. For if that meaning does seem to afford a good sense, still it is not demonstrable that πατριὰ ever occurs so. Again, the idea "fatherhood in heaven" is unsuitable, because in the world of spirits no development takes place. The passage seems then only to become plain, when we take πᾶσα here too, as at ii. 21, in the sense of "entire," although the article is wanting. St Paul conceives in his mind all the beings of the creation in their two halves, the spiritual and the material world, as one posterity, as one family of God (compare ii. 19, οἰκεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ), and this entire family has its name of children from God. As to the sense, therefore, Luther's version: "all that are called children in heaven and on earth," is quite correct.

Ver. 16. The first thing which the apostle now begs of God for his readers is that He, according to the riches of His glory (which includes along with it His almighty power particularly), may strengthen them as to the inner man. The κραταιοθήναι, which is further enforced by the adverbial δυνάμει, refers especially to the will; the strengthening of the will through God's Spirit alludes, however, to the fight which awaits all Christians. In the εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἀνθρώπων, finally, the direction of the working of the Spirit is more accurately defined; the divine Spirit operating in the believer refers particularly not to the σῶμα, the ἔσω ἀνθρώπων, but to the human πνεῦμα, or the latter considered as a faculty, to the νοῦς, as the ἔσω ἀνθρώπων. Mention of this antithesis was made as far back as Rom. vii. 22, 23. The inner man is not = the κακὸς ἀνθρώπων, even the unregenerate man, living under the Law, has the ἔσω ἀνθρώπων, the νοῦς. But without the operation of divine grace through the Holy Ghost it remains in that ματαιότης (iv. 17), which makes it incapable of conquering; it is only through strength from above that the νοῦς becomes a conqueror. (See on Rom. vii. 25.)

Vers. 17, 18. The meaning of the κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν cannot in and for itself be doubtful after what has been observed at ii. 22. By it is denoted the indwelling of Christ, the Χριστὸς ἐν ἡμῖν (Col. i. 27), which realizes itself in the new birth through the working of the Holy Ghost on the one side, and of the receptivity of man (of the πίστις) on the other. (Compare the remarks on John xiv. 23, Gal.
ii. 20.) But how is the idea here connected with what precedes and with what succeeds? St Paul cannot entreat God: ἱνα δοθῇ κατοικήσας τῶν Χριστῶν εν υμῖν, for surely Christ already dwelt in the hearts of the readers (ii. 22), inasmuch as they are treated by the apostle as regenerate. Certainly the regenerate man may by degrees be more and more strengthened in the work of sanctification by the inner man, but regeneration itself, and the dwelling of Christ in the heart connected with regeneration, are incapable of increase, they merely are, or they are not. This difficulty can only be removed by connecting the following words: εν ἡγάπῃ ἐφηκαμένου καὶ τεθεμελιωμένου immediately with the κατοικήσας κ.τ.λ.—True, the passage being considered from a purely grammatical point of view, the connection of the clause εν ἡγάπῃ κ.τ.λ. seems to require a Metathesis of the ἱνα; but the isolation of the κατοικήσας τῶν Χριστῶν διὰ τῆς πίστεως εν ταῖς καρδίαις υμῶν thereby produced totally forbids that supposition, on account of the intrinsic difficulties. The Anacoluthus, which is accordingly to be supposed here (just as in Col. ii. 2), is excellently justified by Harless remarking (p. 318), “the change of construction (in the nominative of the participles) was the more natural here, that the predicate applied in like manner to καρδίαις and to υμῶν, therefore could be less properly joined exclusively with one of the two, and moreover the definition of the predicate as an essential point in the clause could not be subordinate to the preceding, but must appear independently.” In this mode of taking it then that great difficulty entirely vanishes. St Paul prays for the indwelling of Christ not as something else after the being strengthened in the inner man, but this latter appears as a subordinate definition only of the being strengthened, in this sense, that a dwelling of Christ in a mind not as yet established is distinguished from a dwelling in the established one. “That therefore Christ may by faith dwell in you, as in such as are established in love.” The new birth is therefore presupposed in them, but St Paul beseeches God that they may wax in sanctification, that they may be firm also in their regeneration, and not relapse into their old ways. The τεθεμελιωμένου has a retrospective reference to the above figure of the Temple (ii. 20, ss.); on the other hand, ἐφηκαμένου is to be explained by the figure according to which the faithful are compared with plants. (Comp. Ps. i. 3, Matth. xv. 13.) But the ἡγάπη here cannot be
God’s or Christ’s love towards the faithful, but *vice versa* the love of the faithful towards them, which is the expression of the will strengthened by the Holy Ghost, which makes it capable of manifesting the faith in keeping the law, *i.e.* in love. However, that the article is wanting when properties are conceived as subjective possessions,—which Harless is pleased to assert,—I have been as little able to persuade myself as Winer was (Gramm. p. 113.)

Vers. 18, 19. From this grounding in love next proceeds an increased insight into the essence of the Gospel, which insight is here taken telologically as the aim. As the object of the spiritual apprehension (see, on καταλαβέσθαι, Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25) we must understand neither the ἀγάπη going before, nor the one coming after, but that mystery hidden from eternity (vers. 9, 10), which to the angels themselves is first made known through the works of God in the Church. The natural powers of man do not suffice for this καταλαβέσθαι, he is first made capable of it by the power of grace; therefore it is said ἵνα ἔχοι χύση τε καταλαβέσθαι. But this comprehension is not restricted to this or that esoteric circle, as Meier thinks, choosing to understand the άγιοι of the apostles and prophets alone; it is rather to be referred to all believers. The four dimensions, that is to say, borrowed from the relations of space, are not, in connection with the καταλαβέσθαι, to be understood as denoting distinct, conceptional knowledge, just as little as the γνώναι which follows, (that is to say, such a one cannot indeed possibly be the possession of all believers in common), but of that comprehensive knowledge of essentials which by implication knows everything, and which St John describes as the anointing of the Spirit which teaches everything. (See on 1 John ii. 27.) As the second point is then named the ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is the root of the mystery itself, the length, breadth, depth, and height of which is to be comprehended. But the combination: γνώναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην, "to know the love, which passeth knowledge," forms an Oxymoron. The incomprehensible cannot be comprehended. One cannot well answer to *that*, that the knowledge to which love is to lead is the new one operated by the Spirit, the other, which love surpasses, that of the natural man; for the love of Christ surpasses even the knowledge of the regenerate man. But the true knowledge of divine things, and also of the love of Christ, is just this, to recognize that it is the
infinite which to a constantly increasing knowledge must ever present fresh aspects for knowledge. *At first* Luther had correctly rendered *this* passage also, "and know that the love of Christ surpasses all knowledge." But afterwards he allowed himself to be led astray, to understand the love of Christ of the love of men towards Christ, and translated: "and to know that to love Christ is better than all knowledge." (*Εξισοχύω* does not differ in meaning from the simple verb; this is the only place in the New Testament in which it is found.—As to τι, see on i. 18.—As to ἐπερβάλλειν, see i. 19, ii. 7.) But the last words of ver. 19, ἵνα πληρωθῇ εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, are still difficult. However, if one compares i. 23, it cannot be doubtful that πλήρωμα τ. Θ. is here too the divine Being, as comprising the fulness of life and of power. The referring πλήρωμα to the Church, which Koppe in particular has defended, is here inadmissible, as Meier has already well proved. The reading πληρωθῇ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in B. was, we may suppose, devised by such copyists as thought they must interpret πλήρωμα of the Church. Then, with the reference to God, the meaning of the words would be this, "that ye may be filled (with all Christian gifts and virtues) unto the complete fulness of God, i.e. that ye may be so filled, as God is filled," according to Christ's word: "ye shall be perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v. 48, on which see the remarks in the Comm.) But is not that already couched in the κατοικήσαι Χριστόν (ver. 17)? Where Christ, the living Son of God,.dwells, is surely πᾶν τὸ πληρώμα τοῦ Θεοῦ already. Christ in us and we in Christ are to be carefully distinguished. The new birth begins with Christ being in the heart, but it is only by degrees that the new man grows up from childhood to manhood, so that we are also completely in Christ. This aspect of the personal completion in the new birth, up to manhood in Christ, is here denoted by the πληρωθῆναι εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Vers. 20, 21. Finally, a magnificent doxology (similar to those at Rom. ix. 5, xi, 36, and especially xvi. 25—27, also Jude vers. 24, 25) forms the conclusion of this prayer, and at the same time also of the whole first part of the Epistle. The praise of God is referred especially to the almighty power, through which God can not only fulfil prayers, but is able to execute far more than we pray for, or understand. (In ver. 20 the construction of
ἐπεὶρα as an adverb in the sense: "who can do everything supernaturally," is decidedly to be rejected; "to be able to do more than all" is a popular description of almighty power.—Τερεσκεπτερισσωδ is found again 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13. God bestows this on man in Christianity, which gives far more than the boldest prayer can express.—The δύναμις ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργουμένη is according to ver. 16 the power of the Holy Ghost, which produces in the heart all that was expressed in the foregoing verses.—Ver. 21. Ἔν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ is striking. A.C. read καὶ ἐν Χ., D.F.G. also have καὶ, but they place ἐν Χ. before, and make ἐν τῇ ἐκ. come after. Laouchmann has declared in favour of the καὶ, but the intrinsic arguments are too decidedly against it. The origin of the reading is easily explained by the circumstance of an Assyndeton being found in the passage, and of the transposition by its being thought that Christ ought not to stand after the Church. But ἐν Χ. is only meant as a more accurate definition of the ἐκκλησία, "in the Church, which is in Christ," perhaps with reference to the ἐκκλησία of the Old Testament, in which were Jews only.—The formula: εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων has also something strange in it. If there stood merely εἰς τὰς γεν. τοῦ αἰ., the entirety of the αἰῶν would appear simply divided into its different ages succeeding each other; but the repetition of the τῶν αἰ. is confounding, for in relation to the one αἰῶν the αἰῶνες can in their turn denote only sections of the same one. But whereas the γενεάι relate to the short spaces of human development and duration of life, the αἰῶνες denote longer spaces of time, which, taken in their totality, express the metaphysical idea of eternity. [Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Rev. i. 6.] Accordingly, all that is peculiar in this passage is that the separate αἰῶνες are again collected into the entirety of the αἰῶν, of which no other example is found.)
II.

PART SECOND.

(iv. 1—vi. 24.)

§ 4. THE UNITY OF THE FAITH.

(iv. 1—16.)

After the predominantly doctrinal exposition St Paul now brings forward the ethical exposition, which, however, is, naturally, also continually penetrated with, and supported by, the doctrinal spirit.

St Paul opens this second part with a call to preserve the unity of the faith. After the foregoing discussions this can only refer to the relation between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians; it might, therefore, be at first deduced from these verses, that in the churches to which this Epistle is addressed differences also arose of a similar kind as in Galatia. But, as we have already shown in the Introduction, there is here no trace of a formal controversy; everything wears the appearance of a warning only against future differences to be expected.

Chap. iv. 1, 2. St Paul begins his exhortations with again (compare iii. 1), mentioning his captivity, and calls himself ὁ δὲμιος ἐν καρπῳ, i.e. prisoner as a Christian, a Christian prisoner, in which are expressed both the cause of his imprisonment, and the spirit in which he endures it. That St Paul adds this in the sense: "to me as suffering for Christ's sake it is surely at least permitted to exhort you," is very improbable, for his apostolical office, without going further, sufficiently justified him in the exhortation. The
supposition, also, that St Paul wanted by mentioning his imprisonment to awaken compassion, and thereby excite his readers to pay obedience to his exhortations,—pleases me but little. It seems more probable to me that St Paul means by the addition ὁ δέσμος ἐν κυρίῳ to represent himself as absolutely obedient to the Lord’s will, and by that means to encourage them to a like state of mind.

—The nature of the conduct which St Paul recommends to his readers is defined by the ἀλήθεια, which they are to walk worthily of; this call is a holy call (2 Tim. i. 9) to the kingdom of God, the community of the saints; the walking of those called must, therefore, be holy also. Of course the question here is not of any holiness proceeding from one’s own strength, but of a holy walk which grows up as the fruit of the root of faith. In the parallel passage (Col. i. 10), it is: περιπατήσαι ἄξιος τοῦ κυρίου, i.e. walk holy, as the Lord is holy (1 Pet. i. 16).—The connecting the μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πράσιτητος with ἄξιος περιπατήσαι is not suitable, because in the more general word ἄξιος the special ones following are already included with it; humility and meekness, &c., are rather to be taken as a development of what is included in ἄξιος περιπατήσαι. On the other hand, the taking μετὰ μακρομηνίας alone, as Lachmann too punctuates, does not recommend itself to me; on the contrary, it is more properly connected with ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, in this sense: “bearing with long-suffering (the different weaknesses) among each other.” (Comp. the parallel passage Col. iii. 12, where the same words occur.)

Ver. 3. Since long-suffering is only a form of expression belonging to love, ἐν ἀγάπῃ cannot be taken with what precedes, but only with what follows, as Lachmann has also correctly punctuated. The endeavour to preserve the unity of the Spirit in love supposes the existence of the unity, and the fear alone lest disturbing elements should be able to destroy it. This quite agrees with our supposition that no controversy against false teachers already existing is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that endeavours to guard the readers against future attacks of such are alone observable. In the acceptance of the addition: ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης, we must not let ourselves be guided by the parallel passage Col. iii. 14, where the ἀγάπῃ was designated as σύνδεσμος τῆς τελείωτητος, for the two are very different. The εἰρήνη here is rather the contrary to the ἔρις or διχοστασία. As such, the εἰρήνη
is the σύνδεσμος, by which the members of the Church are held together as an ἐνότης πνεύματος; there is couched accordingly in this addition a more accurate definition of spiritual unity as it is meant to reign in the Church; for that the ἐνότης πνεύματος is not, as Grotius thought, the Church herself, is clear enough.

Vers. 4—6. How unity, and consequently union, among the faithful is a necessary condition of their successful development, the apostle further proves, by enumerating all those things in which they are one. The following enumeration is not to be taken in the form of exhortation: "Be ye one body and one spirit, have one Lord, &c.," but as an objective description of the nature of the Church, so that ἐστι alone is supplied. The form of the Asyndeton serves merely to give force to the representation. Now the first proposition: ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, refers back to the simile ii. 15, ss., according to which the Church was represented as έλπις καυνός ἀνθρωπος ἐν ἐνι σώματι καὶ ἐν ἐνι πνεύματι. But the one Spirit which fills the Church is, of course, not the human, but the divine, Spirit, which had been imparted to man through the completion of Christ's work (John vii. 39.) As, however, in the present condition of the Church all the members in her are united to an outward and an inward unity, so have they also a like aim for the future, viz., a hope of the call, of eternal happiness in the kingdom of God. Thus then every division of the unity is excluded for the future also. In actual appearance the Church of Christ has not continued like that beautiful picture; the ἐνότης πνεύματος ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης is ill preserved. Even if all true members of Christ in all confessions and sects form ἐν πνεύμα ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι, still there can be no question as to the ἐν σώμα. But St Paul does not mean to say either, that the Church is no Church unless she exhibits herself as ἐν σώμα καὶ ἐν πνεύμα, but that she is not in her normal state. And that no one will be able to dispute, that the condition of the Church, especially since the Reformation, can only be considered as a consequence of sin, of the neglect of the apostle's exhortation (ver. 3), in that the admonition of God's Holy Spirit to correct the errors which had crept into the Church met with no general attention.

The following subjects (vers. 5, 6) appear now as the cardinal points which the universal Church has inwardly recognized as the supports of her life. The question here is not as to the determining
of the doctrine upon those points, but as to those points as such. St Paul does not say, "the Church has exactly the same doctrine as to the Lord, the faith," &c., but "she has but one Lord, she has but one baptism," &c.—Now, no doubt it is true that by false doctrine truth concerning the Lord, faith, baptism, nay God Himself, can be made something totally different; but it is just as true that differences in doctrine may exist without the nature of the objects of faith suffering by them. According to the apostle's meaning, therefore, those errors in doctrine are alone to be excluded here, which destroy the unity of the essential objects of faith. According to this acceptance, it may justly be said this passage belongs to those which give information upon the fundamental articles, as 1 Cor. xv. 3, ss., Heb. vi. 1, sq., 1 John iv. 2. At first sight, however, the collocation of the words seems improper; i.e. one expects the Father to be put before the Son. But St Paul begins with Christ, because all new life in man proceeds from Him, faith is lighted at Him, baptism, which supposes, and does not make, faith, relates to Him; the Father is named last, because it is only through baptism, i.e. taken subjectively, through the new birth, that man recognizes himself as child, and God as Father. In the next place, it might seem odd that the Lord's Supper is not mentioned. Harless explains this by the assumption "that St Paul here names only the fundamental conditions of Christian communion, as they exist with regard to every one at his first entrance into the same." But surely that is as true of the Lord's Supper as of baptism, since in the early Church, at the baptism of adults, the Lord's Supper followed directly after baptism. If one reflects that in no one of the passages treating of the fundamental articles is mention made of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xv. 6; Heb. vi. 2; 1 John iv. 2), there can be no doubt that the omission of the Lord's Supper must be explained in some other way. The enjoying Christ is what is specific in the Sacrament, though it belongs to faith also, leaving out of sight the exterior act of the Lord's Supper. (See on John vi. 40, 47, 54.) In the εἰς κόριος, μὴ πιάτιν, accordingly, the participation of the Lord in the Lord's Supper is also included, i.e. as faith is not the fides qua creditur (in which sense it surely included all the rest of the points named), but the fides quâ creditur, so also mention is made of the Lord, not merely as known outwardly, but as possessed inwardly, by man. But now, according to the preceding exposition.
(ii. 11—18), there appeared as the leading idea, which brings St Paul to this dissertation on the unity of the faith, the like right, competence, of the Gentiles as of the Jews to an entrance into the kingdom of God. That St Paul here too again addresses himself especially to the Gentile Christians is shewn by ver. 1 compared with ver. 17. According to this, we can understand this description (ver. 4—6) also in the meaning of the apostle only thus: “Gentiles, like Jews, have but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God.” The πάντων, therefore, cannot be taken as a neuter, it must be taken as a masculine. Whilst the Jews considered God as their Father exclusively, and not as the Father of the Gentiles also, St Paul calls Him πατήρ πάντων. But of course afterwards again, in the last words of ver. 6, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι can be taken as the masculine only. The MSS. D.E.F.G. add ημῖν το πᾶσι, which is to be regarded as a perfectly correct interpretation, but can put forward no pretensions to be received into the text. It remains to be said, that we became acquainted as far back as Rom. xi. 36 with this sort of designation, according to which God is represented, in His various relations to His creatures, by means of various prepositions, as Lord over all, and the origin whence they arise, as the instrument through which they are, as the element in which, and the object for which, they exist,—and this as the simplest expression of the relation of the respective persons in the Holy Trinity.

Ver. 7. But now St Paul contrasts the difference of the subjective position with this representation of the objective unity. True, all believers are one spirit and one body, have one master, one faith, one Father; but the gifts of each are variously distributed according to the measure of the gift of Christ. In what way they are variously distributed ver. 11 details at greater length, and ver. 16 more accurately tells us how by that very variety the increase of the Church to an articulated organism becomes possible. But here stress is especially to be laid on the ἐν ἐκάστῳ ημῶν, which is repeated ver. 16. This—referred to the apostle’s main idea, the relation of the Gentiles and the Jews in the Church—is to be taken, so that by it is meant to be expressed: “Each, even the lowest, has his talent, and serves the whole in his part, therefore so have the Gentiles; even if they are not called to the greatest labours,
(as, for example, Gentiles could not be chosen for apostles), still Christ has obtained gifts even for them."

Ver. 8—10. But now, instead of directly describing the different gifts themselves more accurately, and so calling on each man well to fill his place in the great whole, St Paul introduces a series of ideas, which is not only difficult in itself, but, through the way in which it is connected with what precedes and what succeeds it, belongs to the obscurest passages of the New Testament, to the real crucibus interpretum, and for that reason has also been obliged to put up with the most discrepant interpretations. If we, first of all, consider this passage quite generally as to the manner of its insertion in the body of St Paul's discourse, it seems altogether unadvisable to separate it by crotchetts from what precedes and what succeeds, as a totally incidental subordinate remark. For, apart from the consideration that it must surely always be one's last resource, to charge the author with having introduced into a discourse which is strictly progressive something completely heterogeneous, and without any connection with what precedes it, here the διό in ver. 8, and the καὶ αὐτῶς ἔδωκε in ver. 11 (which refers back to the αὐτῶς ἔστι καὶ δ ἀναβὰς), are so decidedly in favour of the writer's intention of meaning to insert vers. 8—10 in the context, that the interpreter must rather look for the fault in himself; if he cannot point to the connecting thread of the discourse, than his author. Accordingly, if we start with the supposition, that St Paul intended to make here no far-fetched, nor even only incidental, remark, but proceeds strictly in his argumentation, the first question that arises is: what does St Paul want to prove by the quotation, what does the διό λέγει, scil. ἡ γραφή, refer to? Since there occur in the quotation the words: ἔδωκε δοματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, and it was said in ver. 7: ἐνι εκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις, it is most natural to say: St Paul does not mean by the quotation especially to represent Christ as the dispenser of the gifts, but to prove from the Old Testament itself the universality of the gifts of Christ, and therefore the equal right of the Gentiles; He has by His redemption bestowed gifts not on these persons, or those, not on the Jews alone, but on men as such, on the human race. The stress would, therefore, have to

1 Harless gives (p. 362) as the sense of the passage according to St Paul's design: "The identity of the God of the Psalm with Christ, from which the way, in which Christ
be laid on the last word, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, not on ἐδωκε δόματα. It is true F.G. read ἐν before τοῖς, but that reading can make no claim to reception, it is merely taken from the LXX., of the constitution of whose text we shall speak more in detail presently. The other difficulties, which we find in the quotation, are, it is true, considerable, but have nothing to do with the main difficulty in this passage, the connection with the context; ver. 8 suits it very well. Let us first treat of those particular stumbling-blocks, which result from the form of the quotation, ere we pass to the discussion of what follows.

The passage Ps. lxviii. 19 (according to the Septuagint Ps. lxvii. 19) is taken from a poem, in which Jehovah, the God of Israel, who went forth before the people in the wilderness (ver. 8), is described as victor over all His enemies. Although Ps. lxviii. is no direct prophecy of Christ, still, according to this purport of it, its typical allusion to the Redeemer was obvious, since it was the God of Israel, the Son of God, the Revealer of the hidden Father, who was made man in Christ, and completed the divine victory in the work of atonement. The assumption, therefore, that we have here not a quotation from the Psalm, but one from an unknown Christian hymn, which Storr and Flatt proposed, is plainly quite inadmissible, and the mere production of the embarrassment how to smooth down the divergence in the quotation from both the original text and the LXX. That is to say, it seems striking that the first words, indeed, of the quotation: ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχομαλ- τευσεν (for which A. and some MSS. of less importance read ἡχομαλωτεύσας after the LXX.) αἰχμαλωσίαν, harmonize exactly with the LXX. and the original text, but those very words, which are decisive for the carrying on of the connection, viz. ἐδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, deviate from the Hebrew text and from the LXX. That is to say, those first words describe in an Oxymoron our redemption by Christ, which appears completed by His ἀναβαλεν εἰς ὕψος = ὁ θεος ἀνήλετο; but in the context of this passage mention is made, not of redemption through Christ, but of the gifts of Christ, which He has got for the human race. It remains therefore, it is true, in reference to what precedes, only a subordinate idea, that the bestowing gifts by Christ is put in connection with the leads His follower whither He will, follows, as an ordinance previously intimated and determined on by God (ver. 10, 11.)" I confess, I don't see how Christ's humiliation and ascension to fulfil all things can be connected with the above train of ideas.
completion of redemption through the return of the Son to the Father; but we shall see in the sequel of the interpretation that St Paul knows how to use it skilfully for his chief object in what follows. (For the rest, see on this connection between the completion of Christ and His work with the gifts of the Spirit John vii. 39, xiv. 12, xvi. 17, and the remarks on those passages in the Comm.) But now as to the words which differ in the second half of the quotation, they run thus in the Hebrew:

ἡμών ἐπέδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, i.e. “thou hast taken gifts to man;” the LXX. give it: ἔλαβες δώματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις, (for which some MSS. read ἀνθρώπῳ.) At first sight there certainly seems to exist here not merely a difference from the apostle’s: ἔδωκε δώματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, but a complete contradiction. Whilst St Paul talks of giving, the text of the Hebrew speaks of taking. This contradiction seemed so insurmountable to Whiston, that he made the naïve proposal, to alter the Hebrew text according to the quotation of St Paul. However, on closer consideration, there is no need either of such monstrous assumptions, nor even of milder expedients, as e.g. that St Paul arbitrarily altered the second half of the quotation according to his views, or undesignedly, in citing from memory, missed the sense; St Paul rather quotes the words not according to the letter, but the spirit of them; that is to say, the idea of the Psalmist: “Thou hast taken to thyself gifts among men” says no more than: “thou hast chosen to thyself the redeemed for sacrifices.” But whomsoever God chooses for Himself for a sacrifice, i.e. for an instrument for His purposes, him He furnishes with the gifts which are necessary for the attainment of them; and this side of the question St Paul here makes most prominent according to his purpose. It was awkward to want to force on the word ἐπέδωκας by itself the meaning of “to give;” it is only through the context that taking can take the form of giving. However, this one thing only in the manner of quoting the passage in the psalm by the apostle might yet seem an arbitrary change, viz., that he, instead of ἐπέδωκας, i.e. “among men,” which points to some, puts τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, i.e. “all men,” and to this very point, as we saw, the context led us as to the point of chief importance in the quotation. But, on more accurate consideration, this deviation too appears quite inconsiderable in reference to the idea. For when the Psalmist says: “Thou hast
taken to thyself some among men as sacrifices," that expression refers to the chosen, therefore, according to St Paul's meaning, to all members of the Church, whether Jews or Gentiles, just as in verse 7 the ενὶ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη is to be understood, i.e. to every member of the Christian community. But neither is the ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις meant to express anything else. Those words do not mean to assert that all men must be redeemed, and, as redeemed men, receive gifts, but all can be redeemed and receive gifts of grace; therefore the difference between Jews and Gentiles is abolished by Christ's αἰχμαλωτεύειν αἰχμαλωσίαν, the Gentiles also can receive gifts. We may, therefore, consider the difficulties in ver. 8 both in itself and in its connection with the preceding verse as removed, for the more accurate definition of the αἰχμαλωσία, which still remains, can only be given as a sequel to the interpretation of verse 9; we here for the present content ourselves with the general interpretation, "objects of redemption, prisoners."

Now, in verse 9, the idea: τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τι ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ δὲ καὶ κατέβη, i.e. "what does the ascension mean other than that he that ascended has also descended," is quite intelligible in itself. That is to say, in the case of men it does not follow from the ἀναβαίνειν, it is true, that a καταβαίνειν preceded, but certainly in the case of the God that dwells in heaven if it is said: "God ascends," it necessarily follows from that circumstance that He has previously descended. But what induces St Paul to take up out of the quotation the idea of the ἀναβαίνειν, and to follow it up through two verses, since it certainly belongs to that part of the quotation which we were obliged to designate as containing the main-thread of the line of argument? One would have expected that the words ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις would form the basis of the more extended deduction. On the answering of this question much depends for the understanding of the whole of this difficult passage; but it cannot be derived from the ideas ἀναβαίνειν and καταβαίνειν alone, but only from the more accurate definition, which they receive through ἰπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, and εἰς τὰ κατότερα τῆς γῆς. Since this latter expression again is the condition preliminary of the former, we require only a more accurate investigation as to the meaning of the formula τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς. (Lachmann has still preserved the μέρη in the text, but, as it is
wanting in B.E.F.G., and the addition of it is easily explained, while the omission of it is difficult to account for, we view it in accordance with the best later interpreters as a gloss, which however is quite correct according to the sense. The πρῶτον before εἷς has been blotted out of the text ever since Mill and Bengel’s time by all the better critics.) Since the phrase is not found again in the New Testament, we are in regard to it obliged to have recourse to the Old Testament, where the expression ἡ γῆ in general is considered as answering to the one here. But in the three passages in which it occurs it has every time a different meaning. In Ps. lxiii. 10 it denotes the world of the dead, the Sheol, and is rendered by the LXX. τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς. In Ps. cxxxix. 15 it denotes the womb, and here too the LXX. translate it τὰ κατώτατα τῆς γῆς. But in the third passage, Isaiah xlv. 23, it denotes the earth in opposition to heaven, and here the LXX. render it by θεμέλια τῆς γῆς. In Ezekiel we find the cognate phrase: ἡ γῆ (which is, however, constantly rendered by βάδος or βάθη τῆς γῆς (compare Ezek. xxvi. 10, xxxii. 18, 24), as a designation of the Sheol. On the other hand, Ezek. xxxi. 16, θεμέλια is rendered ἡ γῆ κάτω (κάτω is wanting, however, in several MSS.), just as in Isaiah li. 6, τῆς γῆς is translated ἡ γῆ κάτω. But in the formulas (Ps. lxxviii. 7, Lamen. iii. 55), ἡ γῆ, the LXX. have always preserved the κατώτατος, translating λάκκος or δόχης κατώτατος. The result of this comparison is, therefore, that the comparative form τὰ κατώτερα does not occur in the Old Testament for the formula τὰ κατώτατα and similar modes of expression, though the superlative form κατώτατα does. But even the latter, the superlative, is not used when mention is made of the earth absolutely in opposition to heaven (τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, or ἡ γῆ κάτω, is used for it), but firstly of the place of the dead, the Sheol, and that, too, predominantly, and secondly of the womb in the remarkable passage Ps. cxxxix. 15 (cxxxviii. 15). (In this latter passage the reading ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτω is found in some MSS. of the LXX. instead of ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτους). After this we can at once reject the interpretation of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς of death (as Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Oecumenius wish), or of the grave (ac-
cording to Beza and Baumgarten), as inadmissible. But even the interpretation of the phrase of *the earth*, so that *καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* might denote Christ’s being made man, which has defenders of such number and importance, to name some, Schöttgen, Grotius, Storr, Winer, Harless, seems to have nothing to recommend it after this. The passage in Acts ii. 19, which is appealed to, and where *ὁ οὐρανὸς ἄνω* and *ἡ γῆ κάτω* are put in opposition to each other, can, after what has been said above, decide nothing as to our phrase; *τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* is something different from *ἡ γῆ κάτω*. To take the genitive *τῆς γῆς* as *genitivus appositionis* (see Winer’s Gramm. p. 336) is admissible, it is true, in a grammatical point of view, but is in this phrase by no means founded on hellenistic custom of language; the genitive in it rather denotes the locality in which the depths are, as the parallel *βάθος τῆς γῆς* plainly shows. Neither is *καταβαίνειν* ever used of Christ’s incarnation. Moreover, the interpretation of the comparative *κατώτερα* by the comparison of the earth with heaven will not bear inspection. For such a comparison is made in all the passages which are quoted, and even in Acts ii. 19, but nowhere is the comparative found; it is constantly *thus* the formula runs: *ἡ γῆ κάτω*. There is also another difficulty which can be removed in a forcible way only, viz. that along with the *ἀναβαίνειν* there stands the corroborative phrase *ὑπεράνω πάνων τῶν οὐρανῶν*, which is clearly put as an equivalent, corroborative of the antithesis *τὰ κατώτερα*. A simple *καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν* would be put in opposition to the mere *ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν* (as in verse 8 *ἀναβας εἰς θύσιν* stands); but since St Paul raises the *ἀναβαίνειν εἰς θύσιν* to the *ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάνων τῶν οὐρανῶν* (as a phrase, which is explained by the well-known assumption of several heavenly regions, see at 2 Cor. xii. 2), the more emphatical *τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* also comes in instead of the simple *καταβαίνειν*. Whilst the *ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάνων τῶν οὐρανῶν* denotes not merely the being taken up *into* heaven (which is accorded to *μετά* too), but also the being set *over* all things that were made, the *καθίζειν εἰς δεξία Θεοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας κ. τ. λ.* (see at i. 20), the *καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς* denotes the deepest depth answering to the highest height. As our Lord’s death is wont to be named to denote the
former, it is intelligible how the notion could be hit on of explain-
ing our phrase of death, or the grave, against which, however, as
we saw, is the custom of the language with regard to the Hebrew
formula. Very important reasons, therefore, stand opposed to the
taking the τά κατώτερα τῆς γῆς = ἡ γῆ κάτω.

After this, if we consider, first of all, that interpretation, accord-
ing to which (after Ps. cxviii. (cxxxviii.) 15) our phrase τά κατώ-
tερα τῆς γῆς is chosen to be understood of the womb, a view,
which Witsius and Calixtus have proposed,—it is certainly not to
be denied that it is possible, as far as language is concerned.
But the LXX. have once also Ps. cxxxviii. 15 again τά κατώ-
tερα; if therefore St Paul had had that passage in his mind, why
should he not have kept the superlative? The assertion, that he
chose the comparative in order to intimate that he did not mean
Hades by that phrase, could hardly admit of a defence. But this
antithesis, which is repugnant to the feelings, to go no further,
viz. “to ascend far above all heavens,” and “to descend into the
womb,” is without example, not only in St Paul, but in the whole
of the Scriptures; there must, therefore, be very decisive argu-
ments brought together to enable us to obstruct it on St Paul
here; such, however, do not admit of being produced, as that
interpretation affords no assistance for the explanation of the
context.

There remains, then, assuming the identity of our phrase with the
Hebrew parallels, only the interpretation, according to which τά
κατώτερα τῆς γῆς is supposed to denote the Sheol, the dead world,
which, after Jerome and Ambrose, the Roman Catholic inter-
preters especially, and among the Protestants Calovius, Bengel, and
Rückert, and others, have defended before all; to those accepting this
interpretation it was natural to understand by the liberated αἰχ-
μαλασσία (verse 8) the souls liberated from Hades by Christ, and
after this it was thought that there had thus been found in our
passage a leading one, along with that 1 Peter iii. 18, to prove
Christ’s descent into Hell. Now much, no doubt, in the vers. 8—10
is in favour of that assumption; to name two points, the custom
of the dialect of the Old Testament, as well in regard to the κατώ-
tερα τῆς γῆς, as to the καταβάσεως, which usually occurs of Hades
(see the above-cited passages), and the antithesis with the ἀπεάνω
πάντων οὐρανῶν. But, on the other side, in the case of this in-
terpretation, too, great difficulties occur. The comparative here strikes us more still than in the case of the interpretation of the earth absolutely; for, first, the Old Testament has always the form τὰ κατώτερα of the Sheol, and second, the nature of the thing also seems to require the plural, inasmuch as Hades is supposed in the depth of the earth, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς. (See Matt. xii. 40.) But then with this interpretation the connexion, too, is completely dissolved. For, since in verse 7 the discourse was of the communication of the Holy Spirit to the living (ἐνι ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν), how is the διὸ λέγει then to bring about a connection between that idea and those that had been delivered from Hades by Christ, consequently the dead?—But now the number of the possible interpretations seems exhausted with that one, if, that is to say, one starts with the supposition of the identity of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς with the Hebrew יָהָא יִנָּה. As no interpretation of the passage which starts with that hypothesis is without difficulty, it might be fit just to consider the phrase τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς without reference to the Hebrew phrase. For the still remarkable form of the comparative might seem to be in favour of the independence of our formula. If one lays a stress upon that, the κατώτερα μέρη might form an antithesis to the ἀνωτέρωκα μέρη (cf. Acts xix. 1), the former of which denote the low tracts of country lying on the sea shore, while the latter denote the inner and higher ones. (See Wetstein’s New Testament, vol. ii. p. 579.) This might be symbolically referred to the regions inhabited by Gentiles, in accordance with the custom of the language, according to which Jerusalem and Mount Sion with the Temple are considered, not so much as a physical, but as a moral, height, to which one ascends from all sides. This idea of the descending to the most forsaken of the human race would certainly suit the context of the whole passage very well, for we saw that in the very beginning of the exposition of this passage, that St Paul has here the opposition between Jews and Gentiles again before his eyes, and wishes to make it observed that Christ obtained those gifts too. But how can it be said that the Redeemer descended to the Gentiles? It would be clearly arbitrary to understand this idea of the half-Gentile Galilee, or to say it referred to the fact that Christ was preached by the apostles among the Gentiles; the καταβαίνειν here, equally with the ἀναβαίνειν, must be taken neces-
sarily as a personal act of Christ's. We here, therefore, find the way out completely closed, and come to the conclusion, that no stress can be laid on the comparative form, and that the identity of our formula with ἅπαντα ἔννοια is to be maintained. Since the meaning of it in the translation κατώτατα τῆς γῆς according to the LXX., which St Paul had here too, as usual, before his eyes, is constantly Hades, we shall just be obliged to be contented with this meaning. Now, after the above criticized interpretation of our passage, according to which the meaning "Hades" was employed, it was especially the impossibility of pointing out a connection, which deterred us from it. But this interruption of the connection is not so much brought about through the idea "Hades," as through the interpretation of the αἰχμαλωσία which precedes, by which the souls in Hades are to be understood, and which is connected with the explanation of the τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς as applying to Hades. The idea of verse 9: "the expression, 'He ascended,' what else does it say but that He (the person ascending) also descended first into Hades?" stands in no disturbing connection with the whole context; the addition "into Hades" merely strengthens the idea of the καταβαίνειν, like the addition "down to the earth," also, according to the other interpretation. If we, therefore, interpret αἰχμαλωσία only of men upon earth, inasmuch as they are fettered by sin, and, if we look to the bottom of the question, by the prince of this world, and particularly, too, of the Gentile world as the part of it which lay most of all in the bonds of darkness, the principal stumbling-block against the interpretation of our passage of Hades, viz., that it interrupts the connection, is removed. But certainly by that interpretation the passage loses its dogmatical importance; that is to say, it only teaches that Christ went to Hades, but the idea that he redeemed the prisoners in Hades falls to the ground. The going to Hades is the natural consequence of the real death of our Lord; that may, therefore, be concluded from the nature of death, but that he was working among the dead as the Redeemer, that is a new idea, for which we now have only 1 Pet. iii. 18 remaining. But if we thus consider the descent to Hades as the fulfilment of death, then, too, the objection falls to the ground that the καταβαίνειν εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς forms no antithesis to the ἀναβαίνειν ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, because Christ's descent into Hell did not belong
to the state of abasement but to that of exaltation. For here the question is not principally as to those two states and their line of demarcation, but merely as to the contrast of the ἀνεβη and κατέβη, for which reason also the addition εἰς τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς is not at all to be considered as a necessary point in the train of argument, but merely as adding force to the κατέβη. If κατέβη stood alone, the exposition would have to be taken in just the same way as with the addition. This contrast of ἀνεβη and κατέβη, however, is meant to show that the same Lord who has power over all has not shrunk from descending to the lowest depths, and that, too, for the purpose of filling everything with His gracious presence, and consequently with His gifts also, not merely the Jews but the Gentiles also. Thus the double αὐτῶς in vers. 10, 11, is explained, and the transition to the distribution of the gifts (ver. 11) of which St Paul had already begun to speak in ver. 7. Although, therefore, the passage still remains an exceedingly difficult one, we may yet hope by this interpretation to have substantially removed the stumbling-blocks, and especially brought the connection of vers. 8—10 with St Paul's whole train of argument to light. To facilitate a general view of the result of the exposition, we subjoin a paraphrastic translation of the whole piece. "The Church is one body and one spirit; she has one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father, (ver. 6.) But grace is not uniformly distributed among believers. It is given, it is true, to each of us, Gentiles as well as Jews, but according to the measure of the gift of Christ, to one more, to another less (ver. 7.) Therefore, too, say the Scriptures: He has by ascending up on high redeemed the captives (especially the Gentiles) and given gifts unto all men (ver. 8.) But the ascension necessarily presupposes (in Christ the Son of God) a descent, i.e., a partaking of the misery of those fettered by sin even unto death, i.e., even unto the depths of Hades (ver. 9.) He that descended is Himself also He who ascended up far above all heavens and rules over all the powers of the universe, in order to fill all things with His power and to give gifts unto each (Gentiles as well as Jews) according to the capacity and the calling of each (ver. 10.) He Himself has made some apostles, others prophets," &c. Thus then the above-mooted question, why St Paul connects ver. 9 with the ἀνεβη, and not with the ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which seems to contain the leading
idea, meets with its answer. That is to say, this is done because St. Paul wishes by the ἀνέβη and κατέβη to carry out the idea of the totality which Christ governs, and which to him is important beyond everything, in order by that means to make it evident that He obtained His gifts for all. With this appears at last plainly the bearing of exhortation also in the passage. Each (according to ver. 2) is to walk with lowliness and meekness; therefore the Gentiles are not to overvalue themselves, nor, on the other hand, are the Jews to despise the Gentiles. Christ is the example of true lowliness. He, the highest, descended to the lowest depths in order to fill all things with His life. According to this, Phil. ii. 5, ss., where also Christ is set up as a type of humility, in that He humbled Himself, but was on that account exalted by God, so that all in heaven, in earth, and under the earth adore Him, seems very similar. Here, therefore, an allusion is made to Hades, too, for the completion of the idea of the universe.

Ver. 11. In the following enumeration the gifts give way to the offices for which the gifts qualify, whereas in the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xii. 28, it was the contrary. (See the remarks in the Comm on Rom. xii. 6, ss., 1 Cor. xii. 28.) The apostles differ from the prophets in such a way that (see as to the idea of the προφήτης the Comm. on 1 Cor. xiv. 1) the apostles, as such, are, it is true, prophets, but the prophets, as such, are not conversely apostles. This latter expression is to be taken here in its most special sense as denoting the Twelve along with St. Paul. As to the rest, it is self-evident that the fancy of the Irvingites, that there must be always apostles and prophets in the Church, has no foundation at all in the Scriptures; just as little do the apostles correspond to the later bishops. The εὐαγγελισταὶ are such teachers as journeying about laboured for the wider extension of the Gospel, as Theodoret had already correctly interpreted οἱ περιώντες ἐκηρυττον. (See Eusebii, H. E. iii. 37, v. 10.) On the other hand, the ποιμένες and διδάσκαλοι are such teachers as are permanently settled with one church; in the former the administrative power is predominant, in the latter the didactic office, as in 1 Cor. xii. 28 the κυβέρνησις is distinguished from the διδασκαλία. This passage, therefore, is certainly not fitted to furnish data for the organization of churches in the first ages; the two latter expressions alone relate to it. (See Rothe on the Church, Wittenberg 1837, p. 257.)
("Εδώκε, for which άθετο stands in 1 Cor. xii. 28, answers to the Hebrew יִנָּחַי.) But now it might seem difficult that in ver. 11 the above idea, conceived quite generally, "to each of us is grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ," (ver. 7) here appears restricted to the teachers alone, as if the laymen had no gift distributed to them. But, first, all the expressions are not designations of offices in the Church; the gift of the προφητεία, like other gifts of grace, laymen too could have; and, secondly, some gifts only are here named instead of all. 1 Cor. xii. shews that there were many more. It clearly results from ver. 16 that St Paul here speaks not to the teachers only, but to all Christians without exception.

Ver. 12. The καταρτισμός τῶν ἅγιων is mentioned by St Paul as the subject of this various distribution of gifts. To connect the εἰς ἔργον διακονίας with this, as Rückert wishes, is forbidden by the invariable use of διακονία for "office in the Church," and St Paul cannot now, after ver. 11, in which the variety of the gifts was made an object of remark, mean to uphold a general preparation for the office of teacher. The two clauses, εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, and εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, rather include the division of the general phrase καταρτισμός τῶν ἅγιων. The ἔργον διακονίας alludes to the exercise of the office of teacher, and the οἰκοδομὴ to the operation of the same in the community. Accordingly, the words would have to be paraphrased thus: for the perfecting of the saints, and indeed partly of those furnished with gifts of teaching for the execution of the teacher's office, partly with regard to the hearers, unto the edification of the Church. That is to say, though the teachers themselves, in one point of view, belong to the σῶμα Χριστοῦ along with the rest of the faithful, yet it is they again who promote the edification of churches. (The form καταρτισμός is found nowhere in the New Testament but here; the synonymous κατάρτισις, however, occurs 2 Cor. xiii. 9.)

Ver. 13. But the object of the perfecting of the saints is further that all may come to the unity of the faith, and to the knowledge of the Son of God. The first person of the verb (καταρτῆσομεν), with the article before πάντες, points to the fact that St Paul includes himself in the body of those who are engaged in the development of Church-life. That is no mere figure of speech; Phil. iii. 13 plainly shows that St Paul knew his individual life to be not
yet perfected, he pressed towards the mark (to see) whether he
might lay hold on it. The direct putting forward the totality, no
doubt, again refers, according to vers. 7 and 16, to the placing the
Gentiles and the Jews on a par; the former too, St Paul means to
say, take their place in the great whole, they too are to grow up
unto perfection. But it is asked, of what growth is mention here
made; whether of that of the individuals in themselves, or of that
of the body of believers? Of the growth of both together, for,
along with the separate members, the whole Church also grows
up from childhood through youth unto manhood (1 John ii. 13,
sq.) But does St Paul refer in the sequel to perfecting of the in-
dividuals and of the whole here below, or yonder in the other
world? St Paul doubtless did not imagine this in his own mind
at all as an antithesis. To him the Church is one, and one only;
it is not only those living on earth that constitute her, but those
also who died in the faith. That body forms itself into a com-
pact, organic whole, in which each has to occupy his place; if he
has attained it, then the μέτρον ἡμικλησία exists for him also. The
absolute revelation of the Church, therefore, in full manhood cer-
tainly occurs first in the kingdom of God, but as St Paul at that
time encouraged his cotemporaries, so every teacher can in every
age encourage his on their part to strive on unto the perfect man-
hood of Christ, and the true strivers of every generation attain this
their mark, yea actually already while here below, according to the
calling and talent of each. Were not that the meaning of St Paul’s
exposition, the ἐνότης τῆς πίστεως could not be made such a point
of, for in the other world faith has passed into contemplation. But
now it seems strange in this passage that the mark, to which all are
to come forward, is designated as the ἐνότης τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς
ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ νοοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. It seems that faith and the know-
ledge of the Son of God is the beginning of the life of faith, not
the highest aim of its development; as it was indeed actually said,
even already in ver. 3, “that all might preserve the unity of the
Spirit (they were already, therefore, in that unity), because the
Church is one body and one Spirit, has one Lord, one faith,” &c.
Even the coupling “faith and knowledge” together is striking, for
it might be easily thought that St Paul said: “until we, taking
faith as a starting-point, press forward to knowledge,” in which
case the ἐπιγνώσεως would seem like a step gained going forth from
the basis of faith, but in the parallel juxtaposition the unity of the faith is always set up as the mark, whilst it seems to be the beginning of the development in the new birth. We might think we were able to resolve this considerable difficulty in the following manner. Either 1. a stress might be laid on o\i\ \pi\acute{\alpha}ρ\epsilon\varsigma\iota\varsigma, in the sense that the advance consists in the circumstance that all arrive at the point to which many have already attained. But the first person of the verb (by which, as we have seen, St Paul includes himself, and consequently all the apostles, among those who are to arrive at the unity of the faith and knowledge), is against that interpretation. Or 2. a stress might be laid upon \epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma\varsigma; it is true all Christians, as such, have faith and the knowledge of Christ, but their task is to attain to unity in them. That might mean, in the first place, "that they may all attain to the same faith, the same knowledge," but that identity is surely already, in ver. 2, presupposed to exist in his readers: he that has not the right faith and the right knowledge has really none at all at bottom. Secondly, however, the stress laid on the unity of faith and knowledge might also be taken so that what each has in himself is to melt away into an organic unity, in the following sense: "that all may attain to unity in faith and knowledge (which are presupposed.)" Then the advance would consist in the growing up of individuals into the unity, supporting one another reciprocally. But if that were meant to be the meaning of the words, \epsilon\nu \tau\eta\ \pi\lambda\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma would be put instead of \epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\lambda\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma\omicron\supserscript{o}, \kappa.\tau.\lambda., and in what follows \epsilon\iota\varsigma \xi\nu\alpha\ \\alpha\nu\delta\rho\varsigma\omicron\nu\pi\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \Theta\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon must necessarily have been put, as it stands ii. 15. It is to be added that that idea does not correspond with the truth in the development of the Church; believers do not stand, first of all, each for himself in faith and knowledge, and then grow up in the progress of development among one another unto unity; but each is immediately in the new birth born into the unity of the whole as a living grown member. Or 3. and lastly, a stress might be laid on \omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\ \Theta\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon, so that the discourse would be, not of the unity of the faith and knowledge in general, but of that of the Son of God, to which one was to attain. Certainly St Paul uses the name \omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\omicron\ \Theta\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron\upsilon\upsilon but seldom, and where he does it is emphatically of the divine nature of Christ. (See at 2 Cor. i. 9, Gal. ii. 20.) Now, if one considers how St Paul, in the Epistle to the Colossians of the same date (i. 16, ss.), zealously defends the divine nature of
our Lord against false teachers, one might suppose one's self obliged to assume here a polemical allusion, in the sense that St Paul sees the progress of the development in the circumstance that all have overcome Ebionitish and Arian representations of Christ. But we have already seen in the Introduction (and we shall immediately, viz. at ver. 14, come back to it,) that polemical references nowhere appear in the Epistle to the Ephesians; we can the less recognize the like in this passage, that it treats solely of the development of the Church in itself in the totality of her members, and not of contrasts. Only this must be conceded, that here too the leading idea of the whole Epistle, viz. that the Gentiles have just as much part in the kingdom of God as the Jews, floats before St Paul's mind in such a way that he ascribes to the Gentile Christians also a share in the development of the Church. Besides, by that plan of laying a stress upon υἱὸς τ. Ὁ., it would seem as if Ebionitish and Arian errors were necessary in the beginning of Christian life, and were able to be surmounted by degrees only; a representation which certainly cannot be justified as Scriptural.

The only correct interpretation of this very difficult passage is, I am convinced, that, according to which the phrase ἡ ἐνοτης τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπηρμνοσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Ὁσιοῦ is understood not as if there were two different things named in it, viz., first, the unity of the faith, and, secondly, the unity of knowledge (in which acceptance the passage is quite inconsistent with all that the Scriptures elsewhere teach as to the beginning of the life of faith, and the mode of its development), but so that one unity alone is meant, viz. that which is possible between faith and between knowledge. The progress in development of which St Paul here speaks consists in the circumstance that faith and knowledge are made one, i.e. that faith, with which the Christian life begins, is really exalted to knowledge. It is true, no doubt, that, at the very first beginning even of regeneration, faith does not exist without knowledge, but that knowledge, which exists together with faith, is that implicit knowledge which is eternal life itself (John xvii. 3.) But the explicit knowledge, which has appropriated to itself the total substance of faith, is the fruit of the complete inner development alone. (See as to the relation between the developed and the undeveloped gnosis, as also of the charismatic and non-charismatic gnosis, the observations in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 7, ss., xiii. 9.) According to
this acceptation of our passage, the parallel passage, 1 John ii. 13, sq., comes out in the plainest light; that is to say, here too the knowledge of Him who was from the beginning, i.e. Christ, is represented as the characteristic of fatherhood, i.e. of manhood in Christ. (See the details in the Comm. ad h. 1. Lücke erroneously wishes the terms: fathers, young men, children, to be taken in a physical sense; they plainly denote steps in the development of the inner life. The physical periods of life, as such, have no influence on the position of men with regard to the Gospel; an old man may be a child in Christ, a youth may, on the other hand, be a man in the Lord.) In Col. iii. 10, too, the ἐπίγνωσις appears as the object of the renewal in the image of the Creator. In it is expressed the idea that beings recognise only those related to them; therefore God recognises the soul that has been made divine and no other. But the knowledge is here especially referred to the Son of God, because in Christ all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge lie shut up (Col. ii. 3), so that he who knows Him knows all. (1 John ii. 27.) But how that comprehensive knowledge is related to the ἐκ μέρους γυνώσκειν, and how in the perfected γνῶσις here below the foundation of the Christian life (the πίστις) is never taken up, has been already detailed at 1 Cor. xiii. 9. It remains to be said that the truth of the striving to attain to the ἐνώσις of the πίστις and of the ἐπίγνωσις, which pervades the whole history of the development of the Church, receives a complete confirmation through this passage of the apostle’s. Lastly, the concluding words of ver. 13 characterize exegetically the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of Christ. The phrase εἰς ἀνδρα τέλειον denotes manhood, in which the idea of personality and of self-consciousness is completely expressed. (Τέλειος is the opposite of νόμος. See Heb. v. 13, 14.) This phrase is totally different from the εἰς ἑνα καὶ ὅν ἄνθρωπον (ii. 15), by which is denoted no degree of development, but the union of what was before separate in the human race to a new spiritual unity in Christ. In the εἰς ἀνδρα τέλειον that unity is presupposed, and starting from it the highest development of its living principle is striven after and attained. Therefore it could not either be εἰς ἄνθρωπον τέλειον, because ἀνήρ exactly expresses the idea of life developed to its full self-consciousness. That idea is more accurately described by the following words: εἰς μέτρου ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, i.e.
unto the measure of the age in which fulness dwells in us. The ἡλικία here is, of course, not bodily stature, but the degree of complete spiritual development, therefore = ἀνὴρ τέλειος. But the phrase obtains a more accurate definition through the τοῦ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which Holzhausen, Meier, and Harless correctly take in the sense above given. But here, too, as at i. 23, and iii. 19, the discrepancy among the interpreters in their acceptations of the word πλήρωμα is great. The reference of the expression to the Church, which Koppe and Storr defend, and which has even crept into some of the MSS., is here at all events quite inadmissible. One might rather take πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a circumlocution for Christ Himself. The age of Christ would then be that climax of development which Christ Himself attained, the highest self-consciousness. But the other passages, in which πλήρωμα occurs, are not in favour of that paraphrastic use. We had best, therefore, be contented with the above interpretation of the words, which is completely in accordance with the context. If εἰς ἡλικίαν alone stood here, then one would not be at all doubtful as to the sense of the passage, only the εἰς μέτρον leads one astray to suppose a comparison. But μέτρον denotes here "the full measure, i.e. ripeness," as we find in Homer, μέτρον ἡβης, "the ripeness of youth." See Passow's Lex. ad. v. (On μέχρι without ἄν see Hartung's Doctrine of the Particles, vol. ii., p. 291, ss. Lobeck ad Phrynichum, p. 14, ss.)

Ver. 14. Next there is placed, in juxtaposition to the positive representation of the development of Christian life, what is no longer to be, in a negative style of expression. In the perfected man, who has attained the unity of the faith and of knowledge, there is fixedness and steadiness of conviction; undeveloped νηπίως are exposed to wavering of every kind; each wind of doctrine sets them in motion. One sees clearly here that the ἐπίγνωσις is no practical one, as Meier erroneously assumes, but the theoretical insight into the faith. Certainly true knowledge always rests on the practical ground of sanctification, but it is not merely practical itself. Now this passage might really create an appearance (see also at v. 6) as if false doctrine had been spread though, also in the churches to which St Paul addresses this Epistle; but it is plain that St Paul here gives no information about the actual state of his readers, but only describes quite objectively the nature of the νηπίως wher-
ever they may be. Even here it can at most be said that St Paul foresaw that Ephesus and the neighbouring churches would not be spared by false teachers any more than other churches, and therefore gave the exhortation to strive after the unity of the faith and of knowledge, in order to be able to withstand their temptations. When St Paul wrote it was still, therefore, in Ephesus as at the time of his discourse to the Ephesian presbyters (Acts xx. 29, 30), according to which St Paul prophesied: εἰσελθόντας λύκοι βαρέως εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου, καὶ εἰς ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσωνται ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα.—Lastly, the concluding words of ver. 14 designate the element in which the false doctrine, which confuses the believer, consists (and whence, too, it therefore proceeds), together with the way in which it is wont to be spread by the false teachers. (Κλυδανίζουσαί is found only here in all the New Testament.—“To be moved by waves” is figuratively “to be brought into an uneasy agitation of mind,” an antithesis to πληροφορία.—The second expression here is, we may suppose, taken from a ship which the winds toss about.—Κυβέλα, playing at dice, was used by the Rabbis too in the form θριβ., [see Buxtorf’s lex. talm., p. 1984], and that, too, in the figurative sense, “deceit, fraud,” connected with πανουργία. The μεθοδεῖα τῆς πλάνης denotes the premeditated plan which the false teachers pursue in their deception. [See vi. 11.] The addition τοῦ διε-βόλου has crept into the text here out of that passage, and is to be erased according to the critical authorities. The preposition πρὸς points to the circumstance that it is the πανουργία, which makes fit for the μεθοδεῖα τῆς πλάνης.)

Ver. 15. It is clear that what follows is grammatically dependent on ἓνα δόμεν κ. τ. λ. in ver. 14. “That we may no longer be children who let themselves be moved by every wind of doctrine, but may grow up well into the body of Christ in all relations.” It cannot surprise us that the discourse here is of growing, whereas in ver. 13 the state of perfect growth, of manhood, had already been described; for in ver. 13 the discourse was surely not of manhood, as of a state already attained, but as of one that is yet to be attained. Further, as to the details in ver. 15, we may consider the usual connection ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ as sufficiently refuted. The ἀληθεύων, “to be, walk, in the truth,” forms the antithesis to the preceding ἐν κυβέλα, ἐν πανουργίᾳ εἶναι. But ἐν ἀγάπῃ does not
suit that, for instance in the acceptance, "to teach the truth in a loving, gentle, temper," as these words are usually taken; in opposition to which is the circumstance that ἀληθεύειν means not "to teach the truth," but "to be in the truth." On the other hand, in connection with αὐξησόμεν, the ἐν ἀγάπῃ affords a very beautiful sense, inasmuch as love is the root of all spiritual growth, therefore we read also, ver. 16, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. But the growth is to be an every-sided one, wherefore St Paul adds τὰ πάντα. The article is satisfactorily accounted for by the reference of the growth to the idea of the Christian, "to grow in all those things in which the Christian must advance." The development of the regenerate man is, lastly, no isolated one, proceeding in him alone, but such a one as is completed in the connection of the individual as a limb with the whole, and especially with Christ, the head of the whole organic unity of the Church. This sort of growth is expressed by αὐξησόμεν εἰς αὑτόν, δι' ἑστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ. As in what immediately follows in ver. 16 Christ is by the εἷς οὗ represented as the source whence all growth takes its first impulse and nourishment, so He is here as the mark to which the act of growing leads. Inasmuch as the faithful are to be conceived as already existing in Christ, ἐν αὑτῷ also might have stood here.

Ver. 16. Proceeding from Christ as the head, the growth of the whole body into a compact structure is at length accomplished, while each according to the measure of his talents and powers (ver. 7) fills his place. The metaphor, according to which the Church is compared to a σῶμα, has already been taken into consideration at 1 Cor. xii. 14, ss., where it is treated especially in detail. Col. ii. 19 is a special parallel passage for this one. Instead of the turn: εἷς οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα—τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σῶματος (i.e. ἑαυτοῦ) ποιεῖται, it is there (Col. ii. 19): εἷς οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὐξεῖ τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (See as to the form αὐξεῖ at Ephes. ii. 21. —The genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ is correctly taken by Böhmer not as designating the superlative, but as an expression of the truth, that the growth of the Church proceeds from God, and not peradventure from inferior powers, the angels, as the Colossian false teachers thought.) The nature of the σῶμα is further more accurately described by the epithets συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον, the former of which has occurred already ii. 21, the latter is found Col. ii. 2. 19, in the same meaning, whereas at Acts ix. 22, xvi. 10,
1 Cor. ii. 16, it is used in a figurative sense. The interarticulation of the members, and the firm establishment of the structure thence arising, is expressed in these epithets. But the somewhat obscure addition: διὰ πάσης ἀφής τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας, receives a more accurate definition through the words διὰ τῶν ἀφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον. Joints and ligaments unite the limbs of the body, thus too the spiritual body of the Church is joined together by all the forms of union of the individual members of it one with another. Ἐπιχορηγεῖν means (see at Gal. iii. 5) "to bestow richly, to proffer," here of course with reference to the higher powers of the Spirit, which fill the Church and direct her development. But that meaning seems more suitable in Col. ii. 19, than in this passage. The combination ἀφή τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας has already induced the Greek Fathers of the Church to take ἀφή in the sense (from ἀπεσθαλ) of αἰσθησις, as if the meaning were: "through every feeling of the proffering and co-operation of the Holy Ghost." But that meaning of ἀφή does not suit here on account of the parallel passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, and of the πάσης, which only finds an intelligible meaning through the interpretation of the word as "joint, connecting limb." One might with Meier rather understand the ἐπιχορηγία of the support and lending of hands of the faithful among themselves, so that the sense would be this: "the body, which is joined together and firmly fixed by all the bonds of the reciprocal lending of hands." Nevertheless, on account of the close parallel of Col. ii. 19, it might be more suitable here too, with Harless, to take the ἐπιχορηγία of the communication of the Holy Ghost, and to explain the combination ἀφή τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας so that the communication of the Holy Ghost itself is the link of connection between the individual believers. For the working of the believers themselves is spoken of in the following words: κατ’ ἐνεργείαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνός ἐκάστου μέρους, i.e. "efficiency, according to activity, in the measure of every part of the body." According to ver. 7, therefore, to every part again is attributed its peculiar measure of gifts and powers, and accordingly a peculiar position as to the whole. (The reading μέλους has, it is true, the important authorities of A.C. in its favour, but the change into μέρους is utterly inexplicable, this various reading might, therefore, be really the original one.) The last words: εἰς ἀικοδομήν ἐαυτοῦ ἐν ἁγίατι can, according to the αὐξησιν ποιεῖται, just before, only denote the object of the
growth, so that thus the ὀικοδομὴ sense _pregnant_ expresses the complete edification of the Church, as the end of the development. But, whereas the ἐν ἀνάγυρι in ver. 15 made the element in which the development is accomplished prominent, the addition _here_ expresses that love is _that_ in which the complete Church has her abiding condition.

§ 5. ISOLATED MORAL PRECEPTS.

(iv. 17—v. 20.)

Ver. 17, 18. The exhortation to a worthy walk, which was begun at iv. 1, is now again taken up here, and now for the first time applied to special relations. St Paul commences with reminding his readers of the Gentile standard of morality, and urgently calling on them to renounce it, whilst he describes the state of the Gentiles in such a way that it is clear what different preliminaries exist among them as Christians, in order to attain to pure morality. In the μηκέτι is couched that their own state was also such, as the description, which follows, purports, but their walk can no longer be thus, in accordance with their present position. The reading λοιπὰ here is certainly genuine; it was only omitted, because it was thought the readers of the Epistle were surely, as Christians, no longer Gentiles. But St Paul even within the sphere of Christianity still adheres to the descent from Israel, and the contrary. Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B.D.F.G., erased λοιπὰ. The wicked course of life of the Gentiles is now described as proceeding from, and therefore consisting in, the μοταιώθης τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν. The νοὸς denotes here too, as in Rom. vii. 23, 24, the higher element in man, the Spirit conceived as a faculty. In the degraded Gentiles (Rom. i. 18, ss.) this higher element in man appears powerless and of none effect, it is not capable of drawing them up to heaven, they sink, therefore, into the flesh and its lusts. The antithesis of this μοταιώθης τοῦ νοὸς is the ἐν ἐν Χριστῷ πεπληρωμένος, Col. ii. 10. Νοὸς is therefore here by no means = φρόνημα, as Harless insists, but, on the contrary, the μοταιώθης τοῦ νοὸς is the basis of the being so minded: "I conjure you henceforth to walk no more as the other Gentiles walk in the nothingness of
their spiritual life." The outward walk is an expression of the inward disposition, of the φρόνημα, and that is founded on the ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς; where through God's Spirit the νοὸς is again strengthened and reinforced, and therefore the δύναμις τοῦ νοὸς is re-established, there the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς is also changed into a φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, and the course of life improved along with it. (See Rom. viii. 6, and in the opusc. theolog. p. 157.) In what follows, the propositions, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοϊᾳ—διὰ τὴν ἄγνωσιν τὴν ὀψαλίαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, and ἄνετος ἀπηλλατρισμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ—διὰ τὴν ποίρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, correspond to one another. But Meier erroneously refers the former to the Gentiles, the other to the Jews; the discourse here is of the Gentiles alone. In the first member of the sentence the reference to the intellect rather prevails, in the second that to the feelings (therefore to the soul.) In the words ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοϊᾳ the last expression causes difficulty; for διάνοια occurs = νοὸς, but also as the action of the νοὸς, = διανοήμα. (See my opusc. theolog. p. 156, sq.) After ματαιότης τοῦ νοὸς standing just before, διάνοια cannot well be here again taken in the meaning of νοῶν, that general expression is rather defined more closely in the succeeding propositions. Where the νοῶν is impaired in power, the process of thinking exhibits itself without discernment by reason of the ἄγνωσις, and by reason of the hardening of the heart the feelings (the conscience) appear without excitability, man being estranged from the life of God. The ἄγνωσις is the state of the ἀθέων (according to ii. 12); where the knowledge of God is wanting, the true light is in general wanting, the active thinking faculty is obscured. The phrase ἔνοι ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ, which is found here only, is not to be referred to a general form of speech, such as this: "virtuous life," because it is produced by God; it rather denotes the life which God Himself is and has, and which is granted to the creature as long as it continues in communion with God, and does not by sin separate itself from the source of its life. (Ver. 17, μαρτύρομαι, like διαμαρτύρομαι, 1 Tim. v. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1, stands in the meaning of obtestari. —Ἐν κυρίῳ must not be taken as a form of swearing, but as a designation of the element, standing in which St Paul propounds what follows [τούτο].—As to καθὼς καὶ see Hartung's Doctrine of the Particles, vol. 1, p. 126, ss.—As to ἀπαλλατημόνθαι see on ii. 12. As to πώρωσις see on Rom. xi. 25.)
Ver. 19. As a result of the hardening of the feelings, which, however, is on its part induced by sin alone even, the giving one's self over to the impurest transgressions is also named, in fine, just as in Rom. i. sin is represented as a result of the service of sin. Of course the words εἰς ἔργασιν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης are not to be understood as if each individual had personally committed all forms of uncleanness; according to Rom. ii. 14, 26, and the testimony of history, there were certainly sober, chaste, characters even in the world before Christ; it is only the state of the whole body of the Gentiles, as such, that is described in them. Comp. at v. 12. For the rare ἀπηλλυκότες D.E.F.G. read ἀπηλπυκότες. But despair is nowhere named as the motive for the giving one's self up to sin, but the hardening of heart, which makes insensible to the exhortations of the Holy Spirit, is. The participle is, therefore, to be translated: "who, because they have hardened themselves." Ἀπαλλαγεῖν, doloris express esse, it remains to be said, is found in the New Testament in this passage only.—Ἀσελγεία is nearly akin to ἀκαθαρσία, and is expressly used for designating lust, but it rather makes, however, the inner side of it prominent, the want of self-control, of power for self-subjection, whereas ἀκαθαρσία makes the outer side of it so. The addition of πάσα points to all the forms of uncleanness which were in vogue among the Gentiles and are enumerated Romans i.—The addition of ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ Grotius wished to refer to the practice of uncleanness for money; but that cannot certainly be said of all Gentiles as something universal. The usual meaning "covetousness" cannot well be here used, if the ἐν is to retain its meaning. The word seems here used in the more extended sense, in which it occurs elsewhere too, and in which the Greek Fathers had already taken it. [See Harless on this passage.] Chrysostom and Theodoret take it as = ἀμέτρωσ, καθ ἑπερβολήν. But it is more correctly understood of physical avidity, of overfilling one's self with meat and drink, by which the sins of lust are promoted. See on this subject at v. 3, 5 also.)

Vers. 20, 21. To this description the exhortation to his Gentile Christian readers, to renounce that course of life as Christians, which the Gentiles pursue,—is then annexed. The φίλοι ὀμοφως is clearly to be taken thus: "ye have not so learned Christ, that ye could combine a Gentile life with the profession of Christ." But
the formula μανθάνειν τὸν Χριστὸν has something singular in it, for μανθάνειν cannot, from the nature of the case, be construed with the acc. pers. It has some plausibility here, if one interpreted Christ figuratively of the doctrine of Christ. But in the peculiar relation of Christ to the Church is couched the satisfactory justification of the singular mode of expression. The person of the Lord Himself is the object of the sermon, not a mere doctrine of Him; accordingly, one may likewise speak of a μανθάνειν Χριστὸν, i.e. of a taking up into one's self and appropriating to one's self the person of Christ Himself, what is called Col. ii. 6 παραλαμβάνειν τὸν Χριστὸν. (See John i. 5, xi. 12.) In Col. iii. 16 stands the kindred phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; which does not mean His doctrine, but His living word, which is He Himself. Ἀκούειν αὐτὸν, which follows, is also to be explained by the same mode of contemplation. That phrase does not mean "to hear about Him, of Him, through others," but to perceive in themselves Christ Himself, the eternal Word (see on John iv. 42 and Matt. xi. 27.) Therefore the act of regeneration is denoted by it, proceeding from which act the progressing renewal in sanctification, of which mention is made in what immediately follows, is developed. Finally, the ἐν αὐτῷ διδαχθοῦναι, which comes next to the above, is to be taken thus: "to be taught, so that one through faith is in Him, i.e. in community of being with Him," which again presupposes the communication of the being of Christ to the soul. (See I Thess. iv. 9, where the Christians are called θεοδιδακτοί by St Paul.) It remains to be said that the two last phrases have such a relation to one another, that they together constitute the μανθάνειν τὸν Χριστὸν. He that perceives His voice in himself, and permits himself to be so taught by it, that he enters into communion with the Lord, is a true μαθητής of Christ. In the ἐγε (see on iii. 2), however, St Paul again supposes the state of his readers not sufficiently known to him, although he is ready to assume the best. "If, that is to say, as I may assume as certain, ye have heard him, &c." But the addition, καθὼς ἐστιν ἀληθεία ἐν τῷ Ιησοῦ, in this verse 21, is difficult. The retrospective reference of the καθὼς to an ὁτιον preceding: "if ye have heard Him so as the truth is in Jesus, i.e. according to the right knowledge of His person," is inadmissible, because then, first, the article must necessarily have
stood before ἄλθεια, and secondly, because Jesus would not have been put, but Christ, because the former name refers to the human side of the person of Christ. Again there is no true and no false hearing of Christ: one either hears Him or hears Him not. Lastly, if the proposition is closed after Ἰησοῦ, the infinitives ἀποθέσαι, ἀνανεώσαι, &c. would be left there without any connecting link. For the interpretation of the passage, according to which the infinitive stands for the imperative, is inadmissible, because that use of the mood is certain in one passage only in the N. T. generally, (see Winer’s Gramm. p. 304, ss.), and here in particular the ὑμᾶς with ἀποθέσαι makes that interpretation impossible. The infinitives are rather to be conceived as dependent on ἐκάθιστο, and the clause, “as truth is in Jesus,” is to represent the person of the Redeemer according to its human development as a pattern for the faithful, after which they on their part are to form themselves. Thus Harless, correctly. The advantages of this interpretation are that thus not only the choice of the name Jesus, denoting the human side of Christ, is explicable, but also the making the ὑμᾶς with ἀποθέσαι prominent, whereby Jesus and the believers on Him are to be placed in juxtaposition. What in Jesus is Truth, not semblance, is to become Truth also in the faithful.

Ver. 22. Now first the negative side of the sanctification is described, the laying aside the old man, or the crucifying of the same (Gal. v. 24), afterwards the positive one, the putting on of the new man. Of course in the inner life the one cannot exist without the other, they are two essentially correlative sides of the same state. But now what is to be laid aside in the sanctification is not merely the habit of sinning, but the entire old man, also the (original) sinfulness inherited by birth itself, whence the habit of sinning first developed itself by unfaithfulness. But the addition κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν seems to oppose that. Storr and Flatt wished to combine ἀποθέσαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστρο- φὴν, τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνθρώπων, so that the sense would be: “to lay yourselves aside according to your previous course of life, i.e. the old man.” But it has been already observed by Rückert and Harless that “to lay one’s self aside” would be expressed by ἀποθέσαι ἑαυτοὺς, and besides the self-contradicting formula “to lay aside one’s self” is nowhere found. Ἀποθέσαι is here to be ex-
plained from the antithesis ἐνδύσασθαι, and refers to the figure of a garment, which is laid aside and put on. But of course no one can lay aside himself, his own being. We have already seen at verses 20, 21, that ὑμᾶς is repeated merely for the sake of the antithesis with Jesus. The addition κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφήν is rather to be taken as a more accurate definition of the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος for this particular case. That is to say, the old man must certainly be laid aside by him even who has not given himself over εἰς ἔργασιν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσῃ, but has led a respectable life according to the Law; yet the necessity of so doing appears much more clearly though in the deeply sunken man, and it is just in order to make that observed that St Paul adds it expressly for the Gentile Christians. In the parallel passage Col. iii. 9 σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ is added to the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος which is to be laid aside, in just the same way; but in many passages "the old man" is not added, even to bring forward such actual wicked works, as they are mentioned Col. iii. 5, ss. For the same reason the addition: τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης also is further added. That is to say, the old man has the φθορά and ματαιότης in him as necessary qualities; every natural man, even he that has not heightened his original sin by actual sin, is of nought, without power to fulfil the Law. But it cannot be said of every one that the old man in him is corrupt in consequence of the lusts of deceit. The ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς ἀπάτης, that is to say, are the lusts which provoke εἰς ἔργασιν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσῃ, which stifle even the good that is still in man, which was left after the fall, which put out the light in him, and thus cause a total darkness (verse 18.) (See on Matt. vi. 23.) The ἀπάτη denotes the nature of sin which amuses man with a show of joy, without being able to afford him true satisfaction. (See on Rom. vii. 11.) We cannot therefore find "the unhappy state of the old man" denoted by the φθειρόμενος κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, as Harless will have it to be, but that especial form of sinfulness, as it had developed itself among the Gentiles in the mass, therefore just so as St Paul describes it in Rom. i. From this form of sinfulness (the ἐργασία ἀκαθαρσίας πάσῃ) individual Gentiles, and the Jews in the mass, were free; among the latter the original sin had certainly, in consequence of their unfaithfulness, generated another form of actual sin, self-righteousness, presumption, and
pride; but still their sinful state could not be described as παλαιὸς ἀνθρώπος ὁ φθειρόμενος κατὰ τὸς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης, because the pernicious effects of sensual excesses are meant to be characterized by those words.

Vers. 23, 24. To the negative aspect of the matter, the laying aside of the old man, is subjoined the positive one, the ἀνανεωθαι καὶ ἐνδυσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἀνθρωπον. No distinction is to be sought for between ἀνανεωθαι and ἀνακαινοθαι (2 Cor. iv. 16, Col. iii. 10), no more than between νοῦς and καινὸς ἀνθρωπος. (See Col. iii. 10.) In Rom. xii. 2 we read ἀνακαινισθεις τοῦ νοος, whereas here the ἀνανεωθαι of the νοος is spoken of. Both words answer to the Hebrew יִשְׁתַּחַל Ps. li. 12. (See Antonin. πρ. εαυτ. iv. 3. ἀνακαινος σεαυτων.) As in the old the idea of the obsolete is at the same time cherished, so in the new is that of the original, of the corresponding with its ideal. In the combination ἀνανεωθαι καὶ ἐνδυσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἀνθρωπον the latter expression appears as a more accurate epexegetical definition of the former, which is particularly shown in the more extended characterization of the new man. (See on ἐνδυσασθαι the remarks at Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. iii. 27.) But if the laying aside the old, and the putting on the new, is here referred to man, of course it is not St Paul's meaning that sanctification is to be completed by one's own power; Christ is our sanctification, as He is our righteousness (see on 1 Cor. i. 30); but all, that Christ through the holy Spirit operates in man, can in the form of the Law be put to him as a demand, because man by his unfaithfulness can hinder the operation of the Spirit. But in verse 23 the πνεῦμα τοῦ νοος, a combination which is found nowhere else, requires consideration too. Every separate expression would have sufficed, as Rom. xii. 2 shows, and would have been intelligible, but how is the idea of πνεῦμα and νοος in this combination of the two words to be understood? We take νοος absolutely as the faculty of perceiving the eternal, in which is contained as well that which we call reason, as also the conscience (or self-consciousness), which last reference plainly comes out in 1 Cor. 14 in the formula προφητεύων ἐν νοτ. In the natural state from this faculty proceed all impulses to what is good (Rom. vii. 23), but the νοος is found in the state of the μεταμόρφωσις (verse 18), it is therefore overcome by the flesh; it is only through Christ that the νοος can serve the Law of God (Rom. vii.
25.) In the renewal, therefore, the νοῦς is reinforced, so that it can overcome. The reinforcement is to be derived from the communication of Christ’s higher spirit to the soul, and this is meant to be expressed by the formula ἀναγεννηθαι τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοῦς. Πνεῦμα is the substance, and νοῦς the power of the substance; when, therefore, the renewal is referred to the substance, by that is meant to be expressed the operation of the divine spirit on the human spirit, which operation is strengthening, sanctifying, purifying.

We can, therefore, find in this passage no occasion for departing from the view of the biblical psychology, which we have propounded in the dissertation on the Trichotomy (opsis. theolog. p. 143, ss.); on the contrary, we find its fundamental ideas completely established here. On the other hand, I must consider as totally inadmissible the reference of the νοῦς to the disposition, for which καρδία usually stands, or the feelings (φρόνημα.) (See further the remarks on Col. ii. 18.) Lastly the words: τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας, are of great dogmatical importance, for they characterize the new man as a re-establishment of the divine image, and at the same time give the specific tokens of that image. Now, the less is found elsewhere in the Scriptures of the idea of that image, the more important must these communications of the apostle appear. In the words κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέν is couched no doubt an allusion to the creation of man, Gen. i. 27, καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν. The new birth is the second creation (see at ii. 10), wherefore the new man is called καὐχ. κτίς ἡμῶν ἡμῶν... (See at 2 Cor. v. 17; Galat. vi. 15.) Now, as God in the beginning created man after His own image, so too in the new birth He again creates him after the same, because sin had dimmed the image of God. That, according to St Paul’s meaning, the κατὰ Θεὸν in our passage stands for κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ is shown by the parallel passage, Col. iii. 10, κατ’ εἰκόνα τοῦ κτισμάτος αὐτῶν. The archetype, however, after which man is made in the new birth is Christ, the second Adam, εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Col. i. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 4.) Therefore the new man is also called the Christ in us; Christ makes His likeness in every human heart, He everywhere begets Himself again. But the idea of the divine image is more accurately determined by the words: ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας. That is to say, by the
preposition ἐν the state in which the property of being like the image of God consists and exhibits itself is designated. The two expressions, δικαιοσύνη and ὀσίωτης, are put in juxtaposition, but in an inverted order, in like manner in Luke i. 75; Book of Wisdom of Solomon ix. 3. The adjectives and adverbs are found in conjunction at 1 Thess. ii. 10, Titus i. 8. The δικαιοσύνη denotes the right relation inwardly between the powers of the soul, outwardly to men and circumstances. (See at Rom. iii. 21.) On the other hand ὀσίωτης denotes, like the Hebrew ἡσυχία (Prov. ii. 21; Amos v. 10), the integrity of the spiritual life, and the piety towards God which it supposes. The two expressions together complete, therefore, the idea of moral perfection (Matt. v. 48.) And indeed in the regenerate man that is not show, but reality; the τῆς ἁληθείας refers to the combined idea δικαιοσύνη καλ ὀσίωτης, and is used in the same sense as in verse 22; as in Jesus there is nothing but reality, no show, He also operates reality in those that are His. Whereas, therefore, here the ethical aspect of the image is put forward, Col. iii. 10 puts the intellectual one in the foreground; renewal alone leads to the ἐπιγνώσις, all knowledge that proceeds not from the renewal of the heart, as was that of those false teachers in Colosse, is seeming knowledge. On the other hand, in the Wisdom of Solomon ii. 23 the physical side of the image is insisted on, that is to say, the ἀφθαρσία of the body, κατ' εἰκόνα τῆς ἱδίας ἤσιότητος God made man exempt from death.

Ver. 25. Now, after this general discussion, special precepts could follow, and indeed, down to v. 2, such as refer to duties towards others. Among these St Paul places first the exhortation to truth, because it is the condition of all sound relations of men among themselves. Therefore, too, St Paul gives his reason for the exhortation in the words: ὅτι ἔσεσθε ἀληθείας μέλη, without truthfulness no Christian communion of life can subsist. (The laying aside of lying and the speaking truth are connected as in vers. 22, 24, the laying aside of the old and the putting on of the new man; by that means the negative and the positive aspects of truth are designated. The words in Zachar. viii. 16, according to the LXX., seem, we may add, to have been present to St Paul's mind here; for they run thus: λαλεῖτε ἀληθείαν ἐκαστὸς πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.)
Vers. 26, 27. The first words ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἀμαρτάνετε are quoted after Ps. iv. 6. As, however, they are not to be viewed as a formal confirmative quotation, but only as a reminiscence after the LXX., no stress is to be laid on the difference between the Greek translation and the Hebrew. According to the context of the Psalm χρόνος means "fear ye," to wit, God; the LXX. have given it ὀργί-ζεσθε, as alone the expression, taken by itself, admits of being taken. But as to the meaning of the obscure words here in the context of this Epistle, it might be assumed with Winer that St Paul is supposing a just anger and means to say: "you may be angry, but sin not in your anger," if in what directly follows (verse 31) anger were not represented as utterly to be reprobated. But to refer the negation to both verbs: "be not angry and sin not," its position plainly does not allow. Harless proposes to take the proposition: "be angry and sin not," as = "be angry in the right way," i.e. without bitterness against the person, with a reconcilable heart. But even in this mode of taking it the permission of anger would surely be given, which stands in contradiction to verse 31. Man's anger is never in itself just and permissible, God's anger alone is the holy and just one; to Him, therefore, alone is anger to be left according to Rom. xii. 19. The only satisfactory interpretation is that which Oecumenius had already propounded, and Meier last defended, viz., to take the imperative hypothetically: "if ye are angry, as it is to be foreseen that it will happen, at least sin not in anger." This use of the imperative is explained from the Hebrew (see Ewald's Gramm. pp. 556, ss.) The being angry and without sin then presupposes that the heart was not embittered by it, but remained appeasable. Taken thus, the following proposition then connects itself very naturally with it, as it is just in it that placability is recommended, the sun is not to go down upon the wrath, i.e. it is not to be carried forward to the following day. (Παροργισμὸς differs from ὀργή so that the former denotes the individual paroxysm of anger; ὀργή), on the contrary, anger as a passion, without regard to the special cause for it. Παρορ-γισμὸς is not found again in the New Testament, but often in the LXX. for ἡρίβα and ἀρίβα. 1 Kings xv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; Jer. xxi. 5.) The exhortation in verse 27, μηδὲ διδότε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ, which in itself wears a perfectly general character, since the devil, as the prince of darkness, incites to everything bad, ob-
tains by the reference to what precedes the special reference to the pernicious element of anger, when it exasperates the heart, in that it destroys peace and stirs up enmity and hatred. The devil is mentioned in a similar way at 2 Cor. ii. 11. (The phrase τόπων ἔδωκα [Rom. xii. 19], for which χόραν ἔδωκα also occurs, answers to the Hebrew וֹפֶץ in the sense "to permit to come into operation, to offer an opportunity for operation." The reading μηδὲ is, with Lachmann, decidedly to be preferred to the μητε, and μηδὲ also suits very well the above-given reference of the passage to the disturbance of peace. See Harless ad h. l.; Winer's Gramm. p. 456.)

Ver. 28. A second exhortation relates to stealing (not merely in its gross exterior shape, but in general as appropriation of others' property), and the encouragement of industry. (Ὁ κλέπτων is here not equal to κλέψαι, the discourse is not of any actual theft here, but of the vice of stealing. The article makes the participle a substantive; ὁ κλέπτων is "the thief." ) Here, however, there is found a great discrepancy in the MSS., as in one τὸ ἁγαθὸν is left out, in another τὰς χερσὶν, in another ἰδίαις also, in another αὐτὸν is added to χερσὶν. As the passage possesses no dogmatical importance, and has no interior difficulty either, it is not to be comprehended what that variation can have its foundation in. To me, with Harless, the simplest reading seems the original one, and all else spurious additions. Τὸ ἁγαθὸν and ἰδίαις may have been interpolated from cognate passages, as 1 Cor. iv. 12 ; Gal. vi. 10. (See on the idea of the ἁγαθὸν the remark on Gal. vi. 10.) The addition: ἵνα ἔχῃ κ. τ. λ. does not express the immediate object of labour, that is, one's own maintenance, but the specifically Christian one. From the impulse towards mutual participation, which the Gospel arouses, the Christian can never wish to possess or enjoy anything alone.

Ver. 29. From outward actions the discourse makes a transition to words. The Christian walking in sincerity says not only no wicked, but even no useless, words. Ἀγαθὸς σαπρὸς denotes here, since at v. 4 special mention is made of immodest speeches, all words that are useless, and do not answer their object, as Chrysostom expresses himself: πᾶν ὁ μὴ τὴν ἰδίαν χρείαν πληροῖ σαπρὸν λέγομεν. (See Math. vii 17, 18, xii. 33.) St Paul means rather, that words should be regulated by the need of those present, so that
they may serve unto edification, and may do good to the hearers. (At εἰ τις κ. τ. λ. ἐκπορευέσθω ἐκ τού στόματος is to be supplied.—Οἴκο-
δομὴ τῆς χρείας is a rare expression, there was therefore a tem-
tation to alter it to πιστεῦως, which D.E.F.G. read. But the reading χρείας deserves the preference, just because it is an unusual mode of expression. “Edification of need” is to be taken: “to the edification of those, who are in want of the same.”—With δὲ χάριν is
to be supplied λόγος ἁγαθός, “That it may confer a benefit on the hearers.” The signification of χάρις, “grace,” is not applicable
here, because διδόναι does not suit it. Χάρις is used 2 Cor. viii.
4, 6 exactly as it is used here.)

Ver. 30. What now follows is not to be taken as quite a new
exhortation, but as a warning against the use of a λόγος σαπρός,
on account of the effect of it on the Holy Spirit, which fills the
heart of the believer, and which is grieved thereby. The λυπεῖν
of the Holy Ghost is of course different from the βλασφημεῖν of
the Holy Ghost (Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10); it expresses the
operation of inferior degrees of sin on the Holy Ghost. In Isaiah
lxiii. 10 we find a similar phrase, παροξυνεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα (Ἰν.)
But it is a question, if this expression, “grieve not the Holy
Spirit,” is to arouse the fear lest the Spirit should depart from them;
or whether it is to awaken love: “you will not surely wish to grieve
the good Spirit in you.” The decision depends on how the fol-
lowing ἐν φέσαραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως is taken.
The idea of the sealing (see on i. 13) is that of confirming, estab-
lishing, here in the state of grace; and the ἀπολυτρώσεως is here,
as at 1 Cor. i. 30, the absolute redemption; therefore the phrase εἰς
ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως denotes the whole course of the sanctifi-
cation unto the completion of the work of God in the soul of man.
Accordingly the εἰς is not to be translated “for the day of redemp-
tion,” as if that were considered as a critical day, but “until the
day of redemption,” i.e. therefore, “in which Spirit ye now and
evermore through the whole course of your development are con-
firmed in the state of grace.” According to this meaning of the
addition it cannot be doubtful that St Paul here wishes to work
upon his readers through love and the holy shrinking from grieving
the good Spirit dwelling in them, and not through fear. The
idea is to be thus paraphrased: “Grieve not the Holy Spirit, for
He it is surely, to whom ye owe the great grace of the sealing in
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the life of faith, and will owe it unto the end of your Christian de-
v elopment, until the day of redemption." The question here is not at all as to the possibility of an apostacy from the faith and of the departure of the Holy Spirit, neither are we to think of a set allusion to Isaiah lxiii. 10, where similar things occur, as St. Paul would elsewhere certainly have retained the παραξενεῖν which is there used; the apostle only means to encourage his readers to walk circum-
spectly by calling on them not to grieve the Holy Spirit which fills them. That this λυπᾶν mean merely "to restrict in its operation," might not be demonstrable. This expression rather belongs to the order of those which represent the divine essence as capable of being affected by sin. Certainly these expressions have in them something of human passion, but in them is couched the important truth, that God will not be unaffected by human sin and misery, but, as the most exalted and purest love really feels even both, only without grieving of His beatitude, because He never contemplates sin without its connection with redemption.

Vers. 31, 32. Christians then are to become also like the divine love, which has manifested itself in Christ as the forgiving, and to that end put away all uncharitableness, both in its root and its expression. (Θυμός differs from δραγή, as the inner cause from the outward effect; the emotion of the soul and the outburst of anger. Πυκνία, however, again contains the cause of the inward boiling up of anger, "irritation, bitterness of mind," which easily occasions anger to arise. Lastly, κραυγή and βλασφημία are the outbreaks of the δραγή. The latter expression does not here refer to God, but to man, against whom the anger is directed. The κακία is finally, according to the context, here specially uncharitableness in all forms of its manifestation. Compare here—with the parallel passage, Col. iii. 8.—In ver. 32 χρηστοὶ forms the antithesis with the πυκνία. Perhaps there is couched in that word, which by Itacismus is pronounced χριστοῦ, an allusion to the name of Christians; the apologists of the first centuries often use it.—The form εὐ-
σπλαγχνος is not found again except at 1 Peter iii. 8, "easily to be moved to compassion." At Col. iii. 12 εὐθύνασθε σπλαγχνα stands for it.—The concluding words: χαρίζωμενοι ἑαυτοὶ κ.τ.λ. are found word for word at Col. iii. 13. Χαρίζομενοι stands here like ἄφεναι elsewhere. Ἐαυτοῖς = ἀλληλοὺς. See Matthie's Gramm. vol. 2, p. 920. At the end of the verse it seems that
\( \eta\mu\iota\nu \) after B.D.E. should be read with Lachmann. For the change into \( \upsilon\mu\iota\nu \) is easily explained, because both before and after the second person stands. It is also intelligible how the consciousness of St Paul that he had to thank God in Christ for his own forgiveness also, urged him here to include himself along with his readers.

Chapter v. 1, 2. As a winding up of this exhortation to exercise the duties which relate to others, St Paul further expressly calls upon his readers, as children of God, to imitate God, and so to walk in love as Christ has loved them, viz., with self-sacrifice and self-denial. There is the same idea in Matt. v. 48, "be ye perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect." This endeavour seems here more closely enforced by the motive implied in \( \omega\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\pi\tau\alpha\). As children bear in them their father's nature, so they can also imitate his example. The relation of children here spoken of refers, of course, to the new birth and the divine life communicated to man in it. But St Paul makes a transition without more ado from the imitation of God to Christ, because God was in Christ, and has loved us in Him and through Him. The aorists \( \gamma\gamma\alpha\alpha\pi\alpha\pi\pi\sigma\varepsilon\), \( \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\varepsilon\) point to the historical fact of the death in which Christ's self-sacrificing love reached its climax. The giving up Himself by Christ is now more accurately described as a sacrifice of His life for man. (\textit{P}ro\kappa\sigma\phi\rho\nu\alpha\, the more general word for sacrifice, is by \( \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\) more closely defined as a sacrifice of blood.) The closing proposition of verse 2, \( \tau\omicron\ \Theta\epsilon\omega\varepsilon\ \iota\nu\omicron\ \delta\sigma\mu\mu\nu\ \varepsilon\nu\omega\delta\iota\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\), is also taken from the idea of sacrifice. It answers to the Hebrew \( \nu\pi\omicron\nu\iota\nu \nu\iota\nu \nu\iota\nu \), Gen. viii. 21, Lev. ii. 12, iii. 5. In Phil. iv. 18 it is found again, and is there interpreted: \( \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\kappa\tau\eta\), \( \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\rho\rho\pi\alpha\tau\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \Theta\epsilon\omega\). But the pleasure that God takes in the sacrifice of His Son does not refer to Christ's suffering and death as such, but to the love and obedience that Christ exhibited therein. Against this very old acceptation of our passage, which so completely corresponds with the words and the sphere of St Paul's ideas (see on Rom. iii. 25; 1 Cor. v. 7), it has in the latest times been objected by Rückert, Meier, Usteri, that the question here is not as to the atoning death of Christ, but merely of Christ's love, by means of which he has left us a pattern. Usteri (St Paul's system, 4th ed. p. 118) expresses himself upon our passage as follows: "The context contains only this: Christ has, in His giving up of Himself, so well-pleasing to
God, left us a pattern. That is to say, the giving up Himself by Christ—was, as we know from Phil. ii. 8, at the same time an act of obedience towards God, and therefore attended by the divine well-pleasedness. Ὄσμη εὐωδίας at Phil. iv. 18, and εὐωδία at 2 Cor. ii. 15, are used in a similar way to denote the divine well-pleasedness, without the slightest allusion being made to an atonement." Now it is certainly correct to say, that the phrase Ὅσμη εὐωδίας by itself is not enough to show the idea of sacrifice, but surely that idea is couched in the words παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν. It is also to be acknowledged that, according to the context of this passage, nothing is meant to be especially taught as to the idea of sacrifice, the first object of it is rather to set up Christ as a pattern; but it cannot and must not be denied that the idea of Christ's sacrifice of His life is here supposed by St Paul to be known, that he exhibits Christ's giving Himself up as a sacrifice, for a pattern to his readers, just exactly as it is done in Matt. xx. 28, in Christ's own words. (See the Comm. on that passage.) That Christ's sacrificial death cannot be a pattern for men in all relations, does not prevent its being set forth as such a pattern for some virtues, to name some, for obedience and pure self-sacrificing love. Thus at Phil. ii. 5, ss., the putting off His divine nature by Christ is also represented as a pattern for humility, without meaning to suppose anything quite analogous in man. Even the idea of the imitation of God would be unsuitable (verse 1) if every imitation required complete equality with the pattern.

Vers. 3—5. Whereas from iv. 25 down to here St Paul has recommended duties towards others, he now (verses 3—20) addresses himself to the duties one owes to one's self. The exhortations, which he gives out, relate collectively to the warning against fleshly lusts and sensual enjoyments, with which a holy enjoyment and spiritual gladness are contrasted as worthy of the Christian (verses 18—20.) This series of exhortations (verses 7—14) is interrupted by a new comparison of Gentilism and Christianity, in which the former is characterised as the element of darkness, the latter as the element of light. But everything as to the comprehension of the context in this section depends on the interpretation of the expression πλεονεξία, πλεονέκτης. That is to say, if by it "covetousness, avarice," is understood, the exhortations do not
confine themselves to fleshly sins. But as everything else in this section admits of being referred to those, and as it is only on the assumption that St Paul means to treat of them here, that verse 18 is fitly combined with what precedes, moreover, as we have been already (at iv. 19) obliged to take πλεονεξία = pampering of the flesh, that meaning seems to be required here also. But the addition in verse 5, δε ἡστιν εἰδωλολάτρης (for which Lachmann without any sufficient reason reads δ), compared with Col. iii. 5, πλεονεξία ητις ἡστιν εἰδωλολατρεία, seems to make that assumption doubtful. That is to say, there seems to be couched in this definition a reference to Mammon, as the God of this world, by which then the acceptance of the πλεονεξία as "covetousness" in the proper sense would seem to be favoured. Harless attempts to avoid this difficulty by referring δε not to the last preceding substantive merely, but to all together, so that all the above-named phases of sin would be called idolatry. But that seems to me to be capricious. It is more natural to say that St Paul takes just the πλεονεξία, in the sense: "carnal desire of enjoyment," as idolatry, because he, as Phil. iii. 19 shows, views in it a deifying of the belly, ὁν ὁ Θεός ἡ κοιλία. St Paul takes the sins of lust first as consequences of the pampering of the flesh (Rom. xiii. 14.) To that is now to be added, that, in Col. iii. 5, too, πλεονεξία is ranged among the sins of carnal nature, and therefore may very well be there too taken as it is here. (See also 1 Thess. iv. 6.) St Paul now represents all carnal-mindedness, in word or deed, as unworthy of the Christian, unholy things do not become saints; the kingdom of God, the fellowship of the saints, permits nothing unholy in it. But of course the idea that no one that lives carnally can have a portion in the kingdom of God is not to be understood as if no one that ever committed a carnal sin can enter into the kingdom of God; why the very readers of St Paul's Epistle had previously lived like heathens (ver. 8.) It is rather meant to declare that without thorough conversion and purification from such things no one can be in the holy kingdom of God. (In ver. 3 the μηδὲ ὄνομαξεθω ἐν υμῖν, i.e., ἐν μέσῳ υμῶν, forms the antithesis with the committing. Such carnal sins are to be quite unheard of among Christians, not even known by name.—In ver. 4 αἰσχρότης is, from its combination with μωρολογία and from Col. iii. 8, where αἰσχρο-
λογία is mentioned, to be understood of indecency in language.—Μορφολογία, which is found here only, means by itself only stultiloquium, ubi risus captatur, etiam sine sale, as Bengel interprets. But according to the context this expression also has predominantly its reference to such discourses, in which double-entendres are introduced.—Near akin is εἰπράσελα also, which in like manner is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. It comes from εἰπράσελας, one who knows how to turn about skilfully; therefore lepidus, facetus. The substantive is used in the meaning scurrilitas in dicendo, which is also wont to take especial pleasure in lascyious talk. Plautus characterizes the Ephesians as especially tempted in this respect. [Miles glorios. iii. 1.] To the impure use of speech St Paul places in opposition the pure and holy use of it in prayer. In ver. 5 the reading ὅσε is, according to the view of all more modern critics, decidedly to be preferred to the ἄσε of the text. rec. The conjunction of the two kindred expressions strengthens the idea of knowledge: “you surely know of your own knowledge that,” &c. It is odd that βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ is found at the end of the verse. The reading Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ in F.G. is, we may suppose, to be explained merely from the notion that God must be named before Christ. The name βασιλεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ now occasions no difficulty, for although in most instances by far βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ stands, still τοῦ Χριστοῦ also is found, e.g., 2 Tim. iv. 1, Matt. xvi. 28. And even if it were not found in the New Testament, the name would follow from the idea that Christ is the King of the kingdom of God, that the Father has handed the dominion over to Him (1 Cor. xv. 27) as admissible in itself. Even among the Rabbis the kingdom of God is therefore called βασιλεία. The striking part of the phrase is merely the addition καὶ Θεοῦ. That St Paul meant to characterize Christ as God in opposition to the false gods is improbable, because then we may suppose τοῦ Χριστοῦ Θεοῦ would have been written. The missing article before Θεοῦ can therefore prove nothing in favour of that acceptance, because Θεοῦ is very often put without the article, and no accurate distinction is meant to be made here between Christ and God. It might be most correct to suppose in the καὶ Θεοῦ a more accurate definition to the ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in this sense: “in the kingdom of Christ, which is also the kingdom of God.” St Paul
adds that definition in order to direct observation to the holiness of the kingdom, in which God, the author of all holiness, reigns. Compare the parallel passages Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10.)

Verses 6, 7. With the kingdom of God and the σωτηρία in it God's wrath is further contrasted. This falls on the unbelieving not merely in future punishments, but also, as Rom. i. shows, even on earth. They are, therefore, not merely shut out from the kingdom of God, but they also fall into Gehenna. St Paul, therefore, warns his readers against community with them, for that also brings with it a like fate.—Only the ὑμῖν ἀπατήτω κενοῖς λόγοις, which points to deceivers, is significant here. Among Gentiles one cannot, of course, imagine them, for the Christians were, as such, separated from them. St Paul must have meant thoughtlessly-minded persons among the Christians themselves, who, we may suppose, were led by antinomian ideas to the notion that such carnal sins were less blameworthy, and who, therefore, abused the Christian doctrine of freedom as a cloak for their wickedness. The passage Col. ii. 8 of the φιλοσοφία and the κενή ἀπάτη cannot be compared here, for it relates to persons of a scrupulous-ascetic tendency (Col. ii. 20, ss.). But here, too, there is no intimation given that such false teachers were in the churches to which St Paul writes; he seems only to warn them against such as will come there. (Ver. 6. Compare the parallel passage, Col. iii. 6. As to the νιῶ τῆς ἀπειθείας see on Ephes. ii. 2. The expression denotes, in the first place, the Gentiles who practised such vices in the mass; but, secondly, all those, too, who let themselves be led into such sins. Ver. 7. On συμμετόχους see iii. 6.)

Verses 8—11. That communion with those that walk carnally must be put an end to is deduced by St Paul from the contrast of his readers' present state with their previous one. They were, as Gentiles, darkness, i.e. they belonged to the element of darkness and to its prince, as they now are light and belong to the lord of light, through communion with Him the original light. (John i. 4.) Hence follows the necessity for walking as children of the light, i.e. to bring fruits of the light, and to that end carefully to search what the Lord's will is. (Compare vers. 15, 17.) Darkness, on the other hand, is represented as the element which is incapable of producing fruits. What it does produce is only deceitful show. In 1 Thess. v. 4, ss. is found a parallel quite similar be-
tween light and darkness and those who belong to them. See also 2 Cor. vi. 14. (Ver. 8. As to τέκνα φωτός see at 1 Thess. v. 5.—The participle δοκιμάζοντες connects itself with περιτατείτε, so that a colon therefore cannot stand after the verb. The parenthetical clause δό γάρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός κ.τ.λ. is meant especially to form the antithesis to the ἀπατᾶν κενοὶ λόγοι, on which account also ἀγαθοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀληθεία are named, and not such virtues as form the antithesis to the πορεία κ.τ.λ. in ver. 3.—The reading φωτός in ver. 9 is, on extrinsic and intrinsic grounds, to be preferred to the reading of the text. rec. (πνεύματος), which we may suppose to be a gloss from Gal. v. 22.—On ἀγαθοσύνη see Rom. v. 14, Gal. v. 22, 2 Thess. i. 11.—Ver. 11. The ἔργα σκότους are those named in ver. 3, ss. But the epithet ἀκάρπος struck even the copyists; it was therefore arbitrarily altered into ἀκαθάρτως or ἀτάκτως. For wicked works seem to be equally fruits too, only fruits of darkness. [Compare Matt. vii. 17.] But ἀκάρπος means not only "without fruit, unfruitful," but also "useless, fruitless." That which is produced of darkness is merely, therefore, to be designated as something which does not deserve the name of a fruit, which has only the appearance of one without the reality. Light alone has real power of production, it alone can create works which bear in them the eternal luminous nature and follow him that executes them into eternity, Rev. xiv. 13.)

Ver. 12. The last words of verse 11, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε, form the transition to verse 12, the γάρ unites itself with them. Θε μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχειν forms a climax to the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖν, "not only have no part in such works of darkness, but rather, on the contrary, even rebuke them as children of the light," dicis et factis luce dignis, as Bengel expresses himself. Whereas, therefore, in the συγκοινωνεῖν a sinking down to the Gentile level is indicated, the ἐλέγχειν supposes a raising of the Gentiles, and of those who are similar to them, to the Christian standard. It is, therefore, not a mere declaration that those things are disgraceful, without any operation on the sinner, but the idea of the ἐλέγχειν involves the conviction of the sinner, it is "to convince by denunciation, to work the conversion of." But how does verse 12 unite itself to that with the γάρ which gives a reason for what precedes? The words τὰ κρυφὰ γινόμενα ὑπ’ αὐτῶν = ἔργοιν τοῦ
σκότους in verse 11, they are not meant to express that one does not, and can not, at all know what they do because it is done secretly (for surely the apostle both here and in Rom. i. openly declares what they do), but only to designate the actions as shunning the light, as such that the conscience of the very persons who do them condemns them. The following words: ἀναχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν, are meant to express the enormity of the hideous vices, "it is not only disgraceful to commit such things, but one is ashamed even to express it only; it is so filthy that one cannot speak of it." Now, the γὰρ joins this idea quite simply with the μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε, so that the necessity for the rebuke is founded on the magnitude of the offences: "rather rebuke them even, for their sin is so great that they urgently need awaking out of their dark sleep of sin" (verse 14.) The magnitude of the sin is therefore meant to move pity in the hearts of the faithful, and that is to incite them to save the lost ones.

Harless wishes to have the γὰρ depend on μὴ συγκοινοινεῖτε, and to refer nothing to ἐλέγχετε before verse 18; but this passing over the verb which stands last, and introduces the whole of the succeeding treatise, has nothing to support it. Meier's interpretation is also to be designated as quite a failure. He understands the λέγειν of "mere indifferent speaking and relating of such secretly-committed vices, which is of itself even infamous and low." That indifferent relating is to form a contrast with the ἐλέγχειν, "the openly blaming to one's face." But the passage does not contain the slightest intimation that St Paul intended a contrast between λέγειν and ἐλέγχειν.

Ver. 13. But the main difficulty in this passage has been found in verse 13, the proverb-like conciseness of which no doubt carries along with it a certain obscurity;¹ however, if we have only defined the idea of the ἐλέγχειν correctly, what follows connects itself plainly with what precedes. That is to say, St Paul means in what follows partly to describe more accurately the effect of the ἐλέγχειν to the salvation of the sinner, partly to represent it as secured in its success, and does that so that he refers it to the contrast of light and darkness which has been used ever since verse 8. St Paul designates light as the divine element of life, as

what illumines darkness with all that is done in it, *i.e.* as the principle which makes darkness manifest in its nature and frightful form; but at the same time also light metamorphoses darkness and its works by its creative power, and makes them light themselves. It follows then from *that*, that light alone is the true reality which has the power to scare darkness into its nothingness; therefore, where light is as in the faithful (verse 8, φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ), there is also the certainty of the victory over darkness, if they only dare to rebuke it. Thus then the δεῦ λέγει ἡγεῖτε κ. τ. λ. in verse 14 is closely united with what precedes, for the rousing voice ἡγεῖτε, ἀνάστα, is exactly the ἐλέγχειν recommended to the faithful by the apostle in verse 11, and the illumination, which Christ performs, is equal to the ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦσθαι in verse 13.

Now if, after this statement of the general connexion, we consider details, it is, first of all, clear that τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλέγχομεν refers back just to the ἔργα σκότους, τὰ κρυφὴ γυμνόμενα, so that the sense is this: “but if all these things are reproved, they will be illuminated by the light, and made manifest in their nature.” Now the peculiarity of this passage consists in the circumstance that St Paul does not adhere to the term φανεροῦσθαι merely in the idea of “to be illuminated, and by that means be made manifest in their nature,” but conceives evil’s being illuminated as at the same time a metamorphosis of evil into the nature of the light. If the interpreter overlooks that, the following words: πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανεροῦμενον φῶς ἐστι, must be inexplicable to him. That is to say, he then falls into the temptation to take φανεροῦμενον as middle, and to understand the clause thus: “for the light is the element which makes all clear.” But, in the first place, it is against *that* interpretation that just before φανεροῦται is used *passively*, and consequently the same word cannot immediately after that be taken in a *middle* sense; further, were φῶς here the element of light, the article could not be wanting; lastly, the position of the πᾶν, which must necessarily be the subject, and φῶς the predicate, is against that interpretation; were φῶς to be the subject, at least the words would have to be placed thus: φῶς τὸ πᾶν φανεροῦμενὸν ἐστι. The words must, therefore, be taken: “for all things which are illuminated by the light are themselves light.” This idea has certainly something singular in it, for it might be said that the light by no means always exercises that
metamorphosing action. A sinner can be reproved by the light without his letting it into his heart, and changing his life; thus, to particularize, at God’s judgment-seat the devil and all the wicked are reproved by the light, without becoming light, though St Paul, no doubt, hit upon this mode of applying the expression φανερωθαι through verse 8, where it is said that the Christians, who were σκότος, are now φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ; so, he means to say, can those too, who are still σκότος, and perform ἔργα σκότους, through the light in you be made light, be enlightened.

Ver. 14. The idea in verse 14 is now most intimately connected with the above; wherefore (because success cannot be wanting to the operation of light on darkness) the Scriptures (Isaiah lx. 1) also summon us to awake from sleep and rise up from death, both of which Christ performs through His illumination. That is to say, sleep and death are figures, which, from the nature of the thing, coincide with the idea of darkness in its figurative sense. (See on 1 Thess. v. 5, ss.) But a difficulty was found in ver. 14, inasmuch as the formula διὸ λέγει, scil. ἡ γραφή is usually employed in Scripture quotations. (See iv. 8.) But this passage is found nowhere in the Old Testament literally as it is here. Now, either it was assumed that St Paul used here an apocryphal writing, or a Christian hymn was referred to, from which the words were supposed to be borrowed; this last view, which Theodoret had already proposed, was approved of by Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, and others. But the formula διὸ λέγει would scarcely have been used for such utterances of uncanonical writings. Rhenferd insisted that St Paul had here referred to a saying of Christ’s which had been preserved by mere oral tradition, such as are mentioned Acts xx. 35; but certainly the phrase καὶ ἐπιφάνεις σοι ὁ Χριστός does not suit that view. But all those propositions are unnecessary, as it can be proved that Isaiah lx. 1 contains the fundamental ideas of this passage, which are only quoted by St Paul freely, according to his custom, and inserted into the context of his discourse. For the Hebrew words are: אלָחָה יְבֹּד אֵנָהּ כֻּלָּהּ לְחֵיתָהּ נָרָהָ שֶׁמָּהָ שֶׁאָהָ נַעַרָ. The LXX. have translated those words: φωτίζου, φωτί-ζου, Ἰερονυσαλημ, ἤκει γὰρ σου τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σὲ ἀνατέταλκεν. With all the difference in regard to the form, our passage corresponds with the above very well in regard to the idea,
as is convincingly shown by Harless ad h. 1.—(On the form ἀνάστα see Winer's Gramm. p. 75.—A.B.D.E.F.G. have ἐγείρει instead of ἐγείρε, and it might no doubt be preferable in concordance with Lachmann. But Fritzche [in Marc. p. 55, ss.] defends the reading ἐγείρε. On the form ἐπιφαύσει see Winer's Gramm. p. 84. The readings ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, and ἐπιφαύσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which latter one D. defends, seem to have to thank the copyists alone for their origin; the metaphor of the light imperatively requires the reading ἐπιφαύσει. Comp. 2 Peter i. 19.)

Vers. 15, 16. After that, St Paul then again resumes the above exhortation (ver. 8), and summons his readers to a circumspect walk, which appreciates the relations of things, and shows wisdom by that means. (Comp. the parallel passage Col. iv. 5, where the further subordinate definition πρὸς τὸν ἔξος is added, which, according to the context of the whole passage [see vers. 6, 7], must here too be supplied.) That we find too the phrase ἐξαγοράζων τὸν καιρόν, which Luther plainly translates incorrectly, “adapt yourselves to the time.” That acceptance also, according to which it is understood of the diligent use of time, is unsuitable, for then ἄι άι ημέραι πονηραὶ εἰς αὐταίρετον ζωής could not follow, the shortness of life on earth would rather need to be insisted on. The days are called evil (in the first instance those of the then time, in the more extended sense of the whole αἰῶν σωτῆς, in which sin has dominion), because of the manifold temptations which obstruct the believer. With regard to that, the ἐξαγοράζων τὸν καιρόν can only be referred to the foreseeing, prudent use of circumstances for the salvation of one's self and of others. Beza had already correctly observed, that the phrase is taken from the figure of a foreseeing merchant who uses everything for his ends. The parable in Luke xvi. 1, ss., also recommends that prudence. (Ver. 16. On the phrase ἡμέραι πονηρά see vi. 13, Ps. xlix. 6, Prov. xxvi. 4.)

Vers. 17, 18. Therefore, continues St Paul (viz. because the time is evil), be not ἄφρονες. That ἄφρονες is not ἄσωφοι is self-evident; they differ as σοφία and σύνεσις or φρονησίς. (See at i. 8.) Here the true σύνεσις is designated as that one which searches out God's will, and at the same time also follows it, which gives for the antithesis of the ἄφροσύνη the following one's own
will and one's own desires as a characteristic sign. Just in the same way, piety is in the Old Testament treated as real prudence, godlessness, on the contrary, as folly. The μεθύσκεσθαι οἶνῳ is put by synecdoche for all the modes of gratifying one's own lusts (the πλεονεξία, ver. 3), as appears by the addition ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ. Pamppering of the flesh bears in itself all the rest of the moral errors, especially the sins of lust, because it invests the σάρξ with the government, and brings the νοῦς into a servile relation. St Paul insisted here on that form of sin in particular, in order to make more marked the contrast with the πληροφορία ἐν πνεύματι. Man in his μετατοπίης τοῦ νοῦς (iv. 18) feels the want of a strengthening through spiritual influences from without; instead of seeking for these in the Holy Spirit, he in his blindness has recourse to the natural spirit, i.e. to wine and strong drinks. Therefore, according to the point of view of the Law, the Old Testament, in the institution of the Nazarines, recommends abstinence from wine and strong drinks, in order to preserve the soul free from all merely natural spiritual influences, and by that means to make it more susceptible of the operations of the Holy Spirit. (Comp. Numbers vi. 1, ss.) We must not by any means suppose special references of this exhortation: μη μεθύσκεσθε οἶνῳ, for instance, to abuses at the Agape, as they are reproved at 1 Cor. xi. 21, (a supposition which Koppe and Holzhausen defend), having regard to the context of the passage. (The reading σωμετερ for σωμέντες, which Lachmann has admitted, on the authority of A.B., is to be considered as a mere facilitating correction.—Ἀσωτία is found Tit. i. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 4, ἀσωτος Luke xv. 13, in the meaning of vita luxuriosa, a loose, dissipated life. The Spirit, with which the believer is to be filled, is of course the Holy Spirit, not his own; the addition ἄγιος, however, which some minusculi have, is spurious.)

Vers. 19, 20. In conclusion, St Paul names, as effects of the being filled with the Holy Ghost and the spiritual joy proceeding therefrom, the public adoration of God in songs of praise, the purport of which is thanksgiving to God in Christ's name. No doubt, the implied contrast, which this spiritual joy bursting forth into songs of praise forms with the carnal joy, which is wont to prevail at worldly banquets, where the μεθύσκεσθαι οἶνῳ takes place, floated before St Paul's mind here. In ver. 19, however, the ἀλούντες
ἐαυτοῖς forms an antithesis with the ἄδοντες and ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ. The former denotes the public adoration of God in the religious assemblies, the latter the silent inward communion with God in the heart. We see, therefore, from this passage, that even in the apostle's time singing was an element of divine worship. According to 1 Cor. xiv. 15, ss., the γέλοσατις λαλεῖν also manifested itself in a poetical shape, and the improvised poems seem to have been immediately presented in musical measures. (See the details in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xiv.) Thus Pliny too relates (Ep. x. 96) of the Christians: carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt secum invicem. Unfortunately, of that primeval Christian poetry there has been as good as nothing preserved; only under the name of Clemens of Alexandria a hymn of, perhaps, primeval date has survived, which I have had printed. (See my Monumenta Hist. Ecclesiae. vol. 1, p. 279, ss.) That assemblies for public worship are here spoken of is likewise shown by the parallel passage Col. iii. 16, 17, in which the department of teaching, properly so called, is put forward, in the words: ἐν πάση σοφίᾳ διδασκόντες καὶ νοθετοῦντες ἐαυτοῖς. Böhmer finds in those words an indication of the universal priesthood of the first Christians; but the διδασκέων and νοθετεῖν ἐαυτοῖς, i.e. αλλήλους, does not exclude order in the form of instruction which required appointed teachers. See the details on this point in the interpretation of the pastoral epistles. As to the synonyms ψαλμὸς, ὑμνος, φδη, the first properly denotes every song performed with a musical accompaniment. It is, however, highly improbable that in the congregations of the primitive Church instrumental accompaniments to the singing were already used; ψαλμὸι are probably here the Psalms of the Old Testament, which passed from the synagogue into the Church-service. Ὑμνος is every song, the main contents of which are praise of and thanks to God, therefore a song of praise; φδη, on the contrary, can have another purport as well; the epithet πνευματικὸς defines the songs here meant, as such as are of genuine religious purport. The same terms are also found in the parallel passage, Col. iii. 16. The reading καρδιαῖς has probably intruded into the text here from Colossians, though there too καρδιὰ is found altered from this passage in some MSS. The peculiar addition; ἐν χάριτι (Col. iii. 16), is not to be referred to the grace of the song, (for it is ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς, therefore
purely inward, but to the grateful feeling of the believer.—Διδων καὶ ψάλλειν is to be viewed as a collective idea, by which the inward spiritual joy is to be denoted.—In ver. 20 ἵπτερ πάντων is to be taken as neuter, "for all that befals you, be it good or evil." The discourse here is not of prayer for others. On the formula ἐν ὀνόματι, which = ὄνομα, see the Comm. on Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39, John xiv. 13.—On τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ see i. 3. In Col. iii. 17 there is further added: τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ, as every prayer is rendered acceptable to God the Father through Christ.)

§ 6. PRECEPTS FOR CONDUCT IN THE MARRIED STATE AND IN ONE’S FAMILY.

(v. 21—vi. 9.)

St Paul comes now, in the progress of his exhortations, to marriage, on which he expresses himself at great length (verses 21—33), and that too by drawing a parallel between the relation of Christ to the Church, and that between man and wife. To the consideration of marriage are further annexed moral exhortations, which have for their object the various relations of families, namely, the relations of children and parents, of servants and masters, which exhortations are contained in verses 1—9 of chap. 6. The common link by which these ethical precepts are held together is the idea of subordination, of obedience. As St Paul wishes above all to bring this home to his readers in its vast importance, he always begins his representation with the party bound to obedience (verse 22 with the wives, vi. 1 with the children, vi. 5 with the servants), and then first introduces the other side of the subject of contemplation, viz. that those who are charged with authority are to exercise it in a mild and religious temper. (In verse 25 the husbands are exhorted, vi. 4 the fathers, vi. 9 the masters.) It remains to be said that this treatise on marriage (v. 21—33) is, along with 1 Cor. vii., the leading passage on this important institution, which includes in equal measure the elements of church and state. There (1 Cor. vii.), however, marriage is treated of more according to its actual appearance as more or less out of conformity with the ideal of it, here, on the contrary, it is taken up altogether in
its ideal dignity, in which it is exactly the copy of that spiritual marriage which Christ and the Church form.

Vers. 21, 22. As to the ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις εν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ (verse 21) one may doubt whether it is to be referred to what precedes or what succeeds. In the former case it must, with λαλοῦντες and the other participles in verses 19, 20, depend on πληροῦσθε εν πνεύματι (verse 18); that is the way Winer (Gramm. p. 319) and Lachmann take it. But, first, one does not see how the exhortation to subordination can be introduced into the invitation to spiritual joy, and, secondly, the τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί forms, and plainly too, the conclusion of the preceding treatise, so that another participle cannot possibly be joined on. United, however, with what follows, the participle at the beginning is strange. For the supposition of Calvin, Koppe, Flatt, and others, that the participle stands for the imperative, is inadmissible in a grammatical point of view. The connection with what follows is made still more difficult by the uncertainty of the reading in verse 22.—B. leaves ὑποτάσσοντες out altogether, D.E.F.G. have it before τοὺς ἰδίους. On the other hand, A. 17. 57, and other inferior critical authorities, have ὑποτασσόσθωσαν. However, all these deviations seem to have arisen only through the difficulty of the ὑποτασσόμενοι (verse 21). Probably the case stands thus with the passage: verse 21 is meant to declare the principle of subordination quite comprehensively for all the relations which are afterwards treated of singly, to which then, next, in verse 22, the exhortation to married women is subjoined. According to this view the participle ὑποτασσόμενοι is most simply explained in accordance with the context by the assumption of an ellipse: “all believers are subordinate one to another in the fear of Christ.”—The definition εν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ excludes all slavish fear, the fear of Christ is the tender timidity which love has in its train. (Cf. verse 33.) It remains to be said that the reading Χριστοῦ is defended by A.B.D.E.F.G., and is no doubt preferable to the readings Θεοῦ, κυρίου, Ἰησοῦ. In verse 22 ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ is also added, for which in the parallel passage Col. iii. 18 ὡς ἀνήκεν εν κυρίῳ stands, in order to exclude every slavish idea. Wives are, therefore, to be subject not to their husbands as such, but to God’s ordinance in the institution of marriage; just as the Christian in his relation to those in authority serves not man, but the ordinance of God, of
which men are the representatives. Finally, the addition Ἱδος cannot with Meier be referred to the right of property, which, according to the view of the whole ancient world, the husband had over the wife; the following representation does not say anything in favour of such a conception of marriage; but men are meant by it to be designated as married men. (See the passages quoted by Harless at p. 490.)

Vers. 23, 24. The necessity of this subordination of the wife to the husband is deduced from the relation of the two parties to each other ordained by God. The man is the head, i.e. the directing, determining, power of the wife, as Christ is of the Church. (See on 1 Cor. xi. 3, ss.; Ephes. i. 22; iv. 15.) Therefore, as the latter is subject to Christ, consequently is determined and guided in its will by Him, so should the wife be by the husband. All frivolous reveries of an emancipation of women to be expected are annihilated by this energetic declaration of St Paul. Among them must also be reckoned Rückert’s (ad h. l.) thinking that there is expressed in this declaration of St Paul, as to the relation of the wife towards her husband, a remnant of still unsubdued Judaïsm in him, as if that alone, not God’s ordinance, had introduced the subjection of the wife to her husband. Only the év παρι t pl. ἵπτοσιν τῆς ἡμῶν might be viewed as an exaggeration. That is to say, the Church is, it is true, subject to Christ absolutely in everything, because only holy claims on her proceed from Him; but the husband, as being a sinner, cannot require of his wife obedience to unholy suggestions. Neither is that, of course, the apostle’s meaning. As in the case of the unconditional command to obey those in authority (see on Rom. xiii. 1), the restriction is still self-evident, that those in authority order nothing against God’s commandments, and therefore the law “to obey God more than men,” always has precedence of all others, so it has here too. Just because wives are to be subject to their husbands ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, they cannot obey their husbands against the Lord’s will. But, as St Paul has Christian marriages in view, it was needless to insist particularly on that self-evident restriction. No doubt, however, the commandment relates not to kind husbands only, but also to the unreasonable and wayward ones; as long as the demands of the husband keep within the domain of the morally indifferent only,—are against no objective divine commandments,—it is the wife’s
duty to perform them. The addition αὐτὸς σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος with ἀλλὰ following alone requires particular notice in these verses. For, that in that addition καὶ ἔστι are to be erased, with Lachmann, the MSS. A.B.D.E.F.G. prove decidedly enough; but certainly ἔστι must be supplied. The main question, however, is: what is the object of the whole observation, which seems to interrupt the connection, and how is the ἀλλὰ, that one stumbles at, to be taken? Harless (p. 488, sq.) thinks St Paul, in the whole section down to ver. 33, "shows himself to be under the influence of two purposes." St Paul intends, according to Harless, to give instruction not merely on the relations of man and wife, but also on that of Christ to the Church, allowing, indeed, that the conditions of the last-named relation would not in all their parts afford parallels for the marriage-state. Harless accordingly takes ἀλλὰ (ver. 24) and πλῆρος (ver. 33) as particles used to recall the reader from a digression to the main subject. But if this does seem quite suitable in the case of πλῆρος in ver. 33, because there ver. 32 clearly exhibits itself as an idea that interrupts the parallel, still the addition αὐτὸς σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος will too greatly oppose the taking it as a digression. To what purpose is this observation, that Christ is the Saviour of His body; if it is to be supposed a digression, as it was surely already known to the readers from i. 22, and to what purpose is, after this rhapsodical digression, a formal resumption of the main subject with an ἀλλὰ? Winer (Gramm. p. 421) has already correctly explained the conjunction ἀλλὰ in this connection. Ἀλλὰ here simply introduces the proof which is drawn from what precedes. In ver. 23 it was said "the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church." Now from that parallel St Paul concludes for the necessity of the subordination of the wife; "but, as the Church is subject unto Christ, so now must wives also be subject to their husbands." Only, we must supply here not ὑποτάσσομαι, but ὑποτασσόμοιοι; from the actual subordination of the Church to Christ St Paul deduces the obligation of the subordination of the wife to her husband. According to this, then, the addition αὐτὸς σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος appears by no means as a digression, but merely as an opposition to the idea of the κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, which has the sole object of setting forth Christ more clearly as κεφαλῆ, whilst it (the addition) denotes the Church as the σῶμα which He governs. (In
ver. 24 ἰδιως is decidedly spurious and is erased from the text by the better critics.)

Vers. 25, 26. After this exhortation to wives, St Paul subjoins the one to husbands (comp. Col. iii. 19), on their side, not to abuse their power, but to love their wives, and that too as Christ loves the Church, i.e. in self-abandoning love, sacrificing Himself even unto death, which love had for its object the sanctification of the Church. This self-sacrificing, sanctifying, love St Paul requires of husbands also in marriage. (See ver. 28, ὀβρως [i.e. as Christ’s sanctifying work was before described] ὁφειλουσιν κ.τ.λ.)

It might be said that surely the wife also is to practise this self-sacrificing, sanctifying, conduct towards her husband; but from the normal position of the sexes the positive influence must certainly always proceed from the man; and therefore the exhortation finds its appropriate place here, not in the description of the relation of the wife to her husband. It remains to be said that it is self-evident, and inherent in the nature of such a parallel, in which every line cannot accurately fit, that the separate expressions have each their bearing indeed, but must not be forced. Thus it is said of Christ: εἰς τὸν παρέδωκεν Ἰησοῦς, “He gave Himself up to death as a vicarious sacrifice for her;” in reference to marriage, St Paul means to be understood by that merely a love capable of a self-sacrifice even unto death; in just the same way the καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ θανατος refers in the case of Christ to baptism, and the new birth effected by it, but in reference to marriage it merely designates love bent upon moral purification. It is extremely tasteless on this phrase to remind one of the Jewish custom of the bathing of the bride before the nuptial night. But still less can a digression be supposed here; the essential ideas, so far as they can be referred to marriage, are meant, according to St Paul’s intention, to apply to it also, so far as they are applicable to it. The closing words alone of ver. 26 require a particular consideration. In them the combination ἵνα ἀντὶ νῦν ἀγάπη καθαρίσας is to be taken so that the ἀγάπης appears as a consequence of the καθαρίζων: “that He may sanctify her, after He had previously purified her by the bath,” i.e. baptism (comp. Tit. iii. 5, where baptism is called λοτρον παλαγημένοις). But the mode of taking the ἐν ἁματί is uncertain. Most of the interpretations exhibit themselves as false at the first glance; e.g. that of Koppe, according to
which ἐν ἑαυτῷ ηνα are to be joined, which then, as he thought, would stand for the Hebrew לְעָבְרָן בְּני, which phrase, however the LXX. never translate so. Moreover, the order of the words is against the connection with ἄγιαση; the conjuncton of the phrases would otherwise not be improper from the analogy of the ἄγιάζεων ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. (Cf. John xvii. 17.) It can only be joined to λοιπὸν τοῦ δειατον. In this connection, people have usually either thought of the ordinance of Christ in the institution of baptism, by which the bath receives its purifying power, or of the declaration as to reconciliation and forgiveness of sins. But in both the relations one does not see how the article could be wanting before ἑαυτῷ, as according to them St Paul would have had a definite word in his mind. 'Ἐν ἑαυτῷ rather stands here = ἐν πνεύματι (ii. 22) as to the sense, and that too with the object of intimating that baptism is no mere bath, but a bath in the Word, i.e. such a one by means of which man is born again of water and of the Spirit (John iii. 5.) Thus, in 1 Pet. i. 28, James i. 18, the Word of God is represented as the seed of the new birth. 'Ῥύμα accordingly is here, as in Heb. i. 3, xii. 5, a designation of the divine power and efficacy in general, which from its nature must be a spiritual one. But in Christianity the Word does not appear in the indeterminate form of universal spiritual efficacy as in the creation, but the Spirit manifests itself only in the Word of Truth, which is in Christ. On this property of the Spirit of being indissolubly joined to the Word of Christ, and further on their respective identity, see particulars at vi. 17.

Ver. 27. The idea of the ἡν εἰμασθη is further carried out and described in its results. Christ wishes to set up the Church for Himself, i.e. for His joy and glory, in splendour and without spot. In the description of the spotless beauty St Paul plainly has in view the image of the bride; for a proof that we have here no digression to do with. As Christ purifies and cleanses the Church, so likewise a faithful husband wishes to deliver his wife from every moral stain. (On παραστάνειν in such a combination see at Rom. vi. 13; xii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Col. i. 22.—A.B.D.E.F.G. read αὐτός for αὐτὴν, and therefore Griesbach and Lachmann have with good reason received it into the text.—Σπιλος is found nowhere again but at 2 Pet. ii. 13. 'Ρicipant does not occur again in the New Testament.)

Vers. 28, 29. This description of the love of Christ is applied to
the love which the husband owes to his wife. *Ovτος* refers back to what preceded, and contains the two points of self-sacrifice and of sanctification; neither can be wanting in a really Christian marriage, in which love rests not merely on a sensual contentment, but is to have a moral basis. By this retrospective reference to what precedes it becomes clear that in vers. 26, 27 no digression is to be looked for; St Paul means even the individual traits of the love of Christ to be referred to marriage, of course so far as they are applicable to human conditions. But here a progress in the chain of argument is shown in the circumstance that St Paul will have the wife loved by her husband ὧς τὸ σῶμα ἑαυτοῦ. As the Church is called Christ's body, thus also man and wife form an unity (verse 31.) But here σῶμα has not πνεύμα, but κεφαλή (verse 28), which is certainly the organ of the spirit, for an antithesis; in verse 33 ὧς ἑαυτῶν stands directly. The intimateness of the connection in a genuine marriage is therefore such that the wife is a part of self, “whoever loves his wife loves himself.” As, therefore, care of the flesh naturally proceeds from self-love, thus too is it with the love of the husband, and with the relation of Christ to the Church; the opposite of that, the want of love in the husband, is accordingly something unnatural. It remains to be said that σὰρξ in verse 29 has by no means the subordinate idea of the sinful, σῶμα might stand here just as well; σὰρξ is here chosen only in order to make the physical neediness of the σῶμα appear more plainly. As for the rest, it might seem as if too much were asserted when it is said in verse 29: οὐδεὶς πῶτε ὑ. τ. Λ. Why, St Paul himself warns (Col. ii. 23) against false asceticism, which deprives the body of what is necessary for it. Meyerhoff (on the Ep. to the Colossians, p. 144) has singular views on this point. He finds, without any foundation, in the whole section about marriage a diatribe against false asceticism which rejected marriage, and in verse 20 he lays a stress on πῶτε in such a way that he refers it to past ages under Gentilism. “Then no one did such a thing as hate his own flesh,” with which we should have to supply: “but some did now.” This acceptance of the passage requires no refutation; there is not even the slightest vestige of polemics in the whole comparison between the matrimonial relation and the relation of Christ to the Church. Besides, there are surely found, even before Christ, vestiges of strict discipline among Gen-
tiles and Jews; even if more rarely in the West, yet in the East. We can only say, St Paul takes the idea: οὐδεὶς γὰρ πῶς ἐμπρόσθεν τὴν έαυτοῦ σάρκα, thus generally, because cases of an opposite description are at bottom only aberrations of the mind; the love of one's own body and life is an essential natural instinct; it can, it is true, be led astray by inferences of the intellect, but never be annihilated.

Ver. 30. In what follows St Paul proves in detail that the unity of Christ with the Church is not a merely figurative, metaphorical, nor even a purely spiritual, one, but also a truly bodily one, and that too so that he, in doing so, again has the comparison of marriage before his eyes. The relation of Christ to the Church is also described after Gen. ii. 23, which passage refers immediately to the relation of man and wife. Because the wife is taken from the man, and in marriage becomes one flesh with him (verse 31), the man loves his wife in himself; thus Christ also loves in the Church His own body, for we are taken from Him. This ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ κ. τ. λ. cannot, of course, be referred, as Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, wished, to Christ's being made man, for it must have been said of that conversely: "He took on Him our flesh and bone;" but to the imparting His glorified corporeity to believers through the communion of His flesh and blood. It is not especially the spiritual birth, which is here mentioned, the corporeal aspect is both here and in verse 31 made too emphatically prominent; it is the self-communication of His divine-human nature, by which Christ makes us His flesh and bone. He gives to His followers His flesh to eat, His blood to drink, ἐκπέφει καὶ δόλπει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. The reference of the phrase: ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν δοσεων αὐτοῦ merely to the general idea of an inward communion would leave the depth of the idea in this passage absolutely unexhausted; Christ, who took on Him our nature (John i. 14), changes us, in return, into Himself (2 Peter i. 4.). The omission of the ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς—δοσεων αὐτοῦ in A.B. can only be considered as an oversight; Lachmann has omitted them without sufficient grounds.

Ver. 31. To the words from Gen. ii. 23 is immediately subjoined, with the omission of some words which were of no importance to St Paul's argument, the following verse, Gen. ii. 24, which is quoted literally from the LXX., only they read, instead of ἀντί
tou'tou', the equivalent formula ἐνεκεν τοῦτου = ἦν, and instead of προκολληθησαται πρὸς they have the dative. The Greek here, as also in the LXX., deviates from the Hebrew text especially in the point that oĩ ðuo stands, while in the original text the words are: ἦν ἔν τῷ μαθητῷ ἦν ὁ χῶρος. This emphatic mention of the oĩ ðuo is considered as an establishment of monogamy, which is nowhere else in Scripture expressly recommended. According to the context in Genesis the passage quoted refers now to the relation of the sexes in marriage; as the woman was originally one with the man and is taken from his body, so too she again becomes one with him in marriage, and indeed not merely one spirit, which also happens in friendship, but also one flesh. Because, then, the unity is original, and the duality yearns to return again to unity, man will give up the most intimate ties even, in order to attain that unity. The exhortation to husbands to love their wives gains therefrom a powerful support; the object, for which the husband leaves father and mother, must also necessarily lay claim to his entire love. But as, both in what precedes and in what succeeds, the discourse is of the relation of Christ to the Church, St Paul's meaning seems to be, that that relation finds its analogy in this verse also. But how is this to be taken? That the love of the sexes, which has received its holy consecration from God the Lord in marriage, is a reflection and an echo of the eternal, holy, love of the Son of God towards man,—that therefore the attachment of the husband to his wife and their intimate conjunction into one flesh can be compared with the intimate, essential conjunction of the Son of God with the Church into one unity,—is clear enough, and proceeds unmistakeably from the spirit of the whole parallel. But the leaving of one's father and mother can have no special reference here to the relation of Christ to the Church, because here His becoming man is the only thing that could be imagined; and that, as has been already observed on ver. 30, is to be excluded here, because, according to it, Christ took on Him our flesh and blood, we did not take His on us. If, therefore, it has been proposed, as has often happened, to refer the καταλείψει τῶν πατέρων καὶ τῶν μητέρων αὐτοῦ to the leaving of the Father and of heaven, or of the upper Jerusalem (Galat. iv. 26), which took place on the Son of God's becoming man, it has no foundation in the context of the whole train of argument. The reference of
the quotation to Christ and the Church is couched here in the last words only: καὶ προσκολληθήσεται—σάρκα μία. But the reference of these words, which first of all relate to union in marriage, extends in its application to Christ and the Church, beyond the idea of a merely spiritual union, as, even among the Fathers, Theodoret, in later times, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Grotius, among the moderns, Holzhausen and Harless, have understood. As we saw at ver. 30 that the faithful are of Christ’s flesh and bone, because they were made partakers of His glorified corporeity; so here too the σάρκε μία is to be understood with reference to the communication of Christ’s flesh and blood to His followers. This His divine human nature the Saviour imparts, it is true, in faith also (see on John vi 45, ss.), but the most intense, most concentrated, communication of it happens at the Holy Communion. As, therefore, man and wife are, it is true, always one in love, but in the moments of matrimonial conjunction, in which the peculiar property of marriage consists, become one flesh in an especial sense; so too the Church in the mass, and every congregation, as also every soul in it, is constantly one spirit with Christ, the head of the body,—but in the moments of the Holy Communion the believing soul solemnizes the union with its Saviour in an entirely special sense, in that it takes up His flesh and blood into itself, and along with it the germ of the immortal body, that divine σπέρμα, which does not permit one to sin (1 John iii. 9), from which the plant of the σῶμα πνευματικὸν grows up. It then plainly proceeds from this interpretation that St Paul does not conceive the relation of the glorified body to this mortal one, so that at the resurrection the former is all at once produced by a creative act of God (see in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xv. 52, where the ἐν ῥυτὶ ὄφθαλμοῖς refers only to the suddenness of the opening, not of the production), but the new body is, even while here below, built up through the communion with the Saviour, and imparting of His nature, in the mortal body; just as in Christ Himself, even before His resurrection, the glorified body was in His mortal body, and at times shone through the latter (see in the Comm. on Matth. xvii. 1, ss.), was already communicated to the disciples at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, and finally, at the resurrection, came forth complete, swallowing up death in life.

Ver. 32. Here now St Paul breaks off the parallel, which he
has carried through so grandly and profoundly, by breaking out into the exclamation: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, upon the relation of Christ to the Church, therefore to the exclusion of marriage. By this it is not meant to be denied, that marriage, too, bears in it something mysterious; on the contrary, that is couched, as self-evident, in the fact that marriage can be compared with such a mystery; but the words do not refer first of all to marriage. This suffices in order to judge with what reason the Catholic divines find in this passage an argument for the assertion that marriage is a sacrament, with which expression the Vulgate, after the custom of the language of the first Christians, translates the word μυστήριον. Now, if we refer the communion of Christ with the Church, described in verse 31, to the spiritual side only, it is not to be conceived for what reason St Paul should have used that strong expression, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. On the other hand, the phrase is completely accounted for by the interpretation given by us, according to which in fact the relation of Christ to the Church is a continuous miraculous process of production of a higher glorified life. We see in it the creative action of God, which seems outwardly completed, inwardly proceed, and in mysterious, deeply hidden operation build up the temple of glorified corporeity, and at the same time also the great joint temple of the new heaven and the new earth. If we, to wind up this remarkable section, cast another glance at the whole comparison carried through in it, it is surely already contained, as to its fundamental idea, in the Old Testament, which often describes Jehovah's relation to the people of Israel as that of a bridegroom. (See Ps. xlv.; Isaiah liv. 5; Hezek. xvi. 1, ss.; Hosea ii. 16, ss., and the Song of Solomon.) The same image is found in the New Testament, in Matth. ix. 15; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 34; John iii. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xxii. 17. But it is peculiar to our passage that this parallel with marriage is expressly extended to the glorified corporeity also, and placed in connection with the special attribute of marriage, sexual union. However greatly marriage appears sanctified by that parallel, however entirely all suspicions of marriage, which proceed from false ascetic ideas, appear unscriptural; yet, on the other hand, it is comprehensible that the very special references to the mysteries of marriage may be thought dangerous to meddle with; in such scruples we have certainly to look for the reason of the
phenomenon, that so many interpreters of greater penetration than most, have yea hesitated to understand the parallel in our passage in all that latitude, that St Paul's words unmistakeably mean it to be understood in. For those scruples are explicable by the fancy's being just in reference to this point so polluted, that a pure contemplation of such images is seldom possible. One ought, therefore, to be as cautious as one can in the application of them in liturgical and homiletical use; but it is self-evident that a possible abuse cannot deter the interpreter from showing the comparison just as it is laid down in God's Word. Truth cannot shape and restrict itself according to the excitability of sin, but the latter is to be mastered and in God's might at last to be subdued by the former. To the pure all things are pure, and thus too says the mouth of the chaste of all the children of men, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, who stands (that is to say, before the door of the bridal chamber) and hears him, rejoices greatly because of the bridegroom's voice," (John iii. 29), in which words, just as here, the union of the bride and the bridegroom is an image for the communion of Christ and the Church.

Ver. 33. From the explanatory subordinate remark in verse 32 St Paul returns with πλην to the treatise, and in conclusion shortly recapitulates once more his exhortations to husbands and wives. (As to the oratio variata υμείς οί καθ ἐνα ἐκαστὸς see Winer's Gramm. p. 502. As to οί καθ ἐνα cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 31; 1 Thess. v. 11. As to the idea of the φοβεῖσθαι see on verse 21. Ἰνα φοβήται is to be explained by the suppressed παρακαλῶ, which is usually joined with ἵνα, instead of the infinitive alone, in the New Testament. See Winer's Gramm. p. 309, ss.)

Chapter vi. vers. 1—3. St Paul makes a transition in his exhortations from parents to children, to whom above all obedience, as the natural duty, based on the right relation of children to their parents, (that is the idea of the ἐκαστον, see on Rom. iii. 21), is held up. But by the addition of ἐν κυρίῳ this duty too is meant to be designated as to be practised in the Spirit of Christ; the parallel passage, Col. iii. 20, has instead of it τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν εὐάρεστον ἐν κυρίῳ. But with respect to this commandment St Paul refers expressly to the ordinance of the Old Testament (Ex. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16), not, however, in order to illustrate the necessity of
practising it, for that is sufficiently well based on the nature of the relation, but in order to draw attention to the magnitude of the promise which is coupled with the faithful performance of this commandment. But now here the phrase ἐντολὴ πρῶτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ creates a difficulty. Πρῶτη could only be understood of the order or of the importance of the commandment, in case, as Holzhausen maintained, ἐντολὴ referred merely to such commandments as related to duties towards men, not towards God; that is to say, the commandment "honour thy father and thy mother" is the first on the second table, which regards those duties. But the collation of Matt. xxii. 36; Mark xii. 28, ss.; and Hebrews ix. 19, shows that Holzhausen's view is erroneous. We must, therefore, join πρῶτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, so that the fourth commandment is designated as the first that is couched in a promise derived from divine mercy, which is quoted in verse 3. But here it seems again embarrassing, that the first commandment has a promise too. But the addition to the first commandment (Ex. xx. 5, 6) is no promise referring to that first commandment, but merely a perfectly general characterization of Jehovah as the Just One, who punishes sin and rewards virtue. The words of the promise itself are quoted freely from memory (verse 3.). The LXX have ἵνα ἐν σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς, ἣν κύριος ὁ Θεός σου δίδασκι σοι. According to the point of view of the Old Testament the divine blessing is referred to the earthly possession of the land of Canaan, which is promised the people (to whom the laws are given as a whole) on the presupposition of a faithful fulfilment of them, and especially of the fourth commandment. St Paul takes this blessing figuratively, in conformity with the point of view of the Gospel (just as Matt. v. 5, on which see the remark in the Comm.), and reaches out after it beyond this earth into the kingdom of God. Compare the typical acceptance of Canaan also in Hebrews iv. 1, ss. (In verse 1 Lachmann leaves out ἐν κυρίῳ, on the authority of B.D.F.G., but probably it is left out in those MSS. only because it is wanting in Col. iii. 20. Ver. 3. μακροχρόνος is not found again in the New Testament.)

Vers. 4. The exhortation makes a transition from children to fathers. These are named alone, because the education of adolescent children is intended, which from the nature of the thing be-
lungs more to the fathers than to the mothers. To take the idea "Fathers" as = "Parents" seems less proper. The treatment of children on the part of their fathers is to be in the spirit of love, the children are not to be provoked to anger by undue strictness. Instead of μη παροργίζετε the parallel passage, Col. iii. 21, has the synonymous μη ἐρεθίζετε, with the addition: ένα μη ἄθυμοσον, i.e. that they (the children) may not be discouraged, viz., in the fulfilment of their duty towards their parents. In our passage beside the negative side the positive one also is brought forward. Christianly-minded fathers are duly to temper gravity with mildness in the education of their children: the side of gravity is denoted by the εν παιδείᾳ, that of mildness by the εν νουθεσίᾳ, and both characterized by the addition of κυριοῦ as supported by the Spirit of Christ. (The genitive κυριοῦ is to be explained by the circumstance that both, discipline and exhortation, are conceived as proceeding from Christ Himself.)

Vers. 5—8. The institution of slavery diffused over the whole of the ancient world was so thoroughly dovetailed into all the relations of life, that the apostle could not leave it unnoticed, the rather that a considerable portion of the first Christian churches consisted of slaves. Besides 1 Cor. vii. 21 (on which see the Comm.), it is also spoken of at Col. iii. 22, ss. (which passage coincides with ours almost word for word); 1 Tim. vi. 1, ss.; Tit. ii. 9, sq.; 1 Pet. ii. 18. The institution as such could not, of course, be approved of by Christianity; it was a production of sin. St Paul, therefore, advises (1 Cor. vii. 21) every slave, if he can become free by legal means, to make use of them. (See also on Philem. vers. 15, 16.) The apostles would, therefore, have blamed, and severely too, the introduction of slavery, if it had not existed when the Gospel came into the world. But, as it did exist, the Church did not strive to overthrow it from without in a revolutionary manner, nor even to address to Christian masters the direct command to set their slaves free (see on 1 Tim. vi. 2); but it sought to abrogate it from within, viz. by the gradual transformation of opinion. The defenders of negro slavery in the present day cannot therefore appeal to the above-quoted passages from the writings of the apostles; for that is not a thing that has existed since the very earliest times, but one that has existed only since a short time
back, and that was introduced too by Christians to their disgrace, and which keeps up its continued existence only and solely through free men being ever and anon enslaved by craft and force.

Now the way in which St. Paul first exhorts slaves to be obedient to their masters (which, _detractus detrahendis_, is applicable also to the servants of our days,) says much both for the profound wisdom which filled him, and the purest moral bias which he followed. He teaches them in the earthly masters (κυρίως κατὰ σάρκα) to obey the true κύριος κατὰ πνεῦμα, Christ; by that means the fear and trembling which he requires become the expression not of a slavish mind, but of the tender timidity of love, which fears to mistake in any way the will of the beloved one (see on v. 21, 33.) Whilst the slave, therefore, in his state of life recognizes God's will, his obedience is also to be pure, without double-dealing, (ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας), the will of the Lord is to be performed not for outward show, merely before men's eyes, but in truth. Through this operation of Christianity, directed to the inmost state of the soul, it is the power which transforms the world. It makes each in his place what he is intended to be, the master a true master, the servant a true servant. But further, not merely is the whole will of the master to be done, even in secret, where no eye observes the performance, but it is to be done from the heart also, _i.e._ with willingness and joyfulness. The will of the earthly master is here conceived exactly as τῆς θελήματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, because the relation of dependence comes from God, and so therefore do the individual manifestations of it. It remains to be said that here too, again, it is self-evident, that this absolute obedience to the earthly master (at Col. iii. 22 there stands expressly ἵππος κατὰ πάντα) does not extend to that which is forbidden by God; he that serves his master as if he served God will never fall into the temptation to sacrifice God's will to his master's. (Ὁφθαλμοδοουλεία is found again only in Col. iii. 22. It is a word coined by St. Paul himself. In the same way ἀνθρωπόμετρος is found again in the New Testament only at Col. iii. 22, and in the LXX. in Ps. liii. 5. [For the rest, compare as to this word Lobeck ad Phrynichum, p. 621.]- The ἐκ ψυχῆς here and at Col. iii. 22, instead of the more usual ἐκ καρδίας, to which our "from the heart" corresponds, is peculiar. Yet we have also the completely corresponding phrase: "to love a person with one's whole soul." See on the relation of Ψυχή and
καρδία my opusc. theol. p. 159, sq.) The connection of the words in ver. 7 is uncertain. Some persons punctuate thus: ποιοῦντες τὸ δήλομα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς μετ' εὐνολας δουλεύοντες, others put the colon after εὐνολας, uniting the participle δουλεύοντες with what follows; finally, others, again, join ἐκ ψυχῆς with Θεοῦ, but separate μετ' εὐνολας from it. This last is in any case to be preferred, because by means of it the nearly kindred expressions ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ' εὐνολας are duly separated, the sense being then as follows: "as such as do God's will from their hearts, who with good-will (not with repugnance) do service, as to the Lord, and not to men." (Εὐνολα occurs only once again, viz. 1 Cor. vii. 8, but in a totally different sense there.) Finally, in ver. 8 St Paul brings forward, as a motive for true resignation in servitude, the future recompense at the day of retribution, by which the unequal distribution of lots here below is equalized. The parallel passage Col. iii. 24, where the general phrase κομμείται παρὰ κυρίου is explained by the ἀπολήψεθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομῆς, is illustrative of this passage. That is to say, the inheritance here, as elsewhere also, is the participation in the kingdom of God (see at Ephes. i. 18.) Besides that, in Col. iii. 25 the threat of punishment is also added in the words: ὁ δὲ ἄδικῶν κομμείται ὁ ἡδίκησε. (In ver. 8 the collocation ὅτι δὲ ἐὰν τι ἐκαστος, for which many important MSS. read τι ἐκαστος δὲ ἂν ποιηση, which facilitates the understanding of the passage, and which Lachmann has received into the text, causes a difficulty. But how, assuming the original existence of this last reading, the ordinary one could have arisen, is completely incomprehensible. Besides, the collocation of the words δὲ ἐὰν τι is to be explained by supposing a Tmeseis. See Harless, p. 528.)

Ver. 9. St Paul makes a transition from the slaves to the masters, and exhorts the latter not, as one might suppose, to make their slaves free; that is left to the free motion of the divine Spirit; but only on their part to exercise mildness towards them, in the consciousness that they too, like the former, have a master in heaven, with whom no consideration of the person is of any value. In the Epistle to the Colossians we find the proposition: καὶ οὐκ ἐστι πρωτοποληψία at the end of iii. 25, so that it therefore still belongs with the foregoing to the exhortation addressed to the slaves. In Col. iv. 1 the exhortation to the masters runs thus: τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἱσότητα τοῖς δοῦλοις παρέχεσθε. Here the δίκαιον
refers to what the slaves are justified in requiring, clothing, food, &c., but of course ἵστος cannot mean "equality with their masters," that would be abolishing slavery, which is against St Paul's intention. That expression rather denotes the equal treatment of all, whereby the preference of one at the expense of another would be excluded. In our passage the phrase ἀνείπτε ὑπ' ἄνειλη can alone excite doubt, as the idea: "to forbear threatening, to cease to threaten," seems unsuitable, because St Paul cannot mean to say that merely the outward signs of unkindness towards slaves are to cease, but the unkindness itself. In the same manner as the slaves, the masters too must do everything towards their slaves ἐκ φυσικ and μετ' εὐνοίας. Απειλή here must be understood of the hardness of heart, whence the threatening proceeds as a consequence; the effect stands figuratively for the cause. (The reading καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν might with Lachmann be preferable to καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. A.B.D. defend it. The reading ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, that is to say, might very easily arise from the collation of the Epistle to the Colossians [iv. 1], whereas αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν presents a perfectly independent idea, viz., that of the identity of the Lord for all. As to the form προσω-ποληφία see Acts x. 34; Rom. ii. 11; Galat. ii. 6.)

§ 7. OF THE SPIRITUAL FIGHT.

(vi. 10—24.)

Finally, returning from the special to the general, St Paul summons his readers to the fight against all enemies of the light and of the truth, and counsels them to put on the armour of God in order to stand that fight well. The metaphor of the Christian fight and spiritual armour is found already in the Old Testament (see Ex. xv. 4; Isaiah xi. 5, lix. 16; Wisdom of Solomon v. 19), and in the New Testament, besides our passage, at 2 Cor. x. 4, 1 Thess. v. 8; but here most completely and in the greatest detail. This is explained, if one considers that St Paul wrote this Epistle in the Praetorian camp, where he therefore daily beheld the equipment and the punctual camp-discipline of this élite of the Roman army. He might often have used such metaphors also in his discourses to the Praetorian troops, of whom many had actually become believers
(Phil. iv. 22), as they made the idea of the Christian fight clear to those warriors, by which means that mode of contemplation might have become familiar to him. It has also such intrinsic truth, that the first Christians conceived their whole life as a militia Christiana; accordingly, to them the confession of faith was the tessera, the parole of their heavenly general, the prayers and fasts the stationes, sin and evil spirits the enemy, the heavenly fatherland the kingdom to be conquered, eternal happiness the wreath of victory. A similar use of language has, in consequence of the intrinsic truthfulness of this comparison, brought itself into vogue in ascetic literature in all ages of the Church.

Ver. 10, 11. For the spiritual fight St Paul summons his readers to seek spiritual strength also, which man finds not in himself, but only in the Lord and His might. The spiritual armour is therefore also called a πανοπλία τοῦ Θεοῦ, because God confers it in the power of that Holy Spirit, who imparts all those weapons of defence and offence, as they are afterwards enumerated at ver. 14, ss. It is only in this armour that one can stand against an enemy such as the devil is with his crafty, dangerous, devices. (In ver. 10 Lachmann, on the authority of A.B., reads τοῦ λοιποῦ [cf. Galat. vi. 17], and on the authority of B.D.E. omits διδακτοῖς ημῶν. Very greatly in favour of the omission of the allocution is the circumstance that St Paul does not address the readers as διδακτοῖς in the whole of the Epistle. On the other hand, τὸ λοιπὸν seems, after Phil. iii. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 1, with the majority of the critical authorities, to deserve the preference.—As to ἐνόπλως see Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 20.—As to κράτος τῆς ἱσχύος see on Ephes. i. 19. —Ver. 11. For ἐνόπλως here, ἀναλαμβάνει, the usual expression in Greek for the putting on of armour, stands in ver. 13. Πανοπλία, τὰ ἐν ὑμῖν, complete armour, weapons of defence and offence. —Instead of στήναι, there stands in ver. 13 ἀνυπνεῖναι, a well-known antithesis of not only "falling," but also "fleeing," in military language.—On μεθοδεῖα compare iv. 14. Both cunning and dangerousness are indicated by it.)

Ver. 12. The mention of the devil occasions St Paul to compare the spiritual fight of the Christian with ordinary fights. (Ταῦτα is to be read instead of ἡμῶν with Lachmann, on the authority of B.D.F.G., as indeed both in what preceded and what follows the second person constantly stands.) In the latter one has weak
men for antagonists, and needs therefore only common weapons for them; but in the fight against spiritual powers spiritual weapons also are required. The understanding of the passage is principally determined by the interpretation of the phrase ἀλμα καὶ σάρξ; this denotes, like מְשַׁ מָמָמ, not the sinfulness of human nature (how could St Paul say that the Christian did not fight against that?), but men in general with the accessory idea of weakness. (See on Matth. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16.) Now certainly the Christian may fight with men, in as far as evil incitements proceed from them, but, fully realizing the contradictions of the universe, he will always view hostile men as only the instruments of the prince of this world, so that his real fight will not be directed against men (in whom the believer always sees objects of salvation rather), but against the devil, who abuses them. Οὐκ—ἀλλὰ here shuts itself completely out; St Paul conceives the spiritual fight in its inmost root. The spiritual powers themselves are fully described in what follows; the kingdom of Satan is, as it were, dissected into its constituent parts. For, that the terms ἀρχαι and εὐσεβλατίαν denote spiritual powers of more or less might, good or evil nature (which the context alone can decide), we have already seen at i. 21, ii. 2. As there are archangels, so are there archdevils also, i.e. evil spirits of more comprehensive influence. But we must entirely renounce any attempt at closer determinations of the difference, as Scripture nowhere gives us any instruction on the point.1 The following term, κοσμοκρατόρες τοῦ σκότους τοῦ τοῦτου, is without further analogy in the New Testament, although the devil by himself is often elsewhere in the Scriptures called ἀρχων τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ τοῦτου, especially in St John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, and in St Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὁ Θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ τοῦτου. What is elsewhere attributed to Satan alone, is here ascribed to all evil spirits, viz., dominion in a world that has fallen a prey to sin. The name קֶּבֶּלֶח was also adopted by the Rabbis, (see Buxtorf lex. talm. et rabb. p. 2006, sq.), and used by Gnostic sects, as terminus technicus. But the phrase τοῦ σκότους τοῦ τοῦτου is striking, that is to say, ὁ τοῦτος can well be

1 Meyer (de praestigiis daemonum. Basileae 1663) pretends to fix even the number of the archdevils; he supposes 572 of them, and 7,405,926 of the common ones.
added to αἰῶν or κόσμος, because there is an antithesis there to μέλλων, but σκότος is in itself the element of darkness in the universe, which οὖσα does not suit. It is, therefore, very intelligible that τοῦ αἰῶνος, which, however, is decidedly spurious according to A.B.D.F.G., was inserted. Therefore τοῦ σκότους τούτου is to be interpreted "of the darkness which is here diffused, in which too ye live," so that the name κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου appears as the foundation for the necessity of the fight with them. As to the rest we certainly are not to suppose any climax in this phrase in its relation to the ἀρχαί καὶ ἐξουσίαι, for there is couched in the very idea ἀρχή the idea of more exalted angels, who rule others; on the contrary, the κοσμοκράτορες only defines more accurately the entirely general idea of the ἀρχή, just as τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς ποιμνίας in its turn defines that of the κοσ•
•
•κοράτορες. That is to say, by this last phrase the antithesis to the ἀλμα καὶ σάρξ is meant to be set forth in its whole force: "spirit of wickedness it is with whom ye have to fight, therefore the weapon of the spirit is needful." For the rest, πνευματικὰ is a substantial adjective, as also is διαμόνα. Finally, St Paul further adds: ἐν τοῖς ἐποιρανίοις. The junction of those words with ἡμῶν or πάλη in the beginning of the verse is at once inadmissible on account of the position of ἐν τοῖς ἐποιρανίοις. But there also arise, besides that, other difficulties from that junction, which must deter us from it. If joined with ἡμῶν the words would have to be taken, "we who are in the kingdom of God;" but τὰ ἐποιρανία never stands for βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Joined with πάλη the sense of the words is said to be: "the fight for heavenly blessings;" but ἐν cannot stand for διὰ or ἐπέρ. From the position of ἐν τοῖς ἐποιρανίοις it can only be an addition to the preceding nouns, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, κοσμοκράτορες, πνευματικά, by which their place of residence is denoted. The fight with flesh and blood on earth is put in opposition to the fight with spirits in heaven. Because people were scandalized at the placing of the evil spirits in heaven, ἐν τοῖς ἐποιρανίοις was put instead of the above, but that reading is found only in totally insignificant authorities. As to the rest, we have already explained ourselves at ii. 2 on this biblical notion of placing the evil spirits in that part of the world which is perceptible to the senses, as also upon the idea ἐποιράνα in i. 3. Heaven denotes here only the spiritual world in opposition to the
material one, and not the region of holy and blessed life, in which sense the evil spirits are out of heaven.

Vers. 13. After this description of the greatness of the Christian fight, St Paul again takes up the exhortation of verse 11: "therefore (because the fight is so hard and of a spiritual nature) take unto you the armour which God through His Spirit bestows on His warriors against the power of darkness; it is only in it one can offer resistance to attacks." The addition εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πολεμα is not to be understood of the day of the fight, for that can surely be also a good, a successful, day; it rather denotes a point of time in which temptation, and consequently the danger of succumbing, is especially great, therefore the day "in which darkness has power" (Luke xxii. 53.) Observation of our own state of mind enables us plainly to distinguish different times, at which the soul feels itself alternately more free and triumphant, more fettered and tempted; seasons of the latter sort are called evil days. This contrasting of good and evil days is found even in the Old Testament. (See Eccles. vii. 15; Ps. xlix. 6; Prov. xvi. 4.) In the last words: καὶ ἀπαντά κατεργασάμενοι στήναι the κατεργασάμενοι cannot be taken of the preparation for the fight, for the preparation for that is surely already assumed in the ἀντιστήναι; nor of the "well performing" of all that the Christian is charged with either, as, among others, Luther takes the passage, for the στήναι, which follows, shows that St Paul still continues in the metaphor of the fight; rather the only right way is, with Beza, Calovius, Koppe, Flatt, Rückert, Holzhausen, and Harless, to take κατεργάζεσθαι = καταπολεμεῖν, in the sense of "to overpower, beat down," so that ἀντιστήναι denotes the negative aspects of the fight, the repulse of the attack,—ἀπαντά κατεργασάμενοι στήναι, on the contrary, the positive aspect of it, the overcoming of the enemy with the victorious maintenance of one's own position connected with it.

Vers. 14—17. Now follows the prosecution of the figure of the armour in its separate parts. That it is not to be too much forced, as if every individual Christian virtue must have been compared exactly with that piece of armour and no other, is shown by the collation of 1 Thess. v. 8, where faith and love are designated as a breast-plate, whereas here righteousness is called the breast-plate, and the shield is brought into a comparison with faith; the helmet is there compared with the hope of salvation, here with salvation
itself. St Paul moves freely about in such figures, and therefore applies them differently according to necessity. As the entire image is taken from the warrior, and indeed, as we have seen, probably from the Roman pretorian guards, every single feature of it must also necessarily be referred to pieces of armour. Now, first of all, St Paul describes in detail the defensive armour of the believer against the attacks of his spiritual enemies; the only weapon of attack which is named is the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. The most vulnerable part of the body, and the one least defended by nature herself, ὀσφύς, the space above the hip below the ribs, is first named as protected by the girdle, subligaculum. Then the breast covered by the breast-plate, the feet by the military boots (caligae). Here now, by strict rule, the helmet should have been named next as a close-fitting weapon of defence; but St Paul further names the shield before it, and then with it the whole department of defensive armour is completed. With these separate pieces of armour the separate features of Christian character are composed. St Paul first names truth, which, here taken quite generally, is the bias of mind which is opposed to falsehood as the element of the διάβολος, therefore uprightness of disposition, whence everything else proceeds. Then follows justice; this cannot be here justness of faith, because faith is also named specially, but merely the δίκαιον εἶναι, as the most general result of the ἀληθεία, in opposition to the πυρπολα of the enemies (ver. 12.) The third point, εν ἐμομασίᾳ τοῦ ἐναγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης, is more difficult. It was natural to interpret the ἐμομασία, as it is brought into parallel with the ὑποδήμασι, of the readiness to proclaim the Gospel of peace, as, besides Chrysostom, Οἰκουμενίου, Theophylact, and Grotius, Luther, too, translates; "ready to promote the Gospel of peace." But that readiness cannot possibly be compared with a weapon, and that, too, a weapon of defence; the propagation of the Gospel is here a very remote idea. After Beza's example Wolf, Bengel, Morus, Koppe, and Flatt, wanted to take ἐμομασία, after the analogy of the Heb. ציון, which the LXX. translate by ἐμομασία (Ps. x. 17, lxxxix. 15, cxii. 17), in the sense of "foundation, firm ground-work," or "base." But even so the comparison does not suit, the weapon of defence must answer to a subjective state, not to a predicate of the Gospel. The only correct way is to
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take ἐτούμαστα, with Calvin, Baumgarten, Matthies, Holzhausen, and Harless, in the meaning of alacritas, and indeed, in connection with the genitive, as alacritas quam gignit evangelium pacis. A vigorous freedom of movement may properly be compared to the ἵππος ἰμαστι, as the latter promote ease and security in walking. The Gospel of peace, i.e. that brings peace to the mind, is properly taken as the cause of the spiritual freedom of movement, because peace removes all obstructions of the spiritual life. That, fourthly, faith is compared to a shield is in itself clearly extremely suitable. Upon the shield the arrows of the enemy, i.e. here of the devil, are received. (Ὁ πυρηνὸς = διάβολος in verse 11.) But here a definite class of especially dangerous arrows are named, which were enveloped in combustible materials and discharged burning, so-called πυρ-φόροι διόστολ (see Thucyd. ii. 75: Amm. Marcell. xxiii. 4. Against these it was usual to cover the shields with moist hides, in order to extinguish the fire in them. In this metaphor there seems to have been present to the apostle’s mind the form of temptation by Satan, according to which abominable thoughts, like arrows of Satan, suddenly attack the soul, which by their fire can inflame desires, if they do not become extinct and lose their power on the shield of faith. Lastly, salvation is compared to the helmet. True, one cannot take σωτήριον = ἑλπίς τῆς σωτηρίας (1 Thess. v. 8), however, τὸ σωτήριον too, like all the rest of the heads named, must be taken by its subjective side; but not so much as hope, rather as a possessing present salvation. Finally, the spirit is named as the sole, but fully sufficient, weapon of attack (sword.) It is self-evident that πνεῦμα here is not the human, but the divine spirit, which the Christian alone receives; surely it is the armour of the Christian that is being described. That man is called upon to seize this sword of the Spirit, to carry it, therefore, in a certain sense to govern it, can be no argument against our here supposing the divine Spirit, for it appears everywhere in Scripture, so far as it is active in man, as subject to the conscience, although this holy Spirit is the principle of the religious-moral life. St Paul also enounces in perfectly plain terms, but superfluously, this important maxim, which must be considered as the rampart against all fanaticism, in that section (1 Cor. xiv.) which is so instructive as to the operation of the Holy Spirit in the believer’s soul, where it is said (verse 32): πνεύματα προφητῶν προ-
(See on this subject the remarks in the Comm. on that passage.) Now in this acceptation one easily comprehends how the Spirit which fills the faithful can be considered as the sword with which they fight against the πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας; the nature of this uncreated Holy Spirit guarantees the victory over the created spirits of evil. But it is obscure how St Paul can add: ὅ ἐστι βῆμα Θεοῦ, as an explanation of the Spirit. For that this phrase designates something individual out of the divine Word, the divine threats against the wicked, or the commands of Christianity, is exceedingly improbable, considering the general character of it. St Paul himself explains the phrase βῆμα Θεοῦ by Rom. x. 8, τὸ βῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὤ κηρύσσομεν. The revelation of God in the Word of truth is therefore, in the most comprehensive sense, the Gospel of peace (verse 15.) But how can this Word of God be designated as the Spirit itself? It seems, the Holy Spirit is something accompanying the Word of God, an operation which the Word of God produces, but not the Word of God itself. But, leaving out of sight the form of the appearance of the Word of God in the letter of the Holy Scriptures, or in vivâ voce preaching,—it is from its inward nature the manifestation of the Deity Himself, consequently Spirit, as the efflux of God, the Spirit. Whether it is taken as the Word of God the Father, or as the Word of Christ (Col. iii. 16), or as the Holy Ghost, depends merely on the writer's mode of viewing it; as manifestation of the triune God it reconciles also the different relations to the Trinity.

Vers. 18—20. What follows describes the manner and way in which the sword of the Spirit is to be handled. Col. iv. 2, ss. is parallel with it. It is in prayer, and indeed suitable prayer, prayer in the Spirit, and relating to all the details of life, that the Christian wields the sword of the Spirit, and thus strives for himself and the whole Church of God against the might of darkness and its powers. Again, by the ἐν πνεύματι is designated not the human spirit, as if the words meant: "with devout mind," but the divine Spirit, in whose strength and by whose influences alone we can pray in a manner really well-pleasing to God. (As to the ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἔστι, see the remarks on Luke xviii. 1.—As to the two synonyms προσευχή and δέησις, the LXX. use the former constantly for προσευχή, the latter, on the con-
trary, for ἐν πνεύματι. Προσευχή is rather the more general expression, "prayer in general, communion with God;" on the other hand, δεήσις is in specie a "petitioning prayer," in which a favour is solicited.) Whereas, at first, the discourse was merely of prayer as relative to the person praying, in the words: καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ ἀγρυπνοῦντες κ. τ. λ. it is conceived in the form of intercession, and therein consists the progress of the idea. The εἰς αὐτὸ refers accordingly not to the following words, but to the preceding προσευχεῖσθαι ἐν πνεύματι, "watching thereunto with all perseverance and supposition." That is to say, the object of the supplication for all saints is just the abiding of all in continual spiritual prayer. By this interpretation the apparent tautology which is couched in the ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει, after διὰ δεήσεως προσευχῆμενοι had already preceded it, is also removed. (In verse 18 the τοῦτο after εἰς αὐτὸ is, no doubt, spurious, and probably came into the text here from verse 22. The origin also of the reading αὐτῶν in D.F.G. is only to be explained by the original reading αὐτό.—As to προσκαρτερέων see Rom. xii. 12; Acts i. 14.) St Paul also solicits intercession for himself in a special relation, viz. for a blessing on his labours, not for his personal religious life. We constantly find it so in St Paul's Epistles. He never solicits his readers for their intercession for the strengthening of his life in the faith, but only for the promotion of his efficiency and for aid in external distresses. (Cf. Rom. xv. 30; Col. iv. 3; Phil. i. 19; 2 Thess. iii. 1.) With respect to the development of their own lives, the Apostles were sufficiently secured by the peculiar operation of the Holy Ghost in them. The object of the supplication for himself St Paul expresses by: ἵνα μοι δοθῇ λόγος ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματος, for the connection of the ἐν ἀνοίξει κ. τ. λ. with what follows is to be considered as decidedly inadmissible. From the parallel passage, Col. iv. 3, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν τὸν θόρυβον τοῦ λόγου, it was proposed to translate ἐν ἀνοίξει στόματος here quite arbitrarily in occasione datū. There rather seems to have been regard had here to passages like Ps. li. 17, "Open thou my lips," and Matt. x. 19, Mark xiii. 11, where the Holy Ghost is promised the Apostles in their discourses. St Paul therefore wishes the congregation may by their prayers obtain for him that the gift of utterance may be given unto him, i.e., that the Spirit, which alone speaketh rightly on divine things, may bestow on him all that is necessary on each oc-
occasion as it arises, for his ministerial efficiency. In this sentence the difficulty might be found that St Paul had surely received the Holy Ghost once for all, and with it the due faculty of speaking, and thus required no intercession of the congregation on that score. But the Holy Ghost is not to be viewed in the Apostles as a constantly operating power, but as a power which manifested itself in different degrees and forms of efficacy at different times. No doubt the Spirit was abiding in the Apostles, not momentary as in the prophets of the Old Testament, but it operated now more now less urgently, at times even quite arresting outward action. (Cf. Acts xvi. 6, and the remarks on it in the Comm.) The sense of this request, therefore, of St Paul's for intercession for himself is this: "Pray that the due faculty of speaking may be given to me in my present position, and, as far as is possible, ever and everywhere." In fact this idea coincides with the prayer: "Pray that it may be given unto me to convert as many as possible to the kingdom of heaven." The consequence of the δοθήναι λόγου εν ἀνοίξει στόματος is afterwards the possibility of the γνωρίσαι εν παρρησίᾳ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. (See as to παρρησία and μυστήριον iii. 12 and iii. 3.) We are not to think here of outward freedom (viz. from bonds), but of inward joyfulness of soul, which enhanced the power of his labours, and is for that reason so desirable to St Paul, not on account of its subjective enjoyment. With this freedom the exterior state of his being in bonds, of which St Paul here makes mention, is meant to contrast; mundus habet legatos splendidos, says Bengel, Christus vincit. (In the singular, εν ἀλώσει, to find an allusion to the manner of fettering St Paul in his Roman captivity, as Flatt still insists on doing,—that is to say, to the circumstance that St Paul was fastened by a chain to a Roman soldier [see the Comm. on Acts xxviii. 20] is plainly unsuitable. In the parallel passage, Col. iv. 3, it is said: δι' ὅ καὶ δέθεμαι.) Finally, the last words: ἦν εν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι κ.τ.λ. are usually taken as a resumption of the εν παρρησίᾳ γνωρίσαι, ver. 19. But that supposition would appear justified only if the words ran, for instance, ἦν καὶ εν αὐτῇ, "that I too might have joyfulness even in bonds." It is more suitable to put this conclusion parallel with the ἦν μοι δοθῇ κ.τ.λ., and to look for the peculiarity of the idea here expressed in the ἦν αὐτῷ—ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. That is to say, the ἦν αὐτῷ is to be referred to μυστή-
μν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; "to be joyful in the Gospel" means "to make known the Gospel joyfully," as it is said, Col. iv. 3, ἥνα φανε-ρῶνοι αὐτῷ ὥς δὲ με λαλήσαι. In these last words, namely, the manner of the παρῆσα τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς is pointed to as it is becoming for an apostle of Christ. No worldly earthly joyfulness is it, but a holy heavenly one, which he is to manifest in the proclamation of the mystery of salvation, and by means of which he wins hearts unto that mystery.

Vers. 21, 22. This reference to Tychicus, the bearer of this Epistle, for more detailed accounts of the person and fate of the apostle, is found almost word for word the same in the parallel passage, Col. iv. 7, 8. It has been already observed in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians how this passage certainly in some measure explains the absence of personal news in it, but still there remains the certainly strange fact that all special salutations, which St Paul usually brings in at the close of his other Epistles, are wanting in this one. It is only comprehensible on the assumption that this Epistle is an encyclical one (to which, as we saw in the Introduction, everything leads), how St Paul, in an Epistle addressed among others to the church at Ephesus, in which he must have known so many members personally, could have refrained from all special salutations. (As to the person of Tychicus see Acts xx. 4, sq., 2 Tim. iv. 12, Tit. iii. 12. In ver. 21 τι πρᾶσσω is not to be referred to the labours of St Paul but to their success, like the Lat. quid agam, and the Germ. was ich mache, "how I am doing, how I get on."

Vers. 23, 24. The last verses show clearly that St Paul had only a general knowledge of the circle of his readers. The turn εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς and χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπάτων κ. τ. λ. is against any special acquaintance with his readers; for, as every polemical reference is wanting in the Epistle, the object cannot be to form a contrast with those who do not love the Lord. But in ver. 23 the juxtaposition εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως is strange; as the πίστις is the basis of the Christian state of mind one expects the inverted order, faith, love, and peace. Meier translates the μετὰ: "in conformity with their own faith." This translation is certainly not quite accurate, but it is extremely probable that it is implied in the connection by means of μετὰ that faith is supposed to be already in existence, as indeed the idea of "brother" requires.
In addition therefore to faith, love and peace only are wished. In ver. 24 ἐν ἄφθαρσι ἄν causes another difficulty. The connection with ἀγαπῶντων, in the sense perpetuo, sine fine, recommends itself but little. So Flatt, Meier, and others, take it. The connecting it with Χριστὸν, "the glorified Christ," which Wetstein recommends, is entirely unsuitable. The ἄφθαρσι here can only be referred to the believers themselves, so that the perfected state to which grace leads is denoted by it. The ἄφθαρσι = ζῶν αἰώνος, and the coupling it with ἐν is to be considered as an abbreviation for the complete formula, ἵνα ζῶν ἔχωσιν ἐν ἄφθαρσι. (Compare Rom. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10.)
EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.
INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE.

The city of Colossæ was situated in Phrygia, and indeed in that part of this province of Asia Minor which according to the Roman division was called Phrygia Pacatiana; it was seated on the Lycca, in the vicinity of Laodicea and Hierapolis, which cities embraced Christianity early (see Col. iv. 13), and are often named in the most ancient history of the Church in Asia Minor. (See Steiger's Comm. p. 365, ss.) Steiger gives copious information as to the geography of the city of Colossæ, which in later times received the name of Chonos, which its ruins also bear even now. (Ubi suprà p. 18, ss, and in the supplement p. 368, ss.) The orthography of the name is doubtful. The MSS. A.B.C. write (Col. i. 2) Κολοσσαί, and, as this form of the name is also found on coins, it seems to deserve the preference. On the other hand, F.G. have Κολοσσαί, and that form is to be supposed in D.E., for they have in Col. i. 2 formed the gentile Κολοσσαί. In Herod. vii. 30, and Xenoph. Anab. i. 2, 6, too, Κολοσσαί is written by the best critics. Perhaps the pronunciation varied among the inhabitants themselves; on which account, because of the uncertainty of the reading, we keep to the usual form of the name.

St Paul travelled twice through Phrygia (Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 28); but he probably never touched at the city of Colossæ. In any case he had no share in the foundation of the Christian church there (Col. ii. 1); that seems rather to have proceeded from Epaphras (Col. i. 7), who was with St Paul at Rome, when the latter wrote the Epistle (Col. iv. 12, Phil. ver. 23), and from whom St Paul, no doubt, received the information which caused him to compose this Epistle to a community personally unknown to him. Epaph-
phras, however, is most probably not identical with Epaphroditus, the apostle of the Philippians (Phil. ii. 25, iv. 18), from whom he had brought St Paul an aid in money to Rome. (See as to the person of Epaphras Winer’s Real-Lex. vol. i. p. 389. Winer seems to be in favour of the identity of Epaphras and Epaphroditus; Steiger and Rheinwald declare themselves against it in their Commentaries at the passages relating to the point, and Böhmer in the Isagoge in Ep. ad Col. p. 41.) No more accurate accounts can be procured from other quarters as to the importance of the Colossian church. We only see by the Epistle to Philemon, which St Paul, as we showed in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, wrote at the same time as the Epistle to the Colossians, and sent by the same messenger Tychicus (Col. iv. 7—9), that that Philemon had the meetings of the church in Colossæ held in his house, and was probably himself, like his son Archippus, invested with some ecclesiastical office in it. (Comp. Philem. vers. 1—3 with Col. iv. 17.) The insignificant population of the inconsiderable city of Colossæ does not admit of our supposing that there were meetings of the faithful at more than one place; at all events, the meeting in the house of Nymphas, mentioned in Col. iv. 15, relates to the neighbouring city of Laodicea, not to Colossæ.

Now, since we have already, in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, observed what was needful as to the time and place of the composition of this Epistle, and shown that the Epistle to the Colossians was written from Rome during the first Roman captivity, at the same time as those to the Ephesians and to Philemon, and was sent by Tychicus, there remain to us but two points which require a closer investigation in this introduction, viz. the question as to the authenticity of this Epistle, and the question as to the occasion for its composition, i.e. as to the false doctrine disseminated in Colossæ. As to the genuineness of it, the Church of Christ had been 1800 years in undisputed possession of this writing as genuinely apostolical, when it occurred to Dr Mayerhoff in Berlin to cast doubts on this well-established inheritance. Then, after him, Dr Baur also, in Tübingen, threw out objections against the genuineness of this Epistle, without, however, up to this time, making them good. But, as he places the pastoral Epistles at so late a date, principally on account of the false teachers pointed out in them, it may be supposed that, in the controversy as to the Epistle to
the Colossians the heretics mentioned in it again constitute the chief argument in his mind against the authenticity of the Epistle, because they are very closely connected with the heretics of the pastoral Epistles. We shall therefore apply ourselves merely to Mayerhoff's arguments against the idea that the Epistle to the Colossians owes its origin to St Paul, which are laid down in a posthumous work of his: "The Epistle to the Colossians, with especial reference to the three pastoral Epistles." (Berlin, 1838.) It has already been remarked in the investigation of the arguments brought forward against the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians, that it is not adapted to dispose us favourably towards the critical works here coming under review, when we see that the impugners of the Epistle to the Ephesians base their arguments against that writing on the presupposition of the authenticity of the Epistle to the Colossians, and vice versa the impugners of the Epistle to the Colossians on their side necessarily postulate the authenticity of the Epistle to the Ephesians. The critics thus cut away from one another reciprocally the bases of their operations, and by that means make their whole proceeding extremely suspicious. According to Mayerhoff the Epistle to the Colossians is to be considered as an abstract of the Epistle to the Ephesians, composed in perhaps the second century, and with which the polemical part is interwoven by the author in order to combat with apostolic authority heretics that were hateful to him. This representation certainly furnishes a not altogether inconceivable motive for the transformation of an apostolical epistle, whereas those who make the opposite assertion, that the Epistle to the Ephesians is a detailed new-modelling of the Epistle to the Colossians, are entirely unable to bring forward an object for such an undertaking, because in that case the polemical element, which was certainly the usual motive for such forgeries under apostolical names, must have purposely and directly been eradicated from the Epistle to the Colossians. But such an assumption as Mayerhoff's could, in opposition to the unanimous testimony of the ancient Church from the earliest times, then only lay claim to recognition, if decisive and clear evidence could be produced, which proved that the Epistle to the Colossians was not St Paul's, and that therefore the ancient tradition of the Church must be rejected. But it scarcely needs to be mentioned that Mayerhoff has been able to point out nothing of the sort. In the
first section of his work he is occupied with the relations of the Epistle to the Colossians towards the rest of St Paul's Epistles in respect of language. The style of the Epistle to the Colossians has hitherto been viewed by the sharpest-sighted critics as undoubtedly bearing on it the stamp of St Paul's mode of writing. Mayerhoff is of another opinion. But the way in which he seeks to show the difference in style between this Epistle and the genuine Epistles of St Paul proves that he proceeded in this inquiry on totally untenable principles. In p. 12 he thinks it worthy of consideration that the words: ἀποκαλύπτω, ἀποκάλυψις, ὑπακοόω, ὑπακοή, ἔρα, διό, διότι, ἐτι, οὐκέτι, μηκέτι, are not found in the Epistle to the Colossians, that γὰρ occurs but six times in it, whereas it occurs seventeen times in the Epistle to the Philippians, twenty-four times in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, forty times in that to the Galatians, 170 times in that to the Corinthians, 150 times in that to the Romans. He that can take account of such pure accidents, and take it so seriously too that he counts how often γὰρ occurs in each Epistle, pronounces on himself the sentence of incapacity for giving his vote on affinity or difference of style. In an Epistle of but few chapters then only can something be inferred from ἀπαξ λεγομένος and similar deviations, when they are found in such modes of expression for which the author has been acknowledged to have coined standing formulas, and even then they have demonstrative force only when they can be brought forward in connection with other decisive arguments. Such Mayerhoff in the second section of his essay (p. 42, ss.) thinks are found in the anomalies in the mode of thinking and of putting forth thoughts which are supposed to show themselves between the Epistle to the Colossians and the genuine Epistles of St Paul. He begins here with the remark that the setting forth of the ideas in the Epistle to the Colossians entirely wants the life, freshness, and force, which distinguished the genuine Epistles of St Paul.  

1 Erasmus, the great connoisseur of antiquity, judged differently, tonat, suisurat, merat flammam loderitur Paulus, says he of this Epistle. Böhmmer likewise finds, in his " Isagoge in Epist. ad Colos.," the mode of setting forth the ideas in the Epistle to the Colossians visa, pressa, solida, nervis plena, massa (l. c. pag. 160.)
himself be carried away in the hortatory part of the Epistles, so that in it everything is mixed together; in the Epistle to the Colossians, on the other hand, it is just the contrary; the hortatory part is quite logically arranged, but the dogmatical part exhibits a confused intermixture." We can oppose nothing more cogent to this remark than if we in the following Commentary on this Epistle prove the close connection of the dogmatical part also, just as we, in respect of the hortatory parts of the other Epistles, have already sufficiently shown the complete untenableness of Mayerhoff's assertion, or shall show it in the sequel in the Epistles which are yet to be explained, by pointing to the excellent arrangement in them. Whereas in early times the Church of Christ particularly admired the Epistle to the Colossians on account of the richness of its ideas both profound and compressed into a small space, Mayerhoff discovers poverty of ideas in it (p. 46), and then finds too (p. 59, ss.) "although the doctrine of the Epistle is essentially St Paul's, in separate points more or less deviation from the doctrine of St Paul's Epistles." On this point too we abstain from all further remarks here, as the exposition itself will give us sufficient opportunity to show the complete identity of the doctrine of this Epistle with St Paul's system of doctrine in general. To that is subjoined in the third section of Mayerhoff's Essay the collation of the two Epistles, to the Colossians and to the Ephesians, which now, as has been already remarked, results in favour of the Epistle to the Ephesians, in direct opposition to the inquiries of De Wette and other critics. To every unprepossessed person the impossibility of making proof of the one or the other of these Epistles having been copied from a genuine one of St Paul's will by these contradictions have been made clear enough, and consequently the authenticity of both has by that means only been confirmed anew. A refutation of that section would be possible only in case of a special following up of the collation of the two Epistles carried out by Mayerhoff, which, it is self-evident, cannot be undertaken here. But by whomsoever it may be instituted it will never leave behind it a satisfactory impression in all points, since it is certainly true that, as we have already seen in the Introduction to the Epistle of St Paul to the Ephesians, this Epistle is near akin to that, and indeed in such a way that the Epistle to the Colossians appears as the shorter; and the assertion that this shorter Epistle was made by an
officious person by means of an unskillful abridgement of the longer one will ever be scarcely refutable in the eyes of those who see or choose to see poverty of intellect in abundance of intellect, and a want of connection in the strictest order.

Thus, then, there remains but the fourth and last section, in which Mayerhoff treats of the false doctrine in the Epistle to the Colossians. Here he seeks to show that this false doctrine is that of Cerinthus, and, as that heretic did not live till after the apostle's time, therefore the Epistle to the Colossians cannot be by St Paul. Now, that would certainly be a just conclusion, if the premises showed themselves capable of proof; we should then have an historical point which we could oppose to the uninterrupted tradition ascribing the origin of this Epistle to St Paul; by that means we should come out of the airy regions of so-called internal arguments (i.e. of merely subjective opinion) on to the firm ground of history. But, as Mayerhoff himself confesses (p. 5) that Baur's attack on the authenticity of the pastoral Epistles, on the ground that the doctrine of the Marcionites is combated in them, fails on the inadmissibility of that single assumption being pointed out, which, as M. owns, has been already done by Baumgarten; so too will his polemical arguments against the Epistle to the Colossians having been written by St Paul fail, on the single proof being brought that there is no necessity in the case of the false doctrine designated in it to think of Cerinthus' gnosis. That demonstration we attempt in what follows, after we have more accurately weighed the characteristics which the Epistle to the Colossians gives of the false doctrine spread among the first readers of it, as also the different hypotheses which have been set up on the subject.

§ 2. OF THE FALSE DOCTRINE SPREAD IN COLOSSÆ.

The circumstance which caused the apostle Paul to write to the Christians in Colossæ, who were not personally known to him, was the spread of serious errors in doctrine among them, as also in the neighbouring church in Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), to whom St Paul had also written, and, it is extremely probable, with the same design of warning them, as he commands that both Epistles, which
might be complements of each other, are to be read at both places. St Paul had, no doubt, received information of those false doctrines through Epaphras, who, as has been already observed, was then with St Paul, and, as founder of the Colossian church, stood in the nearest relation to it. In Coloss. iv. 12 St Paul remarks, in delivering salutations to the Colossians from Epaphras, that Epaphras is earnest in prayer for them, that they, grounded in God's will, may stand firm against all temptations. It does not appear from this Epistle in what manner this false doctrine may have been spread in Colossæ. St Paul does not say that persons from without had brought it thither, neither does he name any individuals who defended it, he does not even strictly separate the heterodox from the orthodox believers, but speaks to the whole body of the Colossian church, as if both the heretics and those that remained faithful were still in church-fellowship. This is especially shown by Col. ii. 20: \( \epsilon i \ \alpha \pi e \theta \alpha n t e \ \sigma \nu \ \chi r i s t \omega \ \alpha \pi \ \tau \omega \ \sigma t o \chi e i \omega \ \tau \omega \ \kappa \circ \mu o u, \ \tau \iota \ \omega s \ \xi \omega n- \tau e s \ \epsilon n \ \kappa \circ \mu o \ \delta o \gamma \mu a t i \zeta \varepsilon \sigma t e \); We cannot here suppose that the false teachers merely are addressed, with an exclusion of the rest of the church, for such a separation of two elements is nowhere indicated, the exhortations go on without interruption, and always refer to the whole church. A later writer would certainly not have selected that form of representation; the latter would have made the heretics appear rigorously separated from the orthodox believers, and combated them as standing out of communion with the church. St Paul writes here perfectly in accordance with the first beginnings of the Christian life. The first symptoms only of heretical doctrine showed themselves in Colossæ. St Paul hastened to suppress them in the bud and to bring back the misguided to the right way. He had no grounds for deducing those errors from an evil intention; he saw their origin in inexperience and weakness; therefore he does not directly apply severe measures, exclusion from communion with the Church, and the like, but he proceeds forbearingly. He views and treats the misguided as still members of the church, and seeks to bring them back to the truth by a gentle exposure of their errors. The matter had assumed a totally different aspect some years later when St Paul wrote his pastoral letters at the end of his life. Then the evil intention of the false teachers had been brought clearly to light, and St Paul durst therefore no longer permit unseasonable gentleness to sway him. The diseased
members were now obliged to be removed in order to keep the whole frame sound.

From this position of the Colossian false teachers towards the church it may now be already inferred that no elaborate system can be supposed in them. The enthusiastic element, which existed in the character of the Phrygian people, and which had found vent for itself under Gentilism in the fanatical worship of Cybele, produced similar phenomena on the reception of Christianity, as the Montanism which arose in Phrygia in the second century shows. The Phrygians had received Christianity as a religion endowed with mighty spiritual powers, but without entirely renouncing with real self-denial their previous predilections; by which means there afterwards arose mixtures of truth and falsehood, as they meet our view in St Paul's sketch of the errors there. Moreover, the Eastern was mingled with the Western element in this part of Asia Minor, numerous Jews, with their different sects, were settled there,¹ a propensity to speculations on the world of spirits was generally diffused, and that too not only in the form of the Greek philosophers, but also in that of the Oriental theosophists,—nothing was therefore more natural than that Christianity, entering that mass full of fermentation, should be eagerly received by the excitable population, but also capriciously disfigured. Before we, however, look any closer into the quality of the Colossian false teachers, we must answer the preliminary question, “Are all the traits mentioned by St Paul to be supposed united in the same persons, or are they men of totally different tendencies of mind, whom he combats?” By far the most of the later critics suppose the former, Heinrichs alone insists that there were in Colosseae not merely false teachers of one opinion, but Judaists, Gnostics, and other heretics, side by side. We must allow that the representation in our Epistle by no means justifies the confidence with which the moderns suppose but one sect in Colosseae. If our Epistle were addressed to a numerous church, such as the Roman one was, it would be even more natural to suppose that St Paul wished to warn them against various erroneous opinions. For he nowhere says that the same persons teach all that he blames; since he, as we have seen, always writes

¹ According to Josephus (Arch. xii, 3) Antiochus the Great had brought 2000 Jewish families from Babylon and Mesopotamia to Phrygia, and made them settle there; he expected of them protection against the unruly native population.
to the church as such, not to individuals in it, it appears absolutely
grounded in the nature of the thing that he ranges the errors to be
avoided side by side, without its following from that that the same
persons entertain them. One might even say that at ii. 16, 17
two tendencies, the Judaizing and the Gnostic, are distinguished,
as St Paul, after the: \( \mu \eta \circ \nu \tau \iota \), begins anew: \( \mu \eta \delta i e i s \ \iota \mu \alpha s \kappa. \tau. \lambda. \), and intimates by that means that he makes a transition
to something fresh. However, neither that passage, nor any other
in the Epistle to the Colossians, is decidedly against the assumption
that all the traits mentioned by St Paul were combined in the same
persons; and if one considers that Colossae was a small place, in which
many opinions can scarcely have been propagated, further, that the
pastoral Epistles introduce us to perfectly similar false teachers in
Epheusus and Crete, in whom kindred heretical elements appear
combined, as in the Colossians,—it certainly becomes probable that
the same persons taught all that St Paul comprehends, but one will
not be able to go beyond the probability. If we, after this, con-
sider the separate features of the portrait which St Paul draws of
the Colossian false teachers,1 we find, first, that they had a ten-
dency to Judaism. They laid a stress on exterior circumcision and
the outward observance of the Law (ii. 11, 16, 21, iii. 10), required
the keeping of the ordinances of the Old Testament as to meats,
the solemnization of the feasts, new moons, Sabbaths. In opposi-
tion to them, St Paul exalts the spiritual circumcision in regene-
ration, and urges that through Christ the distinctions in the Old
Testament between Jews and Gentiles, circumcised and uncir-
rencised, are abolished, that the mystery of Christ is to be made known
unto all men, even unto the Gentiles. But, besides that, St Paul
also warns against a φιλοσοφία καὶ κενή ἀπάτη κατὰ τὴν παρά-
δοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν
(ii. 8.) What that false speculation discovered itself in
is particularly shown by ii. 18, ss. Instead of keeping to Christ,
the one and only head, those heretics occupied themselves with in-

---

1 More extended remarks on the heretics of the apostolic age are found in the Intro-
duction to the three pastoral Epistles, in which particularly the false teachers of the
Epistle to the Colossians are compared with the false teachers of the pastoral Epistles
as regards the affinity and the difference between them. We therefore refer to the more
detailed discussion in the Introduction to the pastoral Epistles, in respect of all points
which are here either not at all, or but briefly, touched on.
quiries into the world of spirits, and even dedicated worship to the angels. St Paul therefore strives above all to put the divine dignity of Jesus in a clear light, and to show that not merely all earthly, but also all heavenly, powers are subject to the eternal Son of God. On the pretended insight into the spiritual world, which the Colossian false teachers recommended, and which, as usually happens, produced conceit and haughtiness along with apparent humility (ii. 18, 23), the Epistle gives us no more detailed information; but it may be deduced from the pastoral Epistles that they were occupied with genealogies of the angels, therefore, we may suppose, assumed Syzygies amongst the angels, after the manner of the later Gnostics. Finally, as to the practical tendency of these heretics, a strict asceticism was cultivated among them, which induces us to suppose that they assumed a Hyle, or substance of evil, although it is nowhere openly expressed. In like manner it is nowhere declared by St Paul that the ascetic principles of the false teachers in Colossæ had extended to the rejection of marriage, and to docetic views of Christ. (See the Comm. on ii. 21.) Now, if these features are conceived as referring to the same persons, the difficulty arises that they seem to have something contradictory in them. That is to say, the stiffer Judaists used to be strongly averse from Gnostic speculation and false asceticism, the Gnostic ascetics, on the other hand, were commonly opposed to the tendency to regard the Law as merely external. Thus it is explained how the views of the learned as to the nature of these false teachers could prove so different. However, the majority of these hypotheses sufficiently refute themselves. (See Böhmer's Isagoge, p. 56, ss., and Bertholdt's Introd. vol. 6, p. 3448, ss.). The notions of Eichhorn, Schneckenburger (contributions to the Introduction, p. 146, ss., and on the antiquity of the baptism of proselytes App. p. 189, ss.), and others, that no Christians at all are meant here, but Jesus, which is deduced particularly from ii. 19, needs no further consideration, for the οὐ κρατεῖν τὴν κεφαλὴν does not mean “not to believe in Christ at all,” but only “not to hold fast unto Christ as one ought.” Had these persons not been Christians, St Paul’s polemical arguments would surely have had no aim at all; it was self-evident that in non-Christians there was much to blame. In like manner the views of Wolf, Junker, and others, who thought Christian Platonists, or Alexandrian sup-
porters of the doctrines of the Logos, were the heretics at Colossæ, can make no pretension to recognition, because the inflexible tendency of the Colossian false teachers with regard to the Law, from which the Platonists and Platonizing Judaists were free, cannot be explained by those views. Again, the assertion of Grotius, that the false doctrine is to be deduced from Pythagorean elements, or those of Kleuker and Hug, that it proceeds from the influence of the Magi or Chaldees, are not merely indemonstrable, but improbable also. The same holds good too of J. D. Michaelis’ hypothesis, that they are disciples of Apollos, which the friendly relation of that man to St Paul is entirely opposed to. Thus, then, there only remains as tenable the single supposition that they were Jewish Gnostics, or Theosophists, who had endeavoured to harmonize their particular views with those of the Gospel. To suppose exactly Essenes or Therapeutes to be meant here, as Zacharie, Storr, and others, wished, is certainly less advisable, because those formed exclusive societies, and it is hardly probable that they would before the destruction of Jerusalem have spread themselves out of Judæa and Egypt into the other provinces of the Roman empire. But neither do we need any annexation to such existing sects in order to explain the mixing up of Jewish Theosophy with Christianity. Theosophical and ascetic opinions of many kinds, shapeless, and without having as yet assumed a decided character, were in the apostolical times diffused among Gentiles and Jews. (Only see what Josephus [vita, cap. 2] relates of a certain Banus.) Those ascetics in Rome of whom St Paul writes (Rom. xiv.), and in later times the appearance of Cerinthus and of the Gnostic Ebionites, of whose opinions a remarkable monument has been preserved in the followers of Clement, sufficiently prove how a theosophical-ascetic tendency, as it appeared in the system of the Cabbala (see the Introduction to the pastoral Epistles) could associate itself with a tendency strictly legal in Judaism, and, on these grounds, such a coalition of those different tendencies was then also possible in Christianity. The latter inquirers, namely Neander and Böhmer, coincide in this conception of the quality of the Colossian false teachers, and Mayerhoff too, in fact, joins them. The latter scholar only concludes, as we have already observed, from the affinity of the heretics in Colossæ with Cerinthus’ bias, that the author of this Epistle had combated the latter and his disciples, and that, as Cerinthus lived
after St Paul, the Epistle to the Colossians must be considered spurious. However, it is to be observed in opposition to that, that the circumstances of Cerinthus' life are by no means accurately enough known to us to enable us to say with any certainty he was not living so early as St Paul's times. That he was along with John the Evangelist in Ephesus is reported to us by such safe witnesses that only the extreme of caprice can throw doubts on their declarations. (See Neander's Church History, vol. ii. p. 672.) It is true we know nothing certain of any relation between Cerinthus and St Paul, for the uncritical Epiphanius, who supposes St Paul in all his Epistles to combat Cerinthus, cannot, of course, come under consideration here; but, in spite of that, Cerinthus might even at that time have been active, at least we have no decisive evidence that would preclude that assumption; therefore an argument against a writing which is founded on the most irrefragable testimonies cannot possibly be based on so uncertain a matter. But then nothing obliges us to assume that it is just Cerinthus and his adherents who are combated in the Epistle to the Colossians. That false teacher certainly did not first stir up the tendency of mind which declares itself in his system. It was, on the contrary, before him diffused in wide circles already. Cerinthus only adopted it for his own, worked it up in his own fashion, and succeeded in gaining over a good many to it. The very general manner in which the false doctrines are set forth in this Epistle, as we have seen, speaks clearly for the opinion that there had not yet risen up any individual who had adopted independently for his own the tendency of mind which they suppose, and given it a characteristic and definite form. Cerinthus may, therefore, when St Paul wrote, have already been in Colosse and committed himself to those views, but he had hardly exercised influence already and made himself the independent master of that tendency.

In its main purport, therefore, the Epistle to the Colossians is directed against errors which have long since vanished, while the Word of Truth which dissipated them has remained to us inviolate. That Word also exercises even yet its power of destruction and edification. For, if the form of error is changed, yet the essence of it continues the same in all ages of the Church, because it is ever generated anew out of the sinful heart; it therefore also needs incessantly refutation through the Word of God. The pith, how-
ever, of the error which began to entangle the Colossians consists in seeking a wisdom and a holiness apart from Christ, in capriciously-made images of the fancy or of contemplation, in works of the Law, of chastening, of mortification; a striving, along with which, in whatever form it may present itself, the poisonous plant of conceit and haughtiness always grows up in the heart. Against these the word of St Paul, "In Christ are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," (Col. ii. 3), holds good for all times, and especially even for ours, so rich in its own wisdom. He that digs them out wins the greatest treasure at the same time with them, viz., humility, which is never found along with the conceited wisdom of man.

§ 3. THE COURSE OF IDEAS IN THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle to the Colossians falls, like the rest of St Paul's Epistles, into two parts: in the first of which (from i. 1 to ii. 28) the dogmatical element predominates, in the second (from iii. 1 to iv. 18), on the contrary, the ethical.

We further divide the first part into two paragraphs, the first of which (i. 1 to 23) after the salutation expresses thanks to God for the faith of the readers, and contains the prayer of St Paul for their growth in knowledge and in every good work. St Paul represents the fulfilment of that prayer as guaranteed by Christ and His redemption, who is personally described in His eternal Godhead as He through whom all is created and in whom everything consists, as head of the Church and first-born from the dead. As Lord over all Christ has reconciled all through His blood. Even them, the readers of the Epistle, He has reconciled, that they might be holy and unspotted instead of their previous state of estrangement from God, if they stood fast in the faith and in the hope of the Gospel, whereof he (St Paul) is a minister. In the second paragraph (i. 24 to ii. 28) St Paul declares his joy at his call to be an apostle in spite of all the distresses attending it, as those very sufferings must serve the welfare of the Church of Christ. He says he has the calling, as minister of the Gospel, to fill everything with the Gospel, and to teach all men (Gentiles as well as Jews), and to
present them perfect in Christ, whereunto, therefore, he labours with all his might, and is accordingly particularly anxious for them, the Christians in Colosse as also in Laodicea, while he strives to bring them to the knowledge of God and of Christ, in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hid. He says this, he tells them, in order to warn them against false human wisdom, which is sought for apart from Christ, in whom, nevertheless, the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, and whose redeeming power they themselves had experienced in their hearts. They should not, he says, let themselves be again subjected to the yoke of the Law, and be seduced from Christ by a puffed-up wisdom; for he that is dead with Christ from the elements of the spiritual life must not again let himself be brought back to a self-chosen worship of God which seeks salvation by works. In the second part the third paragraph (iii. 1 to 17) contains the general ethical precepts to the readers, as such who are risen with Christ, to seek also what is above, and to renounce all that is earthly and sinful. St Paul says they ought for that end to put on the new man, created after the image of God, with all his virtues, to let, above all, love and peace reign in them, and in reciprocal teaching and edification thank God and the Father for the salvation which had become theirs. The fourth and last paragraph (iii. 18—iv. 18), finally, is taken up with exhortations for the special relations of family life, to which is subjoined at the end of the Epistle a reference to Tychicus, the bearer of this Epistle, for more detailed news as to the apostle personally. Salutations, and the charge to communicate this Epistle to the Christians in Laodicea, and, on the other hand, to read publicly in Colosse also that addressed to the Laodiceans, fill up the last verses of the Epistle, on which St Paul further stamps the seal of authenticity by means of a salutation written with his own hand.

§ 4. LIST OF WRITERS ON THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Besides several works especially devoted to the Introduction to the Epistle to the Colossians, such as C. G. Hoffman (Leips. 1749, 4to), Bömer (Isagoge in Ep. ad. Col. theol. hist. critica, Berol. 1829. 8.), Rheinwald (de pseudodoctoribus Colossensibus,
Bonnæ, 1834, 4to), Osander on the Colossian false teachers in the Tübingen Journal for 1834, part 4, we have to cite the following special Commentaries. By Davenant (expositio Ep. ad Col., Genevæ, 1655, 4to), George Calixtus (expositio literalis, Brunsvicæ, 1654. 4.), Solomon van Till (Amstelod. 1726, 4to), Storr (in his opusc. acad., vol. ii. p. 120—241), Junker (Mannheim, 1828), Flatt (edited by Kling, Tübingen 1829), Bühr (Basle, 1833), Böhmer (Breslau, 1835), Steiger (Erlangen, 1835.)
EXPOSITION
OF THE
EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

I.
PART FIRST.
i. 1.—ii. 23.

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE READERS AND FOR SALVATION IN CHRIST.

(i. 1—23.)

The salutation (i. 1, 2) presents nothing particular, as what was necessary as to the form of the name of the city of Colossæ and the various readings in ver. 2 has already been remarked in the Introduction to this Epistle (§ 1.) At the end of ver. 2 the usual καὶ κυρίον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the blessing is wanting in the MSS. B.D.E. and several minuscules. Considering the constant occurrence of this formula in the beginnings of St Paul's Epistles, the omission of the words is certainly not so easily explained as the addition of them; however, Lachmann has not, for all that, ventured to strike them out altogether; they might also have been left out in some MSS. by accident.

Ver. 3, 4. Exactly as in Ephes. i. 15, ss., here too St Paul begins with thanksgiving to God and mentioning his intercession for the Colossian Christians for the sake of their faith and their love, therefore for the sake of their Christian state of mind, of which St Paul, however, had information (άκονταντές) only through the
communications of others (especially of Epaphras, ver. 8), not through beholding it himself, for he had neither founded the church in Colosse, nor ever visited it (see Introd. § 1).—As to the connection of the words, it is more correct to join πάντως with what follows than with what precedes, for the incessant prayer for the readers appears as the more important point here. In εὐχαριστοῦμεν is expressed the thanksgiving of St Paul, which he expressed at the moment, and by the medium of writing; the intercession, on the contrary, is meant to be represented as going on, and to be grounded on what St Paul had heard of the Colossians' life of faith. So too, ver. 9, where this idea is again taken up and further carried out. Love is again (as in Ephes. i. 15) conceived of as brotherly love, because Christian love manifests itself as such in the first place, without thereby derogating from universal love. In ver. 3 MS. B. reads for τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί, as St Paul generally writes,—τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ, and D.G. τῷ Θεῷ τῷ πατρὶ, which latter reading Lachmann has received into the text. In fact, it seems to deserve the preference, as the more unusual form of expression could easily be changed into the usual one.—Τπερ is to be preferred after B.D.F.G. to περὶ.—In ver. 4 the reading ἂν ἔχετε after τὴν ἀγάπην is vouched for by so many and important MSS., viz., by A.C.D.E.F.G., that one cannot hesitate to declare it the original one, the rather as the reading τὴν seems to have come into the text here from Ephes. i. 15.

Ver. 5. St Paul represents the faith and the love of the Christians in Colosse as purchased by the hope shown them by means of the Gospel. Here too again St Paul disdains not to cast his eyes on the divine μυστήριον, which even the Saviour Himself often places before His disciples. The ἐλπὶς, accordingly, is here not, as in 1 Thess. i. 3, subjective hope, but objective hope, i.e. the hoped-for object, eternal happiness in the kingdom of God. It is designated as ἀποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς ὑπεραναῖοις, in order to indicate partly its being securely laid up, partly its not being yet present. But man cannot deduce the existence of such a heavenly hope from himself; he perceives it only in the Word of Truth, which is in the Gospel. (Τοῦ εὐαγγελοῦ is to be taken as genit. appositionis.) In this, the Colossians have already here (before the fulfilment) received information of that hope. For the προηκούσατε is to be taken so, not, as Böhmer wishes, with reference to the Apostle's Epistle, as
if the meaning were, "of which you have already heard before the composition of this Epistle." For that this was the case was surely already plain enough from the ἀκοῦσαντες preceding. Again, in the words which follow: τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς καὶ κ. τ. λ., the bare fact that the Gospel is preached in Colossæ is not related; the citing of that would be completely needless, as the existence of faith necessarily presupposes the preaching of the Gospel. St Paul means rather in that addition to render prominent the nature of the Gospel, as a treasure belonging to the whole of mankind, and which for that very reason could not be withheld from them (the Colossians) either: "which is come unto you, as it is also (in conformity with its destination) in the whole world." The reason why the apostle makes the universality of Christianity prominent here is the same which causes him at the end of the chapter (i: 27, ss.) to repeat so often, that he teaches and warns all men, viz., opposition to the one-sided bias of the Judaïstic false teachers, who looked on the Gospel as intended first of all for the Jews merely. Neither, therefore, can the ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ be taken with Böhmer as an hyperbole, for even if, when St Paul wrote those words, the Gospel was not actually as yet generally diffused, still it has in its first elements even the tendency and energy to fill and govern the world; from his knowledge of that energy St Paul prophetically expresses the future as if already realized. (See on i. 23.) For the rest, in the τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς is to be seen an antithesis to the ἐπὶ τῶν ἄποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; whereas the glory and blessedness of the kingdom of God are still far off, the substance of these blessings is already spiritually near to the faithful in the Word of Truth.

Ver. 6. Here the connection of the words is disputable, in consequence of the different readings; St Paul's discourse proceeds with καθὼς καὶ thrice repeated: it is true, the καὶ is wanting in the third, in very many and important MSS., but the omission is far more explicable, because it had already been put twice before, than the addition of it. But then A.C.D. read in the beginning of ver. 6 καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶ καρποφοροῦμενον. By that reading the proposition καθὼς—κόσμῳ is separated from what precedes, and joined with what follows, which brings with it the great inconvenience that then the words: καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν do not fit the beginning of the proposition: καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ
κόσμον, since the Colossians are to be conceived as included of course with the rest in the whole world. It is with reason, there-
fore, that Steiger, Bähr, and others, have retained καὶ ἐστὶ κάρπο-
φοροῦμενον, and supplied ἐστιν at καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ.
The existence of the Word of Truth, therefore, in the world is to be more accurately represented as not unfruitful, but efficient; from its productive power it brings forth fruits in the souls of those who receive it, and it had just shown itself so in the Colossians also from the moment that they had heard of the grace of God (viz., in Christ, as the object of the preaching of the Gospel), and had truly received what they heard. But a difficulty is created by the καὶ αὐξάνομενον, which, it is in the highest degree probable, is to be considered genuine, and to be taken into the text, after A.B.C.D.E.F.G., though it might have been interpolated here from ver. 10. But the idea of growing seems of necessity to precede the bringing forth fruit, and not to be able to follow it. The reference of the καρποφορεῖσθαι to the inward, αὐξῶσθαι to the outward, growth, is plainly improper after the mention of καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ. It corresponds better with the context to refer αὐξῶσθαι to the growing and ripening of the fruits themselves, with which the parallel passage, ver. 10, also suits best. The operation of the Word of Truth is not yet concluded with the bringing forth of fruits, it works away, on the contrary, on and on, to present the fruits still more ripened and complete, so that a growing is, therefore, to be recognized in the bringing forth of fruit itself. The acceptation of the ἐν ἀληθείᾳ may be questionable. That no reference back to the λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας in ver. 5 is couched in it, and that therefore ἐν ἀληθείᾳ must not be joined with χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, in the sense: "grace of God in truth," follows decidedly enough from the article being away. The ἐν ἀληθείᾳ can only be taken as an adverbial accessory definition to the whole proposition, by which the nature of the ἐπίγνωσις as a true one, in contrast to a mere apparent knowledge of the grace of God, as it showed itself in the false teachers, is to be designated. (See Bähr on this passage, and Winer's Gramm. p. 128.) But the καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθητε points also, as Steiger has already correctly perceived, to a further reference of the ἐν ἀληθείᾳ to the idea in verse 7; St Paul in it ratifies the preaching of Epaphras in Colosse as the genuine apostolical one (perhaps with regard to suspicions which might
have been disseminated on the part of the false teachers against Epaphras and his doctrine), and with it refers the Christians there to that, as the only true one, in opposition to the arbitrary disfigurement of the Gospel, which the false teachers had permitted themselves.

Vers. 7, 8. The ratification of the doctrine, and authentication of the person, of Epaphras, here pronounced, are so far important, as from them we learn how the apostles considered themselves as the true possessors of pure evangelical truth, and maintained their title. He whom they did not recognize was by that very circumstance shut out from the body of Christ, the true Church of the Lord, quite according to the word of the Saviour: "As my Father has sent me, so do I send you" (John xx. 21), "He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me" (Luke x. 16.) The apostles were representatives of Christ (2 Cor. v. 20), "We are ambassadors in Christ's stead, for God admonisheth through us," the apostolical assistants were in their turn representatives of the apostles. This position St Paul here expressly assigns to Epaphras, as he not only names him as his beloved fellow-slave (see iv. 7, σύνδουλος ἐν κυρίῳ. In the LXX. it stands for ἕντρον. Ezra iv. 7, 9; v. 3, 6; vi. 13), but also πιστὸς διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in his (the apostle's) stead. It is true, the text. rec. reads πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος, but the MSS. A.D.G. read ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, which could easily be altered to ἡμῶν, but scarcely ἡμῶν to ἡμῶν. Lachmann has, therefore, with reason taken ἡμῶν into the text. As to the rest, the person of Epaphras has been already mentioned in the Introduction (sect. 1). According to iv. 12 he seems to have been a born Colossian. St Paul had perhaps, during his long stay in Ephesus, sent him out into the neighbourhood, and caused the Gospel to be proclaimed by him in those cities of Asia and Phrygia which he could not touch at himself. It was Epaphras, too, according to verse 8, who had given St Paul information as to the state of the Church in Colossæ; if here mention is made merely of the love of the Christians there, of which Epaphras informed St Paul, other information is not thereby excluded, especially that as to the threatening false teachers, only St Paul does not find himself moved to make that a prominent feature already at the very beginning of his Epistle. As to the rest, the love of the Colossian Christians is meant by the
addition ἐν πνεύματι to be designated as one kindled by the Holy Ghost; and therefore distinguished from mere natural love.

Ver. 9. Exactly as in Ephes. i. 15, St Paul in what follows again takes up the idea of his diligence in prayer for them, which had been already touched on in verse 8, and details what he prayed for on behalf of the Christians in Colosse. He designates this his praying as an uninterrupted one since the day that he heard of them and their faith. (Αἰῶ τοῦτο connects verse 9 with what precedes, so that the life then existing in the Colossians was the motive to St Paul to pray for the perfection of his readers in the same. —Ἀλτέσθαι after προεύχεσθαι denotes the particular act of beseeching in the more general idea of praying.—As to the use of ἰνα after verbs of commanding, praying, &c., see Winer’s Gramm. p. 310, sq.—The construction of the προεύχεσθαι with the accusative is quite regular. See Winer’s Gramm. p. 205, sq.)

St Paul now wishes and beseeches for his readers the being filled with the knowledge of the divine will, which makes itself known, and proves itself in all wisdom and spiritual knowledge. As to the ideas σοφία and σίνεσις we have already observed what was necessary on Ephes. i. 8, which passage stands parallel to this one. The idea of the being filled with the knowledge of the divine will is to be explained by the fact, that ἐπιγνωσις is to St Paul no mere act of reflection, to which certainly προεύχεσθαι would not be adapted, but a real contemplation, which has its origin in the communication of the Holy Ghost. The idea would, therefore, have to be paraphrased thus: “that you may be filled by the Holy Ghost, and by means of His illumination may receive knowledge.” But the “knowledge” is, by the addition τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, designated as practical knowledge, in opposition to an unfruitful theoretical knowledge, such as the false teachers made great efforts to attain to. (See on ii. 8, 23.) According to this, Steiger’s view is quite a failure. He is pleased, on this passage, so to distinguish γνῶσις from ἐπιγνωσις, that by γνῶσις vague knowledge without any complete insight into the reality is understood, while ἐπιγνωσις is supposed to be a seeing into the special, resulting from meditation and design. The uncertain nature of his view is sufficiently apparent from the single fact of his bringing in another definition alongside of the former one. He thinks that ἐπιγνωσις is sometimes above, sometimes beneath, γνῶσις: if the latter
be the case, then γνώσις means the full, pure, knowledge of things, as it arises in intellectual contemplation; and ἐπίγνωσις, on the contrary, is then the result of a partial investigation on a more laborious road. As we have already observed in the exposition of the Epistle to the Ephesians (at i. 8), there is no specific difference at all between γνώσις and ἐπίγνωσις to be assumed in the dialect of the New Testament, and particularly in St Paul's; both terms always denote the immediate knowledge by the reason through the perception of the eternal, by means of the νοῦς illuminated by the Holy Ghost (compare on ii. 8); on the other hand, the insight which is gained by an intellectual process through the activity of the reflective powers is called φρόνησις or σύνεσις. (See my Opusc. acad. p. 156, ss.)

Vers. 10. From the true practical knowledge of God proceeds of itself an outward walk which is worthy of the Lord; i.e. redounds to His glory. In the Infin. περιπατήσαι we are not to see a second prayer, as if it were co-ordinate with the ἐν πληρωθῇ, but the περιπατήσαι is to be viewed as dependent on the knowledge of the divine will, so that the meaning of the words is: "in order (by means of this knowledge) to be able to walk worthy of the Lord," in which the idea is couched that this is impossible without that knowledge. Afterwards, in the εἰς πᾶναν ἄρεσκεια is indicated the aim of the truly Christian walk, "to please the Lord in every respect." (Ἀρέσκεια is not found again in the New Testament. In profane writers it is used reprovingly in the sense of "coquetry." [See Theophr. char. ch. 5.] Εὐδοκία is more usual with St Paul.—As to the relation between καρποφορεῖν and αὐξάνεσθαι see at verse 6. Both are here plainly referred to works by the addition ἐν πάντι ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ, i.e. in works, which, as proceeding out of faith and love, are truly pleasing to God.—By the words τῇ ἐπιγνώσῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ the bringing forth fruit is represented as effected through the knowledge of God designated in verse 9. No distinction is to be sought between the knowledge of God and that of His will, for every true knowledge of God is precisely that of His will, because the being of God is not to be separated from His will. The reading of the text rec. εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν has most decidedly extrinsic and intrinsic arguments against it.)

Ver. 11. The constitution of those who can bring forth fruit in
every good work is more accurately defined to the effect, that the spiritual strength requisite for it is imparted to them by God: "as such, who are strengthened in all might, according to the power of His (i.e. God’s) glory." (On the relation between δύναμις and κράτος see the remarks on Ephes. i. 19.—As to κράτος τῆς δύναμις see at Ephes. i. 6, 12, 14, 18.) It cannot be doubted that by the δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος, "strengthened in accordance with His power," the strengthening of the faithful is meant to be designated as one proceeding from God. God Himself fulfils His will by His Spirit in them! Exactly corresponding to the word: "with God nothing is impossible," and to this other: "to him that believes all things are possible," for it is God who works in the believer. (See the Comm. on Matt. xix. 26; Mark ix. 23.) But Θεὸς must not be supplied at ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει also; on the contrary, πάσῃ plainly points to the variety of human situations and wants, and of the strength requisite for them. These forms of life, in which that strength is a necessity, are more closely defined by: εἰς πάσαν ὑπομονήν καὶ μακροθυμίαν. St Paul is thinking of times of suffering and temptation of various kinds, as they then befall every church, in which events the faithful have to approve their patience and forbearance, and that, too, not by any means in hypocritical peevishness, but with joy, as in that too fulfilling God’s will. Certainly, the words μετὰ χαρᾶς are by several critical authorities joined with εἰςχαριστοῶντες which follows, but Steiger and Bühr have already with justice declared themselves against it. For in the εἰςχαριστοῦντας by itself alone is couched the idea of joyful resignation to God’s will, but the υπομονή and μακροθυμία need the closer definition by μετὰ χαρᾶς, in order to characterize them as genuinely Christian.

Ver. 12. From the state of mind described in the foregoing verses the prayer of thanksgiving to God proceeds as an efflux. For he that in God’s might can bring forth fruits in good works finds in it an inexpressible joy (the feeling of which urges him to thanksgiving towards the Father of light, who has regenerated him to such an existence), and at the same time a guarantee of his future eternal happiness; he sees that he is by the Spirit made fit for the holy kingdom of God, that he bears it in himself even here below, and that it will therefore also certainly belong to him at some time. According to this connection St Paul here places in
the foreground the conception of the Father (proceeding from the consciousness of adoption), and that of the being made meet. It is true, the readings vary here too very much, as in verse 3; for in some MSS. τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ, in others τῷ Θεῷ τῷ πατρὶ, and other words, are read for τῷ πατρὶ. But these various readings are sufficiently explained by the fact that nowhere else in St Paul's Epistles does ὁ πατὴρ occur alone. As to the idea of the ἰκανόν see 2 Cor. iii. 6. The aorist form points to a divine action which was performed but once, by which the faithful are made meet, viz. to the work of Christ, as it is described in vers. 18, 14. (MSS. D.G. read καλέσαντι for ἰκανόσαντι, MS. B. has both, side by side. Lachmann has, without sufficient reason, received this latter reading. Doubtless ἰκανόσαντι is the right reading. But if one referred the having made meet to the subjective state of the mind, one could easily take offence at it (because surely in none was the meetness absolutely realized), and therefore think καλέσαντι must be substituted for it.) Lastly, in the concluding words of the verse the object is mentioned for which God the Father makes His children meet, viz. εἰς τὴν μερίδα τοῦ κληρον τῶν ἁγίων. The saints, i.e. all regenerate, true children of God, conceived as a unity, have a joint κληρός (Ῥάβις), of which each individual has his μερίς (Ῥάβις or Ὁμοίως). In like manner, it is said John xiv. 2, "in my Father's house are many mansions." Here the house answers to the κληρός, the mansions in it to each individual μερίς. The question of whether St Paul is here thinking of the earthly kingdom of God, or of the heavenly world, is idle, inasmuch as here it is not exactly meant to distinguish between the various forms in which perfection may realize itself. That world is, as a portion left by the Father to the children, without further distinction, contrasted with this sin-ridden earthly world. Akin to the expression in this passage are not only Ephes. i. 18, ἡ κληρονομία εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, but also Acts xx. 32, κληρονομία εἰς τοὺς ἑγγόσμενοις πᾶσιν, and xxvi. 18, κληρός εἰς τοὺς ἑγγόσμενος. Only in these passages the distinction between μερίς and κληρός, which is so prominent here, is wanting. But a comparison with Canaan, the earthly heritage of Israel, in which every Israelite had his share, lies at the root of the whole form of expression. (See Heb. iv. 1, ss.) In conclusion, it is also a question how ἐν τῷ φωτὶ
is to be connected. The connecting it with ἰκανόσωματί, as if light were the element through which God has made the children of God meet, is a failure in every respect. Φῶς is never used in such connection, but always πνεῦμα; to refer it to baptism, as several of the Fathers proposed, is in like manner quite unsuitable, because φωσιμός, at least, would have to stand for that; further, ἰκανόσωματί does not refer, as we have remarked above, to the already complete subjective process of being made meet, for St Paul is really only just praying (verse 9, ss.) that God may be pleased to fill them with the knowledge of His will. We must rather take ἐν τῷ φωτὶ as a more accurate definition of the nature of the ἐληφθὸς τῶν ἀγίων. As in verse 13 the element of sin is called σκότος, so here the element of good, in which the saints are, is called φῶς; as children of light they are heirs of the kingdom of light.

Vers. 13, 14. No pause can be made here with Griesbach; on the contrary, St Paul's discourse moves on again, as at Ephes. i. 6, ss., by means of nothing but relatives, which join one clause to another by connecting it with the last substantive. God, who is the subject of the last proposition, is represented as the author of redemption by Christ (2 Cor. v. 19.) Redemption is represented as positively accomplished by deliverance from the power of darkness, negatively by translation into the kingdom of Christ. Now the ἐξονόμα σκότος, as an antithesis to the kingdom of Christ, is not merely subjective sinfulness, but that in connection with the whole element of evil in the devil and in his angels. The deliverance of the faithful from the power of darkness does not, however, exclude the continued fight against the evil powers; on the contrary, St Paul describes it as subsisting precisely for Christians (Ephes. vi. 12, ss.) The deliverance from the power of darkness consists rather in the fact, that the believer exactly through faith knows himself as Christ's servant, and therefore can fight against the darkness as without him, as belonging to it himself no more. But this deliverance from one element and its determining influence supposes a being transferred to another element; this is denoted by the phrase: μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ νόι τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτῶν. Here, just as in Luke xvii. 21, the kingdom of Christ is imagined as inwardly present, "the kingdom of God is inwardly in the faithful, and they in it;" Christ is that spiritual kingdom itself, He is in us and we in Him. Into that inward
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kingdom the regenerate man is even here below transplanted in the spirit, as he also through the death of the old man presses through unto life even here below (1 John iii. 14.) Christ's kingdom is, therefore, here not = the μετάς τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἀγάπων (ver. 12) by which the future state in glory is designated, in which man will be in a holy and perfect state as to all his powers, even as to his body. The name that Christ bears here is also peculiar: δύος τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. It is erroneously taken as a merely hebraizing designation of νῦς ἀγαπητός; the expression rather corresponds in St Paul to the μονογενής of St John (see on John i. 18.) Christ is called "son of His love," inasmuch as He was born of the essence of God, as St Augustine (de trinit. xx. 19) had already correctly interpreted it: filius caritatis nullus est alius, quam qui de substantia est genitus. This Son of the divine love is the personal love itself, which induced Him to give Himself up unto death for men; therefore it is further said of Christ: ἐν φίλουν ἡμῖν ἀπολύτρωσιν κ. τ. λ., words, which we have already explained at Ephes. i. 7. Not merely through Him, St Paul means to say, is redemption accomplished, we rather possess it as an abiding reality in Him; Christ is from His representative character the never-failing source of redemption; he alone who is in Him truly possesses it. As to the rest, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ is to be struck out here in accordance with A.B.C.D.E.F.G. It seems to have only come into the text here out of Ephes. i. 7.

Ver. 15. To the above St Paul now subjoins a detailed description of the person of Christ, which is unmistakeably designed to have a bearing on the Colossian false teachers. This passage forms, along with Ephes. i. 20—23, and Phil. ii. 6—11, the leading passage in St Paul's Epistles on the doctrines concerning Christ contained in them, and has, therefore, as may be supposed, in an equally great degree attracted the attention of interpreters and theologians, especially of the writers who treat of St Paul's system of doctrine. We have even to mention particular treatises on this important passage, especially those of Schleiermacher (Stud. for 1832, part 2, reprinted in the collected works relating to Theology, vol. i., p. 321—361), and, against it, the works of Holzhausen and Osiander (in the Tübingen Journal for 1833, part 1.) As to the division of this whole important section, Bähr (p. 54), will have it that in ver. 17, 18, the progress (of the description) makes itself
plainly known by means of the καλ ουτος; that is to say, he supposes in verses 15, 16 the relation of the Son to the Father, in ver. 17 that of Christ to the world in general, and from ver. 18 downwards the relation to the Church, as the new creation, are treated of. But ver. 16 is decidedly against that view, as that verse already describes the relation of Christ to the world; we can therefore ascribe to the καλ ουτος no such decisive importance as to the division. Even in the πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισεως there is already couched a reference to Christ's relation to the creation. We can distinguish two parts only: 1. In vers. 15—17, Christ is delineated without reference to His incarnation; 2. in ver. 18—20 with that reference.

First, Christ is called εικων του Θεου του αορατου. St Paul had already at 2 Cor. iv. 4 called Christ εικων του Θεου (αορατου is there spurious); it is a question what the expression, when used of Christ, means, for the image of God is attributed to man too (see iii. 10.) But as everything is created through Christ (ver. 16), so is man too; he, consequently, has the image of God in a derivative manner only, he is the image of the image, Christ is the original image of God. It must not be concluded from the absence of the article that we must translate in this passage: “an image of God;” on the contrary, the article is wanting because εικων τ. Θ., is a familiar collective idea, like πνευμα τ. Θ., νοος τ. Θ.; in 2 Cor. iv. 4 the article is wanting in the same manner, and even Philo uses εικων τ. Θ. without the article. Now it would be altogether leading one astray to refer this expression: “Christ is the original image of God” to the human nature of Christ along with the divine one, as Junker and Schleiermacher will have it; for here the Son of God, still purely in His eternal divine being, is set on a par with the Father. It would be just as wrong to suppose the idea of “the designedly-made or formed” in the term εικων, by which Christ would be degraded into a creature. The meaning of the term is here made completely plain by the epithet αορατος (1 Tim. i. 17). Christ is not called image of God as a being formed after God, but as He who manifests, so that they can be seen in Him, the fullness of the essence and of the divine attributes, which are hidden in the Father. (So judges, correctly, I think, besides Bühr, Steiger, and Böhmcr, Usteri also, on St Paul's system, p. 308.) As, therefore, it is said, John i. 18: Θεου ουδεις εορακε
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πῶπτε (1 Tim. vi. 16, φῶς οἰκών ἀπρόστημον, δινείς οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ ἔδει διναται), but it is added afterwards: ὁ μονογενὴς νῦς ἐκεῖνος ἡγηθήσατο, so St Paul designates the Father as not to be viewed (for it is plain enough that there is no question here as to a physical seeing), but as manifesting Himself in the reflection of His essence (Heb. i. 8) the Son. Accordingly, then, our Lord says too, John xiv. 9: "he that sees me, sees the Father, for the Father manifests Himself through the Son," who ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ἵπταρχει, Phil. ii. 6. Thus taken, then, the essential equality is expressed in the name εἰκὼν τ. Θ., but, as the being begotten is couched in the name νῦς, so is the idea of the radiation of the divine glory in the conception of εἰκὼν. The Father is the source, the eternal and original cause, of light, from whom the Son, as image of the divino nature, proceeds. (Philo had already got this view of the relation of the Son to the Father correctly in the essential points. Compare some passages from him belonging to this subject in Usteri ubi suprà; they are fully collected in Grossmann questiones philoneæ, Lips. 1829. The idea of a ἡγηθήσατο, in which God manifests Himself, is found even in the Old Testament [see Numb. xii. 8, Ps. xvii. 15], and from those instances it passed over to the Cabalists, who describe the Metatron [comp. on John i. 1] as God's image or countenance.)

The second phrase, by which Christ's nature is described, is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. That πᾶς stands here without an article, as it has been already observed on the Epistle to the Ephesians (on ii. 21) for totus, after the more modern custom of the language, Bähr has already correctly remarked. The κτίσεως is the whole of the creation, not the creation in its individual parts. But the term πρωτότοκος is difficult, and one cannot but think it very intelligible that, from the first, Arians, Socinians, and other impugners of the divine nature of Christ, strove to found their views on this passage. For it must be granted that the words πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, viewed purely grammatically, can be so understood that Christ Himself is reckoned in the κτίσεως, and is only placed at the summit of the whole κτίσεως. The possibility of such an accetpation of the words is sufficiently proved by the πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, which follows, and which cannot be understood otherwise than that Christ Himself was dead too. But the context of the whole passage speaks so decidedly against the possibility of taking the words
so, that there can be no doubt at all that St. Paul means the phrase πρωτότοκός τῆς κτισεως to be taken in another sense. For in ver. 16, 17 all created things are represented as in absolute dependency on Him, the Son of God, who cannot, therefore, possibly be meant to be designated as Himself belonging to the rank of creatures. The appeal to the passages of the books of wisdom (Prov. viii. 22, ἐκτεινε μὲ ἀρχήν οἴδαν, LXX., Sir. i. 4, 8, πρωτερα πάντων ἐκτειναι σοφία, κύριος αὐτὸς ἐκτεινει αὐτὴν) can therefore prove nothing, for in the latter κτίσεως is merely used in a more extended sense = γενναν. The σοφία is by no means to be represented as itself κτίσμα. To interpret the passage by altering the accent, with Erasmus, J. D. Michaelis, and others, will at the present day hardly come into any one's head again. That is to say, πρωτότοκος is used in a feminine sense only, ἡ πρώτως τέξασα, as Thomas Magister explains it. But, even without looking at that, the creative operation of the λόγος can never be designated by τικτεῖν, and indeed the combination with πρωτότοκος also in this acceptation would be extremely inconvenient; for, if Christ were called primus genitor totius creaturar, it would seem as if there were several more, without and after Him. But just as little can Schleiermacher's proposition lay claim to approval. He insists on having πρωτότοκος joined with εἰκών (as he in ver. 18 joins also ἀρχῇ πρωτότοκος together, but just as unsuitably), in the sense: "Christ is, in the collective compass of the spiritual world of men, the first-born image of God." The interpretation of the term κτίσις of the world of men is, it is true, not impossible in itself, for mankind can certainly, as an essential part of the creation, be designated by the name κτίσις. (See the Comm. on Rom. viii. 17 and on Col. i. 23.) But πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις without any further definition never does and never can so occur, neither does the context here permit the employment of that signification. The τὰ πάντα in ver. 16 clearly interprets the πᾶσα κτίσις, which precedes, as the whole of the creation. But, even without looking at that, Schleiermacher's interpretation is totally inadmissible. For, first, πρωτότοκος seems not to be a suitable epithet for εἰκών. Böhmer has already justly remarked that one would rather have expected πρωτότυπος. But, secondly, grammar necessarily requires the article before πρωτότοκος in the connection with εἰκών, as Matt. i. 25, τὸν πάντα ἀυτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον shows. (See Winer's Gram., p.
The omission of the article is only explained by the supposition that πρωτότοκος is treated as a well-known idea, which, besides, in the connection with πάσης κτίσεως, cannot belong to any other. The use of this phrase had, no doubt, its origin in the Old Testament, where it is said, Ps. lxxix. 27, καθώς πρωτότοκος ἐστιν Θεός ομοιαί αὐτόν. (See Heb. i. 6.) Philo calls the λόγος both εἰκών and πρωτόγονος (see Bähr on this passage, p. 61), which name is near akin to the μονογενής of St John. Just in the same way Jehovah is called in the Kabbala the first-born, as the original manifestation of the infinite, through whom the creation is brought about. After this the name πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως can only, with the oldest Fathers, be taken so that the Genitive is dependent on the πρώτος in the signification of prior (see at John i. 15), in the sense, πρωτότοκος πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, as Justin Martyr calls the λόγος, in complete accordance with the phrase in ver. 17, αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων. There is then couched in the name the Son of God’s being born of God in the beginning before every creature.

Now that St Paul represents Christ as εἰκών τ. Θ., as πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως, had doubtless its origin in the circumstance that the heretics in Colossæ called in question the divine dignity of Christ. In all probability they saw in Christ a mere man (like Cerinthus and his disciples) with whom at His baptism a higher Æon had united itself, but which again left Him after the completion of the work of redemption. The supposition of Steiger and others (p. 139) that the Colossian false teachers had themselves employed the terms εἰκών and πρωτότοκος of Christ, only in another sense, is extremely improbable. Had that been the case, St Paul would have defined those terms so much more accurately that it might be perceived wherein the genuine apostolical use of those phrases differed from the false one of those false teachers. But any such more accurate definitions are wholly wanting. On the contrary, St Paul uses the name πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως with so little reserve that it might be understood in a sense derogatory to Christ, which surely would have been avoided, if the heretics, whom St Paul means to combat, had applied the word in an exactly similar way. But the apostle’s mode of expression seems suitable, if the heretics, in like manner as Cerinthus and his school, proclaimed Christ straightforwardly an ordinary man, and only supposed an
Eon to have been united to Him during His labours as the Messiah: the force of St Paul's argument lies in the idea, not the words.

Ver. 16. With all the difference in the expressions there still appears in the thing the completest agreement between the Christologies of St John and St Paul. The names εἰκῶν τ. ᾿Ω., πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, St John is a stranger to, but, on the other hand, he likewise declares that one sees in the Son the invisible Father in all His glory, that the Son is the only-begotten of the Father. So now verse 16 too corresponds perfectly with the description in St John i. 3, πάντα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἐν δὲ γένοι. (Compare also Heb. i. 4, xi. 3.) But the idea that all is created in Christ is joined by St Paul with what precedes by διὰ, and by that means the sense which we obtained of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως is established. "He (the Son of God) must have been born of the substance of the Father before all the creation, for all things are created in Him." Considering the accurate distinction drawn afterwards between the prepositions διὰ, εἰς, ἐν, it is extremely improbable that ἐν stands here instead of διὰ; ἐν rather denotes here very comprehensively the connection of the Son with the creation, which is afterwards divided into its separate relations. "In Him are all things created, i.e. the Son of God is the intelligible world, the κόσμος νοητός, i.e. things themselves according to the idea of them, He carries their essentiality in Himself;" in the creation they come forth from Him to an independent existence, in the completion of all things they return to Him. The referring of the τὰ πάντα merely to the collective body of the regenerate, and of the κτιζεῖν to the transforming energy in the regeneration, is quite inadmissible, as the following development of the purport of the πάντα shows. It is incomprehensible how Schleiermacher could say (ubi suprà, p. 507) κτιζεῖν is not used for θεῷ of creating, as it often occurs so, Deut. iv. 32; Ps. l. 11; Isaiah xlv. 7, and elsewhere. (Cf. Schleusn. Lex. in LXX. vol. iii. p. 402.) The conception of the πάντα is now carried out by means of two antitheses, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (cf. Ephes. i. 10; Rev. x. 6), τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἄνωτα, by which the ideal and material sides of the creation are meant to be expressed, and consequently its totality. Then, in continuation, the highest forms of those two departments of the creation are named separately, εἰτε θρόνοι, εἰτε κυριώτητες, εἰτε ἀρχαί, εἰτε
εἰρωσίας, in which there is the assumption that, if the highest is created in Christ, it is self-evident that the low and insignificant is so too. From Col. ii. 10, 15, and the remarks on Ephes. i. 21, it cannot be doubtful that St Paul means by those four synonymous expressions particularly to designate powers of the spiritual world, angels and angel-princes, without making a more accurate distinction between good and bad angels. As to the impossibility of defining more accurately the differences between the separate expressions we have already explained ourselves at Ephes. i. 21. But the question may arise whether, from the connection with the foregoing antitheses, heaven and earth, visible and invisible, we are not in the four names of governors and powers, at the same time with heavenly powers, kings, princes, magistrates, to suppose earthly ones also to be meant, who indeed, as administrating their offices in the name of God, are even called Elohim in the Old Testament. For the assumption, that reference is here made only to earthly relations, which even Schleiermacher has pronounced, is at all events inadmissible. That divine would even understand the antitheses τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ. thus: “everything which refers to heavenly, i.e. religious, relations, and which refers to political, legal conditions.” That is decidedly inadmissible, because, no doubt, in that declaration of St Paul, that everything on high was created in Christ, consequently He is higher than all high things, is couched an antithesis against the view of the Colossian heretics as to the dignity of the angels, whom they, according to the Gnostic idea of the Æons, even adored with invocation and worship (cf. on Col. ii. 18), and with the greatest probability named by these and similar names. (See Steiger and Bähr in their Comms. on this passage, where passages of the later Gnostics are collected.) Only St Paul did not borrow them from the habitual language of the Gnostics; they were familiar to him already from the general sphere of Jewish ideas in which he had grown up. But certainly much may be said for the notion, that St Paul was thinking of earthly powers along with the heavenly ones, because directly after, in ver. 17, the τὰ πάνω appears again, and St Paul has plainly the intention of representing the absolute totality of the creation as determined in regard to its existence by Christ. Only we find no trustworthy passage elsewhere, in which these expressions, used commonly of angels absolutely, are also em-
ployed of earthly powers. If one will lay a stress on the circumstance that Christ is elsewhere with reference to earthly powers called King of kings, Lord of lords (1 Tim. vi. 15; Rev. i. 5, xvii. 14, xix. 16), it seems more reasonable to find this might of Christ’s over every earthly greatness in the words τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, than in the names θρόνοι κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 17. After this partition of the universe St Paul again takes up the opening words of verse 16, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, and shows how the creation in its totality related to Christ in all the dimensions of time, the present, the past, and the future, viz., is absolutely dependent on Him, who is, as the Eternal One, before every thing that was created, whereas everything in the nature of a creature was made. (See on John i. 3.) The various relations of the creature to the Eternal are expressed by the prepositions διὰ, εἰς, and ἐν. The διὰ refers to the origin of the creature, which proceeds from the Father through the Son; εἰς refers to the end of the same, as all is created to or for Him, as the final aim of things (see verse 20); on the other hand ἐν points, as the αὐτότητα unmistakeably shows, to the present consistence of the world, which is always in the Son, inasmuch as He supports and upholds the world with His word (Heb. i. 3), and the upholding may also be considered as a continuation of the creation. There is but one difficult point in this description, which sets forth Christ’s divine nature in the most distinct manner; and that is that elsewhere the relation of the Holy Ghost to the creature is usually expressed by the prepositions εἰς and ἐν (see on Rom. xi. 36), but here the Son is always the subject. In other passages, e.g. 1 Cor. viii. 6, εἰς is also used of the Father. However, this difficulty is satisfactorily explained by the fact, that to each single one of the three divine persons, just because they are real persons, and carry life in themselves, all the relations of the Trinity can be attributed. However, the prepositions ἐν and ἐπὶ, by which the relation of the creature to the Father is usually designated, are never assigned to the Son and the Spirit, but those usual with the Son and the Spirit are certainly found attributed to the Father, and those used with the Spirit are found given to the Son. Again, it is never said, “the Son has created the world,” but constantly “it is created

1 See Bahr, p. 82, and the passages cited there.
through Him." The absoluteness of the Father, as the foundation also of the Son and of the Spirit, comes out unmistakeably in this mode of speech.

Ver. 18. After this there follows in the apostle's description of the Christology the especial relation of Christ to the Church, which His being made man supposes. He, the eternal Son of God, who is infinitely exalted above every creature, He Himself has even entered into the life of a creature, and has Himself tasted death; but even in this relation to the creature and its sufferings He is the leader and guide of all. St Paul designates the Lord first as the κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος (see Ephes. i. 22), in which is couched the exhortation to let one's self be determined by Him who is the head; it was just that the false teachers did not do, and it was for that reason they were so blameworthy. Secondly, Christ is called ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Here it is certainly more easily explained, how one might seek to connect ἀρχή πρωτότοκος; for the ἀρχή without an article has something striking by the side of the substantive-like πρωτότοκος. In some of the MSS. we find ἡ ἀρχή, in others ἀπαρχή, in others ἐν ἀρχή, but in such unimportant ones, that those readings can make no claim to reception into the text. But the combination "first-born beginning" has also something repugnant in it; no adjective like πρωτότοκος, which must refer to a concrete, suits ἀρχή as an abstract. For to take ἀρχή downright for ἀπαρχή, "first-fruits," might both have its difficulty, viewed as a point of language, and the expression in this mode of taking the passage coincides with πρωτότοκος, which is used as = ἐν ἡμῖν. The two must therefore be separated, and πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν be taken as a more accurate definition of the more general ἀρχή. The absence of the article with ἀρχή is explained by the abstract form of the word (see Winer's Gramm. pp. 113, 117); Christ, however, is not called "beginning" in the sense in which He is above called πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως, i.e. not as He, in whom the creature, as such, has its beginning, but as He, who in the life of the creature, which was fallen under the power of death, Himself established a new beginning through His victory over death. Christ is called in the same sense ἀρχηγός, Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2. This reference must be adhered to, because Christ is here throughout represented as He that became man. How far Christ is called exactly "the beginning" is more accurately determined
by the addition πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Christ Himself was
dead, and, as such, among the dead in Hades, but he was the first
of them by resurrection unto life was born in the glorified body,
and thus became the beginning of a new series of developments. In
His unglorified humanity He was through Mary ἐκ σπέρματος
Δαβίδ, therefore ranked among mankind as such, but when glori-
fied He was an absolutely new man, the ἄρχη. (In Rev. i. 5 the
ἐκ is wanting, and Christ is called merely ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκ-
ρῶν. On the other hand, in Rom. viii. 29 we find the expression
πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.)
The raising of many from the dead cannot be quoted against
Christ's being called πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, for those were
raised with their mortal bodies, and died again at a later day. But
Enoch and Elias did not taste death at all, and cannot be brought
forward either against Christ as the first-born of the dead. In ge-
erg, the corporeal glorification of the body in those Old Testa-
ment worthies seems to have been a preliminary one only, which
cannot be compared with Christ's glorification. Neither, cer-
tainly, is a reference of the words ἄρχη, πρωτότοκος, to the cus-
tomary language of the Gnostic false teachers to be looked for here;
had the latter made use of those expressions in another sense, St
Paul would have more accurately defined the true sense in which
they must be used. An antithesis could be couched in St Paul's
words only so far as he seems in them to assert the reality of the
resurrection against spiritualistic false doctrines. But this Epis-
tle is wanting in a definite explanation as to the docetic tendency
of the false teachers, as will be detailed farther on (see at ver. 22);
St Paul seems to have intended to designate Christ as only the be-
ginner of the glorification. According to the teleologic concep-
tion of the life of Jesus, St Paul sees in it a special divine design;
Christ was necessarily so the first-born of the dead by God's direc-
tion, in order to have the first place in all; He, the Lord of all
things, was necessarily to have the first place in all earthly rela-
tions also. The ἐν πᾶσιν is not, with Beza, Flatt, Heinrichs, and
others, to be taken as a masculine, "among all men," for then πάν-
tων would certainly have stood, but as a neuter, "in all points, in
every point of view." Excellently says Chrysostom: πανταχοῦ
πρώτος ἂνω πρώτος, ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρώτος, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει
πρώτος. (The verb πρωτεύω is not found in the New Testament
except here. In the LXX., it is found Esther v. 11. It also occurs 2 Macc. vi. 18, xiii. 15.)

Ver. 19. Christ's precedence in all respects is grounded on the relation of the divine to the human nature; by God's good pleasure there resided in Him the whole fulness of the divinity. He was therefore no mere man, like the rest, but the God-Man; human nature was the residence, the temple, for the divinity which filled Him. Thus it is said of the faithful too (John xiv. 23) that Father and Son will come to them and take up their abode (μονήν) with them. But whereas in Christ the whole fulness dwells, i.e. permanently manifests itself as active, the individual believer receives but a ray of the divine light. Now the idea of the τῶν πνήματος is authoritatively explained by πνήματος τῆς θεότητος in the passage ii. 9. It is, therefore, the divine essence itself, inasmuch as it is conceived as comprehending in itself a fulness of vital powers; the abstract form θεότης suits that better than Θεός. But, as the divine essence can manifest itself in an all-embracing (central), or partial, manner, τῶν is added to express that in Christ the former is the case. But here again it may be asked, whether in the selection of the expression πνήματος there might not be supposed an allusion to the customary language of the Gnostics. For the Gnostics used, as is well known, the word πνήματος to denote the kingdom of light, the world of Αέως, in opposition to κέλευμα. Now, as the Colossian false teachers devoted a worship to the individual angels or Αέως, St Paul's design might have been to oppose the truth to those erroneous notions by describing Christ as the only object of adoration, in whom more than one Αέων resided, that is to say, the whole πνήματος. But we have already detailed at Ephes. i. 23 the reasons which determine us not to suppose such an allusion to the customary language of the Gnostics in the use of the word πνήματος. We cannot point out that the false teachers in the time of the apostles already used the word πνήματος as the later Gnostics did. But, even were that demonstrable, St Paul, if he had had in view an antithesis in the word πνήματος, would have more strictly defined the sense in which he took it, in opposition to the Gnostics' use of it. One may rather admit the supposition of an antithesis in the expression κατουθησίας, against such Gnostic views as look upon Jesus' animation by a higher Αέων as only temporary, from His baptism till His death. (See the re-
marks on ii. 9.) Nevertheless, we must adhere to this as a principle, that we can see in this whole passage only a dispute against the teachers of the heresies in the mass and on the whole, and not against what was special in their mode of expression, as Steiger and Bähr particularly have assumed in great detail; in no case have we a right to admit into the polemics of the first chapter points which receive no confirmation in the accurate description in the second. The false teachers mistook the true divinity of Christ, and placed Æons on a level with Him as objects of veneration; this it is which St Paul combats by describing Christ as the Son of God, and as Him through whom also all angels and powers have received their existence. In ver. 18, I should without hesitation see an antithesis against docetic errors, if the passage occurred in the Pastoral Epistles, for the heretics there described seem no doubt to have followed a docetic bias (see the Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles), but in the Epistle to the Colossians we find nothing of the kind; on the contrary, the low view of Christ held by the false teachers combated in this Epistle seems more to point to a materialist tendency than to a spiritualist-docetic one. However, see particulars on this point at ver. 22, where the supposition that the Colossian false doctrines too had a docetic tendency has a certain plausibility. (That conception of the construction of this verse, according to which πᾶν τὸ πληρωμα is looked on as the subject of ειδόκησε, "it pleased the whole fulness of the Godhead to reside in Him," cannot possibly recommend itself. Ὅ Θεὸς is rather to be considered as the subject of ειδόκησε, as the incarnation of the Son is regarded as the ordinance of the divine decree of grace and mercy.—In the selection of the word κατοικήσαι here and at ii. 9 the reference to the idea of the Shechinah is not improbable. [See at John i. 14 on that point.] Jesus walked on earth as an abiding Shechinah; he that saw Him saw the Father.)

Ver. 20. As a further tendency of the divine intention of grace in Christ's incarnation, the reconciliation through Christ to Himself, so that He is both means and end (ver. 16), is named. What sets on foot the reconciliation (there is no real difference to be sought between ιεριστοιείν and ἀποκατάλλασσειν) is more closely defined as the blood of Christ, and indeed as the blood of His cross, i.e. as the blood shed in the death of the Saviour on the cross, and for the sake of emphasis the δι' αὐτοῦ is once more repeated. That
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the totality of the creation to be reconciled is here meant is made more clear by the fact that the τὰ πάντα is explained by: εἴπε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἴπε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (ver. 16.) The difficulties of this passage have been already spoken of in the explanation of the parallel one, Ephes. i. 10. The more general term ἀνακεφαλαίωσασθαί, used there, cannot be employed, as Bähr insists it can, to explain the more special one ἀποκαταλάβαί here, but vice versa the latter illustrates the former. But the absolute acceptance, which is here given the atonement of Christ, must, as we prove at Ephes. i. 10, be understood of the tendency of the same. That resistance is made to the comprehensive divine design of grace by a part of the creatures, is a point which is here not reflected on by St Paul. As to the rest, τὰ πάντα cannot be interpreted here otherwise than in what preceded (ver. 16, ss.), viz. of the absolute totality of the creation, not merely of the conscious beings; for the reconciling power of Christ, beginning with fallen men as the first objects of its operation, influences properly also the universe to its restoration and perfection. (See the Comm. on Rom. viii. 17, ss.)

As to the rest, from what follows (vers. 27—29), the reference to the Gentiles especially seems to have been present to St Paul's mind in this representation of the universality of Christ's reconciling power; these too are not to be imagined as shut out from salvation in Christ, St Paul means to say, as the Judaistic false teachers probably maintained they were.

Ver. 21. After finishing the description of the person of Christ, in opposition to the inferior representation of Him by the false teachers, St Paul addresses himself again to his readers, and remarks that they themselves have experienced the reconciling efficiency of Christ now (in the state of their conversion), whereas they once were estranged from God. In the parallel passage, Ephes. ii. 1, 11, 12, the same opposition between ποτὲ and νῦν is found, and a similar description of the unconverted state. In comparison with Col. ii. 13, and the tendency of the false teachers, who wished to press Judaism as the necessary form of the religious life for the Gentiles also, it is extremely probable that St Paul, in this description of the state before conversion, had principally in his eye the born Gentiles among the Colossians, who probably composed the great majority of the Church there. But, whereas at Ephes. ii. 12 the Gentiles are described as ἀπῃλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολεῖας τοῦ
'Ισραήλ, here ἀπηλληλοτριμένοι in combination with ἐχθροὶ can only be referred to God. The τῷ διανοα改革发展es, judging from its connection, to both expressions, in order to characterise the alienation from and enmity against God, not as a mere outward one but as an inward spiritual one, in like manner as at Ephes. iv. 18 the Gentiles are described as ἐκοιμημένοι τῷ διανοα改革发展, οὔτε ἀπηλληλοτριμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ. The addition ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς, i.e., in the wicked works well known to all, expresses further and finally wherein the estrangement from and enmity against God manifests itself and is made known, as in the fruits of the disposition.

Ver. 22. St Paul here names "the death of Christ" as what operates reconciliation, as just before (ver. 20) "the blood," but ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is added. The combination σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς is not found in the New Testament except here and at κ. 11. It seems to have something incongruous in it, for it is understood of itself that the σῶμα is of σάρξ. The formula can only be explained, either by a polemical consideration, or by the intention of contrasting the σῶμα, as the physical one, to a spiritual σῶμα, i.e., the Church (ver. 24.) For the former interpretation the later interpreters, Böhmer, Steiger, and Bähr, decide. They conclude, from the strict asceticism of the Colossian false teachers, that they necessarily look on matter as the seat of evil, and must, therefore, have taught Doceticism; that St Paul wished to combat the latter, and therefore asserts the true corporeity of Jesus and His real death. But that conclusion is by no means necessary, especially in that early age, in which errors had not as yet developed themselves in all their consequences. The Epistle to the Colossians contains not the slightest certain trace of docetic doctrines in the heretics of that place, such as the pastoral epistles undoubtedly betray. As the Jewish ascetics in Rome were free (Rom. xiv. 1, ss.) from docetic doctrines (for otherwise St Paul would have refuted those errors, and not represented those ascetics as merely weak brothers), the same may be supposed of the Colossian false teachers also. Had they favoured such hereesies, St Paul could not have failed to direct an open attack against them. The
allusion here is so cursory that one cannot possibly recognise in it a serious antithesis against so dangerous an error. We decide, therefore, for the other acceptation, viz., that by the subordinate definition τῆς σαρκὸς the σῶμα is intended to be distinguished from the Church as the spiritual σῶμα. Had St Paul written merely: νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατηλλαξέν ἐν τῷ σώματι διὰ τοῦ θανάτου, one would be apt to take the words thus: "but now He has reconciled you through His death to unity in the Church." In order to prevent that St Paul added τῆς σαρκὸς, by which the body is meant to be designated as the physical body of Christ upon which death passed. If other interpreters have chosen to find here another antithesis between σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς and δόξης, that interpretation is to be rejected, because nothing is given in the context which could lead to the distinguishing the natural and the glorified body. In Col. ii. 11 σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς refers not to Christ but to man. Here, therefore, the term requires a special consideration, as σὰρξ there denotes not merely the physical but also the sinful. However, Col. ii. 11 shows that the phrase σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς has nothing polemical in it. The last words of ver. 22, παραστήσαν υμᾶς ἅγιος καὶ ἁμώμονος καὶ ἀνεγειλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ, express the aim of the reconciling labours of Christ, which relate to the making the faithful like the Lord. (See on Ephes. v. 25—27.) Here this aim is placed in the time of the judgment, at which the faithful will appear before Christ, i.e. before His judgment-seat. (See on Rom. xiv. 10.)

Ver. 23. As the condition of attaining this end (εἰγέ, "provided that you, as I meanwhile may suppose," different from εἴπερ, see at 2 Cor. v. 3, Ephes. iii. 2, iv. 21) St Paul names the continuing grounded in faith and in hope, for it is only through the believing state of mind that man receives into himself the powers of the invisible world, which generate the new, spotless, man, the Christ in us. The terms τεθεμελιωμένοι καί ἐδραίοι are to be explained by the figure of the temple, of the κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ (Ephes. ii. 22), in which every individual forms (1 Pet. ii. 5) a living stone, which is inserted firmly into the whole building through faith (see ii. 7.) No doubt St Paul, in using the ἐπιμεένειν and μὴ μετακινεῖσθαι, was thinking principally of the false teachers and their misleading, although personal moral unfaithfulness can also subvert the foundation of faith. The hope of the Gospel is again to be
taken objectively, as in ver. 5, so that the participation in the kingdom of God, which the Gospel promises, must be understood by it. It is joined for brevity with μη μετακινούμενοι, instead of ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκπίστως αὐτοῦ. The apostle then anew (see ver. 6) extols the universality in the Gospel, and designates himself as (by God ordained) the minister of the same (ver. 25); both, we may suppose, with reference to the contradictions of the heretics, who declared the Jews a privileged nation, and threw suspicions probably on St Paul’s apostolical authority, although they did not openly combat him, for otherwise more definite explanations on that point would be found in the Epistle. (The aorist τοῦ κηρυγμένος is, as has been already observed at ver. 6, to be explained by prophetic contemplation; St Paul saw the universal tendency of Christianity already realized in the spirit. The πᾶσα κτίσις has here its restriction in the addition ἡ ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν, therefore the κτίσις ἐπίγειος is the one meant. It is understood at once that by that, in the first place, men, and indeed all, Jews as well as Gentiles, are intended [ver. 27, ss.] However, the choice of the expression is probably to be explained by the fact that St Paul, as Rom. viii. 17, ss. shows, always conceived nature also, along with mankind, as the object of the work of Christ. The ἐν before πᾶσῃ κτίσει is also in favour of that interpretation; for, if the πᾶσα κτίσις were designated downright as the object of redemption, the dative alone would have been put.)

§ 2. WARNING AGAINST FALSE TEACHERS.

(i. 24—ii. 23.)

The following obscure and difficult passage may be designated as a real crux interpretatum, especially the Protestant ones. Before we enter upon the difficulties themselves, however, we have to point out what justifies us in making a fresh paragraph begin here. Were the reading δι' υἱών, which D.E.F.G. defend, correct, undoubtedly ver. 24 would connect itself intimately with ver. 23; but the later critics generally have justly rejected δι', as it probably owes its origin only to the endeavour to connect ver. 24 more closely with ver. 23, to which it seemed to the copyists to belong, especially on
account of ver. 25. But that is only an illusion, that ver. 25 is a
continuation of ver. 23. On the contrary, St Paul in ver. 24, with
the νῦν καὶ ρω κ.τ.λ., begins a totally fresh idea, which, however, he
does not carry out and complete till ii. 1, ss.; in vers. 25—29 he
permits himself, according to his custom, to be led away from it, in
order to pursue the idea (so important to him on account of the
Judaizing heretics in Colosse) that he is called, according to the
dispensation of God, to preach the Gospel to all without exception
to the Gentiles no less than to the Jews. The fresh idea, however,
is that the sufferings and conflicts of St Paul are a means of per-
fection to the Church of Christ, and consequently to each individual
also in her, therefore their (the Colossians') steady perseverance in
the life of faith essentially depended on them, and their increase is
brought about by them, as is further detailed at ii. 2, ss.—But, ac-
cording to this, νῦν cannot be a mere particle of transition, as Bähr
still insists on making it, but a definition of time. The emphatical
placing of the νῦν first (as at 2 Cor. vii. 9, where it is also to be
taken as a definition of time), whereas it usually stands after when
used as a mere particle of transition, is already sufficiently against
that supposition. (Comp. Matt. xxvii. 42, 43; Mark xv. 32; John
ii. 8; Acts vii. 34; James iv. 13, v. 1; 1 John ii. 8.) But now, how
does the νῦν obtain here its complete signification of time? By
reference back to the preceding τοῦ εὐαγγελίου—τοῦ κηρυκ-
θέντος. St Paul, in the consciousness of being near the end
of his labours, contemplates the Church as firmly established in
the world, and, proceeding from that contemplation, breaks out into the words: "now I rejoice in my sufferings for you, for
those too serve to the perfection of the Church;" working and
suffering, St Paul means to say, I am a minister and a pro-
moter of the Church, I am thought worthy to take a part in
the sufferings of Christ for truth and righteousness. (See Matt.
v. 11, 12.) Lücke (Göttingen Christmas Programm of the year
1838) endeavours to combine both meanings, the one relating to
succession and the one relating to time. He says, p. 6, verissi-
mum hoc est, particulam νῦν, ut solet etiam Latinorum nunc,
aliquid habere consecucionis, et quidem itu, ut Paulus dicit, se,
quum de latissimis laborum suorum etiam apud Colossenses
fructibus audiverit, ob id ipsum gaudere de calamitatibus ex illâ
re sibi ortis. At the end of the same treatise on this passage
that scholar thus assigns (p. 15) the connection with what precedes: *que cùm ita sint* (i. 3—23), *tantum abest ut me peniteat, inquit apostolus, ut gaudeam de malis, quae vestra causâ pertulerim.* Lücke seems, therefore, certainly also to recognize the beginning of something new with verse 24, even if he *does* ascribe to the *νῦν* a connecting signification. So likewise Göschen and Lachmann, who make a break at verse 24 in their editions.—The *μου* after *παθήμασιν* is certainly a gloss, but a *correct* one, for the *παθήματα* = the *θλίψεως ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.* According to this interpretation of the particular words, neither can, in what follows, the *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* of course be understood as, “for your sakes,” nor even “in your stead,” but “for your benefit.” (See Ephes. iii. 1, 13.) But this idea, “I rejoice in my sufferings for you,” which St Paul expresses often enough, would not have the interpreters put into perplexity, as it readily admits of being taken in a modifying form, *e.g.* what, as the extreme, presents itself first, through the benefit which the example of a resigned sufferer affords, unless the words which follow it gave it apparently a meaning which may justly make one hesitate. However, taken literally, the words which follow would suit neither the Roman Catholic, nor any other, notion of the reconciling and redeeming force of human sufferings, *e.g.* that of Gichtel. For in all of them the suffering of the person of the God-Man is certainly represented as in itself sufficient for redemption, and as the source through which alone the suffering of men can become a redeeming one also;¹ but here the suffering of Christ Himself seems to be represented as insufficient, so that St Paul’s suffering must first make it complete. Therefore the incompleteness of Christ’s sufferings, and the ability of St Paul to fill up that deficiency, through his sufferings in the flesh for the Church of Christ, seem to be asserted in this difficult passage, both which assertions are equally dark and repugnant to Scripture doctrine elsewhere. One conceives how the Roman Catholic Church eagerly seized on the passage, in order by its means to prop up their doctrines of the merits of the saints and of the treasure of good works plausibly. But the phrase *ὑπὲρ ὑμᾶτα τῶν θλίψεων*

¹ Thus the Roman Catholic Church refers the stoning sufferings of Christ especially to original sin, and the reconciling power of the sufferings of the faithful and of the saints to the actual sin of themselves and of others. But the redeeming power of human suffering is derived, along with faith and holiness themselves, from Christ’s work as the final cause.
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τοῦ Χριστοῦ, referred to Christ's person, contradicted, as we have just remarked, the Roman Catholic theory also of the sufficiency of Christ's sufferings. On the other hand, understood of the Church, the words would certainly, taken by themselves, admit of being interpreted in favour of those Roman Catholic doctrines; but the apostolical doctrine, taken as a whole, contradicts the idea of any redeeming and reconciling work of other men along with and besides the God-Man so completely, that the interpreter is obliged to look about him for another acceptance of the words. After setting aside several totally untenable interpretations of this passage, as that of Bolten (who translates: "now you cause me joy in my sufferings, and for the afflictions which I myself endure I have a recompense in His body, that is, in the Church"), or that of Heinrichs,1 ("Jesus' passion was become known in Judea only, therefore τὰ ύπερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the circumstance that they had not come to the knowledge of the Gentiles also, which St Paul therefore supplies with his suffering,")—the following, in which the decision turns on the expressions ἀντανακλη-ροῦν, and θλίψεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, are to be taken more accurately into consideration. We must look on the latter as the leading idea for the whole passage, for the nature of the ύπερήματα and of the filling up of them depends altogether on the definition of it; we therefore begin with the consideration of it. The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ can be taken subjectively or objectively. In the latter relation the interpretation propter Christum can alone be endured, for that of earlier theologians, as of Calovius, Sebastian Schmidt, Carpzovius, and others, "sufferings which Christ sends," or even "which are similar to Christ's sufferings," are to be rejected as arbitrary.2 But the interpretation "sufferings for Christ's sake" is grammatically possible and defended by many interpreters, especially last by Böhmer also with an appeal to 2 Cor. i. 5; Philem.

1 Who gives at the end of his Commentary on this Epistle a particular excursus on the passage Col. i. 24.

2 That holds good, therefore, also of Schleiermacher's interpretation of this passage in the sermons upon this Epistle, edited by Zabel. (Berlin, 1833, vol. 2, p. 269.) He thinks St Paul calls his sufferings Christ's sufferings, because they were similar to them in the point that St Paul was persecuted by the Jews even as Christ was. "And," says Schleiermacher, "St Paul did suffer for the Church, inasmuch as he by his activity among the Gentiles first established the Kingdom of God properly." I doubt whether this interpretation of the great theologian will be found satisfactory.
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13; Hebrews xi. 26, among which passages, however, Philem. ver. 13, can alone be acknowledged as a satisfactory proof. Lücke entertains the same view in substance, though he takes the genitive somewhat differently, viz. as genitivus auctoris, so that the θάλψεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ are said to be sufferings, quo Paulo apostolo, Christo auctore et auspice Christo, perferenda erant (l. c. p. 13, sq). In the passages Philem. verses 1, 13, Ephes. iii. 1, Gal. vi. 17, Lücke finds likewise this genitive of the author. That acceptance of the words may also, like Böhmer's, be called grammatically possible. But we cannot come to a decision whether one of these possible interpretations is applicable here, till we have more closely considered the other side too, the explanation of the genitivum τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitivus subjecti. Now in the subjective acceptance of the genitive it is most obvious to think of the sufferings of Jesus on earth, of His agony in Gethsemane and His death on Golgotha. That this explanation would be possible, the collation of 2 Cor. i. 5 shows, (see the remarks on it in the Comm.), although to me it is probable that, if the apostle had wished to express that idea here, he would have written θάλψεως Ἰησοῦ or Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. But, without regarding that, this idea, that something was wanting in the sufferings of Christ, which were vicarious and reconciling for the whole of the human race, and that St Paul by his sufferings supplies that deficiency, is so completely repugnant to the whole of Scripture doctrine, and especially to St Paul's system, that we should place the author in the grossest contradiction with himself by the adoption of that acceptance. For the fancy that St Paul points here to certain forms of outward suffering which Jesus did not undergo and he himself supplied, e.g. imprisonment, needs only to be known in order to refute itself. Τοῦ Χριστοῦ can be understood subjectively of the mystical Christ alone, i.e. of Christ so far as He fills the Church with His life and being. This interpretation has been received by Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, J. D. Michaelis, besides several Greek and Latin Fathers (Augustin, Chrysostom, and others), and in the latest times by Steiger and Bähr, and we also decide in favour of it. For, if the interpretations "sufferings on account of Christ," or "sufferings imposed by Christ," are grammatically possible, still they recommend themselves the less that elsewhere too, according to the representation of the Scriptures, Christ is set
forth as suffering in the faithful (according to the term of the dogmatists σχετικός, in opposition to the suffering of Christ in his corporeity, υποστατικός), and the emphatic way in which St Paul here expresses himself as to his sufferings makes us expect more than the bald idea of an outward suffering for the sake of Christ and of the labour in His Gospel, in which idea the indwelling of Christ, which St Paul always makes appear in the foreground, is entirely ignored. Such passages are Acts ix. 4, 5 (where the persecutions of the faithful are represented as a persecution of Christ Himself), 2 Cor i. 5 (on which, however, compare the Comm.), Phil. iii. 10 (where the power of His [Christ's] resurrection and the κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ is not to be understood of an outward uniformity, but of an inward essential community through the indwelling of Christ, as also Rom. vi. 5, 8, 17; 2 Tim. ii. 10—12; 1 Pet. iv. 13), Hebr. xi. 26 (where ὁ ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot be merely "reproach propter Christum," but the reproach which Moses, as the real type of Christ, through His spirit working in him, bore), Rev. i. 9, where St John calls himself συγκοινωνός ἐν τῇ θλύσει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἅπεμνη Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which expresses more than a mere outward similarity and community. From this reference of the θλύσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ to the Christ in us it follows naturally how the ἰστορήματα of the same are to be taken. (See 1 Thess. iii. 10; Phil. ii. 30.) The Church of Christ, which had suffered much from the very beginning, is to endure more suffering still by God's dispensation: a certain measure of suffering is allotted her, which must be filled up; St Paul supplies that deficiency on his part by his sufferings in the flesh. In the ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ is couched not merely the proper bodily suffering, but also the sufferings of the soul, in short, all those conflicts which (ii. 1, ss.) the apostle had to stand against, in consequence of the sin in the world, and which the Christ in him bore as His sufferings jointly with him (St Paul.)

But next, the term ἀντανακληροῖν requires an interpretation, for which it is ripe only now. This doubly compound verb is not found again in the New Testament; it also occurs but rarely in classical language, though it is by no means entirely wanting. (See Wetstein ad h. l.) Now it must certainly be adhered to as a principle, to maintain the force of the preposition in compound verbs
where it is possible. First of all, then, ἀρναπληρὸν must signify not merely explere, but vicissim explere, "to fill up something as an equivalent for something else." This meaning would here admit of being applied so that the apostle's sufferings would be brought into comparison with the sufferings of Christ; as the Lord suffered for men, so too the Church in return suffers for Him, and St Paul thus fills up what is wanting in the sufferings of the Church in return. So Böhmer, Bähr, Tittmann (de synonymis N. T. p. 230), and others, take it. If one translates θλίψεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ "sufferings for Christ's sake," as Böhmer does, one has certainly good reason to lay such stress on the ἀνάλ, but not, if one takes the phrase, as must be done: "sufferings of Christ, i.e. of the mystical Christ in the Church." Bähr, who decides for this also, had therefore no occasion to lay a stress on the meaning of ἀνάλ. For the conception of substitution can then only be adhered to, when man is conceived as standing opposite the person of Jesus; but here he is not considered as standing opposite the person of Jesus, but as filled with the life of Christ Himself, so that He suffers in man. Therefore the context requires us to say that St Paul after his manner uses a doubly compound verb here, without laying a special emphasis on the preposition ἀνάλ. The meaning of the words is only this: "now rejoice I in the sufferings for you (viz., because I know the Gospel victorious in the whole world), and fill up in my flesh that which is yet wanting in Christ's sufferings for His body, i.e. the Church." But here now, according to our interpretation, another difficulty arises, which is couched in the ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. It is clear that the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν is meant to be more accurately defined by it; St Paul suffers not merely for the one church in Colosse, but he names that one for the whole Church. In accordance with her organic unity, she increases all together when a part increases, and suffers all together when a part suffers. (See at I Cor. xii. 26.) For the rest, it cannot be doubtful that ὑπὲρ is to be taken here in the sense "for the good of," and not in that of "instead, in lieu of," as Steiger insists. For St Paul is himself a member of the Church; he cannot therefore possibly mean to say he suffers instead of the Church, as a substitute for her. Christ alone can be vicarious, as He is not an individual member of the Church, but is potentially the Church herself. But a difficulty is involved in the circumstance that St
Paul designates his sufferings after the indwelling of Christ in him as sufferings of Christ, and yet afterwards represents the same as advantageous to the Church, i.e. the mystical Christ (1 Cor. xii. 12), for, according to that, Christ seems to suffer for Christ, the Church for the Church. But this difficulty is removed thus: as the suffering of Jesus served for the salvation of mankind, but perfected Himself also (Heb. ii. 10), so too the suffering of the individual believer advances him and the Church of which he is a member. For the Church in the mass, though a living, single, organism, the body of Christ, is yet divided into more active and more passive, into advanced members and members requiring advancement. To the former St Paul of course belonged, he could therefore justly represent his sufferings, i.e. the sufferings of the Christ in him, as a means of advancing those members of the Church who especially required increase, and their advancement was then an advancement of the whole Church, from the connection of every member with the whole body.

But this idea itself, the advancement of the individual and thereby of the whole too through suffering, still needs a closer consideration; for it might seem as if the principle of a false asceticism were couched in it. Nevertheless, we read in 1 Pet. iv. 1 declared quite openly: ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ πέπανται ἀμαρτίας. The false asceticism is, however, completely excluded by the mere fact, that the question here is not of self-chosen, wilfully invented and imposed, sufferings, but of such as God imposes, and indeed, as we have already remarked, not merely of physical sufferings, but also of sufferings of the soul, in short, of all that which befalls human nature, weighing it down in its weakness (the σάρξ). That such sufferings have something that advances men in sanctification, that they exercise men in patience, meekness, and resignation, is surely as clear as possible. There is no question here of a vicarious, sin-forgiving, efficacy of sufferings (Jesus alone has by His once-performed sacrifice established reconciliation with God and forgiveness of sins), but only of the advancement in sanctification by means of sufferings. Forgiveness of sins the Church has already, otherwise she could not be called the body of Christ, but she is also expected, proceeding from that, to increase in the new life, and sufferings are in God's hand a means of advancement in that. But they evince themselves as such only when they are taken in
the right spirit (met with resistance and bitterness, sufferings do not profit, but rather injure, the inward life), the completely right mind which is well-pleasing to God can be given by regeneration only, in which Christ takes up His abode with us, wherefore St Paul speaks not of his sufferings merely, but of the sufferings of Christ in him. But, as everything in the development of mankind has its measure and its order, so too has the way of perfection through sufferings; wherefore St Paul represents his suffering as a complement of the joint suffering, which, according to God's dispensation, mankind will have to bear. By this manner of taking the difficult passages their contents are clearly in perfect harmony with the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures in general and of St Paul in particular. But the idea that Christ suffers in the faithful, though not vicariously and reconcilingly, but merely sanctifyingly and perfectly, has its difficulty. For one would think the old man was the suffering one in the faithful, that, on the contrary, the new man, the Christ in us, was in heavenly joy even in all sufferings. No doubt the old man suffers too, but he suffers what his deeds deserve, his suffering is the punishment of sin, and has no profiting, sanctifying, power, but one that destroys him (Col. iii. 5.) But here the discourse is of such sufferings as can be a means of advancement to the individual and the whole; those are sufferings of the Christ in us, because they refer to sin as such, not merely to its consequences and their disagreeableness. Christ suffering is a type not merely of the whole Church, but of the whole of mankind; and indeed not only an outward empty type, but a living substantial one, in that Christ, as the eternal Word of God, has filled and borne up mankind in its true members with His power from eternity forth, suffers in them, overcomes in them, and by means of the victory tempers and perfects them. Thus Moses even bore the reproach of Christ (Heb. xi. 26), and took it upon him willingly in the knowledge of the blessing which is in it; thus even in the prophets of the Old Testament the Spirit of Christ worked and testified to them of the sufferings which are in Christ, and the glory

1 However, the difference between the Old and the New Testaments still remains this, that in the Old the divine essence is present only substantially in man, not personally and forming a person, as in the New; and that, therefore, it is only in the latter that there can be any question of a new birth, which supposes the personifying form of the divine energy, a form which creates a higher consciousness.
after them (1 Pet. i. 11), *i.e.*, not merely the sufferings of the historical person Jesus, but of the entire holy Church, the substantial type of which He is; thus the Prophet Isaiah (chap. liii.) already describes the suffering of the saints and the suffering of the person of the Messiah as coinciding in their fundamental features. Christ is the suffering God in the history of the world; in the sinful world He has suffered in all pious men from eternity forth, and through sympathetic indwelling He constantly transforms the curse of sin into blessing, on which account too, according to Scripture, no one is saved without suffering (2 Tim. iii. 12); in Christ pain and suffering are sanctified, His cross is the royal road to salvation for all. In the person of Jesus suffering was vicarious and reconciling, in the times before Christ preparing for His appearance, in the times after Christ it operates by sanctifying and perfecting. For the rest, it is quite clear that the idea of God’s sympathy with sanctified humanity cannot becloud the idea of God in its purity, therefore must not be taken so as to derogate from the perfect, eternal, blessedness (1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15) of God. As God is present in the creature in every moment of its development, without by that means Himself becoming subject to the limits of time and space; so too He is present in the suffering creature, without feeling its suffering as suffering. The compassion of God must therefore be considered as only the form of the presence and operation of compassionate, divine, love in the suffering creation.

Vers. 25, 26. As has been already remarked at the beginning of the explanation of verse 24, St Paul here begins a digression, in which he describes his relation to the Church; his suffering and conflict are not further pursued till ii. 1, ss. St Paul treats (it is to be presumed in opposition to the theosophical Judaists in Colossæ, who cast suspicion on his apostholical authority, even if they did not exactly impugn it) of how he was called to the ministry of the Church, and that too among the Gentiles (εἰς ὑμᾶς), according to God’s dispensation, in order to spread abroad on all sides the mystery so long hidden, but now made manifest. See Ephes. iii. 7. (As to οἰκονομία see on Ephes. iii. 2. As to the phrase πληρώσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ see the Comm. on Rom. xv. 19. It is to be interpreted: “to proclaim the Word of God completely in its whole meaning and extent.” [See also Tholuck’s Interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount, p. 135, sq.] Vers 26. See, as to θεμνοτήτι-
ρην τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, the remarks on Ephes. iii. 8. It stands here as an epexegeesis of τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ.—As to the juxtaposition of γενέα and αἰών see at Ephes. iii. 21. The νῦν δὲ ἑφανερώθη, which is subjoined by anacoluthon, has given occasion to alterations in the MSS. Some of minor importance read ἑν τῷ ἑφανερώθη downright, which openly betrays itself as a correction, and D.E have the reading νῦν δὲ φανερωθεὶν, which certainly recommends itself very much to us, but cannot however make any claim to reception into the text either, because it is extremely probable that it too arose from the alteration of the copyists. Before ἄγιος αὐτοῦ F.G. read ἄγνωστος, which, it is to be supposed, was taken up into the text here from Ephes. iii. 4. But, considering the close affinity of the two Epistles, it certainly seems that we must assume that the gloss is correct as to the sense, and that under "saints" the apostles are to be understood, only, however, as representatives of the body of all the faithful.

Ver. 27. The reason of making known the mystery to the apostles does not consist in their worthiness, but in God's will (Ephes. i. 9); this ἥδιστατος δὲ Θεός points then to the necessity of reverencing that will of God, and of recognising the apostles as those from whom the pure Gospel is to proceed. The glory of the Gospel is then exalted in the words: τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ, to which Ephes. i. 18 (on which see the Comm.) corresponds. (The neuter form τὸ πλοῦτος is to be preferred here too with Lachmann after A.B. The genitive τῆς δόξης is not to be taken adjectively, but to be considered as a definition of the nature of the heavenly mystery, in which the glory of the latter is insisted on as an independent attribute.) As to the rest, it is clear by the addition of ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν τοῖς μυστηρίων τοῦ, that neither "the mystery" in itself alone, nor even the "Word of God," (verse 25) denotes the diffusion of the Gospel among the Gentiles, otherwise the addition would be superfluous; the mystery is rather the Gospel as such, in the manifestation of the infinite compassion of God in Christ. The riches of the glory of the Gospel manifested themselves most brilliantly in its operation among the Gentiles only because it appeared among them in the sharpest contrast with the deep shade. In the last words of the verse Christ Himself is at length designated as the mystery of redemption. For in the Gospel Christ is everything living; in it there is not preached a mere
doctrines about Christ, but He Himself, the living, personal, Christ, the eternal Word of the Father, is Himself doctrine and teacher in one. The Colossians had already recognised Him as such. He was not merely outwardly preached among them,—He had made His abode in their hearts, as it is said Ephes. iii. 17: \( \chi r\varphi\tau\sigma\varsigma \; \delta \acute{i} \varsigma \; \pi\iota\varsigma \theta\varepsilon\varsigma \; \kappa\alpha\tau\omega\kappa\iota\epsilon\iota \varepsilon \nu \tau\acute{i} \varsigma \; \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma \iota \varsigma \; \upsilon\omicron \nu \). (A.F.G. have \( \delta \; \dot{o} \tau\iota \; \chi r\varphi\tau\sigma\varsigma \), which Lachmann has also adopted, but probably that is only a correction for \( \delta \chi \), which is to be explained by attraction to the \( \chi r\varphi\tau\sigma\varsigma \) following. See Winer's Grammar, p. 482.) But it seems striking that the Christ in us is designated as the \( \epsilon\lambda\iota\varsigma \; \tau\acute{i} \varsigma \; \delta\acute{a} \varsigma \nu \varsigma \; \sigma\iota\iota\lambda\lambda\omega\upsilon\varsigma \varsigma \); it might seem where Christ lives in the heart there is already the kingdom of God and all its glory subsisting. In the germ, no doubt; but the inward divine life yearns also for a completely homogeneous outward state, and that makes its victorious entry only at the end of the development. The Christ in us is therefore the living hope of the glorious future, inasmuch as He bears in Himself the energy to realise it and with that the pledge of it.

Vers. 28, 29. Now this Christ, who is the mystery itself, is the object of the apostles' announcement (1 Cor. ii. 2), and indeed in such a way that they preach Him to the human race as such, without regarding the theoretical distinctions. The thrice repeated \( \pi\acute{a} \tau\acute{a} \; \epsilon\nu\theta\rho\omicron\omicron\nu \omicron \) has, as we have already remarked on i. 6, a manifest polemical reference in favour of the universalism of St Paul against the Jewish one-sidedness of the Colossian false teachers. In the \( \nu\omicron\beta\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu\ ) the practical phase of instruction is more pointed to; in the \( \delta\dot{d}a\theta\kappa\epsilon\nu \) the intellectual. (As to the \( \epsilon\nu \; \pi\acute{a} \theta\upsilon \; \sigma\omega\omicron\iota \; \varsigma \) see the Comm. on Ephes. i. 8.) The object of it is the \( \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu \; \epsilon\nu \; \chi r\varphi\tau\sigma\theta\varsigma \; \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\tau\theta\eta\sigma\varsigma \). (Compare ver. 22.)

The definition "perfect in Christ" is to be explained, "perfect in communion with Him through His life which is imparted to us." The perfection of the believer is none of his own, separate, beside God and Christ, but Christ's perfection is his in the faith. (See at Matt. v. 48.) As that is the universal task of all teachers of the Church to form all unto perfection in Christ, so St Paul declares then of himself also that he strives to guide his disciples thither. But it is not in his own strength that he fights for that exalted aim, but according to the power of Christ which worketh in him. (See as to \( \kappa\alpha\tau\dot{a} \; \tau\acute{i} \; \epsilon\nu\beta\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\epsilon\nu \) on ver. 14.) But the conflict, the mag-
magnitude of which St Paul mentions on this occasion, refers, as Steiger justly observes on this passage, not merely to outward enemies and obstacles, but especially to the inward power of darkness which strives against the consequences of light. (See on ii. 1.) J. D. Michaelis proposed to refer the ἐν δυνάμει to the miraculous gifts. In fact these cannot be conceived as excluded in the mention of the power working in St Paul, but just as little are they alone, or even only particularly insisted on in it; ἐν δυνάμει is an adverbial addition to ἐνέργουμένη, and comprises all the outward and inward manifestations of power of the Spirit of Christ filling St Paul together. It is, secondly, intimated at the same time in this description of His operation that it is not without success, but overcomes the world; consequently the opposition also proceeding from the false teachers who were active in Colossae against him.

Chap. ii. 1. St Paul describes in the following verses the magnitude of the conflict, which was especially for the Christians in Colossae and Laodicea, and all whom he could not instruct personally. St Paul with that again takes up the idea of ver. 24 completely; for the ὑγίων περὶ ὑμῶν coincides with the παθήμασι ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The conflict on behalf of the Christians there was, along with other grievous circumstances, a real suffering on the part of St Paul for them, as the temptations which the heretics there prepared for them sorely grieved his heart, but at the same time also incited the faithful apostle to the most ardent conflict in prayer for them. As to the rest, that St Paul here designates the Christians in Colossae and Laodicea as such who did not know him personally, and therefore had received no instruction from him, is convincingly shown by Steiger and Böhmer (in the first Appendix to his Commentary, p. 411, ss.) But why does St Paul add καὶ δεινοὶ οὐκ ἐώρακαν κ.τ.λ.? It seems as if his conflict for those who knew him personally would necessarily be more painful than one for those not known to him, because he must have had more at heart the welfare of the former; but the words of this passage give one the impression as if the magnitude of the conflict were defined by the absence of personal acquaintance. No doubt it is so, and indeed this idea is explained by the fact that St Paul is the more solicitous for those unknown to him the less it has been possible for him to labour in person for their life in the faith, and to convince himself of their established state. The weaker children require the most
faithful care and the most earnest prayers. (The addition καὶ τῶν ἐν Ῥωμαῖοις is derived from iv. 13, and is spurious here. On the other hand the form ἐσώρακαν is to be preferred with Lachmann after A.B.D. as the more rare.—Πρόσωπον ἐν σαρκὶ puts the bodily countenance in opposition to the spiritual physiognomy; the latter the Colossians knew well, but the bodily appearance of St Paul was unknown to them.)

Ver. 2. Now the aim of St Paul's conflict is the advancement of the faithful. This is expressed in the words: ἵνα παρακαληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν. The idea of consoling does not suit παρακαλεῖν here, because there is no question of any grief or any persecutions of the readers of the Epistle. It is just as little suitable to take παρακαλεῖν in the meaning, "to exhort, to instruct," for καρδία does not suit that. The heart can, indeed, as the organ of feeling, be comforted but not exhorted or instructed. Παρακαλεῖν is therefore, with Böhmer and Flatt, to be taken here in the meaning, "to confirm, strengthen," after the analogy of the Hebr. בַּרְפָּא. (Deut. iii. 28, Isaiah xxxv. 3, Job iv. 3), which, however, is not applicable at 2 Thess. ii. 17 also, as Böhmer will have it to be. Generally παρακαλεῖν is to be taken only per metonymiam, so that the cause is put for the effect. Exhortation, where it bears fruit, has a strengthening, heart-establishing, operation, and in that relation the context here requires the term παρακαλεῖν to be taken. It was not going far out of the way in what follows to alter the reading συμβιβασθέντες, which is certainly the original one, into συμβιβασθεῖται, as the text. rec. reads, in order to make the construction more uniform. The MSS. A.B.C.D.E. and other authorities defend the more difficult συμβιβασθεῖται. (See as to such anacoluthias Winer's Gramm., p. 497.) We have already had the term in the same signification at Ephes. iv. 16. The figure by which the Church of Christ is compared to a σῶμα is the foundation of it. Love is that in which the individual members are joined and combined into unity. Of course this συμβιβασθεῖται ἐν ἀγάπῃ also is to be conceived as dependent on what precedes. The aim of St Paul's conflict is to make his readers firm (against all corruption of them by means of false doctrine), and to unite them in love, with the victory over all controversies and divisions. Finally, the exalted insight into the mystery of God is brought forward as the object of this union in love, with which afterwards security against being led
astray is given by Christ as the only possessor of all true wisdom. But the καλ before εἰκ πάν has something perplexing in it; it is either to be explained by the omission of a verb, perhaps ἔλθες, or to be taken in praegnanti sensu as et quidem, for which Böhmer decides. (Compare Matt. xxiii. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 5; Heb. x. 25.) The σύνεσις is here more accurately defined in its riches by the addition πληροφορία (see as to πληροφορεῖσθαι on Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5), by which the insight is meant to be characterised as not a mere outward one, dependent on the intellect, but as an inward one, resting on the testimony of the Holy Spirit. This Spirit testifieth to the truth by His presence (1 John v. 6) and operates thereby a divine πληροφορία. To the idea of the σύνεσις (see at Ephes. i. 8) the πάν τὸ πλοῦτος answers well, because the understanding conceives in itself the manifold forms of the concrete. The ἐπίγνωσις, on the contrary, is the knowledge through the reason which gathers every individual thing into unity. St Paul, therefore, could not write καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως, so that this genitive also should be dependent on πλοῦτος. (See at i. 9.) The ἐπίγνωσις appears here as a higher grade of knowledge than the σύνεσις. True, knowledge precedes the cultivation of the understanding in the individual, but, by means of the latter, knowledge is also raised to a more perfect degree of depth and inwardness. At the end of ver. 2 a number of various readings are found. A.C. read τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, D. reads τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἔστι Χριστός, B. τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, the text. rec. τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Most of the modern critics and interpreters, especially Lachmann, Böhmer, Steiger, and others, decide for the reading Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ. Steiger tries to set forth in detail how from that reading all the rest arose, partly by mere interpolations, partly through interpretation. But I cannot convince myself of the correctness of that assumption; I rather believe τοῦ Θεοῦ only is the original reading, as Griesbach and Bühr likewise suppose, and my arguments are the following. It is inconceivable that St Paul should have written Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ, which never occurs elsewhere either; for the words may mean: 1st, “of the God of Christ,” (but in that case St Paul always puts the plena locutio ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as Ephes. i. 17); or 2dly, Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, i.e. “of God, which here means Christ;” or lastly, as the advocates for this reading will have it, “of Christ, who is God.” The possi-
bility of this last acceptation is, however, undoubtedly to be denied; St Paul would have expressed that idea by: Χριστοῦ, Θεοῦ. The two others, as is confessed, do not suit the context; it appears, therefore, as the simplest way, to view Χριστοῦ as a gloss of the copyists, and the reading ἕως Χριστοῦ, which stands parallel with it, plainly shows that it is nothing else. But they came to that gloss quite naturally as follows: in ver. 27 of chap. i. Christ Himself was designated as the mystery; now, as it was thought necessary in ver. 3 of chap. ii. to unite the ἐν θεῷ to the last subject Θεὸς, it seemed also necessary in this passage that Θεὸς should be Christ, not the Father; for which reason the explanatory Χριστοῦ was added. But, if Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ was once written, this unheard-of juxtaposition could not fail to give rise to the most various readings intended to facilitate the understanding of the passage.

Ver. 3. But the connection of ἐν θεῷ with Θεὸς here is by no means to be recommended, because Θεὸς is not the principal substantive, but only defines the principal idea of the μυστήριον more accurately; the latter forms, ever since i. 25, the centre of the argumentation. In fact, it again coincides, it is true, with the other mode of connecting the words; for God in Christ is Himself His mystery (i. 27), the mystery in which all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, i.e. of both practical and theoretical knowledge, are hidden. That mystery is no abstract doctrine separated from its author, no dogmatical formula, but the living God Himself, who in Christ entered into humanity; without knowledge of God, therefore, neither is there any knowledge of this mystery nor any eternal life (Matt. xi. 27; John xvii. 3.) Consequently, in Him alone are all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge to be sought, not, as the heretics in Colossae insisted, in all sorts of sham wisdom, apart from Christ. But in the phrase: ἐν θεῷ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ Θεούροι ἀπόκρυψιν it is not intimated that they, as being absolutely hidden, can and may never be taken up—(St Paul in ver. 2 actually uttered the very hope that they might come to the knowledge of the mystery, and, with it, of its purport, i.e. of its treasures),—but that human strength is not sufficient for it, that, in one word, no one knows God, but he to whom He manifests Himself (Matt. xi. 27.) God veils Himself to the prudent and wise of this world, whose wisdom is in themselves, and proceeds
from themselves alone; they know nothing of Him, their knowledge is mere show; God reveals Himself only to "babes and sucklings" and to the humble, by imparting Himself to them as their portion. For the rest, this passage sufficiently refutes all those dreamers and fanatics, who thought they were bound to expect a still higher and more comprehensive revelation of God than that in Christ is; viz., an age of the Holy Ghost. All that the Holy Ghost reveals He takes from that which is Christ's (John xvi. 15), in Him are all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge. (From the context of vers. 3 and 2 γνώσις here can be nothing else than ἐπίγνωσις is in ver. 2, which testifies against the asserted difference between the two expressions. See the remarks on i. 9.)

Ver. 4, 5. St Paul now applies the preceding general exhortation to the special circumstances of his readers. Its object is to warn them against the deceitful discourses of the false teachers. St Paul bases this interest in the welfare of the absent on the spiritual union in which he knows himself to be with them, his readers, and which enables him with joy to perceive the firmness of their state of faith. (Παραλογίσμοι is not found again in the New Testament, except at James i. 22, as here, in the sense, "to deceive by false conclusions [paralogisms."]" The choice of the term is to be explained by the form of arguing which the false teachers made use of for their views.—Πιθανολογία is found only here. In 1 Cor. ii. 4 ἐν πειθοὶς σοφίας λόγοις stands for it. The term has here a subordinate idea of blame, it designates a striving not to convince by the force of truth, but to persuade by the show of it.—Ver. 5. Comp. the parallel 1 Cor. v. 2 to the antithesis here: σαρκί ἄπειμι —πνεύμα σὺν ὕμων εἰμι. Πνεῦμα is, of course, not the Holy Ghost, but forms here the antithesis with σαρκί, "outwardly far, I am yet inwardly near you, and take part in your welfare." The collocation χαίρων καὶ βλέπων is strange; for it seems necessary that βλέπων should come first. Schott and Bähr choose to take it as a Hendiadys: letabundus observans, or cum gudio considerans. But Winer [Gramm. p. 440] and Böhmer justly remarked that it is simpler to take καὶ in the meaning of scilicet, by which means the καὶ βλέπων κ. τ. λ. receives the character of an epexegetic addition: "in the spirit I am with you in joy, viz., inasmuch as in the spirit I see your firm attitude." Tάξις is taken from the metaphor of military service which so often occurs; "the
compact order of the warriors, which attests their ability for fighting out the combat well." The στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ύμων, which follows, and in which faith is described as the power which strengthens them in their position for the fight, explains τάξις. The reading υστέρημα has arisen merely from the circumstance, that from what follows [ver. 20, ss.] it seemed not well possible to predicate firmness in the faith of the Colossians. But St Paul praises their firmness, in order to show what he expects of them. As to the rest, neither need ver. 20, ss., be understood as if the Colossians had already given themselves up to the false teachers; the question is there more an oratorical figure. [See the explanation at that passage.] Στερέωμα is not found again in the New Testament, the LXX. use it for ἡγησία, Gcn. i. 6; however, the verb occurs Acts xvi. 5.)

Vers. 6, 7. With reference to the instruction received (from Epaphras, chap. i. ver. 7), St Paul then exhorts them to remain faithful to it. But Christian instruction, as at Ephes. iv. 20 (on which compare the Comm.), is not represented as a mere reception of a doctrine of and on Christ, but is designated as an actual reception of Himself, in that really a higher living principle fills the faithful by means of the communication of the Holy Ghost; in Him (Christ) they are to walk, in Him be firmly rooted and built up. But Christ is here emphatically designated as the Lord, in order to make the necessity of letting Him rule be observed. (As to ἐφίκομενος and ἐποικοδομομενος see Ephes. iii. 18, ii. 20, 22.

—From the ἐν αὐτῷ Christ cannot in the ἐποικοδομεῖσθαι be conceived as the foundation and foundation-stone, on which the faithful are built up, but He is the element that fills the whole building as the life-giving breath. The metaphor is rather to be taken thus: the building is begun, the foundation has been laid by the apostles and prophets [Ephes. ii. 20], all now are built up on that foundation through being and living in Christ. Christ is the author and finisher of the faith [Hebr. xii. 2.]—In the words βεβαιούμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἑδιδάχθητε, πίστις cannot be understood of the subjective πίστις, but of the objective one, of the fides qua creditur, of the doctrine. In the latter one may be instructed and establish one's self in accordance with the instruction that one has received. St Paul means therefore that the Colossians are to adhere to the doctrine of Epaphras, which he confirms as true, and
not suffer themselves to be led away from it through the deceits of the heretics. [The opposite to βεβαιοῦσθαι is κλίνοντισθαι, Ephes. iv. 14.] But they are not merely to adhere to that faith, but also to increase in it [ἐν αὐτῷ scil. πίστει], and that too with thanksgiving, consequently with thankful hearts, for God's grace given them through the communication of the pure truth. As to the rest, ἐν αὐτῷ is wanting in A.C., and D.E. read ἐν αὐτῷ, but the omission and alteration are too easily explained for any stress to be laid on those various readings.)

Ver. 8. After that, the apostle then pronounces an open warning against false philosophy, as the Colossian false teachers disseminated it; a warning, however, which is not, before ver. 16, again resumed and carried out more in detail, as in vers. 9—15 the idea that one must not depart from Christ, as in Him everything needful unto salvation is given, is carried out. The destructive element, which St Paul warns against, is called ἡ φιλοσοφία. But that, according to St Paul's intention, not every philosophy, not every striving after an insight into, and a knowledge of, the truth, is meant here to be rejected, and a blind uneducated faith recommended,—is partly clear already from the doctrine of St Paul in general, in which there plainly manifests itself a striving after knowledge, and the endeavour to reconcile faith and knowledge, therefore Christian philosophy and science, is expressly recommended, nay, is set up as the aim of the development of the Church (compare the remarks in the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 13); partly from the addition καὶ κενὴς ἀπάτης. For the absence of the article shows that this is not meant to be a second and different point, by the side of philosophy; it also lies in the nature of the thing that such discordant matters as philosophy and vain deceit cannot be placed side by side, if, that is to say, the term "vain deceit" were meant to designate generally every form of empty delusion. Ἀληθὴς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενὴς ἀπάτης rather forms one joint idea, and that too so that the empty deceit must be taken as manifesting itself precisely in philosophy. The empty, deceptive, philosophy, therefore, presupposes another genuine one as acknowledged. The former is here the self-styled fictitious "wisdom," which the false teachers in Colosse extolled, pretending to possess (verse 18) knowledge of a peculiar kind as to the spiritual kingdom, whereas they were in fact blind in divine things; only such false wisdom (the ψευ-
δόμος γνώσεως of 1 Tim. vi. 20, which does not deserve the noble name of knowledge) is meant to be blamed, not the true. That false wisdom receives from St Paul for a more accurate definition the predicate: κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. But still every human endeavour to find the truth, manifesting itself in the following the traditions of a school, seems to be blamed here, and revelation alone, which is not man's at all, but God's only, seems to be represented as the rightful source; for, as, after this, κόσμος and Χριστός are opposed to one another, so here Θεός forms the tacit contrast to ἀνθρώπος. No doubt; but human philosophy is only blamed in so far as it sets itself on a par with, or in opposition to, the revelation of God. Where the question is not of revelation, e.g. as among the Greeks before Christ, there St Paul would not blame a φιλοσοφία κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων as such. But certainly within the domain of revelation no human wisdom can or dare claim authority along with, much less against, the divine wisdom; philosophy must always be κατὰ Χριστὸν, i.e. be in harmony with the truth manifested by and in Him, if it wishes to pretend to the name of a Christian philosophy. Christ, who is personal truth itself, can also alone be the truth of philosophy. As to the rest, St Paul shows by the term παράδοσις that these false teachers had not invented their views themselves, but received them in the way of tradition. That is in favour of the view expressed in the Introduction, that the Colossian false teachers sought to amalgamate the Cabalistic tenets, which were already in existence, and which had come down to them in the way of tradition, with Christianity. The name φιλοσοφία can be no argument against our supposing Jewish wisdom to be here meant, for the Jewish inquirers also were called philosophers, not only by the platonizing Philo, but also by the Pharisee Josephus. Certainly Bähr is right in maintaining against Titmahn that φιλοσοφία cannot mean merely knowledge of the Jewish Law, much less, as Heinrichs insists, “religious worship according to the Law;” but Josephus calls philosophy every more than usually deep inquiry into religious matters. Thus by him the sects of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, are called philosophers (B.J.

---

1 It is not improbable that in the term παράδοσις an allusion to the name τῆς παράδοσις, i.e. tradition, is contained.
The correctness of this declaration that "the deceptive philosophy" here denotes the Gnostic-Cabbalistic system of the false teachers, which they knew how to present in a very plausible way (ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ verse 5), is further confirmed in what follows by the phrase κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. We have already at Gal. iv. 3 made acquaintance with the same phrase, which is explained ib. iv. 9 by ἀδεηνὴ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα. This phrase, too, points to the Old Testament, and therefore is in favour of the Judaistic character of the false teachers. The name στοιχεῖα alone would contain no reproach, it is only the Old Testament that is characterized by it as containing the elements of religious life, whereas in Christ the τέλος of the Law, the τελειότης, is contained. But the addition τοῦ κόσμου involves the blame; for St Paul does not mean to blame the Old Testament in itself, but that spiritless, external, literal, manner, in which the false teachers understood it. Instead of considering it as actually fulfilled in Christ in its spirit, they endeavoured faithfully to observe it outwardly in the letter. Thus they degraded the Word of God to a mere form of the world, to beggarly elements. (See the particulars as to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in the Comm. on Gal. iv. 3.) The assumption, that elements of Gentile wisdom are also to be understood by the "elements of the world," is here, as at Gal. iv. 3, not demonstrable. Verses 16, 17 pronounce too decidedly for the purely Jewish character of the Colossian false teachers for any one to be able to feel himself justified in supposing any Gentile elements in their system. Even though the Cabbalists might originally have received their impulse from Persian and Chaldean ideas, yet their system had long so entirely passed over into the Jewish life and mind, that St Paul could have no motive still to distinguish in it the originally Gentile ideas from the Jewish ones. (Βλέπετε μὴν with an indicative following expresses the conviction that what the warning is given against might actually take place. The article with the participle συλαγογών denotes a definitely-conceived personality [see Winer’s Gramm. p. 100]: it is supposable that that perverse tendency in Colossæ originated with some definite individual whom St Paul had in his thoughts here.—Συλαγογεῖν, from σύλη, booty, is only found here. One need not imagine, as the object, faith, or anything of the kind, in the Colossian Christians, it is they themselves who are meant to be caught by the false
teachers. In 2 Tim. iii. 6, αἰχμαλωτίζω is used in the same combination.)

Ver. 9. That St Paul here, directly after naming the name of Christ, permits himself to be determined to come back to the sublimity of the person of Christ, of which he had in i. 15, as already so copiously treated, plainly shows that the error of the false teachers as to the person of Christ appeared to St Paul's mind especially dangerous. The idea of verse 9 unites itself to what precedes as follows: “beware lest any one should spoil you through the deceptive philosophy which is not after Christ, for one must beware of it, because in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead, consequently that alone can be true which is after Him.” According to the parallel passage i. 19 the sense of our passage cannot be doubtful: the interpreting the πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος of the totality of the Church, or of the whole circle of doctrine which God had meant to convey to man through Christ, is so arbitrary and contradictory to the context that it must be rejected as completely inadmissible. (See Bähr in the Comm. ad h. i.) St Paul speaks here, as at i. 10, of the conjunction of the divine and human natures in Christ, of the Son of God's being made man in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Only the σωματικὸς is obscure, and requires a closer consideration. The interpretation totaliter, which Hermann among others defends, is to be rejected at once; for, not to mention that no passage can be adduced in which σωματικὸς has that meaning, the totality is surely already expressed in the πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα in the strongest way. Neither likewise can the taking the σωματικὸς in the meaning verè, realiter, in opposition to the typical, which Grotius, Nösselt, and others, defend after Augustine, recommend itself. For, even if σῶμα, as the opposite to σκιά, means the essential fulfilment in opposition to what is typical, still no example occurs in which σωματικὸς is used in opposition to τυπικὸς. Besides, in that sense the combination with κατουκεῖ does not suit. For one can indeed say: “the temple is a type of Christ,” but not “the Son of God dwells typically in the Temple;” but that would necessarily have to be said, if we wished the antithesis to the idea: the fulness of the Godhead dwells really (not merely typically) in Jesus, to come out clearly. Now the σωματικὸς can mean either “bodily,” or “in substance.” For the former acceptation many of the Fa-
thers had already declared themselves, in later times Calixtus, Calovius, Gerhard, Storr, Flatt, Bähr; Böhmer leaves it undecided which might be preferable. Steiger expresses himself too harshly in calling that acceptance nonsensical; on the contrary, it is very intelligible how it was hit upon, especially if one considered the heretics as docetics. Now we cannot do that, as was remarked on i. 22; but, even putting out of sight that point in the doctrine of the Colossian false teachers, the explanation of σωματικός = ἐν τῷ σώματι does not recommend itself, because surely that indwelling in the human nature of Jesus, and therefore also in the body, is already couched in the ἐν αὐτῷ. Now, if this ἐν αὐτῷ were meant to be more accurately defined, St Paul would not certainly, for that purpose, have chosen the adverb by which the idea is united with the verb κατωκεῖν, but would have written simply: ἐν τῷ σώματι. The adverbial form admits of no other acceptation than essentialiter, substantialiter, σῶσων. Thus Athanasius, Theophylact, Æcumenius, have already interpreted, and later the Reformers in a body, as also Wolf, Bochart, Steiger, and others. For the explanation of this use of σῶμα = substantia one must appeal, not so much to the Hebrew גֵּדַע, to which σῶμα does not accurately correspond, as to the use of κοίτη, body, which in the rabbinical dialect is completely analogous to our “substance.” (See Buxtorf. lex. rabb. et talm. p. 405.) But the further question arises, what is the meaning of this clause, “the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells essentially, substantially, in Him,” against what heretical mode of conception is it meant to form the antithesis? The verb κατωκεῖν and the present tense are especially to be insisted upon; by them St Paul opposes those Gnostic views, according to which a merely temporary influence of a higher spirit upon Jesus was supposed, from His baptism to His death; Christ is a permanent divine Schechinah, even on the throne of the Father the glorified human nature is combined with the divine nature. But in the σωματικός is intimated the difference between the Being of God in Christ and that in man, of which the words next following treat; in Christ God is essentially present, not merely an operation, but centrally, so that Jesus is not a deified man, but Godman; on the other hand, the indwelling of God in man is to be considered as only operation. God is in them, but they are not God.

Ver. 10. That καλ ἐστε cannot be taken imperatively is suffi-
ciently inherent in the very idea; one cannot demand to be filled by God. Besides, the New Testament puts γίνεσθε for the imperative, not ἐστε. The clause depends, like ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ, on ὅτι, with which no doubt an express ὑμεῖς would have been suitable, because the dwelling of the fulness of God in Christ, and the believers' being filled by Him, form antitheses. With ver. 8 this clause is thus connected: "beware of a philosophy οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν, for He fills you, recollect; therefore you must not give place to any foreign influence." Only the ἐν αὐτῷ is strange. One might think one's self obliged to take ὅτι here in the sense of διὰ, as Christ is certainly to be considered as He who fills His own. But it is more suitable to suppose a conciseness in the phrase, in that ἐστε ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι stands for: "in Him, i.e. as being in communion with Him, ye are filled with His life." After this, St Paul details further how everything is given to the faithful in Christ, therefore they have to keep themselves to Him alone, as the Head, which is just what the false teachers do not do (ver. 19), in that they unite themselves to subordinate powers, whom Christ governs. Therefore St Paul calls Him ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας. (See at i. 16.) The name κεφαλή is derived from the image of σῶμα; the Church is usually so called; the reading ἐκκλησίας for ἀρχῆς in D.E. could therefore very easily arise. Here St Paul seems either to have conceived the whole spiritual world as the σῶμα whose κεφαλή Christ is, or he has only in this latter expression adhered to the idea of Him that guides and governs. As to the rest, the names ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι in themselves might be used as well of bad angels as of good ones; only, from the polemical tendency of St Paul against the angel-worship of the Colossian heretics, it is to be assumed that St Paul had the good spirits principally in his mind. (See, however, at ver. 15.) The reading δ or ὅ has certainly important authorities in its favour; Lachmann has received δ into the text, and Steiger defends it, considering πλήρωμα as the subject. But then, in vers. 11 and 12 too, ἐν φίλοις necessarily have to be referred to πλήρωμα, which, however, is entirely unsuitable; it is not in the fulness of the Godhead as such that the faithful are circumcised, dead, risen again, but in the person of Jesus Christ, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells, therefore in the Son of God who was
made man, in the God-man. This decides, even with inferior critical authorities, for δι as the true reading.

Ver. 11. St Paul then shows in the sequel of this representation, how in Christ all that the believer can possess in spiritual blessings is already given him in Christ. Christ’s death and resurrection are vicarious for mankind: as all fell in Adam, so all are dead and rise again in Christ and with Him. This idea is very familiar to St Paul and has already been particularly considered in detail in the Commentary on Rom. v. 12, ss., vi. 1, ss.

The acrists receive by this means their proper meaning (see on Rom. viii. 30); in Christ all is fulfilled once for all, Ηις τετελεσται holds good for eternity, the life of the Church and of the individual in her is only the development of what has already been given in Him. It seems peculiar in this passage that the vicarious operation of Christ (according to which the ἐν δι is to be taken quite literally, inasmuch as the faithful are conceived as reposing spiritually in Christ, the spiritual Adam, in the same way as all reposed bodily in Adam, their bodily progenitor,) is referred, not merely to the particular events of the death and the resurrection, as usual, but to circumcision also. But in the ἐν δι και περιτμῆθη we must not think, for instance, of the bodily circumcision of Christ, as if that were understood as a circumcision of all (for the discourse here is surely of the spiritual circumcision of all, and not of the bodily one), but the ideas of death and circumcision are here treated as identical, as the expository annexation of the clause συνταφέντες αὑτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι to what precedes shows.

For the burial is only the absolutely consummated death, to which baptism is compared, as Rom. vi. 4, with reference to the rite of submersion, by which the old man is withdrawn from sight in the same way as the dead man by burial. But circumcision is a figurative death; the entire old man ought to die as a sacrifice for sin, instead of which his blood is partially shed and the foreskin removed, as a type of the sinful appendages of the soul (προσαρτήματα, as the Gnostics said). The faithful are therefore circumcised in Christ spiritually, as His death in the faith is their death too; in baptism, as the act in which the new birth is realized, the faithful died with Christ, are buried with Him, and receive therewith the circumcision of Christ, i.e. the περιτμῆ ἀχειροποιητος, which
Christ accomplishes by His Spirit, the circumcision of the heart. (Comp. Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, Jerem. iv. 4, with Rom. ii. 28, 29.) The exegetical addition εν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός is also peculiar. The whole of the context shows that σώμα τῆς σαρκός cannot here denote, as at i. 22, the physical body, for the spiritual circumcision certainly does not liberate from the physical body; σάρξ here has a reference to the sinfulness of human nature. If we compare Col. iii. 9, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἀνθρώπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, it cannot be doubtful that the ἀπεκδυσάς τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός is meant to denote the same thing. Σῶμα τῆς σαρκός = σῶμα σαρκικόν, a σῶμα, which contains in it the nature of the σάρξ, of sinfulness. It is presumable that St Paul chose that expression with reference to the death which the συνταφθῆς coming after presupposes. Death is the laying aside of the body: in like manner the spiritual death which man dies with Christ—the total circumcision which Christ performs—the laying aside of the sinful body, i.e. the putting off the old man and the putting on the new one. This way of taking the words was, no doubt, the foundation also of the reading τῶν ἀμαρτίων, which it is true, can make no claim at all to reception into the text, but is a correct interpretation of τῆς σαρκός. On the other hand, that interpretation of the σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, for which among the latest interpreters Bähr and Steiger declare themselves, and according to which σῶμα is said to mean not the corporeity, but the totality, and the allusion to circumcision is so taken, that the removal of an insignificant part of the body is meant to be opposed to the removal of all the sinfulness,—seems to me far-fetched. St Paul himself declares, Rom. vii. 18, ὃν οἶκεί ἐν ἐμοί, τούτ' ἐστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου, ἁγαθόν, certainly, therefore, the body is not, as such (as matter), the cause of sin, but sin takes root in the body, as the latter now exhibits itself; i.e. in the body and the soul which animates it, without which the body cannot exist, unless it is to sink down to the mere κρέας. In this sinful condition the body is a σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, and Christ delivers from it. Of course, the operations of Christ are here conceived ideally, as surely verse 12 plainly shows; it cannot, therefore, be objected: "the Christian is not really here below freed as yet from the carnal body;" just in proportion as he is not yet freed, he is also not yet
Christ's; hence at iii. 5 the exhortation νεκρῶσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

To this comparison of the death of the faithful, as the inward, spiritual, circumcision, with the outward circumcision in the Old Testament, in which is couched the intimation that in the New Testament baptism has stepped into the place of the bodily circumcision, St Paul was, no doubt, prompted by the over-rating of that outward act on the part of the Colossian heretics. Those Judaists, along with other ordinances of the Old Testament (see verse 16), imposed circumcision also on the Gentile Christians. That betrays their utterly materialist tendency, for the Old Testament had already recognized bodily circumcision as a symbol of the circumcision of the heart, and so had deeper-penetrating Rabbin too. (See Böhmer ad h. l. p. 187.) And not merely so, for instance, that they considered both, the outward sign and the inward disposition, as necessarily connected, but also in such a way that they looked on the inward reality as a compensation for the absent outward sign. Thus Rabbi Moses, Nachman's son, says: qui concupiscit et ad voluptates inclinat, illo dicitur יָרֵך, qui-cunque verò nec voluptates nec concupiscientias sectatur is dicitur יָרֵך. Compare besides Rom. ii. 28, 29, and the words of the Rabbi Lippmann cited in the note in the Comm. on that passage. (As to ἀρειποπολτὸς see Mark xiv. 58; 2 Cor. v. 1.—The substantive ἀνέκδοσις is only found here. As to the figure which lies at the root of the words ἀνέκδοσις, ἐνδοῦσις, ἐνδοῦσις, see the Comm. on Rom. xiii. 14, 2 Cor. v. 3.)

Ver. 12. As the faithful are in Christ's death dead with Him and in baptism buried with Him, so they are now also risen with Him in His resurrection. (See at Ephes. ii. 6.) The power of God, who bears the title of raiser from the dead, is, of course, to be considered as the positive cause of the raising from the dead; and faith, with which the divine operation is laid hold of, as the negative one. St Paul makes the latter aspect of the matter prominent here, in order to make it observed by what means Christ's work first really becomes man's. But faith is here more accurately designated as πίστει τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. All the later interpreters are unanimous on the point that those words are to be taken thus: "faith, which the operation of God calls forth,"
and not: "faith in the operation of God." Only we cannot acknowledge the reason that Bähr urges for that interpretation, viz. that the parallel passage (Ephes. i. 19) is to be taken in the same way, since, as was detailed in the exposition of that passage, the connection of the κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ. τ. λ. is a different one from the one here in Colossians. For the rest, this passage is the most decided and open of those in the New Testament in which faith is referred to the operation of God. In man as God's creature every good thing is without exception precisely God's work, the prerogative of resistance, and therefore of sin, is alone man's property. Faith is not something which man himself can make and call forth at will, it is God's work in him.

Ver. 13. At first sight the idea of verse 12 seems to be tautologically repeated here, but, whereas in what precedes from verse 9 downwards the person and work of Christ were described quite generally, here now the special application of that work to the readers of this Epistle and to their Christian experience is made. It is true the second person (περιεμβάλλετε, συνηγέρθητε) had already been put in vers. 11, 12; with those words, however, the Colossians are not addressed as such, but the second person is meant to set forth the readers of the Epistle as representatives of the totality of the church. The emphatic καὶ ὑμᾶς first marks the point at which the apostle's discourse makes a transition to his readers personally, since it must be taken: "and thus He hath quickened you too, who were dead in your sins." For the rest, the passage is completely parallel to Ephes. ii. 1, 5, and we therefore refer in respect to it to the exposition there. It might seem, however, as if this passage contradicted the difference between συνεκποιεῖν and συνεγείλειν assumed at Ephes. ii. 5, as the latter here precedes the former expression, whereas, according to the difference there declared, it should have stood after. But, as we have already remarked above, no progress is to be supposed in verse 13 in relation to verse 12, which rather expresses the objectivity of Christ's work, while verse 13, on the contrary, expresses the actual state of the Christians in Colossæ. These were roused, quickened, but not yet arrived at the fullness of the risen life; here too, therefore, the difference between the two words assumed by us is fully verified. The life-giving, resuscitating, point in the Gospel is the forgiveness of all sins, not of the actual ones merely, but also of
original sin, not of the past only, but of the future sins also; for
in Christ an inexhaustible stream of forgiving love is opened, which
stream is accessible to every one who approaches it in true, profound,
repentance, and pure, unsigned, faith—therefore with a lively
yearning to be made pure from sin. Only the addition to νεκρόνι
τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν is peculiar to this passage.
It plainly refers to the above comparison (verse 11) with circum-
cision; the spiritually dead, carnally living, state, in which the
flesh is master, is the one analogous to the ἀκροβυστία, but the
spiritual and living condition, in which the lusts of the flesh are
mortified, answers to the circumcision. (The σῶν αὐτῷ is not, of
course, to be understood of outward companionship, but is to be
interpreted of inward unity, in accordance with the preceding ἐν ὑ.
—Instead of the reading ἤμων of the text. rec., the MSS. with an
overwhelming majority have ἤμων, which might easily have been
altered on account of the ἤμας preceding.)

Ver. 14. The idea of the forgiveness of sins is further expounded
in what follows, but in an entirely peculiar, and besides extremely
obscure, manner. At first, one is inclined to believe, that, after
the well-known figure, according to which sin in its relation to
God's justice is conceived as a relation in the nature of a debt, the
burden of sin is here called a bond or note of hand, which the Re-
deemer has blotted out, nay destroyed, by His work. For that rea-
son many interpreters have understood either Adam's sin, as the
original sin, which comprises all others in itself (so had thought al-
ready Irenæus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Theophyelact, Ócumenius),
or the conscience, i.e. the consciousness of sin in man; thus par-
ticularly Luther and the other reformers, Calvin excepted. But, if
that were the meaning of the words, in the first place χειρόγραφον
ἡμῶν would be said, not καθ᾽ ἡμῶν, and secondly the addition τοῖς
δόγμασιν is decidedly opposed to that acceptation, for the expres-
sion cannot be understood of the dogmas of Christianity, which has
been already observed on Ephes. ii. 15. The reference of the χειρό-
γραφον to the body of Christ, as Theodoret proposes, is based on
the last words of this verse: προσηλώσας αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ. But
Bähr (ad h. l.) has convincingly shown in opposition to Steiger,
who in the exposition of the first Epistle of Peter (p. 294) had
declared himself for that interpretation of Theodoret's (in his Com-
mentary on the Epistle to the Colossians Steiger himself has altered
his view), that the body of Christ cannot possibly be designated as a note of hand or acknowledgment of debt. Besides, the τοῖς δόγματι finds no satisfactory explanation even so. According to the parallel passage Ephes. ii. 15, the discourse can here too be of the Law alone, not only of the law of the conscience, nor even merely of the ceremonial part of the Mosaic Law (for, as Böhmert convincingly proves, the πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα preceding obliges us to adopt a comprehensive acceptance of the Law), but of the Law in all its relations, only, however, in respect to its commanding, requiring, form, without the faculty of communicating higher power, by which it can kill but not make alive. (See on Rom. vii. 9, ss.; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Gal. iii. 10.) Inasmuch as this characteristic of the Law has arrived at the completest development in the Mosaic Law, we must direct our thoughts especially to the latter. Accordingly, χειρόγραφον is not a bond, by which man acknowledges himself to be a sinner, but a bill which declares the guilt of man on the part of God, and rouses in man the consciousness of it. God's Law is, on account of this operation, a bill against man, and that bill is also blotted out with the debt itself, i.e. in the case of the reconciled sinner the Law has no longer the effect of condemning him, for Christ's righteousness is his righteousness. The δόγματα suit this way of taking the word very well, just as in the passage Ephes. ii. 15; for this expression denotes exactly the imperative form of the Law. Only one might here too, as there, wish for ἐν τοῖς δόγμαισιν, instead of the dative alone. It is true, Fathers and translations read ἐν, but no MSS. The annexation, however, of the dative to χειρόγραφον for the idea: "bill, which consists in ordinances," is intolerably harsh; it would certainly have been obliged to be rendered by τῷ ἐν τοῖς δόγμαισιν. I prefer, with Winer (Gramm. p. 196, ss.), the connection with what follows, in the sense: "which bill, by means of the ordinances, stood hostilely against us." Certainly, even so the position of the dative is not quite natural, but Winer draws attention, no doubt with justice, to the analogous passage Acts i. 2; at all events that difficulty cannot be put in comparison with that which is caused by the connection of the τοῖς δόγμαισιν with what precedes. In the sequel of this passage a more accurate explanation of the ἐξαλείψας would be alone perceptible in the καὶ αὐτὸ ἥρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μισου, if the clause προσλέκοντα αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ did not lead to something else. For the
opinion that a law is proclaimed to be abrogated by a nailing of it up, which Grotius propounds, does not recommend itself, because, even if the custom is capable of proof, yet the Scriptures do not know it, and particularly in this connection, after the discourse having been, in vers. 11 and 12, of the death and resurrection of Christ, His cross alone can be thought of. Neither, of course, is this passage to be referred to the superscription: “This is the King of the Jews,” but to the nailing of Christ Himself to the cross, consequently to the atonement of our Lord, by which surely the Law itself in its merely imperative form was also abrogated along with the blotting out of sin, therefore the Law, as χειρόγραφος, was abolished, nailed, as it were, with its δόγματι, in Christ Himself, together with Him, to the cross. Then the αἱρεὺς ἕκ τοῦ μέσου receives by that means the signification of the being killed, annihilated; Christ’s death was also the Law’s death, or, by a different turn of the thought, the faithful are with Christ dead to the Law, as it is said Rom. vii. 6: κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες, ἐν δὲ κατειχόμεθα. (Ἐξαλείφω is found Acts iii. 19, of the forgiveness of sins. See also the LXX., Isaiah xliii. 25; Ps. l. 10. In Rev. [iii. 5, vii. 17, xxi. 4] it is found in the sense of “to wipe away, blot out.”—Χειρόγραφος denotes properly every writing, but especially a bond, γραμματεῖον χρέους ομολογικόν. —Τενάντιος is found again in the New Testament at Heb. x. 27. —The LXX. often use it for ἐνίος. Böhmer wishes without sufficient reason to lay a stress on the υπὸ, and to take the idea thus: “which is secretly hostile to us.”—The reading ἦρκεν is with justice preferred by Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, to that of ἡρεν, which D.G. afford. Αἱρεύει ἕκ τοῦ μέσου answers to our “put out of the way,” either in the meaning, “remove, exclude from a community,” as 1 Cor. v. 2, or in that of “kill,” as 2 Thess. ii. 7; Isaiah lvii. 2.—Προσηλών, from ήλων, a nail, is not found again in the New Testament.)

Ver. 15. St. Paul at length closes all this grand and profound description of the person of Christ and of His work with the idea, that the Redeemer is the victor over all the hostile powers of the universe, that He leads them all in triumph as vanquisher of them on His cross. As to its form, this idea is subjoined independently as an asyndeton, since, after the foregoing καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν κ. τ. ὁ, no new tempus finitum could be expected without a conjunction. For
the rest, here too the representation is still so conceived that God is the subject; He, the Father, performs everything through Christ. Therefore, too, at the end of this verse, the reading ἐν αἰτίᾳ is to be preferred to ὣν αἰτίᾳ. Now, that the ἀρχαὶ and ἐξουσίαι, which are here spoken of, are not the Jewish magistrates and theocratic powers, nor the good angels either, is admitted by all later interpreters and convincingly shown; it can only be the evil powers, which, as κοσμοκράτορες, have in their power men who are in sin. (See at Ephes. vi. 12.) Along with sin itself the princes of this world, the devil and his angels, are also conquered. But the comprehension of the ἀπεκδύσαμενος is difficult, especially on account of the remarkable reading τὴν σάρκα, which F.G. and several of the Fathers defend. Were that reading correct, the accusatives τῶς ἀρχάς καὶ τῶς ἐξουσίας must have been joined with what follows, and then ἀπεκδύσαμενος τὴν σάρκα would refer to Christ's laying aside the flesh in death. But intrinsic and extrinsic arguments are against that reading. The critical authorities for the omission of τὴν σάρκα preponderate, and the origin of that addition is easily explained by the foregoing προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, upon which it seemed necessary for death to follow. Besides, St Paul would certainly have said ἀπεκδύσασθαι τὸ σῶμα of the death of Christ, instead of τὴν σάρκα. If, therefore, we have to connect ἀπεκδύσαμενος τῶς ἀρχάς καὶ ἐξουσίας, it is a question, how then might the verb ἀπεκδύσασθαι have to be taken? With reference to the θρίαμβευέων following, the evil spirits must be imagined as warriors in their armour (see Ephes. vi. 12), against whom Christ fights and deprives them of their armour, strips them of it. The meaning answers to the words εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἐργα τοῦ διαβόλου, I John iii. 8. To the mention of the vanquishing the evil powers is further subjoined the making an open show of them by means of the triumph. In the ἔδειγματισοῦσε we are not to see something different from the θρίαμβευέων, on the contrary, the former is effected in and through the latter. As, therefore, St Paul at 1 Cor. iv. 9 represents himself and his fellow apostles as a spectacle for the world, and for angels, and for men; so is Christ's victory in an exalted form a spectacle for the universe, in which He leads the conquered in triumph. The expression of this powerful image is still further strengthened by the trait, that it is Christ's cross in which this
triumph is accomplished. For the ἐν αὐτῷ is to be explained with a reference to ἐν σταυρῷ (ver. 14), as indeed many MSS. read too here ἐν σταυρῷ or ἐν ἐξιλῷ, in which, to be sure, merely explanations of the ἐν αὐτῷ are to be seen. The cross of Christ, the apparently shameful destruction of His work, was therefore the victorious triumph over all His enemies, over the visible and over the invisible ones. (Δευνματίζω stands here = παραδευνματίζω, Matth. i. 19; Heb. vi. 6. The conception of the showing at the triumph necessarily passes into that of an exposing to shame. Ἐν παρακολούθῃ here expresses the publicity. [See John vii. 4, xi. 54.] But, of course, the idea of publicity is to be understood here spiritually, "Jesus led them in triumph before the eyes of the world of spirits," not before the physical eyes of men.—On ἑκαμβενεια see 2 Cor. ii. 14, where, however, it stands, as in the Hebrew voice hiphil, for triumphare facere. Here it is = πομπενεια, triumphum agere.)

Ver. 16. After this long discussion on the person and work of Christ (vers. 9—15), St Paul, connecting his discourse again with ver. 8, returns to the direct combating of the Colossian false teachers. Their Judaizing character stands out here quite unmistakably, inasmuch as St Paul calls on his readers not to let themselves be frightened by their requiring a strict fulfilment of the ceremonial ordinances of the Mosaic Law. It is questionable, however, whether these Judaists preserved the ordinances of the Old Testament pure, or mixed them with Rabbinio-Talmudical additions. The latter is the more probable from the whole of their character. As they practised a rigorous asceticism (ii. 23), they will not have confined their decisions as to meat and drink to the Law of Moses (in which, besides, no ordinance was given in regard to drinks), they will rather, as may be supposed, have avoided all indulgence in meat and strong drinks, like the Roman ascetics (Rom. xiv.) At the root of this ascetic tendency there lay, probably obsourelly, the opinion that matter is the cause of evil, which must have led as a natural consequence to Docetism. But in the commencement of heresies we do not find the perverted fundamental ideas developed as yet in all their consequences; we have, therefore, no right on that account, viz., because they lived ascetically, to suppose Docetism in the Colossian false teachers. The Roman ascetics were no Docetes either. As to therest, the feasts denote here the well-
known three great feasts of the Jews, the Passover, Pentecost, and the feast of tabernacles. The new moons were, according to Numb. xxviii. 11—15, solemnized as great and joyful festivals. See details in Winer's Encyclopaedia, vol. ii., pp. 176, ss. (Κρύετος has here, as at Rom. ii. 1, the meaning of a rejecting, condemning, judging.—The εν μέρει μητρός, instead of the simple εν, is difficult. The reading εν ημέρα is plainly a mere refuge from the difficult reading μέρει, and can make no pretension to recognition. The attempts of earlier interpreters to get its special meaning out of the phrase, according to which μέρος was to be taken as segregatio or participatio, are recognized as untenable in the latest times. Εν μέρει is used adverbially in profane writers also, in the sense, "with respect to, with regard to," and that is here perfectly suitable. [Compare the passages in Wetstein and Loesner belonging to this subject.]—The plural σαββάτων is not to be referred to the sabbatical years and the years of jubilee, there is only to be seen in it, on the contrary, a plural form which is used along with the singular form, as Matth. xii. 1, Luke iv. 16, show. Compare in the LXX., Ex. xx. 10; Levit. xxxiii. 32; Numb. xxviii. 9, 10. Also 1 Macc. ii. 38, Josephus Arch. i. 1. 1.)

Ver. 17. Those institutions of the Old Testament (it refers to all that precedes, not to σάββατα merely) are designated as σκιά τῶν μελλόντων (μελλόντων is a totally needless conjecture). The antithesis to σκιά is formed by σῶμα, shadow and substance are opposed to each other; that substance is in Christ and the New Testament which He established. For the latter, therefore, the images (or shadows) serve no longer. To imagine in the σῶμα the spiritual body of Christ, the Church, was possible only through a total misapprehension of the passage. Nevertheless, the genitive Χριστοῦ has some difficulty in it, (the article before the word is according to the best MSS. to be expunged), one expects the nominative ὁ Χριστός, a reading which is, however, found only in authorities of no importance. But the genitive here denotes property: "the substance is Christ's, i.e. it comes from Him, is derived from Him." Of course, Christ and His operation on the human race are precisely τὰ μελλόντα, of which the Old Testament with its symbolical-typical character forms the σκιά. That Christ was already come, and the Church already established, at the time that St Paul wrote this, can cause no difficulty as regards the
choice of the term μελλοντα, for that is chosen from the point of view of the Old Testament, seen from which the New Testament was the future. But, as to the more accurate idea of the σκια, there is, of course, couched in the antithesis to σωμα, first of all the idea of the nothingness, unsubstantiality of the shadow, compared with the body, which forms it; but, further, also the analogy between shadow and body. The latter, the body, portrays itself accurately in the shadow, which presents an image of the body; thus too the Old Testament is a shadow (image) of the New, a μορφωσις της άληθείας (see at Rom. ii. 20), as symbol and type of Christ, of His works, and of His Church. Thus, Heb. viii. 5, the tabernacle is called σκια των ἑσποραντων, and, x. 1, the Law is called σκια των μελλοντων ἀγαθων, to which εικα των πραγμάτων is an antithesis. According to this, it is clear that it cannot possibly have been St Paul's meaning that the institution of the Sabbath by Moses is to hold good even in its outwardness for the Christian Church; this is surely, like all the rest in the Old Testament, to be reckoned among the σκιαι των μελλοντων. According to Rom. xiv. 5, 6, there seems to have been no particular festival-time at all in the ancient Church, their whole life was just one feast in the joy of the Holy Spirit. It is true, inasmuch as in the outward Church of the present the idea of the Church of Christ is only approximately realized, certain regulations and ordinances become a necessity, but a Christian celebration of Sunday is still ever to be distinguished from the slavish service of the Old Covenant. This is well shewn by Rücker, in the essay "of the Lord's day," Erlangen, 1839. 8. in opposition to Liebrut's work, "of the Lord's day and its celebration."

Ver. 18. The Colossian false teachers had, however, other considerable errors also, besides their outward adherence to the ordinances of Moses;¹ they pretended to a deeper knowledge of divine things, which, with an apparent humility, was accompanied by an excessive pride. Against this tendency, which may easily infect nobler minds thirsting after truth and knowledge, St Paul gives the

¹ It has already been observed in the Introduction to this Epistle (§ 2, ¶ 2), that these words might be taken as if these false teachers here designated were different from those described in ver. 16; their identity is not expressly asserted, but the analogy of the heretics in the Pastoral Epistles makes their identity in the highest degree probable though.
most emphatic warning. The word καταβρασθενειν, which the apostle here employs, is not found in the New Testament except here. Jerome thinks he discovers in it a Cilician peculiar to St Paul, but without reason, as Demosthenes, Polybius, and others, use it. Βρασθενείν is to adjudge the prize of combat (βρασθεῖν), therefore, in general, "to determine, decide;" accordingly, καταβρασθενείν is used = κατακρίνειν in the sense of, "to decide against any one," properly, "to deprive him of the prize of victory." That meaning suits here perfectly well, as the μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβρασθενέτω here answers to the μὴ τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω in ver. 16. Hesychius and Suidas had already explained the expression thus with reference to our passage. Since St Paul makes use of the figure of the βρασθεῖν elsewhere too (Phil. iii. 14), after the comparison of the Christian life with the running on the race-course, we can here keep to the proper meaning of the word καταβρασθενείν, so that the sense of the words is this: "let no one (by leading you astray to his false doctrines) rob you of your prize," that is, draw you away from Christ, and consequently from your eternal happiness which rests on Him. The four participles which follow describe more accurately the nature of these heretics, and depend therefore, one and all, on μηδεὶς καταβρασθενέτω. By that construction then the interpretation is already refuted, which Steiger, among others, has once more defended, according to which θέλων is to be taken adverbially here, in conformity with the well-known Greek use of the word, according to which it stands for "willingly." For Bähr justly observes that each of the four participles must clearly have its independent meaning, as each has its particular appendage. Besides, no combination gives a natural sense, if θέλων is taken adverbially. Connected with what follows, the words would necessarily mean, "willingly walking solemnly with humility and angel-worship." But Steiger himself confesses that it is unsuitable to take ἐμβασθενείν in the sense "to walk in state," and besides, then the ἀ μὴ ἐώρακεν does not join on well. But neither will θέλων give a suitable sense when connected in an adverbial acceptation with what precedes: "let no one willingly rob you of your prize," gives an incongruous idea; for, even if we turn the words so, "let no one have a pleasure in robbing you of your prize," the awkwardness surely remains, that, according to this, the words would contain an admonition to the heretics,
whereas, according to the meaning of the whole passage, it is intended to be addressed to the *Colossians exposed to the being led astray*. But just as little does the interpretation recommend itself which takes ἰδέαν in the usual meaning of the word, so that the sense is this: "as he (the misleader) will designedly deprive you of your crown in false humility and angel-worship." For how the angel-worship of others is to contribute to deprive the Christians in Colosse of their prize is not to be seen. The only correct method is, certainly, according to Hesychius and Phavorinus, whom most of the interpreters have followed, especially, among the latest, Bähr, Böhmer, and others, to take ἰδέαν here = εἴδοκὼν: "who takes a delight in humility and angel-worship." ἰδέαν is often found so in the Hellenistic dialect, with ἐν following after the analogy of the Hebrew יִֽאַֿדַּאֶה. (See the LXX. at 1 Sam. xviii. 22; 2 Sam. xv. 26; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Ps. cxvi. 2.) It is clear from the nature of the case that the ταπεινοφροσύνη here is a pretended humility; elsewhere the term is used of true humility, as Ephes. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; 1 Pet. v. 5; and also Col. iii. 12. *Here,* on the contrary, and at ver. 23, that simulated humility is denoted by it, which appeared in those heretics coupled with conceit and pride. But as to the second phrase, ὀργεκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων, the more ancient interpretations, according to which the genitive was taken subjectively, may be viewed as sufficiently refuted. (See Bähr on this passage, p. 209, ss.) The translation: "worship, which is taught by angels," or "which the angels practise," i.e. worship in angel-like holiness, plainly does not suit the context. Bähr observes with justice that the defenders of this interpretation seem to be compelled to it only by the circumstance that they had interpreted the names ἐξουσίας, ἀρχής, κ.τ.λ., in what precedes, not of angels, but of human powers. The οὐ κρατῶν τήν κεφάλιν, i.e. Christ (ver. 19), leaves no doubt that the discourse is here of a worship dedicated to the angels, which many of the Gnostic sects practised, and for that purpose clothed themselves with secret names of angels. (See Iren. adv. haer. i. 31, 2, ii. 32, 5; Tertull. de præscr. c. 33. Josephus also relates similar things of the Essenes [B. J. ii. 8, 7.]) With this interpretation the conjunction of "false humility" and "angel-worship" is also made distinct; that is to say, the false teachers in the worshipping of angels strove after a humility false in so far as they thought they durst not venture to approach
the supreme God Himself; in like manner as the adoration of angels and saints in the Romish Church is usually justified. Thus Chrysostom had already observed of this false humility: εἰς τινες οἱ λέγοντες οὐ δεῖ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προσάγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἐκεῖνο γὰρ μείζον εστιν ἢ καθόμας. (See Böhmer’s second excursus after his isagoge.) This self-chosen and invented worship is called afterwards in ver. 23 ἑθελοθησκεῖα, which term also there again appears in conjunction with ταπεινοφροσύνη.

In the words following: ἐὰν μὴ ἐόρακεν ἐμβατεύων the critical authorities vary exceedingly. First of all, F.G. read οὐκ instead of μὴ, but A.B.D. leave the negative out altogether. This latter reading Lachmann has adopted, and it seems, in fact, to deserve the preference; for it is easily understood how people thought they were obliged to add a negative to ἐόρακεν, which was afterwards expressed at one time by οὐκ, at another by μὴ, but scarcely how one could strike out the existing μὴ. For, without a negative, the ἐόρακεν is to be taken ironically; it refers to the pretended knowledge of the heavenly world on the part of the heretics which they gave out that they possessed through visions and intuitions. The readings ἐοράκαμεν and ἐοράκατε have but inconceivable authorities for them, and their origin is also explained by the assumption that ἐόρακεν was the original reading, which some copyists endeavoured to make intelligible to themselves by referring the contemplation to the apostle or to the readers. The word ἐμβατεύων is not found again in the New Testament, but is often found elsewhere in the sense, “to go, intrude, into something,” and that, too, both of God, inasmuch as He penetrates the world and the hearts of men, and of men in relation to God and divine things. (Compare the citations in Bähr on this passage, p. 212, ss.) The meaning, “to go in state, incedere,” which Erasmus ascribes to the word, is founded on a false etymology. In meaning the ἐμβατεύων here answers to the term κενεμβατεύων, which, however, is read here only by a conjecture. It means εἰς τὰ κενὰ βαθὺς, i.e. to strive to find out empty things. The words blame, therefore, the pretended possession of profound wisdom which these false teachers boasted of. For the relative ἐὰν refers to the angels and to all which is taught concerning them. They thought they had penetrated into the depths of the spiritual world by means of spiritual contemplation, εἰκὴ φυσιούμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν νόσ τῆς σαρκὸς
Their conceit had not even a show of truth, when taken along with the absurdity of their pretended secrets as to the realm of spirits, they were so conceited εἰκῆ without ground or reason." (See as to φυσιούθαναι 1 Cor. iv. 6, v. 2, viii. 1, and passim.) The combination νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς is found only here. The apparently contradictory form of the combination is chosen purposefully in order to mark the unnaturalness of their condition of mind. That which should govern the flesh, the νοῦς, is itself in those false teachers sunk under the power of the flesh, their νοῦς is become σαρκικὸς. (See my opusc. theol., p. 157, not.) For the rest the σὰρξ here is not to be understood of gross fleshliness, for the Colossian false teachers were actually given to a rigorous asceticism (see ver. 23). The term rather marks the entire ungodly tendency of the natural man, even when it exhibits itself in more spiritual forms.

Ver. 19. Finally, St Paul closes the description with the words: καὶ ὁ κρατῶν τῆς κεφαλῆς, i.e. Χριστὸν. It has already been remarked in the Introduction to this Epistle that the οὐ κρατεῖν cannot be understood as if the false teachers had not known of Christ at all, nor wished to know of Him. Had that been the case, St Paul would have been able to spare all his polemics. The κρατεῖν is to be taken here as = κατέχειν, the metaphor, as is shown by what follows, being derived from the members of the body, which remain members of the organism only by preserving their living connection with the head. Those false teachers, therefore, if they do not adhere to Christ, are by that very circumstance separated from His Church, and by that from His Spirit and Life. The heretics in Colossi wished, it is true, to be Christians, but they placed the angels on a par with the Redeemer, did not consider Him as the only way and the truth, and by that course had already pronounced their own sentence,—they were apostate members. The succeeding words describe the relation of the whole body, i.e. of the Church, to Christ, more in detail. (St Paul writes εἰς οὐ with reference to the person of Christ, which is the head.) As to the rest the passage exactly answers to the one already explained at Ephes. iv. 16, on which see the Comm.

Vers. 20, 21. To this warning description of the perverseness of those heretics, the fundamental features of whose character fit the sects of all ages, so far as they pursue a similar direction as to knowledge, St Paul now annexes an apostrophe which sounds as
if the heretics themselves were members of the Church, or as if the Christians in Colossæ had already lapsed to the false doctrine altogether. But the remaining contents of the Epistle fit neither of those suppositions. The defenders of that false philosophy (ii. 8) cannot possibly be conceived as to be found in communion with the Church; they rather wish to draw the Christians in Colossæ out of that into their circle. But, again, the laudatory description (ii. 5), and the continuing exhortation (ii. 8, 16, 18) not to let themselves be led astray, do not suit the supposition that the Colossian Christians were already led astray. We can therefore in ver. 20 see only a form of representation, "Ye who are dead with Christ to the worldly elements, why do ye again set up worldly ordinances?" stands for the idea: "ye incline that way; ye are on the point of again setting up worldly ordinances." In order to bring the inconsistency of that proceeding more home to them, St Paul represents their apostasy as already accomplished. With reference to the description ii. 11, 12, St Paul assumes that the Colossians, as true believers, are with Christ dead to the world in general, and therefore to the worldly elements also, i.e. to the Law in its outward literal mode of conception. (Cf. on ii. 8.) It must therefore appear as something contradictory if those dead to the world, like those who still live in the world, wish again to set up ordinances which are in accordance with the στοιχεῖον τοῦ κόσμου. (Ver. 20. as to ἀποθανόντες ἀπὸ see on Rom. vii. 6, Gal. ii. 19.—Ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ forms the antithesis to ἀποθανόντες. The discourse, therefore, is not of physical life in the world, but of life in the element of worldliness which forms the antithesis to the element of Christ. —Δογματίζει is not found again in the New Testament. It means "to set up an ordinance," in the middle, "to let an ordinance be imposed on one." But in the "letting be imposed on one" is couched the acknowledgment of the righteousness of the ordinance; consequently, the giving one's self up to error. In the choice of the word is couched a clear reference to the δόγματα in ver. 14. The imperative form μὴ ἀψῆ, κ.τ.λ. unmistakeably expresses the character of the δόγματα.) In ver. 21 the μηδὲ γεώργ points back to the laws as to meats, which were spoken of in ver. 16, but the two expressions μὴ ἀψῆ and μηδὲ θέγγοι present a difficulty because of their being synonymous. One of those two expressions might be referred to the touching of corpses and other
things which the Mossical Law pronounces unclean, but how then is the other to be taken? It has a certain plausibility if one (as, to name one, Böhmer still does,) refers the μη δψη to the prohibition of marriage. For ἀπειροθα is used per euphemismum for matrimonial cohabitation. It is so in 1 Cor. vii. 1, and according to 1 Tim. iv. 3 the false teachers in Ephesus, who were akin to those at Colosse, decidedly forbade marriage. The ascetic tendency of the Colossian false teachers (see ver. 23) also well suits the assumption that they abstained from marriage. But, as any certain intimation on that point fails us in this Epistle, just as it is with regard to the docetic tendency, it might be too bold though to found on the word δψη alone a fresh and so important a feature of the heretics in Colosse. In the passage 1 Tim. iv. 3 St Paul designates the opposition to marriage as a devilish doctrine. From that it is scarcely probable that he would have here touched merely thus by the way on that error. To me it is most probable, as Bähr, too, supposes, that the three synonymous words are to express together the formal tendency of the false teachers, and their reception of the Law according to the letter only, looking for holiness in the outward instead of the inward, although the individual prohibitions have not, and cannot have, a definite separate reference to different objects.

Ver. 22. The succeeding words admit of being interpreted in two ways, either so that the reasons of the false teachers for their ordinances are given in them, or so that they contain condemnatory words of St Paul in respect of those worldly ordinances. In either case by κ. πάντα are to be understood, not the prohibitions themselves, but the different objects to which the prohibitions of the heretics, μη δψη, κ.τ.λ. refer; but φθορά, in the case of the reference to the false teachers and their defence of their ordinances, is to be interpreted of eternal perdition; in the case of the reference of the words to St Paul and his argumentation against the false teachers, on the other hand, of the physical destruction of the prohibited substances. In the former case the meaning of the words would be this: “all which, by the use which is made of them after the commandments and doctrines of men, lead to everlasting perdition, and therefore must be avoided.” This interpretation is defended by Storr and Böhmer. In the case of the other acceptance the words would have to be translated
thus: "all which are destined to destruction through using them, i.e. which, according to God's design, are meant to be used," whence it follows, that God's will can not possibly be that we should avoid them, and that the avoiding these objects is not capable of producing any holiness. In this acceptation the words ἄπορχησις have a parenthetical character; the words following, viz. κατὰ τὰ ἐνταλμάτα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, allow, according to it, of no immediate connection with what comes just before, but contain a more accurate definition of the δογματιζομένου κ. τ. λ., in that they designate the δόγματα of the heretics as mere human inventions. For this interpretation Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Fathers of the Church, had already declared themselves, afterwards Luther, Grotius, Bähr, Steiger, and others. The decision between these two interpretations is difficult, as many things are in favour of both, and yet no other is admissible. For if Ambrose, Augustine, and some later interpreters, wished to explain the words so that ὅ would refer to the δόγματα themselves, and the sense would be this: "which commandments, if they are followed, all lead to man's destruction,"—it is decidedly against that plan, that ἄπορχησις cannot be taken as fulfilment of the commandments. Or, if one chose in ἄπορχησις to insist on the meaning "abuse," in opposition to the right use, in the sense: "all these things tend through the abuse of them to the destruction of men, but not through the right use of them," that thought would lead into a totally different circle of ideas. For St Paul is not occupied with the question as to where the limit between use and abuse of meats and other outward things passes, but is combating the whole principle of the heretics again to enslave under a new Law the faithful released from the old Law. There remain to us, therefore, only those two above-given interpretations, which are equally admissible, grammatically viewed. Nevertheless, though, the context might seem to be in favour of the supposition that confutatory words of St Paul are to be seen here, and not defensive utterances of the heretics. For, in the first place, the whole passage is not of the sort to admit of our supposing that St Paul wished here to draw attention to the way in which the false teachers defend their opinions. But, in the second place, it is unsuitable to consider the words: κατὰ τὰ ἐνταλμάτα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων as utterances of the heretics, for then
according to that, the apostles themselves and all true believers would be the ἀνθρώποι here. From the phrase in ii. 8, κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, it is in the highest degree probable that the analogous one in this passage is also meant to characterize the ordinances of the false teachers as mere human conceptions, in opposition to the divine doctrines of Revelation. Besides, we find the same idea, that meats and such outward things are, as being empty, without influence on the moral life, elsewhere also in St Paul (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 13, with 1 Tim. iv. 4, Math. xv. 11); it is, therefore, not improbable, that he has laid a stress on it here too. It is clear then, according to this, that St Paul is far from reckoning the Mosaical ordinances, as such, among the στοιχεῖος τοῦ κόσμου, it is only in the purely outward acceptation and arbitrary transformation of them by human teachers that he treats them as human ordinances. The terms ἐντάλματα and διδασκαλίαι seem to differ here, so that the ἐντάλματα are the definitely-conceived commandments or prohibitions, and the διδασκαλίαι the principles on which those are grounded. (See Math. xv. 9; Mark vii. 7.) In consequence of this our interpretation of the words: ἢ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τὴν ἀποκρήσει, the interpretation of ver. 21 above given is then also confirmed. We declined in the μὴ ἀψυ the reference to the rejection of marriage, ver. 22 shows that such a supposition is inadmissible for this reason also, that otherwise the repulsive meaning would arise, that the woman, according to God’s design, exists for the purpose of being used by man. (Ἀπόκρησις is not found again in the New Testament. The proper meaning of the word is “use, wear and tear,” i.e. the consuming by use. It is, however, used, even by good writers, without that reference, as completely = χρήσις. Thus by Polybius i. 45, 2, xvii. 15, 9.)

Ver. 23. St Paul, in finishing off this warning against the false teachers at Colosse, again recapitulates in conclusion the preposterous notions in them. They have but an apparent wisdom in their hypocritical worship, in their affected humility, in their self-invented and self-imposed mortification of the flesh; in short, all is human and earthly in them, not divine and heavenly, as in Christ’s doctrine. The ἄτυχα connects itself quite simply with the preceding phrase, ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίαι; but the construction of the ἐστι is questionable. Some have proposed to connect
it with the οἷκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, or even with πρὸς πλησιμονή τῆς σαρκὸς, as, to name one, Bähr still does. But Böhmer justly observes, that then ἔστι would stand altogether unsuitably, not only separated from the words with which it was especially connected, but also unduly separating ἄτιμα from the λόγον ἔχουσα belonging to it. In the second place, the connection ἔστι πρὸς πλησιμονή τῆς σαρκὸς would, it is true, afford a good sense, but, when connected with οἷκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, a less suitable idea appears: "these precepts are not exactly in a certain honour, have no direct significance." Who can persuade himself that St Paul would have declared himself so indefinitely as to doctrines which he elsewhere blames so severely? The τιμη along with τιμῇ leaves no doubt that the foregoing ἄφεδρα σώματος is meant to be more accurately defined by it. The only correct combination, for which too most interpreters by far have from the first decided, is that in which ἄτιμα ἔστι λόγον μὲν ἔχουσα σοφίας are united. For λόγος is here, as it occurs also elsewhere, an antithesis to δύναμις or ἄληθεν (1 Thess. i. 5, 1 John iii. 18). The μὲν is to be explained by the suppressed antithesis, "but not the substance of wisdom." By means of ἐν now the particulars are introduced in which this show of wisdom after the opinion of men declares itself. With regard, first, to the ἐθελοθρησκεία out of the three points produced, that word is found in the classics not at all, and in the later Christian writers it is, we may presume, to be considered as borrowed from St Paul. We are, therefore, in respect to the interpretation of that word, which we may presume to have been formed by St Paul himself, obliged to have recourse to its etymology. But the numerous words compounded with ἔθελω have a twofold meaning: in them is couched the idea either of what is voluntary, self-made, or of what is simulated, self-pleasing. Accordingly, ἐθελοθρησκεία may mean "a self-invented, arbitrarily-contrived worship," as a contrast to that ordained by God. Thus Suidas explains the term: ἐθελοθρησκεία by ἵνα θελήματι σέβει τὸ δοκοῦν. Or ἐθελοθρησκεία may mean "a self-pleasing, hypocritical, worship," as Theophylact explains ἡ ὕποκριμονεν ἐνθαξεία ἐν τῇ θρησκείᾳ. The parallel passage, ver. 18, decides for this latter explanation, as in our passage a reference to the θέλων ἐν θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων there is, no doubt, to be seen. In the same passage (ver. 18) is also found the second of the three particulars, in which the appa-
rent wisdom of the false teachers shows itself, the ταπεινοφροσύνη, i.e. here too the hypocritical humility, which acts as if it dares not draw near to God. And thirdly, in fine, the ἀφειδία σώματος is mentioned, i.e. the rigorous asceticism which deals unmercifully with the body as a dungeon of the soul. This is especially adapted to create the appearance of wisdom and godliness, because it represents itself as an abnegation of what is earthly, as a mastery over the desires, and yet such self-chosen abnegation is exactly calculated to make the old man strong. For the more accurate defining the preposterousness of this asceticism, St Paul further adds: οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, where only σώματος can be supplied. These words point to the doctrine; that to the body, as the temple of the Holy Spirit, a relative honour and care, determined by its position towards the spirit, are due; that, therefore, the withholding that care is not holiness, but sin. The connecting the last words: πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός with the directly foregoing οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινι, and the referring them to the satisfying of the body, as if the sense were: “without showing the body a certain honour, so that the flesh is satisfied,”—cannot possibly recommend itself. Neither does πρὸς admit of that connection, nor is it conceivable that σάρξ and σῶμα should have been exchanged so. Even the difference between those two words leads to the opinion, that σάρξ has here the ideal meaning, “sinful nature,” by which means then this pertinent meaning of the words, which is also one that accords with experience, arises, that outward abnegation and chastising of the body may yet afford nourishment to sinfulness, in that they, as proceeding from one’s own strength, beget conceit and pride in the mind. All abnegation possesses value only when it is done for Christ’s sake, and therefore is born of faith in Him and love to Him. (See Comm. on Matt. x. 39.)
II.

PART SECOND.

(iii. 1—iv. 18.)

§ 3. GENERAL ETHICAL PRECEPTS.

(iii. 1—17.)

Several critics and interpreters have wanted to connect chap. iii. 1—4 also with what precedes, and do not therefore admit the hortatory part to begin before ver. 5; but the ἐκρατεῖτε οὖν in ver. 5 is nothing but the resumption of ver. 1, inasmuch as what is here predicated is predicated there, only otherwise expressed, viz. from the negative point of view. Thus, in point of fact, one directly seeks what is above when one mortifies what belongs to the earth. Therefore the hortatory part must also begin with the third chapter.

Vers. 1, 2. With a retrospective reference to ii. 12, St Paul conceives his readers, and in them all believers, as risen with Christ. Now, as the Redeemer who rose in the body ascended into heaven also in the body, because He belonged to the earth no longer, so also must those risen in the Spirit tend towards things above with all their thoughts and in all their ways, for there is the magnet which attracts them to it, viz., Christ, who sits at the right hand of God, i.e. takes part in the Government of the world, who is therefore the Lord, and, as such, must alone be the object of aspiration. (On the formula καθησάμεν ἐν δεξίῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ see the remarks in the Comm. on Matt. xxvi. 62, ss.—In the antithesis τὰ ἄνω and τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς the idea of the τὲ κάτω alone is to be sought
in the latter phrase; but, no doubt, heaven and earth, above and below, have here their own reference to the opposition of the spiritual and pure to the material and impure [compare ver. 5]; without, however, placing the origin of evil in matter as such. It need not be observed that it is improper at τὰ ἄνω to supply ἄγαθα, for the ὤ, which is connected with it, obliges us to keep the locality of heaven in mind. Between ζητεῖν and φρονεῖν here the distinction is to be supposed that φρονεῖν denotes the state in which ζητεῖν has passed over altogether into the disposition.)

Vers. 3, 4. The necessity of aspiring after the heavenly and pure is further grounded on the assertion that they as dead (in the old man) can no more be turned towards earthly things, in that the receptivity for such is wanting. Their real life is now hidden with Christ in God; all their aspirations, therefore, must be directed towards divine things. The life of believers is called hidden, inasmuch as it is inward and the outward does not correspond with it. The believer bears a twofold life; outwardly poor, weak, and in shame; inwardly, filled with divine life and heavenly peace, as St Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 8, ss., so beautifully describes it by a series of antitheses. In like manner the Redeemer, dying on the cross the most despised and unvalued of all men, was at the same time the victor over all the foes of the spiritual world. (See on Col. ii. 15.) The κεκρυμμαι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ is not to be flattened by the translation, "is known to God alone." God is rather conceived of here as the element into whose essence the faithful, like Christ Himself, are taken up, and in which they are concealed, so that no one can penetrate into this element of life, as God is called and is φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον (1 Tim. vi. 18.) But when Christ shall manifest His glory which He has of the Father (John xvii. 24), viz. on the day of His appearance, then the faithful too will be made manifest with Him in their glory which Christ has given them (John xvii. 22). As such a one who has communicated His glory to us, which is His essence and life itself, Christ is called ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν, Christ in us. The expression must, therefore, not be resolved into the more general idea: "author of our life." No, He is the element itself of the spiritual life. He lives in us and we in Him. (In ver. 4 the reading ζωὴ ἡμῶν is, with Griesbach, Lachmann, and others, to be preferred, on the authority of C Π E F G to the usual one ζωῆ ἡμῶν. As at the end of ver. 4
the second person again appears, ἧμῶν might easily be changed into ὑμῶν.)

Ver. 6. The exhortation of vers. 1 and 2: τὰ ἀνω ζητεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς φρονεῖτε, is now specially extended to individual points. But with the phrase τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, i.e. τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς, "what belongs to the earth," (which is expressed at Tit. ii. 12 by κοσμικὰ ἐπιθυμίαι), there is here conjoined the image of the body, and its separate members, as which the natural man is represented with his lusts and desires. Those members, that is, lusts, which are here named are only cited by way of example, for ver. 8, where the exhortation is again taken up with another turn of expression, mentions other forms of sin. But it is remarkable that, whereas in ver. 8 it was ἀπεθάνετε, St Paul here writes νεκρῶσατε, for the mortifying presupposes a life of the being to be mortified, and therefore is opposed to the being dead. In a similar way St Paul describes in the Epistle to the Philippians, iii. 12, ss., the state of the faithful as completed, and yet directly afterwards says, "not that I am perfect, but I follow after." For at first St Paul views the believer quite objectively, in the manner that God looks on him in Christ, but afterwards he views him in his subjective position, viz., according to the actual degree of sanctification, which is determined by the gradual extension, through all the functions (members) of the man, of the life of Christ which is rooted in his inmost being. Both modes of expression are necessarily grounded on St Paul's doctrine of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ and the λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην. (See the Comm. on Rom. iii. 21.) What is here expressed by means of νεκρῶσατε τὰ μὲν ἐστὶ at Gal. v. 21 denoted by σταυρῶν τὴν σάρκα σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. As to the rest, it is understood at once that the mortification of the old man is not to be achieved in one's own strength, but in the strength of the Holy Spirit. The exhortation is accordingly to be thus taken: "leave through fidelity room in you for the Spirit which mortifies the old man!" Among the members to be mortified St Paul names, above all, the carnal sins in their various shades, because, proceeding from them, all the rest of the tendencies of human nature are poisoned. Whilst πορεία denotes the natural gratification of sexual desire, though without marriage, ἀκαθαρσία refers to the unnatural and secret sexual sins. On the other
hand, πάθος refers to the disposition towards lust, to the inward lasciviousness of desire, as it is put together with ἔπιθυμία, 1 Thess. iv. 5. By the ἔπιθυμία κακῆ being here further distinguished from πάθος it is presumable that the special manifestation of the more general πάθος in a definite case and for a definite object is intended to be denoted. But the explanation of the expression πλεονεξία is rendered difficult partly by its combination with nothing but sins of lust, partly by the addition ἦτε ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρεία. However, it has been already proved at Ephes. iv. 19, v. 3, 5, that St Paul uses the word πλεονεξία also of greediness, in so far as it declares itself as pampering of the flesh, and by that means promotes lust. The designation of the πλεονεξία as εἰδωλολατρεία is sufficiently elucidated, as has been observed already on Ephes. v. 3—5, by the circumstance that St Paul at Phil. iii. 19 conceives the pampering of the flesh as making a god of the belly. In the passage 1 Thess. iv. 6 πλεονεκτεῖν is used of adultery as a sin in which an inroad on the property of one’s neighbour is seen; that aspect of the idea is of course inapplicable here on account of the addition ἦτε ἐστίν εἰδωλολατρεία. The article might seem to be in favour of the supposition that πλεονεξία is intended here to designate another vice different from the former expressions, unless the supposition that it has been put on account of the ἦτε which follows were more natural.

Vers. 6, 7. In order to make the incompatibility of such sins of the flesh with the life in Christ as plain as possible, St Paul causes it to be observed that the wrath of God comes upon unbelievers on account of these sins, therefore that every one who chose to give himself up to those sins would sink down to the level of the unbelievers. The reminding them of their previous state before their conversion to Christ is intended to assure them (the readers), from their own experience, of this truth, that God’s wrath comes upon those who commit such sins, and to be an argument for the necessity of ridding themselves of them. (With verse 6 compare Ephes. v. 6, with verse 7 Ephes. ii. 2.—The ἐν οἷς is not to be taken as masculine, for surely they even yet lived among the οἰκος τῆς ἀνθρεθείας as converts, but as neuter: “in which vices ye too once walked.” The ξην, however, bears such a relation to the περιπατεῖν that the former denotes not physical life, but the
tendency of the man, the disposition, from which the conduct proceeds as the consequence.—Ἐν τούτων is with Lachmann on the authority of A.B.C.D.E. to be preferred to ἐν αἴτων.)

Vers. 8—10. Hereupon the apostle again takes up the ethical exhortation of verse 5, but in another metaphor: "Now (νῦν is a designation of the state of conversion, an antithesis to ποτὲ in verse 7—compare Ephes. ii. 11, 13) do ye too lay aside every sinful thing." The expression ἀποτιθέναι, like the ἀπεκδύσασθαι (verse 9), has for its foundation the figure of a garment, which is laid aside when soiled in order to be put on again fresh and clean. (Compare verse 12, ἐνδύσασθε ὄν ν. τ. λ., and at Rom. xiii. 14, Col. ii. 11.) Here too neither completeness nor accurate order was kept in view by St Paul in the enumeration of individual sins which are to be laid aside. (On ὅργῃ and θυμός see Rom. ii. 8; Ephes. iv. 31.—The very general term κακία has been already interpreted by the Fathers here as μηνιακία, i.e. as malice, in the sense of revenge, desire to resent injuries.—Βλασφημία is here, as at Ephes. iv. 31, not the speaking impiously of God, but all abuse and railing, as an effect of anger.—Αἰσχρολογία, lewd discourse, see on Ephes. v. 4.) Now in verse 9 all that is to be laid aside is called ὁ παλαιός ἄνθρωπος, from whom sins proceed as πράξεως. (See on this point the remarks on Rom. vii. 21—23.) But the act of laying aside the old man has for its indispensable correlative the putting on the new man, because the creative efficiency of God, which calls for the latter, alone mortifies the former at the same time. (See at Ephes. iv. 23, 24.) As to the description of the new man, as the renewal of God's image, in verse 10, compare the remarks on the parallel passage Ephes. iv. 23, 24. In the εἰς ἐπήρωσιν scil. τοῦ Θεοῦ the knowledge of God in its true meaning is represented as the result of the renewal alone; without Christ man is without God (Ephes. ii. 12; 1 John ii. 23.) Ἡ εἰκών τοῦ κτίσαντος αἰτῶν, i.e. the image of God, the Creator of man, is, according to Col. i. 15, Christ, ἡ εἰκών τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; after Him, as the prototype of man, the νῦς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος.—man is created.

Ver. 11. With a retrospective glance at the Judaistic heretics in Colosse St Paul sets up as the peculiarity of the new man, of the Christ in us, the circumstance that the national distinctions of race acknowledged and prevailing apart from Christ, and the
religious differences occasioned by the same, have in Him no
longer any meaning; in the Gospel and the kingdom of God,
which the former establishes, Christ alone has any value. We
have already spoken about the sense of this passage at the parallel
one Gal. iii. 28, 29. St Paul does not mean that every distinction
whatever between the opposites just adduced is abolished (for he
immediately [at verse 22] allows the distinction between slave and
freeman to subsist even for believers, and at Gal. iii. 28 even man
and wife are named among the antitheses which no longer hold
good in Christ); but that in a religious point of view all nations,
all ranks, have through Christ a like access to God, whereas in the
Old Testament the people of Israel had a more immediate position
towards God than the heathens. And yet, even in the New Testa-
ment, in the outward Church the position of the nations is not
equal. According to Rom. xi., even after the appearance of Christ
the election remains to the people of Israel, and the apostles, for
instance, could not have been chosen from the Gentiles also. St
Paul, therefore, means especially to describe the inward condition
alone of the renewal; no outward distinctions hold good as to that
condition, no one is shut out from this favour by his outward posi-
tion, nothing in outward advantage can supply the place of, or bring
about, the renewal; Christ alone operates it in an equal measure
in all, and thereby unites all to unity in Himself. Bähr finds in
this passage the assertion, that there is no distinction in Chris-
tianity between esoteric and exoteric religion; but the discourse in
the main is only of these points, that the entrance into the Church
stands open to all, that all may experience regeneration; all that
extends beyond that can only be derived from this passage by de-
ductions. (The ἄνακακανόσθει above, it can therefore be paraphrased by ἐν τῷ ἄνακακανόσθε.—As to ἐν see at
Gal. iii. 28. While Ἐλλην and Ἰουδαῖος designate the national
distinctions, περιστρφή and ἀπεριβολία refer to the religious dif-
fERENCE. But it is difficult duly to define βάρβαρος and Σκῶθης.
That is to say, St Paul seems to intend to conjoin four pairs, ac-
cording to which one would think that of those two terms also the
one is meant to designate the condition of higher cultivation, the
other that of barbarism. But the attempts to get the signification
of the "civilized man" out of the βάρβαρος are to be entitled total
and complete failures. We must, therefore, give up the distribu-
tion of the words into four pairs, and look on βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, as merely an amplification of the meaning of ἀκροβυστία according to local differences, so that the sense is this: "in Christ there is no distinction between circumcised and uncircumcised, be they even Scythians, yea even Scythians, as the rudest among the barbarians, be they slaves or freemen." The concluding words: τὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πάσῃ Χριστῷ are remarkable, compared with the simple, easily understood, πάντες ἐστὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, Gal. iii. 28. But the words, "Christ is all and is in all," are meant to declare the very same thing which the ἐστὶ in the Epistle to the Galatians expresses, viz. that Christ, without the exclusion of any nation or any sect, unites all in the Church, and so through His indwelling in all is Himself all, on which account also the community of the faithful is called in plain terms Christ. [1 Cor. xii. 12].)

Ver. 12. To the negative exhortation (verse 8) to lay aside the old man is now subjoined in ver. 12 the positive one to put on all virtues; for the virtues named are again only named by way of example. Now Ephes. iv. 32, on which compare the Commentary, corresponds with this passage of ours. St Paul, however, does not base this exhortation on the Law, which demands holiness, but on the recollection of the grace just described, of which God has thought even them worthy. As elect and saints they must also walk worthy of their calling. (Compare Ephes. iv. 1.) The phrases, ἐκλεκτὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιος καὶ ἡγαπημένος, describe the Christians as the spiritual Israel, which is formed of all peoples and nations. Thus in Isaiah xlili. 1 Israel is called ἡγαπημένη ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς μου, and the Christians also are called in the same way ἡγαπημένοι in the same relation. (See on 1 Thess. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13.) As to the combination σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ see the similar passage Luke i. 78, where σπλάγχνα ἐλέους is read.

Ver. 13. In a parenthetical clause St Paul lays particular stress on the virtues named last, gentleness and long-suffering, in relation to the mutual forbearance of Christians, which might be needful for the Christians in Colossae, as the disputes on account of the false teachers had called forth much bitterness. Ephes. iv. 32 forms the parallel passage to this one also; we refer to the remarks in the Commentary on that passage. (For μομφὴν D.E. read μέμψιν, but F.G. ὥργην. The latter reading is at all events a mere correction of the copyists; but μομφὴ is with respect to
meaning quite equivalent to μέμψις. Only on account of the extrinsic authorities the form μομφή is to be preferred.—On the authority of A.D.F.G. ὁ κύριος is to be with Lachmann preferred to Χριστός.

Ver. 14. Finally, St Paul, again connecting his discourse to the ενδύσασθε (verse 12), names, as the virtue to be striven after above all, love, in which all else is comprised, which alone is of an eternal nature (1 Cor. xiii.), because God is love itself (1 John iv. 8.) In the closing words of the verse the reading ἐνόητος is certainly an alteration of the copyists, from their erroneously making use as a parallel passage of Ephes. iv. 3, where the discourse is of the unity of the Spirit. (Compare the remarks in the Comm. on Ephes. iv. 3.) But for ἶτις A.B.C.F.G read δ, and Lachmann has, in accordance with his maxims, put that reading in the text. But, without regarding the many extrinsic important testimonies, the less supported reading ἶτις might yet be preferable here on intrinsic grounds. For δ could only refer to the ενδύσασθαι of all those virtues, but that this personal act should be called a σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος is extremely improbable. But copyists might easily think in their own minds that love alone was placed too high by such a designation, and that St Paul had meant to call all the virtues named jointly a σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, overlooking the fact, that ενδύσασθαι, the leading idea in what precedes, denotes a subjective activity. But love is here called σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος, inasmuch as it bears all the single phases of the perfect life, all virtues included, as it were bound up, in itself. In like manner the Pythagoreans called friendship σύνδεσμον πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν. In meaning, the phrase ἡ ὀνάπη πληρωμα νόμου, Rom. xiii. 10, is equivalent. This mode of taking the phrase is preferable to the reference of it to the unity of the faithful among themselves, in the sense: love is the complete bond, i.e. it unites all completely one with another (thus Erasmus, Melanchthon, Michaelis, and others interpret), because that unity is first spoken of at ver. 15. For that reason too Ephes. iv. 3 cannot be considered as a real parallel. But Storr's opinion that σύνδεσμος τελειότητος stands for τελειότητι itself, as, according to his erroneous view, in Acts viii. 23 σύνδεσμος ἀδικίας denotes ἀδικία itself—needs no refutation.

Ver. 15. To the exhortation in verse 12 ενδύσασθε οὖν a fresh
one is here annexed, but in the form of a wish, as the nature of peace requires. For no one can acquire peace for himself, though it follows, according to God's ordinance, the honest striving after sanctification; in that respect St Paul might rank what follows among the moral exhortations. But peace, i.e. the sentiment of peace, manifests itself in the heart, as the centre of personality, and the depository of feeling. All believers are called to the enjoyment of this peace, as they, being united in one body, the Church (which Christ fills with His Spirit of peace), are to have a share in its life. Then St Paul begs them to let the inward peace be also outwardly perceptible in meekness. (A.B.C.D.F.G. read Χριστόν for the usual εἰρήνη Θεοῦ, which reading the later critics have justly preferred. Christ, who is Himself our peace [Ephes. ii. 14], creates peace also in us.—Bραβείεν is, first of all, "to dispense the prize of combat," then, generally, "to decide something, to determine, regulate, rule." Philo often uses it, and as entirely = βασιλείεν. The proper meaning does not admit of being here retained without violence, but the idea: "let peace reign in your hearts," is very suitable; in it is couched the wish that peace may make itself known to the feelings so powerfully, that all other disturbing feelings may be subdued by it, may, therefore, be unable to raise themselves to dominion in the mind.—In the ἐκλίθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι a studied brevity is to be seen: "to which peace ye are called, inasmuch as ye all, united in one body, are to be made partakers of His life and peace." [See at Ephes. ii. 16.] The form εἰκάριος is not found again in the New Testament. The word has the twofold meaning of "grateful," and "gentle, mild," comis, blandus, synonymous with εἰκάριος. The latter meaning suits the context better, for the summons to gratitude appears very incoherent here, it has no place till the end of the section at ver. 17; but the summons to let the inward peace be also outwardly perceptible in mildness and meekness is connected very properly with what precedes. In Ephes. iv. 32, the clause γίνεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους κρηστοί answers to this passage.)

Ver. 16. To these admonitions for the subjective wants of individuals an exhortation is now annexed with reference to the public worship of God in teaching, preaching, and singing. But what is necessary on this passage has already been observed at the parallel passage, Ephes. v. 19, 20, which coincides with it almost word for
word. Only in regard to the words at the beginning, which are peculiar to this passage, one may doubt whether the dwelling of the word of Christ is to be understood of its inward indwelling in the heart, or of the dwelling of the word of God in the Church. In the latter mode of taking it ἐν ὑμῖν would have to be taken = ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. However, I prefer with Böhmer the former acceptation, and consider these words as the necessary presupposition to the διδάσκειν ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ κ.τ.λ. For there only, where Christ dwells in the heart with the fulness of His word, i.e. of His divine power, which, as such, is the principle of truth and pure doctrine, can a successful teaching and preaching take place, and spiritual songs be pleasing to God. (The readings ταῖς καρδίαις and Θεῷ are, with Griesbach and Lachmann, to be preferred to the readings of the text. rec., τῷ καρδίᾳ and κυρίῳ.)

Ver. 17. With the summons to do and say all in the name of Christ and in gratitude to the Father St Paul concludes this general ethical part. On this passage, too, what was needful has been already observed at Ephes. v. 20. Only, with regard to the construction, one may be doubtful whether πάντα is a resumption of the πᾶν with ποιεῖτε supplied, or is to be taken adverbially, so that εὐχαριστοῦντες is immediately subjoined: “in all that ye do thanking God.” Storr has defended this latter view of the passage. But it clearly has something very forced in it, especially because then πάντα must be taken quite arbitrarily = πάντοτε; we therefore decide, with Bähr and others, for the former one.

§ 4. SPECIAL MORAL PRECEPTS.

(iii. 18—iv. 19.)

In ver. 18—21 exhortations to wives and husbands, children and parents, which have been already treated of by us in the Epistle to the Ephesians in a more detailed form, are in a few short words pronounced. (Here also, as in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the subordinate parties always precede those who are above them. See at Ephes. v. 21, ss., vi. 1, ss.) Only in ver. 19 the phrase μη πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτὰς, which is peculiar to this passage, requires a remark. The word πικραίνω occurs in the
physical sense at Rev. viii. 11, x. 9, 10. Here it is used in the ethical sense. In the construction with προς it is to be taken passively: "let not yourselves be exasperated against them." (Lachmann has adopted the reading παραπροβεβλισθείτε in ver. 21, but it is, no doubt, to be derived from the parallel passage Ephes. vi. 4; here ἔπεσεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν is to be taken for the original reading.)

Chap. iii. ver. 22, to chap. iv. ver. 1. The exhortations to the Christian slaves and their masters which follow have also been already discussed at the parallel passage, Ephes. vi. 5—9, which corresponds almost literally with this one and to the remarks on which in the Commentary we refer.

Vers. 2—4. Before St Paul passes on to the purely personal relations (ver. 7, ss.), he utters a further exhortation to prayer, and particularly an invitation to intercession for himself, and for a blessing on his labours. With this passage, too, the parallel one, Ephes. vi. 18, ss., is nearly connected. We refer here also on the whole to the remarks there made in the Commentary. We only add to them what follows. In ver. 2 the preceding προσκαρτερεῖτε is more accurately defined in the γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῷ. By the "watching" here no physical keeping awake is to be understood, but the spiritual wakefulness of the inner man, without which no perseverance well-pleasing to God in prayer is imaginable. But by ἐν εἰγνατίᾳ the more general προσευχή is again more accurately defined. The Christian's prayer can never, in the consciousness of the grace which has beset him, be anything else than a thanksgiving. In ver. 4 Lachmann reads δια' ὑμῶν for διὰ τὸ διὰ, on the authority of B.F.G. No doubt the διὰ might easily have been changed into δια, on account of the position of μυστήριον; but the majority of the copies is for δια, for which numerous MSS. also vouch, reading δια. As to the rest, the δεδεμέναι points to the fact that this Epistle was written during a captivity of St Paul's; by which, as was shown in the Introduction, we have to suppose the first Roman one.

Vers. 5, 6. The exhortation to a prudent walking (ver. 5) is found word for word at Ephes. v. 15, to which we refer in like manner; only the restriction of the περιπατεῖν ἐν σοφίᾳ to the non-Christians (πρὸς τοὺς ξύω) is peculiar to this passage. Ephes. iv. 29 is parallel with ver. 6, as to matter, but not as to form. What is here expressed positively is there worded negatively, thus: πᾶς
λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μη ἐκπορευέσθω. The χάμρα, which is here recommended in conversation, points most to the necessity of meekness; the ἄλατι ἡρτομένος, which follows, denotes, on the contrary, the animating, and seasoning, quality, which should mark the speech of the believer at the same time, in order to be able to give every one such address and answer as becomes a child of God. At Mark ix. 50 it is said just in the same way, ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλατος. (See at Matth. v. 13.)

Ver. 7—9. For these verses, too, Ephes. vi. 21, sq., is a parallel passage. As we have already remarked in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Tychicus brought both Epistles, that to the Ephesians and that to the Colossians. According to ver. 9 Onesimus, of whom particulars will be noted in the Introduction to the Epistle to Philemon, was in Tychicus' company. (Ver. 7, εν κυρίῳ refers not merely to σύνδονος, but also to διάκονος and ἀδελφός.—Ver. 8. The reading γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν has such important authorities for it that one cannot hesitate to prefer it. Bähr thinks, as the same thing is put in vers. 7 and 9, it would be inconceivable that St Paul should again have said in ver. 8 that he would communicate to the readers news of himself, it would be more reasonable to suppose he had here expressed the wish to hear through Tychicus something of the readers too. But that very consideration might easily cause the alteration of the original text. But it is also found, on more accurately viewing it, that there is no mere repetition in these verses; for in ver. 7 St Paul announces that Tychicus will make communications to the readers as to his state; in ver. 8 he remarks that he has sent that, his fellow-labourer, expressly for the purpose of making those communications; finally, in ver. 9 he speaks not of himself alone, but of all that was occurring in Rome where St Paul wrote; here, therefore, he gives news of the circumstances of the Church in general, not of himself alone.)

Vers. 10, 11. St Paul first transmits greetings from some fellow-countrymen, born Jews Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus with the surname of Justus. Aristarchus has already been named Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, and his name occurs also Philem. ver. 24. Marcus' name often occurs in the Acts, especially xii. 12, 25, xv. 37, 39, and he is also named by St Paul at Philem. ver. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 11. —We see by this passage that he was connected with Barnabas,
which throws light on the relation of the two to one another according to the accounts of the Acts. (See the Comm. on Acts xv. 37.) It does not admit of being determined what the addition περὶ οὗ ἐλεύθερον ἐντολὰς refers to. It is to be presumed that the "commands" had proceeded from St Paul, but it is wholly unknown through whom they had come to the Colossians, and what they spoke of. Mosheim's opinion, that those commands must have referred to the reception of Marcus if he came to Colosse, on account of the words immediately following, is very improbable, because then neither would the plural (ἐντολάς) have been put, nor, further, would the repetition of this command have been obliged to have followed, if the Colossians were already informed that Marcus was coming and was to be well received. The third Jewish Christian from whom St Paul sends a salutation, Jesus, with the surname Justus, is known no further. Here we find that the name of Jesus is still given to other persons also; in later times it becomes a custom in the Church, out of reverence towards the Redeemer, to use that name no more. It seems striking that St Paul designates these three alone as his fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, as he in ver. 12 and 14 transmits salutations from several more, who must surely, therefore, have also been in his circle. We may presume, however, that the μόνοι refers to the preceding δυτὶς ἐκ περιτομῆς, so that those three are designated as the only Jewish Christians who approved themselves to him as fellow-workers for the kingdom of God and so became a comfort unto him. For the majority of the Jewish Christians were his opponents, and prepared grief for him instead of comfort. (Ver. 11. παραγγελία is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. Plutarch often uses the term in the sense "comfort.")

Vers. 12, 13. To this are annexed salutations from Gentile Christians, and first indeed from Epaphras, the apostle of the Colossians and of the Christians of the neighbouring cities of Laodicea and Hierapolis. (See on Col. i. 7.) Epaphras was a Colossian born, (ὃ ἐφ ὑμῶν), and therefore took an especially hearty interest in his nearer and more remote countrymen. This interest declared itself by earnest prayer for them, which St Paul compares with a spiritual wrestling and a labouring. The object of this supplication of Epaphras is the spiritual welfare of the Christians there: they are, as being perfect, to stand fast (with an allusion to the
fight which the faithful have to wage in the world), and as πεπληρομένος εν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. It is very intelligible that the copyists stumbled at these words; in fact A.C.D.F.G. read πεπληροφορμένοι, which Lachmann, in accordance with his critical principles, was obliged to receive into the text. But precisely the circumstance that πεπληροφορμένοι is better and more easily connected with the στήτε τέλειοι makes it more probable that it is a correction of the copyists. If one, however, compares Col. i. 9, where it is said: ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὴν ἐπήρμωσιν τοῦ θελήματος, it is conceivable how the term πεπληρομένοι could be placed by St Paul along with τέλειοι, for the being filled is only a closer definition of perfection, as the being filled with the Holy Ghost is meant, by which alone man is made perfect. The words εν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ connect themselves quite naturally with πεπληρομένοι. For the acception which Bähr defends, “by means of or by virtue of the whole will or decree of God,” is unsuitable, because πᾶν does not fit that interpretation. The whole will of God has unmistakeably its reference to the ideas of perfection and of the being filled, in which it arrives at fulfilment. The connection of πληροφορία with εν has no difficulty in it; at Ephes. v. 18 we read πληροφορεῖ εν πνεύματι, and one does not see why that passage should be translated, as Bähr wishes: “through the Spirit.” Being filled by or through anything presupposes a being in that element, and accordingly πληροφορία is directly united to εν. But if the πληροφορία here is referred to the will, the view, according to which God’s will is one with His spirit and being, is the foundation of it; “to be filled with the whole will of God” is to be made capable through the Spirit of executing the will of God in every relation. As to the two cities which St Paul names in ver. 13 as near Colosse, both are situated in Phrygia. Laodicea, situate on the Lycus, was a very considerable city, to the church of which one of the seven Epistles in the Revelation is addressed. (See Rev. iii. 14.) Hierapolis was only a small place, but has become celebrated in the ancient history of the Church by means of the well-known bishops of the church there, Papias and Claudius Apollinaris.

Vers. 14, 15. Further salutations are delivered from Luke and Demas. It has been doubted whether the Luke named here is the Evangelist; for it has been said St Paul meant by the desig-
nation of ἵατρός to distinguish this Luke from the well-known Evangelist, whom St Paul at 2 Tim iv. 11 designates by no addition. But Bengel has already pertinently remarked in opposition to this, that in an Epistle to Timothy the person of Luke required no closer designation, but it did in an Epistle to a whole church, among the members of which might be many who did not know Luke more nearly. Therefore, not to multiply without reason the persons of the same name mentioned in the Bible, we take this Luke for the Evangelist. As to the rest, tradition differs with respect to his calling: it is well-known that he is also designated as a painter; however, the two might be conceived as combined in him, the physician's art and love for painting, if the account of his works as a painter did not belong to too late a time to be able to lay claim to credibility. (See Winer's Encyclopædia in vo.) Demas, contracted from Demetrius, is brought in without an epithet of praise; as he, according to 2 Tim. iv. 10, again fell in love with the world, and forsook St Paul, it is not improbable that St Paul even then was not quite satisfied with him, when he wrote to the Colossians. St Paul delivers salutations to the brethren of the neighbouring church in Laodicea, and especially to Nymphas and the Christians who joined the church which was in his house. (See as to ἐκκλησία κατ' ἐκατον the Comm. on Rom. xvi. 5.) As to the rest, this man is not to be supposed in Colossæ, but in Laodicea; at Colossæ Philemon had the church in his house (Philem. ver. 2). True, there might have been several places of meeting in Colossæ, but the way in which St Paul proceeds (ver. 16) to speak of the church in Laodicea makes it extremely probable that Nymphas belonged to it and not to the Colossian church. (The reading αὐτῆς for αὐτῶν, which B. defends, Lachmann has received into the text; A.C read αὐτῶν. This latter reading is alone explained by the hypothesis that αὐτῶν was joined to ἐκκλησίαν, and referred to the brethren in Laodicea. Ἀυτῆς, however, certainly arose from the circumstance that Nymphas was erroneously looked on as a woman's name.)

Ver. 16. In what follows St Paul further orders, that, when this Epistle has been read among the Colossians, it may be imparted to the Christians in Laodicea also, and vice versa. We see from this that the Epistles to churches were not merely read by the presbyters, but also publicly read out in the congregations.
bible even of private Epistles from apostles (see Tit. iii. 15), if they happened to offer a more general interest. In the passage 1 Thess. v. 27 St Paul expressly declares that his Epistle is to be read out before all of the brethren. As to the rest, the reciprocal communication of the apostolical Epistles, recommended in this passage, explains the rapid spread of the writings of the New Testament into all the churches of the then existing world, and their great multiplication by means of copies. The regular public reading of the writings of the New Testament in the congregations of the faithful first came into use much later of course; in the beginning they used only the books of the Old Testament for that purpose.

The closing words of this verse alone occasion difficulty. The reading ἐν for εἰκ is supported by too few vouchers for it to be taken into the text. But the words ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκ Λαοδικείας admit of being variously explained. However, the context clearly shows that the discourse here is of an Epistle of St Paul's; we must not, therefore, at those words think of an Epistle of the Laodiceans to St Paul; but St Paul himself never was in Laodicea, therefore the words cannot express either: "read also that Epistle which I have written from Laodicea." The εἰκ is rather chosen by St Paul only because he put himself in the position of the Colossians receiving the Epistle. It came from Laodicea for them, it therefore was for them ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκ Λαοδικείας, though it was addressed by St Paul to the Christians in Laodicea. But is the Epistle here meant that to the Ephesians, which might be intended for Laodicea also as an encyclical Epistle, or is it to be considered as distinct from the Epistle to the Ephesians, and therefore as lost? This question has already been decided in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians, to the effect that we have to consider the Epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned here by St Paul as a lost writing of his, and by no means as identical with the Epistle to the Ephesians. For, even were it supposed that the Epistle to the Ephesians was, as an encyclical Epistle, addressed to the Church in Laodicea conjointly with that in Ephesus, still the charge of St Paul here in ver. 16 scarcely admits of being interpreted of that Epistle, for, considering the near affinity of the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, St Paul could have no special occasion further to refer the Christians in Colossae expressly to the
Epistle to the Ephesians. Surely too the same Tychicus brought both Epistles; according to that it is hardly probable that the circular Epistle could have come so quickly from Ephesus to Laodicea that St Paul could, in his Epistle to the Colossians, designate the same as already to be found in Laodicea.

Ver. 17. Nothing justifies us in placing Archippus, to whom St Paul gives a special charge, in Laodicea. Philem. ver. 2 shows that he was in Colosse; from the putting him together with Philemon and his wife it is possible that Archippus was Philemon's son. The exhortation given him here is most simply explained on the assumption that the ecclesiastical office, the worthy fulfilment of which St Paul here recommends, had only a short time previously been committed to Archippus. For, after the way in which Archippus is named at Philem. ver. 2, one cannot well imagine any blame of him here. Inasmuch, however, as the exhortation is bestowed on Archippus through the medium of the church, it reminds him more forcibly of his obligation towards the church which he serves. Deductions as to the relation of the ministers towards their churches, and as to the dependence of the former on the latter, in the time of the Apostles, can in no wise be made from this passage. (In itself the διακονία might mean every form of ministry in the Church, but from Philem. vers. 1, 2 it is probable that Archippus was deacon in Colosse, while Philemon, his father, was bishop there. The ἐν κυρίῳ is to be joined with παρεξήγεσις, with which word it is especially connected by its position.—As to the construction of the proposition, it is far-fetched with Böhmer to combine ὑπέτετο τῇ διακονίᾳ, and to take the words in the sense: “fix your eyes on the ministry!” Ὑπέτετο occurs so nowhere in the New Testament except Phil. iii. 2. It is better, with Bühler and others, to suppose that ὑπέτετο is here used in the sense, “to be on one’s guard, to look before one,” which is usual in the New Testament. —With that acceptation the αὐτῷ is then, according to the Hebraizing style, redundant at the end of the verse, since διακονία depends on παρεξήγεσις.)

Vers. 18, 19. The salutation by his own hand shows that St Paul, as usual, dictated the Epistle; from Col. i. 2 Timothy was, we may suppose, the writer of the Epistle to the Colossians. The addition, however, is not merely an expression of St Paul’s love, but is also meant to be a mark of the authenticity of the Epistle. (See the
remarks on 2 Thess. ii. 2, iii. 7.) In the request: μνημονεῦετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν, we are not to suppose assistance in money, but aid by supplication; and that, too, partly by prayer for patience and other Christian virtues, partly for a speedy deliverance from bonds. That St Paul hoped for a speedy deliverance when he wrote this Epistle is clearly shown by Philem. ver. 22. True, there has already been above, Col. iv. 8, a mention of supplication for St Paul, but merely in respect to his labours in the ministry, not in respect to his personal situation.

The usual blessing: ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν finally closes the Epistle.
EXPOSITION

OF THE

EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.
INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. OF THE OCCASION OF THE EPISTLES BEING WRITTEN.

The city of Thessalonica in Macedonia was originally called Thermae; it first received the name of Thessalonica from Cassander. On the conquest of Macedonia by the Romans it was fixed on for the chief city of the second district of that province, and, as such, was the seat of the Roman authorities. The city now bears the name of Salonichi. As early as at the time of the Roman dominion there dwelt a numerous body of Jews at Thessalonica, as is even now the case, because, being situated on a fine gulf, it drove an extensive trade. To this body of Jews many Gentiles of consideration, especially women, had united themselves as proselytes. (Acts xvii. 1, ss.) Now, when St Paul, about the year 53, visited Thessalonica with Silas, on his second missionary journey, he made his appearance three Sabbaths one after another in the synagogue there, and showed from the prophecies of the Old Testament that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. The space of a few weeks sufficed to assemble the church in Thessalonica; a remarkable testimony to the divine power which manifested itself in the labours of St Paul. It is true, Schott thinks the three Sabbaths mentioned in Acts xvii. 2 related merely to his labours among the Jews, and that it is to be presumed St Paul had laboured a longer

1 See Tafel's historia Thessalonicae. Tubing., 1826.
time among the Gentiles. But, according to the representation of the Acts, the tumult of the Jews, which drove St Paul out of Thessalonica, followed immediately on the third Sabbath; there is no mention at all of special labours of St Paul merely among the Gentile inhabitants of Thessalonica. But when Schott lays a stress on the circumstance that St Paul worked at his craft in Thessalonica (1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 7, 8), which he did only where he meant to remain a rather long time, that objection is avoided simply by saying that St Paul seems, no doubt, to have had the design of remaining a longer time than usual in Thessalonica, but was hindered in doing so by the tumult. Finally, the manifold supplies, of which mention is made Phil. iv. 16, refer, not to the first sojourn of St Paul in Thessalonica, but to the later one, which followed upon his flight from Ephesus (Acts xx. 1, ss.) Among the dwellers in Thessalonica who became believers but few Jews were found (Acts xvii. 4: τινὲς ἐκ αὐτῶν [scil. Ἰουδαίων verse 1] ἐπεισόδησαν); on the other hand, however, a great number of proselytes, especially many women of rank. This success excited the envy of the Jews, who raised a mob which drove St Paul away. The rioters assembled before the house of a certain Jason, with whom St Paul dwelt (Acts xvii. 5); and, as they did not find St Paul and Silas, dragged Jason along with some of the brethren before the magistrates. In their malice they here accused the same of high treason, in that they acknowledged another sovereign than Caesar, namely Jesus. For the rest, one perceives from this charge, what the Epistles themselves confirm, that St Paul might in Thessalonica have represented Christ especially as the king of the kingdom of God which was to be expected. Now, in order to moderate the rage of the Jews, St Paul left the city, and went first to Berœa, then to Athens. His yearning after the Christians in Thessalonica, to whom he had only been able to devote himself so short a time, left him, however, no peace; he made, starting probably from Berœa, two attempts to return to that city, but in vain. (See 1 Thess. ii. 18.) There remained, therefore, nothing for him but to send thither Timothy at least from Athens (1 Thess. iii. 1, ss.) in order to collect information as to the state of things there. St Paul meanwhile betook himself to Corinth, and here Timothy, who brought with him the best accounts of the young church in Thessalonica, again met with the apostle. (Acts. xviii. 5, 1 Thess. iii.
6). Hereupon St Paul wrote from Corinth the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, taking notice of the reports of Timothy; its composition, therefore, falls within the year 54, or thereabouts. A very short time thereafter the second Epistle was also sent off. (Cf. the general Introd. to the life of St Paul, p. 24.) The Epistles to the Thessalonians are, accordingly, the earliest among the apostolical writings which have been preserved to us. They fall some years even before the composition of the Epistle to the Galatians. This view, which is all but generally received by the critics, has been in the last instance again victoriously defended by Schneekenburger (Klaiber’s Stud. for 1834, part i. p. 187, ss.) against Wurm, who thought it necessary to set the composition of these Epistles after the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem, only hinted at by St Luke, to be supplied in Acts xviii. 22. (Tübingen Journal for 1833, part i.) But Wurm has on his side again refuted with striking arguments Schrader’s (vol. i., pp. 90, sq., 164, sq.) utterly inadmissible hypothesis, supposing the Epistles to the Thessalonians to have been written during the three months’ stay of St Paul in Greece (Acts xx. 2, ss.), and Köhler’s, who places them even as late as the latest times of St Paul’s life, after the Acts (pp. 68, ss., 112, ss.).

Now the first Epistle to the Thessalonians contains, like that to the Ephesians, entirely general encouragements to the life in faith and in love. Only in the fourth chapter (iv. 13, ss.) mention is made of a particular point which affords an insight into the special condition of the church in Thessalonica, and at the same time was the occasion of the composition of the second Epistle. For, as we have already observed above, St Paul seems in Thessalonica to have especially preached Christ, as King of the kingdom of God, and the hope of the setting up of that kingdom on earth. This the Christians there had eagerly caught up, but not without misapprehensions and mistakes, as being inexperienced in that difficult field. Their view was directed more to externals, more to the outward glory of that kingdom, than inwardly to the moral conditions of participation in the same, and to its spiritual nature. It was indeed because of this outward relation to such hopes that it also happened that (as Timothy, we may suppose, had reported) the Christians were in anxiety whether their dear departed ones would not lose the kingdom of God, and those only come to the
enjoyment of it who should be alive at the coming again of the Lord. Now St Paul relieves them on that point by the assurance that the dead would rise first, and the living be, along with them, lifted into the air to meet the Lord. The time, however, of His advent did not admit of being fixed, as the Lord would come like a thief in the night. They should, therefore, continually expect Him, and be found watching as children of the light. However, these instructions by no means relieved the Christians in Thessalonica. On the contrary, symptoms developed themselves there which afforded reason to fear that the Church would become a prey to fanaticism. Probably St Paul was indebted for the knowledge of these errors to an Epistle of the Christians in Thessalonica to him. He therefore replied immediately in a second Epistle, in order to bring back those in error as soon as possible into the right way. For it is apparent from 2 Thess. ii. 2 that the believers in Thessalonica were thrown into great agitation, and that, too, not merely by pretended revelations and prophecies, but also by a fictitious Epistle under the name of St Paul, from which they thought they might gather that the coming of Christ was quite near. They had in consequence of these announcements given up their handicrafts and callings (2 Thess. iii. 11), and went about in a state of religious bustle but real idleness; a proceeding, of which, according to the first Epistle (1 Thess. iv. 11), signs had shown themselves even earlier among the Christians of Thessalonica. With regard to that error, as if Christ's coming were certainly immediately impending, (whereas in the first Epistle, v. 1, ss. it was only asserted the Lord could come at any time), St Paul now details the necessary conditions, without which that coming would not take place. It is particularly the appearance of Antichrist which must first precede the coming of Christ, but that is still kept back by something. Before, therefore, that something is removed the Lord comes not. Now this explanation (2 Thess. ii. 3, ss.) is extremely important, because it is the only connected communication of St Paul's on the end of the world. We therefore obtain by means of it a necessary complement to the doctrinal system of St Paul. But, if we compare these elucidations as to the end of all things with the intimations on that subject in the later Epistles, all that can be referred to the second coming of Christ and the kingdom of God in these latter loses its prominence in a remarkable way. St
Paul seems in later times not only to have given up the hope of living to see Christ's second coming himself (compare Phil. i. 23 with 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17), but also to have allowed in his teaching the proposition of the approach of the outward kingdom of God to retire into the background, and to have brought more forward the inward aspect of the kingdom of God. One need not hesitate to assume that the experience of what misapprehensions that doctrine, preached to the neglect of others, had given occasion to in Thessalonica, brought St Paul to this modification of his form of teaching. His dogmatical conviction remained unaltered, St Paul only modified his manner of propounding it according to the necessities of his mostly Gentile auditors, who, after such experience, justly seemed to him but ill adapted to receive that doctrine pure and unclouded. Without concealing it either in later times, he yet never permitted it to appear except as an appendix on the basis of the foundation of the new birth first inwardly laid down, in which form no further abuse of it was then to be apprehended.

§ 2. OF THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLES TO THE TESSALONIANS.

The first Epistle to the Thessalonians belongs to the few in the New Testament which have had the luck neither in ancient nor in modern times to be attacked with regard to their authenticity. Even the most ancient of the Fathers use it as an authentic apostolical writing, and the carping criticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has also been forced till now to recognize its collective contents as genuine. It has not fared quite so well with the second of these Epistles; for, though it was clearly in ancient times just as much recognized as the first, yet modern critics have thought they remarked in it something that seemed suspicious to them. No one has yet ventured, however, decidedly to deny St Paul's authorship of the second Epistle on account of those points. In fact, too, such weighty arguments have been brought forward in favour of the authenticity of it\(^1\) by the defenders of the same, and

\(^1\) See especially J. G. Reiche authentia poster. ad Thess. epist. vindicium, Göttingen 1832, and Guericke, Beitr. p. 32, ss.
such sufficient solutions of the doubts which were propounded, that we cite the chief articles on which they have attempted to ground the doubts only for the sake of noticing them. J. G. Chr. Schmidt (Library for Criticism and Exegesis, vol. ii. p. 380, ss.; Introd. to the New Testament, vol. ii. p. 256) expressed first and most decidedly the doubts as to the authenticity of the second Epistle, which De Wette (Introd. p. 229) repeats with but slight approbation. Now Schmidt insists on the following points: that there is no mention at all of the first Epistle in the second; that the latter is on the whole a mere repetition of the first; that the author of the second lays a stress on his being the writer of it, as if he had a distinct purpose in it (2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 17); that the mention of a fictitious Epistle (2 Thess. ii. 2) points to his own consciousness of having fathered an Epistle on St Paul; that St Paul himself could not possibly have thought of it, as he had written but two Epistles, that to the Galatians, and the first to the Thessalonians. (For Schmidt supposes an earlier composition of the Epistle to the Galatians.) But these arguments are plainly one and all without any significance, for, even if the Epistle be authentic, there is no absolute necessity for making mention of the first Epistle in it; the assertion that the second Epistle is a mere repetition of the first shows itself completely untrue; it is only the first chapter that is of similar purport, the second and third are altogether independent. Of a distinct purpose in the writer to designate himself as St Paul so much only is true that, on account of the fraud which was attempted with a supposititious letter, a mark of authenticity is added. But such an occurrence is by no means improbable, considering the great authority of St Paul; it does not come under consideration in that inquiry, whether he had already written many letters or but few; the only question is whether one might hope to attain an object by means of such a fiction under an apostolical name; that this was possible in Thessalonica is sufficiently vouched for by the attachment of the Christians there to the person of St Paul. But now the apostle had, no doubt, at that time even, already written many Epistles, only we by accident possess none of the earlier ones. De Wette's question: "Did the apostle even then think of writing many Epistles?" (Introd. p. 198) appears, accordingly, completely superfluous. The apostle's writing Epistles was a natural consequence of his position towards the churches, not an
act of reflection on his part; if he did not wish to drop all connection with them, there remained to him no other means, as they were in such remote countries that he could seldom visit them in person. Certainly the circumstance, which Schmidt lays a stress on, that in 2 Thess. iii. 17 a mark of the authenticity of the Epistles is given, which however is not found everywhere in the Epistles of St Paul that we have, would be important; but it actually is found in 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Gal. vi. 11, Col. iv. 18, Philem. v. 19; where it does not occur, either special circumstances prevailed, which made such a precaution superfluous, or the fear of the repetition of such frauds was lost altogether. Thus, then, but two arguments are left, by means of which Schmidt justifies his suspicion against the authenticity of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians with some show of reason. Firstly, the doctrine of Antichrist, as it is brought forward in 2 Thess. ii., is said to be not in St Paul's manner; secondly, such a contrast is said to exist with the first Epistle that it almost seems as if it were meant to excite suspicion against the same. But, even if the doctrine of Antichrist is not found further propounded elsewhere in St Paul's Epistles, it is not on that account against St Paul's doctrines. That could only be asserted if passages could be pointed out in the rest of his Epistles which were opposed to the doctrine of Antichrist. Such, however, are not to be found. St Paul's silence on the subject in his later Epistles is satisfactorily explained by the arguments already given above. But the other assertion, of contradictions of the 1st Epistle, looks somewhat comical by the side of the previous one, that the second Epistle to the Thessalonians is a mere repetition of the first. One does not rightly perceive how they can subsist side by side. But, overlooking that, what then is that contradiction said to consist in? Nothing more can be cited than that in the first Epistle (iv. 13, ss.) Christ’s second coming seems to be represented as just impending, whereas in the second (ii. 3, ss.) signs are given which must first appear. The two, however, are very easily reconciled by the assumption that St Paul imagined those signs might very quickly be realized. No doubt, experience has not established that, but surely St Paul also freely admits that neither he nor in general any man knows the day and hour of that coming. As long, therefore, as no more tenable arguments can be brought forward, we may be
perfectly easy with regard to the authenticity of the second Epistle as well.¹

§ 3. TRAIN OF THOUGHT IN THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The first and longer Epistle divides itself, as is usually the case with St Paul's Epistles, into two parts. The one reaches from chap. i. ver. 1, to chap. iii. ver. 13; the other from chap. iv. ver. 1 to chap. v. ver. 28. The former is more taken up with general considerations and the purely personal relations; the latter with special exhortations.

In the first part the first paragraph (i. 1—10) contains, after the greeting, a thanksgiving on account of the faith, love, and hope, of the Christians in Thessalonica, by means of which they had become patterns for all believers. The second paragraph then reminds the readers of St Paul's first appearance among them, how he in purity of intention had exerted himself only about their souls, and, supporting himself by his handiwork, had been a burden to none. He therefore praises God that they had received His word out of his mouth, and in joyful self-sacrifice like the churches in Judea endured willingly all the persecutions which came upon them (ii. 1—16.). After that, St Paul in the third paragraph expresses his longing to see them again, and remarks that he had made several attempts for that purpose, but had been prevented; however, he had felt himself obliged to send Timothy at least to them from Athens to strengthen them in the faith. Now he had received through Timothy the best accounts of them, for which he thanked God, and besought Him to advance them still more in the life of faith (ii. 17—iii. 13.)

In the second part of the first Epistle (iv. 1—v. 28), St Paul in the first paragraph gives exhortations to some Christian virtues (iv. 1—12), he then comes in the fifth paragraph (iv. 13—v. 11) to the

¹ It was not till after the completion of the work that Dr Kern's essay (Tübing. Magazine for 1839, part 2), in which the unauthenticity of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians is decidedly asserted, came to hand. However, this scholar founds his assertion entirely on his interpretation of the passage, ii. 1—12. We shall therefore show, in the exposition of the same, that those verses contain nothing which can lead us to infer for them a date after the time of the apostles.
question as to the latter days, and shows that the dead by no means lose the kingdom of God, but would be with the Lord at the same time as the living. With respect, however, to the time of Christ's coming St Paul remarks that the Lord comes quite unexpectedly, and therefore His coming must be constantly looked for; they should consequently walk like children of light, in order to be found waking and not sleeping (iv. 13—v. 11.). To this are finally annexed in the sixth paragraph some further exhortations, with the prayer that God may sanctify them in spirit, soul, and body. A blessing concludes the Epistle (v. 12—28.).

The second and shorter Epistle contains three paragraphs, the first of which (i. 1—12), after the greeting, begins with the remark, how much reason he, St Paul, has to praise God for the patient faith of his readers under all persecutions, by means of which God intended to make them worthy of His kingdom, on the coming in of which a punishing of the wicked, as well as a rewarding of the good, would take place. Therefore also he prayed continually for them, and wished that they might be filled with all good things, unto the glorification of the name of Christ. To this is subjoined in the second paragraph (ii. 1—17) the exhortation, not to let themselves be troubled by any prophecy, doctrine, or pretended Epistles, as if the day of Christ were already there; on the contrary, the man of sin must first be revealed, whose revealing is however withheld by something; when that is taken away, then he would appear, but Christ would subdue him and make known His whole glory, to a participation in which they too are called. He must, therefore, exhort them most urgently to take fast hold on his traditions, and would beseech God to establish them in every good word and work. Finally, in the third paragraph (iii. 1—18) St Paul calls on the readers to pray for him, in order to promote the dissemination of the Gospel, and to save him from the violence of the wicked. To themselves, however, he expresses the sure hope that they would act according to his exhortations, avoid all disorderly conduct, and especially after his example faithfully continue their outward labour; he threatens the disobedient with emphatical chastisement. A blessing concludes the Epistle.
§ 4. COMMENTATORS ON THE TWO EPISTLES.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians have been, proportionably, but seldom treated of separately; the reason of that fact is surely to be looked for in the circumstance that the contents of them have but little that is peculiar to them, and that the accounts of the last things, which alone impart to them their specific character, have till now exercised but small attraction on the learned interpreters. The most important separate works on these Epistles are by Turretin (Basileae, 1739), Krause (Frankfort, 1790), Koppe (3d Edit. by Tychsen, Göttingen, 1823), Flatt (edited by Kling, Tübingen, 1829), Pelt (Gryphiswaldiae, 1830), and Schott (Lips. 1834). A very copious and learned essay on all the interpretations of these Epistles is given by Pelt, Introd. pp. xxxv., ss.
EXPOSITION
OF THE
FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

I.
PART FIRST.
(i. 1—iii. 13.)

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE READERS.
(i. 1—10.)

Together with St Paul, Silvanus and Timothy send salutations. According to Acts xvi. 1, 19, they had accompanied him in his missionary labours in Macedonia; then they had at first indeed remained behind in Berea, but soon came after him to Athens (Acts xvii. 14, 15), whence Timothy was sent to Thessalonica, and met with St Paul in Corinth, as has already been detailed in the Introduction. One of the two is probably the writer of these Epistles, St Paul dictating to him, for, according to 2 Thess. iii. 17, St Paul had appended the salutation alone with his own hand. The addition: ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ in the salutations of both Epistles, for which at 2 Thess. i. 1 the fuller phrase: πατρὶ ἡμῶν is read, is peculiar. For in several Epistles ἐν Χρ. Ἰ., it is true, is found (Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1), not joined with ἐκκλησία, however, but with τοῖς ἀγίοις. But in no salutation except in those in these two Epistles do we read ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ. Now it is a question whether the ἐν refers to the salutation itself, for instance with χαίρετε supplied (Winer’s Gramm. p. 129),
or is to be joined to τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, with ὅση supplemented. The absence of the article τῇ is in favour of the former, in favour of the latter is the apostle's custom constantly to unite the formula ἐν Χριστῷ in the salutations with the persons, never with the salutation itself. The latter argument seems to me the more preponderating that it is quite unimaginable that St Paul should have left his beloved church in Thessalonica, whose faith he immediately rates so highly, without any epistle of praise; the absence of the article is then to be explained by the fact that ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Θεῷ κ. τ. η. is conceived as a collective idea. The last words: ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς—Χριστοῦ are wanting in B.F.G. and other critical authorities; however, for all that, even Lachmann has not ventured to strike them out downright, but has only included them in crotchets; without them the salutation would be altogether too bald.

Vers. 2, 3. In the usual words (Rom. i. 8, 9; Ephes. i. 16; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Tim. i. 3) St Paul first of all expresses his thanks to God for his readers, of whom he makes mention in his prayers, while he remembers their faith, their love, their hope. In 1 Thess. v. 8, these three Christian cardinal virtues stand in the same order as here, while at 1 Cor. xiii. 13 (see the Comm. there) love stands last. The latter collocation is more in accordance with the abstract style of contemplation, in the concrete Christian life hope appears as the last and highest, because it is the connecting link between this world and the world to come. Each of the three virtues has, however, an epithet, which are not merely, as Koppe thinks, to be taken paraphrastically, but are meant to represent those virtues in their practical exercise. They are ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, κόπως τῆς ἀγάπης, ὑπομονή τῆς ἐλπίδος. The two latter designations are intelligible of themselves. Κόπως τῆς ἀγάπης is meant to characterize love not as a mere beneficent feeling, but as a power which is active in self-denial and exertion; in the same way ὑπομονή τῆς ἐλπίδος describes hope as it is held fast and proved in combat with temptations to doubt. But the phrase ἔργον τῆς πίστεως is difficult. Several interpreters (to name some, CaLovius, Wolf, and others), took it so, that by it faith would be described as a work of God in the souls of men, as it is, no doubt, to be taken at 2 Thess. i. 11. But there is nothing in the context here to lead us to lay a stress upon this at all; the interpreter must
rather let himself be guided in the acceptation of the ἐργον τῆς πίστεως by the analogy with the other two virtues named here. As in those the proving them in real life is insisted on, so in the case of faith too that aspect is here designated. In 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7, the discourse is of a fight of faith, by which this passage is elucidated. For, though faith is a work of God in men's souls, just as love and hope are, yet man bears not an absolutely passive relation towards it; he has to fight against the faith-stifling power of sin in him and in the world. The phrase ἐργον τῆς πίστεως is meant to denote that independent activity in the life of faith. It must not, therefore, be taken as exactly = ἐργα τ. π., but it is to be translated: "labour or conflict of faith." For the effects, which proceed from the living faith maintained and increased by conflict, are particularly mentioned in love and hope. The whole passage, therefore, is meant to paint the independent manner in which the Christians in Thessalonica let Christianity become operative in them and know how to uphold it against all attacks of the world.—The genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is not to be joined with ἐλπίδος merely, as if the sense were: "of the hope of the speedy coming again of Christ," for this special utterance of hope cannot be alone spoken of here, since hope is taken quite generally, just as faith and love are; this genitive rather refers to all three virtues, in order to show that they are one and all derived from Christ and are instilled into man by His Spirit. The last words of the third verse, however, ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν, admit of no other construction than with μημονεύοντες; but the remembering, the thinking of, in God's sight is = to the εἰχαριστεῖν, or to the μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχών ἡμῶν, so that thus verse 3 is to be considered as only a detailed elucidation of verse 2.

Vers. 4, 5. That thanksgiving, continues St Paul, is derived in him from the knowledge (εἰδότες) that they are really elect, and that knowledge again is grounded on the matter of fact, that he, St Paul, was able to work so powerfully among them. The train of thought is, therefore, this: "I know ye are elect, for, where elect are, there God gives His Spirit also, in order to bring the election to completion." This certainly sounds quite predestinarian; but that St Paul does not mean personal self-activity to be excluded plainly appears from ver. 3, where he insisted on that very quality.
(See a more accurate account of the idea of election at Rom. ix.)
St Paul here means only to show how he, from the way in which
the Spirit operated in him at a certain place, drew a conclusion as
to the disposition of the persons there. Where it manifested itself
powerfully, argued he, there must be elect; where the contrary was
the case, he concluded the contrary. Thus at Acts xvi. 7 the
Spirit suffered him not to travel through Bithynia, because there
were no elect there. (Verse 4. ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ, or,
as it stands 2 Thess. ii. 13, ὑπὸ κυρίου, denotes the faithful as the
ture Israelites, as they are called in the Old Testament also. See
2 Chron. xx. 7.—Ver. 5. The τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν ἐκ Ἰησοῦ, by which the εἰς ὑμᾶς also is explained. See
at ii. 9. As to the antithesis of λόγος and δύναμις, or ἔργον, see Col.
ii. 23; 1 John iii. 18.—The words: καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐν
πληροφορίᾳ πόλεμον ἐξατάλημμα for the συνεχομένου ἰσχύος, and indeed
so that the Spirit renders the objective, the full assurance the subjective, side prominent.
As to πληροφορία, πληροφορεῖσθαι, see
Rom. iv. 21, xiv. 5, Col. ii. 2.—The last words: καθὼς ὀδηγεῖς
κ. τ. λ. appeal for confirmation to the knowledge of the readers them-
selves.—The ὁλοις, according to the context, to be taken: "in
what power and freshness of spirit." By δι' ὑμᾶς; all secondary
objects are excluded: "for your own sake, for the salvation of
your souls.")

Vers. 6, 7. St Paul goes still further in his praise of the Chris-
tians in Thessalonica, by laying a stress on their having become
imitators of himself, nay of the Lord even, in that they had received
the word with joy in spite of much persecution. Persecutions can
of course take place only when the faith has been embraced,—imita-
tion, too, necessarily presupposes regeneration; in the δέξασθαι
λόγου, therefore, the abiding reception, i.e. the holding fast what
has been received, is couched rather than the first reception of
the word. By means of this powerful, victorious, faith, adds St Paul,
the Thessalonians were become a pattern for all believers in the
whole of Greece; in many other churches many might by the per-
secutions have been brought to apostacy. (Ver. 6. On μίαντα
γίνεσθαι see 1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1, Phil. iii. 17. Λόγος stands preg-
nant in sensu for λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, τῆς ἀληθείας. Comp. ver. 8.—
The χαρὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου is opposed to natural, sensual, joy,
which cannot, of course, consist with the θλύψις. Christianity
makes no such Stoical demands. Spiritual joy does not even exclude, but includes, sorrow at the blindness of the men who persecute God in those that are His. See details at Matth. v. 11.—In ver. 7 B.D. read τῶν τῶν, which Griesbach has adopted; but the singular with Lachmann deserves the preference for extrinsic and intrinsic reasons. For the singular could easily be changed into the plural, as several persons are spoken of. Macedonia and Achaia are the two provinces into which Greece was divided according to Roman partition. Athens and Corinth belonged, according to that, to Achaia. See on Acts xix. 21.)

Ver. 8. A pattern for others the church in Thessalonica could have become only when their faith had been heard of; but this, continues St Paul, was the case, and to such a degree, that the report of the same had spread everywhere even (ἐν παντὶ τῷ πώρῳ), wherefore he (St Paul) had no need to say anything about it (viz. about their faith). According to this, there results as a climax in the sentence, that the whole world is put in opposition to the one country (Greece), to which also the collocation of the οὐ μόνον—διὰλά is alone suitable. But now it is understood at once from ver. 7, that not all men, but only all believers, in all countries are meant as those to whom the faith of the Christians in Thessalonica had penetrated. One might suppose, however, that even more was couched in this verse than the information that the knowledge of the life of faith of the Thessalonians had spread abroad even beyond the borders of Greece. The phrase ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν, it is true, cannot well be understood of the spreading abroad of the faith to other cities from Thessalonica as the starting point; if it were meant to express that, the words must have run: ἡ πίστις ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἐξελήλυθεν. It is clearly meant to declare only: the report of your faith has come to other believers. But it seems to be otherwise with the first clause: ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἐξηκταὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου. These words, viewed in themselves, can be translated: Christianity has spread from you to others, i.e. you are become efficient unto the further propagation of the Gospel. But that would be a statement of wider purport than the mere spreading of the fact that the Christians in Thessalonica continued so lively in the faith; besides, then the οὐ μόνον—διὰλά would not suit well. Moreover, it is not known historically that Christianity had spread further from Thessalonica as a centre. The course which Grotius, Storr,
Flatt, Koppe, follow for the solution of this difficulty, but which Pelt has already justly designated as monstrous, is clearly quite inadmissible. For they want to join "οὐ μόνον with ἐξήκρυται, and ἄλλα with ἐξελημένειν, so that ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ would merely stand parallel with Macedonia and Achaia. The train of thought appears quite simple, as soon as one only takes the ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐξήκρυται ὁ λόγος — ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἐξελημένειν. St Paul puts foremost the source of the report (ἀφ' ἡμῶν), and on account of the genitive κυρίου could not add ἡμῶν to λόγος, as he subsequently did to πίστις. But the word of the Lord is here to be taken subjectively, as the word received by the Christians in Thessalonica (ver. 8), so that the passage is to be rendered thus: "from you (i.e. your church) as a starting point, not only has your reception of the word of the Lord become publicly known in Macedonia and Achaia, but the report of your faith in God has also penetrated to all countries." (Ἐξηκρύθαι is not found again in the New Testament, but at Joel iii. 14, Sir. xl. 13, it occurs in the sense: "to resound, to sound."—Kal is wanting after ἄλλα in A.B.D.F.G., and is, no doubt, an interpolation, as it usually follows upon οὐ μόνον. Yet it is wanting also at Matth. iv. 4; Acts xix. 26. [See Viger, p. 522.] As to πίστις πρὸς see Gal. vi. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 4; Phil. ver. 5.—A.B.C.D.E.F.G. read εἴχεω ἡμᾶς for ἡμᾶς εἴχεω, and it is undoubtedly preferable. As to the rest, the ὤστε μὴ κ. τ. λ. is not to be understood: "so that I have no need here in this Epistle to say anything about it," but "so that I have no need anywhere in the course of my personal labours first to make your faith known by recommending it, for all know of it already.")

Vers. 9, 10. We need praise you to none, for men themselves have already related to me how ye have been converted, and how ye walk. In the ὅποιος, πῶς is expressed not merely the quickness but also the radicalness of the conversion. (Ver. 9. Αὐτόι are all those to whom St Paul preaches, who come in contact with him. How the copyists could alter περὶ ἡμῶν for ἡμῶν is very explicable, and the ἡμῶν is to be explained by the ἐσχόμεν following. St Paul only means to say: "they show of me insomuch as ye have received me." Ἕρωδος refers not merely to the outward entrance, but also to the access which St Paul found to their hearts. Compare ii. 1.—As to ἐπιστρέφειν see Luke i. 16, Acts xxvi. 18. The conversion is attributed to God, because St Paul is thinking
of the Gentile standing-ground of the readers. If \textit{Jesus} were in question, πρὸς τὸν κύριον would certainly be put. The absolute infinitives, δουλεύειν, ἀναμένειν, are put to denote the aim of the conversion, for which commonly the infinitive with εἰς τὸ is put. For, while in the ἐπιστρέφειν faith is couched, the δουλεύειν denotes love, and the ἀναμένειν hope, both which proceed from the former. Θεὸς ξών (= ὁ θεὸς ἄνευ φύσεως) and ἄληθινος (= ὁ θεὸς ἰδίων) [2 Kings xix. 4; Isaiah lxv. 16; Rev. iii. 4] form the antithesis to the dead unsubstantial idols. The expectation of the second coming of Christ, in which Christian hope concentrates itself, is named as the last point. At Phil. iii. 20 ἀπεκδέχεσθαι stands for ἀναμένειν.—Ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν scil. ἐρχόμενον.—Ῥεσσάθαι = σῶξεν 2 Cor. i. 10.—Οργὴ ἐρχόμενη = μέλλουσα. See at Matt. iii. 7; Rom. ii. 5, iii. 5.)

§ 2. DESCRIPTION OF ST PAUL'S LABOURS IN THESSALONICA.

(ii. 1—16.)

To the praise of his readers' faith St Paul subjoins a description of his labours among them. He lays particular stress on his purity, his disinterestedness, in the preaching of the Gospel, and concludes with a sharp invective against the Jews, as against his and Christianity's bitterest foes, who had filled up the measure of their sins. No intimation is found that St Paul in this description had had in his thoughts Christian opponents of the sort that we became acquainted with among the Galatians, and who might have been active in Thessalonica, but probably St Paul foresaw that the Judaists would not delay to damage him in that community too, and therefore in anticipation spoke out upon the points that were usually blamed in him.

Vers. 1, 2. First, St Paul reminds his readers of the way in which he appeared among them in the beginning. "He had, it is true," says he, "had even before in Philippi much to suffer; he had also in Thessalonica itself taught in much contention, but still with joyful heart and in God's strength." These two verses are substantially of equivalent purport with i. 5. (Compare also 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.) The phrase εἰκοδός οὗ κενὴ γέγονε answers to the
ἐν δυνάμει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; the παρῆσσια here is the outward expression of the πληροφορία there. As to the previous sufferings and ill-usage of St Paul in Philippi, of them Acts xvi. informs us. But the ἐν πολλῷ ἁγίῳ, which refers to St Paul's sojourn in Thessalonica, can be referred at the same time to an outward and an inward contention; but, according to ver. 9, it refers certainly to the former in particular. (Ver. 1. On εἰκοδος see i. 9.—Προπάσχευ is not found again in the New Testament.—On παρῆσσιτε ἐκαί see Acts xiii. 40, xviii. 26. The ἐν τῷ Θεῷ is to be immediately joined with it, as the παρῆσσια is meant to be represented as founded on the living union of the soul with God.)

Verss. 3, 4. To the idea of the παρῆσσια what follows is so united by means of γὰρ that the purity of his intention, the consciousness of having no impure underhand designs, is a guarantee to the apostle that God’s protection does not fail him. The παράκλησις is to be understood here in the wider sense of his labours in Christian teaching generally (Acts xiii. 15, xv. 31). St Paul first denies of these that they had an impure origin (ἐκ), then that they were connected with an inherent perverseness (ἐν). The πλάνη is more accurately defined by δόλος which follows; it denotes the state of the being deceived, be it by the deceit of others, or by fanaticism, while δόλος denotes one’s own intention to deceive. The ἀκαθαρσία is not to be understood here of sexual, but of moral, impurity; covetousness is certainly especially pointed to in it. That such reproaches were made St Paul the section 2 Cor. chapters xi. to xiii. especially shows.—Verse 4 puts the positive side in opposition to the negative. “We speak (i.e. work in our office) so as being approved, i.e. acknowledged, of God, in order to preserve the Gospel entrusted to us, not as pleasing men but God.” But now we should take this idea in a sense contradicting the doctrine of St Paul to the utmost, if we understood it thus: “I have been tried by God who knows all hearts, and have stood the test; on account of my purity and sincerity God has intrusted His Gospel to me, and in the same purity also I now preach it, pleasing God alone, seeking no man’s honour.” For, as (Rom. i. 2) St Paul denies all men purity, so he denies it himself also; every thing good in man is God’s work of grace in him (2 Cor. iii. 5, 6). But now, if St Paul’s disposition is something operated in him by God, it seems obscure how St Paul can say,
"we have been approved of God as such to whom the Gospel can be entrusted;" it seems as if the idea should of necessity have run thus: "as God, in His election by grace, has made us able through regeneration to preserve the Gospel committed to us, we are also in a condition to labour in purity for the same." But in the δεδοκιμάσμεθα seems to be expressed not the being created anew, but the trial, and, in consequence of that trial, the approval of what already existed. One seeks in vain for explanation from the interpreters here; perhaps, however, the following remarks may throw some light on the subject. All positive good St. Paul attributes to God as its real source; on the other hand, he derives just as decidedly evil only from the human will as the final cause; this will, now, can, in spite of the universal sinfulness, still be corrupted and polluted in a very different degree in different men; the one may be so far pure, that, when he sees the light, he receives it as such, without polluting it by a sinful taint; the other, on the contrary, has added so much of his own guilt to his innate sinfulness, that he pollutes even what is holy. According to this, then, St. Paul can say, perfectly in harmony with his fundamental ideas, that God committed the Gospel to him because He had found him approved; not as if St. Paul had been by nature good, but only so that he was in a state to receive in purity the holy matter which was to be committed to him, and not to corrupt it by mingling his sin with it; therefore on account of the negative good in him. Man in all his sinfulness can still, however, be sincere and upright, acknowledge good as good, evil as evil; such upright souls God can alone make use of as labourers in His kingdom, and as such St. Paul represents himself here. (In verse 3 οὐδὲ is certainly on the authority of A.B.C.D.F.G. to be preferred to οὐτε with Lachmann and Winer [Gramm. p. 460.] Verse 4. As to the well-known construction of πεπληροφορήται see Winer's Gramm. p. 237; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 17; Rom. iii. 2.—Θεὸς ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰς καρδίας see Acts i. 24, xv. 8; 1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings viii. 39.)

Vers. 5, 6. Proceeding from the οὐχ ὃς ἀνθρώπως ἀρέσκοντες Gal. i. 10 the negative side (verse 3) is again taken up and further carried out. Flattery, covetousness, and the itch for glory, are excluded from the motives of St. Paul's labours. (In verse 5 γίνεσθαι or εἶναι ἐν = ἐν denoting "to occupy one's self with
anything, to have to do with." Compare 1 Tim. iv. 15.—The ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας is to be explained after 1 Cor. ii. 5, ἐν λόγῳ σοφίας, flattery, which manifests itself in the discourse, in the mode of representing things, which is busied in taking from the doctrine of the cross its offence. To understand λόγος of guilt, or fault, as it occurs at Matt. v. 32, xii. 32, which Pelt has defended last, has been already satisfactorily proved inadmissible by Schott. —The ἐν προ φάσει πλεονεκρίας is difficult. In no case can it be taken, with Koppe and Rosenmüller, as a mere paraphrase of πλεονεκρία, neither can πρόφασις be taken in the sense of "appearance," for St Paul means to declare himself free not merely from the appearance of covetousness, but from covetousness itself. One can only, with Beza, Grotius, Flatt, and Schott, take the words in such a way that the genitive contains the motive of the πρόφασις, in this sense: "I laboured not among you with pretences, the motive of which was covetousness," i.e. "I always went out openly, never made use of a pretence veiling my real motives."—Θεος μάρτυς = γινηκας γιν. 1 Sam. xii. 5.—In ver. 6 ἐκ and ἄπο are not quite synonymous; the former denotes the immediate origin, the latter the mediate one. Winer’s Gramm. p. 348.)

Vers. 7, 8. The ἂλλα ἐγενήθημεν ημοι (which latter word is only found again at 2 Tim. ii. 24) comes in aptly in opposition to the assumption that is couched in the δοξαν ζητεών. St Paul compares his indulgent gentleness, as he exhibited it in Thessalonica, to the care which an ursing mother devotes to her little children; as she dedicates herself, her own life, to the children, so, says St Paul, he also gives himself to them, as to such as have become dear to him. Without the clause: δινάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι, ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι the connection is clear enough, with it the connection is confused, for which reason indeed Griesbach has separated it by crotchets from the rest of the discourse. That is to say, one feels tempted to take the ἐν βάρει εἶναι as = ἐπιβαρεῖν (ver. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8), or καταβαρεῖν (2 Cor. xii. 16), and to refer it to the bodily support, which St Paul as an apostle could demand, as indeed Baumgarten, Koppe, and Flatt, have taken the passage, after the example of Theodoret. But, taken so, the passage will not agree at all well with what precedes, and, if taken with what follows, the ἂλλα is plainly unsuitable. But, if one only takes ἐν βάρει εἶναι in the wider sense, viz. of the authority and dignity that belonged to St
Paul as an apostle, generally, of which properties the ἐξουσία to allow himself to be maintained by the churches was only one consequence among several, a satisfactory connexion presents itself. For the δυνάμενοι κ.τ.λ. connects itself with the preceding ἐγγένει δόξαν thus: “we seek no glory of men, although we should surely, as apostles of Christ (clothed with that exalted dignity), be in a condition to present ourselves with high authority; but we have not done that, we have made ourselves efficient among you with indulgent gentleness.” So Vitringa,¹ Wolf, Pelt, Schott, have already interpreted correctly. (Ver. 7. Τροφὸς is properly “a nurse,” here “a nursing mother,” on account of the τὰ ἐαυτῆς τέκνα. The ὁς ἀν, with the subjunctive following, is to be taken as utcumque. See Schott, p. 68.—Instead of ἰμειρόμενοι the reading of the text rec., ἰμειρόμενοι is to be read according to the preponderating majority of the MSS. But the word is found nowhere else. The lexicographers only have it, but perhaps merely from this passage. Theophylact explains it by ὁμοῦ and εἰρευν, firmiter alicui adherere. [See Winer's remarks on it, Gramm. p. 92, sq.] Hesychius and Phavorinus explain it by ἐπιθυμεῖν. In any case it is, according to the context, quite synonymous with ἰμείρεσθαι.—The ou μόνον—ἀλλὰ καὶ might perhaps have something in it to give one pause, in so far as the Gospel of God certainly seems to be more than one's own life. But St Paul here considers the Gospel not in its objective value, but as the gift entrusted to him for distribution. Now, the proclamation of the Gospel is a duty to St Paul (1 Cor. ix. 16), but the giving up his life is a voluntary act of love; the latter, therefore, is set higher.—Ἐγεννηθητε is to be read at the close of ver. 8 ; ἔγενησας, which Griesbach has in error put into the text, proceeds from such copyists as took εὐδοκοῦμεν for the present tense, whereas it is the imperfect, the augment being omitted, which is often the case in the words compounded with εἰ. See Schott ad h. l.)

Ver. 9. For a proof of his pretensionlessness, St Paul appeals to the fact, well known to the Christians in Thessalonica, that he maintained himself there by the work of his hands, in order to prove a burden to no one. Of the reasons which moved St Paul to this renunciation of something appertaining to him as a matter

¹ See Vitringa's Essay on this passage in the observat. sacræ, p. 852, sq.
of right we have already spoken in detail at 1 Cor. ix.; 2 Cor. xi. It is only to be observed here that St Paul perhaps finds himself impelled to lay this before the Thessalonians, because they had, in consequence of religious idleness, begun to abandon their handicrafts. (1 Thess. iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 11.) (The expression μόχ-θος is stronger than κότος. See 2 Thess. iii. 8.—The ἐργά-ζονται here is to be understood of the exercise of the handicraft, which has the object, among others, of relieving the Christians in Thessalonica from all the burden of his maintenance.—On the construction of the κηρύσσεων with εἰς see Mark xiii. 10; Luke xxiv. 47; 1 Pet. i. 25; Winer's Gr., p. 189, sq.)

Vers. 10—12. As in this one point, so too in everything else, respecting his blameless walking, and his faithful, fatherly, labours among them, St Paul appeals to the Thessalonian Christians' own witnessing. (Ver. 10. ὅσιος denotes the relation towards God [see at Luke i. 75], δικαίος and ἀμεμπτός the relation towards men, and indeed δικαιός from the positive, ἀμέμπτος from the negative, point of view.—Ver. 11. As St Paul in verse 7 compared himself to a careful mother, so he now compares himself to a conscientious father who brings up his children to all that is good. The words παρακαλέω, παραμυθεῖσθαι, and μαρτυρεῖσθαι, form a climax. [See Phil. ii. 1 as to the two first.] Μαρτυρεῖσθαι = θυγηθείσαι, "to conjure by all that is holy."—In ver. 12 βασιλεία καὶ δόξα stands as εἰς διὰ δούλων for βασιλεία ενδοξός. That St Paul by this kingdom does not understand merely the inner kingdom of God we shall see farther on. [Comp. on the idea of the βασιλεία, Θ, in general the note on Mat. iii. 2.] As to the rest, it is not implied in the καλεῖν εἰς that the Thessalonians are already in that kingdom, they are only called to be citizens of it at some future time. In the connection in which the apposition τοῦ καλοῦντος κ. τ. λ. stands with the εἰς το περπατήσας ὑμᾶς ἄξιος τοῦ Θεοῦ is intimated a strong motive for a serious, holy, walk: "to walk worthy of God, who has, out of love to you, prepared such glory for you," therefore to love Him again, who has first loved you.)

Ver. 13. For the sake of this calling of them unto the kingdom of God (διὰ τοῦτο), St Paul now anew (i. 2) expresses his unceasing thanks to God for their having received the word which he had preached to them, as it is in truth the Word of God. Thus St
Paul considers the receiving the word of God not as an independent act of his readers, but as an operation of God's grace in them. To Him, therefore, alone are thanks for it also due. The second half of the verse, οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων—πιστεύουσιν, has the object of representing this word of God as a mighty principle, the receiving of which, accordingly, includes in it the possibility of the περιπατήσαν αξίως. (The phrase λόγος ἀκοής παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ is difficult. The λόγος ἀκοής is, it is true, = ἀκούσθεις [Isaiah liii. i., Jer. x. 22], but the position of the τοῦ Θεοῦ after παρ' ἡμῶν is very strange. It is, however, to be explained by the fact that St Paul considers the phrase λόγος ἀκοής παρ' ἡμῶν as a joint idea, "the of us received, i.e., the by our preaching made known to you, word of God."—Δόγος ἀνθρώπων, in opposition to Θεοῦ, indicates the origin, and at the same time with that the nature which necessarily passes from the source over to what proceeds from it. In this acceptance the λόγος of which St Paul speaks is not the mere doctrine, i.e. not only the series of ideas in which Christ and His salvation are conceived and propounded, but at the same time with and in that series the fulness of the divine Spirit which God has annexed to it. It is precisely, too, through the latter that the doctrine is then in a condition to work so powerfully in believers in fruits of faith and of love.—'Αληθώς for a confirmation is found again Matth. xiv. 33; John i. 48.—"Ος refers not to Θεοῦ, but to the joint idea λόγος Θεοῦ. For the middle form ἐνεργεῖσθαι requires the reference to an impersonal subject. [See Winer's Gramm., p. 236.] Schott erroneously observes that ἐνεργεῖσθαι does not occur in the middle. Besides this passage it is so found also Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii. 7. He wishes to take it as a passive unsuitably: "which is made effectual in you." But the word of God is itself the principle of all moral activity, it is not made effectual by means of something else. In the participle τοῖς πιστεύουσιν the condition of all efficiency is pointed to: "In you who believe, i.e., because and inasmuch as ye believe and continue believing."

Ver. 14. From their behaviour, in that they have been able to walk like the churches in Judea, St Paul draws a conclusion as to their faith; "ye are believers, for ye have undoubtedly imitated the churches of God in Judea, which is possible through the power of faith alone." In saying that St Paul has in his thoughts especially the persecutions by which the Christians in Thessalonica
did not suffer themselves to be made apostates from Christianity. The Acts inform us of the persecutions of the Christians in Judea, v. 18, ss., vii. 1, ss., viii. 1, ss., of those in Thessalonica xvii. 5, ss.—But, according to 1 Thess. iii. 3, they had still been persecuted even after the departure of St Paul. As to the rest, that St Paul is here thinking only of this latter persecution cannot be concluded from the addition ὑπὸ τῶν ἱδίων συμφιλετῶν, i.e. by their Gentile fellow-citizens. For, although, according to Acts xvii. 5, the first persecution of the Christians in Thessalonica proceeded from the Jews, yet we can interpret the words of this passage of that persecution too, inasmuch, that is to say, as the Jews stirred up the Gentile population.

Vers. 15, 16. St Paul, however, uses this comparison of his readers with the Christians in Judea, in order to remind the former of the old sin of the Jews and their hostile feelings towards him and his labours among the Gentiles. This diatribe is only explained by the assumption that St Paul wished to draw the attention of the Thessalonian Christians to the intrigues of those men, with whom the Judaizing Christians stood quite on a level, as it was to be foreseen that they would not leave this church undisturbed either. (Verse 15. Christ Himself represents the Jews as murderers of the prophets Matth. xxiii. 31, 37.—The πᾶσιν ἁνθρώποις ἐνάντια reminds one of the odium generis humani, that Tacitus (Hist. v. 5) reproaches the Jews with. As to the rest, it is understood without explanation, that that, according to St Paul’s meaning, is not couched in the Jewish national character, nor in the influence of the Mosaical institutions either, but solely in the perverted pharisaical spirit which had taken possession of the supreme power over the people.—Verse 16. καλεῖσαι stands pregnant sensu for εὐαγγελιζόμεθα. Now here St Paul seems to say that the Jews entirely forbid preaching to the Gentiles, which Baur might take advantage of for his strange hypothesis. [See my essay in the Stud. for 1888, part 4.] But St Paul clearly means here too that such a preaching alone is offensive to the Jews, by which the Gentiles would not be moved to allow themselves to be circumcised; therefore the form of preaching of St Paul. That Jews had ever forbidden Gentiles to become Jews or Jewish Christians, to have themselves first circumcised and then baptized, is entirely indemonstrable and in itself improbable. In this bitter
jealousy, which begrudges the poor Gentiles even their salvation, St Paul justly sees God's chastisement according to the teleological conception of history; the Jews must by that means make their own sins, that is, the measure of their sins, full, [sin becomes the chastisement of sin], and thereby become ripe for the chastisement. [We find the same idea Matt. xxiii. 32, on which see the remarks in the Comm.]-The πάντοτε is striking. In the ordinary meaning "ever" it does not suit here; for St Paul does not mean to say, that the Jews had at all times filled up their sins, nearly in the sense that every generation had been equally godless, but he clearly represents to himself the nation, as a whole, engaged in a course of development in sin, whose last and most flagrant consequence is the enmity against Christ in His saints. Therefore Bretschneider's view [in the Lex. in vocabulo] that πάντοτε here stands = πάντως or παντελῶς, may be correct. That learned man finds the same meaning at 2 Cor. ix. 8, but the ordinary one is quite sufficient here. In consequence of this completion of their course of development in sin, concludes St Paul, the wrath of God, i.e. His chastisement, has, however, already overtaken it. Schott insists that the Aorist ἔφθασε stands prophetically instead of the future; that is quite inadmissible for surely St Paul in this passage utters no prophecy. The passage is rather to be explained by the apostle's fundamental view, that the latter days, and consequently also the manifestation of the divine wrath, were already at hand. The sufferings, therefore, which even then under the dominion of the Romans came upon the Jews, St Paul considers as beginnings of the great manifestation of wrath nearly impending, in perfect analogy with the representation in Matt. xxiv., according to which the destruction of Jerusalem is treated as a type of the last judgment. By this acceptance, then, the obscure εἰς τέλος also is explained. That is to say, it cannot possibly be = tandem, postremo, for which τέλος occurs alone. [Ælian, V. H. x. 16, xii. 22, Xenoph. Mem. ii. 7, 13.] Justice must be done the εἰς; the phrase εἰς τέλος can be taken only as "on unto the end," so that all that has now happened appears as merely the beginning. Neither, accordingly, can we supply αὐτῶν, "till their ends," i.e. their annihilation, but the end must be referred to ὑδή, and understood, as Grotius, Flatt, and Pelt, have already correctly taken it, of the full magnitude of the divine chastisement. "The wrath [of God] is
come upon them, and will now work on to its full manifestation."
A reference to the eternity of punishments, as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Benson, and others, insisted on finding here, as they take εἰς τέλος = ἐως or ἄχρι τέλους, is clearly not couched in the words.
—As to the rest, D.E.F.G. have added Θεω after ὄργη; however, this is surely to be considered as only a gloss.)

§ 3. OF ST PAUL’S DESIRE TO SEE THE THESSALONIANS.

(ii. 17—iii. 13.)

Now, the third chapter ought to have begun here, for with ii. 17 St Paul makes a transition to something new; between ii. 20 and iii. 1, on the other hand, there is no break in the ideas, but the most intimate connection exists. For St Paul in what follows declares his heartfelt desire to see the Christians in Thessalonica again, and describes how he has exerted himself to satisfy that desire. On this occasion he again starts with the figure of his parental position towards his readers, as carried out in the second chapter, and calls them "orphans," an expression by which the abandonment by the beloved being, and the longing to see it again, are denoted most purely and forcibly. (The form ἀπορφανιζόμενοι is not found again in the New Testament. The word is commonly used of children in relation to their parents; here it is employed conversely.—Πρὸς καίρον ὀφειλεῖ, usually πρὸς ὀφειλεῖ, "for a short while." John v. 35; Gal. ii. 15; Philem. ver. 15. St Paul could not know, it is true, whether and when he should see them again in general, but, considering the nearness of the kingdom of God which St Paul supposes, they would find themselves united there in any case shortly. To the believer this whole temporal life is but a short span of time.—The antithesis of προσώπῳ and καρ δί already is merely meant to designate the separation as a purely outward one. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 12, x. 7.—No particular comparison is to be sought in the comparative περισσότερος here, any more than in the analogous Latin ones abundanter, vehementius. St Paul never uses the positive περισσῶς adverbially, but constantly the comparative alone. It only means "more vigorously than it is usual," that is, very vigorously.)
FIRST THESALONIANS II. 18—20.

Ver. 18. This desire, continues St Paul, had urged him personally to visit them. By the ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος the plural is determined more definitely to the effect that his companions are not meant along with him, but he alone. St Paul had twice attempted to put it in practice, but in vain. The formula καὶ ἀπαξ καὶ δις, "not merely once, but twice," denotes, as Flatt and Schott have already justly observed, a definite number, whereas ἀπαξ καὶ δις expresses an indefinite one. (Comp. Nehem. xiii. 20; 1 Macc. iii. 30; Phil. iv. 16.) The impossibility of coming to the Christians in Thessalonica St Paul attributes to Satan. If we compare on this point the passage Acts xvi. 7, it is said there: "the Spirit suffered not St Paul to travel into Bithynia." It is asked how the two could be distinguished. One might think the two were only different modes of expression for the same thing, that of what Satan does it might always be also said, according to another mode of contemplation, that God does it, as Satan has no independent power. In a simply scientific point of view, that is, no doubt, quite correct, but still one can scarcely refer to science as regards St Paul's purely practical mode of treatment; the rather, that the phrase: οὖν εἰλασεν αὐτοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ infers an inward operation in the apostle's heart. In the case of external hindrances, through illness, accidents, adversaries, it might certainly be thought that St Paul used "Satan has hindered me," and "God has withheld me," that is to say, by means of Satan and his influence, synonymously; but not in the case of purely inward obstacles. As to those, we must assume in the apostle, as a man of practised inward feelings, a sound faculty of distinguishing between what was stirred up in him by his own natural will, what by Satan, and what by the Holy Spirit of God. (Instead of δις, the reading of the text. rec., the Codd. A.B.D.F.G. have διότι, which Lachmann has justly received.—The attempts of St Paul to come to Thessalonica probably proceeded from Berea.—The καὶ before ἄνεκοψε is to be taken adversatively. —F.G. read ἄνεκοψε, which, however, has surely only come into the text here from Gal. v. 7.)

Vers. 19, 20. The γὰρ in the beginning of ver. 19 connects itself with the ἥθελεναμεν in this sense: "to whom could I well have more urgently desired to come than to you, for you are indeed my hope, &c." The turn τίς γὰρ κ.τ.λ. stands for the superlative: "who is so, if ye are not so, i.e. ye are so in the proper and
widest sense." But the following: ἥν ὑπέλθα καὶ ὑμεῖς is obscure. For, if it should, as Griesbach and Lachmann punctuate, be annexed to what precedes, one would expect ἥν ὑμεῖς alone; in any case, no satisfactory reference is to be got out of the καὶ so. Pelt translates, it is true, nisi inter alios vos etiam, but what suits the τὰ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. is not that the Thessalonians are so too along with others, but that they are so in the more special sense. It is, therefore, certainly more suitable with Schott to set the note of interrogation after καυχῆσεται, to supply: "when, or if, ye are not so," and then to begin a fresh sentence with ἥν ὑπέλθα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐμπροσθέν κ.τ.λ. But now Schott translates the words: nonne etiam vos eritis spes, gaudia, corona; however, the ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐστε, which follows, will not well suit that; neither is the nonne exhausted by ἥν ὑπέλθα. The difficult passage is only made quite clear, if one takes the sentence ἥν ὑπέλθα—παρουσία as expressing a doubt, which is afterwards in the concluding words: ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐστε—χαρά plainly overcome, in this sense: "or do not ye also (as I myself and all the rest of the faithful) appear before Christ at His second coming?" i.e. without hesitation, without any doubt, ye will surely be also recognized by Christ as His, and therefore will not fall away again at any time from the faith. The certainty that that will not happen St Paul possesses in their election by grace; they are, as it were, made a present of to him for his glory and joy, neither will God permit him to be robbed of them. It might be found fault with in this interpretation that according to it "to appear before Christ at His coming" is taken = "to be recognised by Christ," whereas it surely only expresses: "to be placed before the judgment-seat, to be proved, whether one can be recognised." But as according to several passages of Scripture (John iii. 18; 1 Cor. vi. 3), the faithful are not judged at all, wherever the idea of judgment is used of them it is only to be conceived so that by it the recognition of the faithful as really such is expressed. (Ver. 19. The Philippians also are called [Phil. iv. 1] χαρά and στέφανος. The latter term is taken from the metaphor so often used of the public games, the victor in which was crowned.—Στέφανος καυχῆσεται, i.e. ἐν ὁ καυχησθεν ἐχω answers to the Hebrew תְּפִלִּים Proverbs xvi. 31; Ezek. xvi. 12. As to the idea of the παρουσία and the kindred terms see on Matt. xxiv. 4, 5.)

Chap. iii., 1, 2. As St Paul's attempts to come himself to Thes-
salonica miscarried, he sent, unable to hold out longer without immediate news, Timothy thither from Athens with self-sacrifice, in order to their confirmation and encouragement in the faith. That this was done with self-sacrifice is couched in the εἰδοκησα-μεν καταλειφθέναι ἐν Ἀθήναις μόνον. To be without assistants in a city like Athens must have necessarily brought many inconve-
niences on St Paul. (Ver. 1. As to στέγω compare 1 Cor. ix. 12. 
Ver. 2. The MSS. vary in the epithets which are bestowed on 
Timothy. The text. rec. has καὶ διάκονοι τοῦ Ἐθεός καὶ συνερ-
γόν ἡμῶν. Griesbach and Lachmann have had merely καὶ συνερ-
γόν τοῦ Ἐθεός printed. Copyists might take offence at the συνεργός 
Ἐθεός, and hold διάκονος Θεοῦ more proper. See 1 Cor. iii. 9 on 
the subject. The στηρίζαι refers to the patience under persecutions, 
as ver. 3 immediately shows, the παρακάλεσαι to the growing in 
grace. In the passage 2 Thess. ii. 17 the two expressions stand side 
by side also, but in an inverted order. See as to the use of ὑπὲρ 
2 Cor. i. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 1. The ἡμᾶς after παρακαλέσαι Lach-
mann has erased on authority of importance. Griesbach has had 
πελπίν gsi printed instead of ὑπὲρ in his larger edition; ὑπὲρ has been 
more correctly retained by him in the smaller one, and Lachmann 
too has decided for it.)

Vers. 3, 4. It was inherent in the nature of the thing that young 
churches not yet well confirmed, such as that in Thessalonica was, 
might easily be shaken by the vehemence of the persecutions. St 
Paul had, therefore, even directly after the founding of the church, 
made them observe the inevitableness of the same. The Christian 
Church must have been persecuted, because light and darkness, the 
spirit and the flesh, are necessarily opposed to one another. (See 
on 2 Tim. iii. 12.) But in the εἰς τούτο κείμεθα is couched more 
yet than the mere necessity (μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι), viz., the ordi-
nance of God that the Christians are to suffer, inasmuch as suffer-
ing is for them a means of perfection, if it is borne in the right 
spirit (In ver. 3 the dative of the intention τῷ σαίνεσθαι is very 
harsh in a grammatical point of view. (See Winer's Gramm., p. 
303.) The Codd. A.D.E. read τῷ, which Lachmann has received; 
then εἰς would have to be supplied from what precedes. But the 
very harshness of the construction naturally occasioned a correction 
of it to be attempted. The τῷ might therefore be still worthy of 
retention, the more so as the σαίνεσθαι cannot be co-ordinate with,
but only subordinate to, the other two infinitives. One must cer-
tainly explain to one's self the dative by the use of the infinitive
with ιν in Hebrew.—Σαίνω occurs no more in the New Testa-
ment. It is properly, "to wag the tail insinuatingly like dogs." [AElia-
ν V. H. xiii. 42.] Then, generally, "to move, shake." Hesychius
interprets σαίνεται by κυνεῖται, σαλεύεται, ταράττεται.—As to the
phrase, κείσθαι εἰς τι, see on Luke ii. 34; Phil. i. 17. In ver. 4
the καὶ οἴδατε at the close of the verse merely alludes to what St
Paul had foretold having actually come to pass. It forms, there-
fore, no tautology with the αὐτὸι γὰρ οἴδατε at the beginning. In
Griesbach's text all from αὐτοὶ, ver. 3, to οἴδατε [at, the close of
ver. 4] appears included in parentheses, which is, however, quite
unnecessary, as the course of ideas moves on uninterruptedly.)

Ver. 5. Now exactly because St Paul knew the Christians
in Thessalonica to be wrestling with persecutions, it was (διὰ
τοῦτο) that he felt so urged to gather information as to the state
of their faith, in order that the tempter might not incite them to
apostacy, and thus St Paul's entire labour be lost. (The καὶ γενῶ
is explained by the circumstance that St Paul in his sufferings had
also experienced great sympathy from the Thessalonians, which he
now reciprocates on his side.—At γνῶναι, αὐτοίν is first of all to be
supplied, St Paul learnt it then only by Timothy.—That ὁ πειρά-
τος ζητοῦ is Satan, as at Math. iv. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 5, is understood with-
out explanation; the μητίως ἐπειράσεων ὑμᾶς surprises one, how-
ever, inasmuch as the temptation seems to be there already in the
shape of the persecutions that had happened. But St Paul does
not consider the persecution in itself as temptation; he had indeed
in ver. 4 just represented it as, under God's direction, resulting in
the salvation of the faithful: it then alone becomes a temptation
through Satan's power, when the latter succeeds in calling forth in
the heart of man doubts of the truth of the Gospel,—unbelief,
therefore, on occasion of the persecution. As to the connection of
the μητίως with the indicative and conjunctive see Winer's Gramm.
p. 473.—Εἴς κενῶν = מִלִּי, Lev. xxvi. 16.—The idea that St
Paul's labour is lost, if the Thessalonians fall away, has something
child-like and simple in it. Of course no spiritual selfishness is
to be seen in it, but the expression of the conviction that the
Thessalonians will also let themselves by love to him, St Paul, be
induced to hold fast to the faith.)
Vers. 6—8. St Paul then further describes with a touching sensibility how beneficially the good tidings which Timothy brought of their firm state of faith and of their love had operated on him; he says they are a comfort to him in all distresses, they had brought him life in death. (In ver. 6 ἀρτι shows that St Paul wrote directly after Timothy’s return.—As to εὐαγγελιζομαι, employed in the wider sense, of every sort of good tidings, see on Luke i. 19. —In ver. 7 the διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως is the explanation of ἐφ’ ὑμῖν, while ἔτι θάλψει denotes the subjective state in which St Paul was when he received the comfort.—As to the rest, the collocation ἀνάγκη καὶ θάλψει might, according to the MSS., be preferable, as Lachmann and Schott also think.—In ver. 8 the νῦν ξώμεν supposes that St Paul did not live previously; from 1 Cor. xv. 31, “I die daily,” it is clear that he considers the continual conflicts and dangers in which he was obliged to move as a continual dying, into which joy at the firmness in the faith of the Christians in Thessalonica entered as a new element of life. Therefore also the idea of life must not be diluted here into the more general one of joy.—In the ἔδω στήκητε the future too is intimated besides the present: “if ye stand and continue standing.”)

Vers. 9, 10. St Paul justly considers these tidings as the fountain of life; for nothing more grateful could happen to him, no thanks can sufficiently recompense the benefit. (Ver. 9. As to ἀνταποδίδοναι see Luke xiv. 14; Rom. xi. 35.—Perhaps with this idea the parallel passage, Ps. cxvi. 12, was in the apostle’s mind.——As to χαράν χαίρειν see John iii. 29.—The ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ characterizes the joy as a holy one admissible before God’s countenance.) But the greater the joy the more lively becomes the wish also in St Paul to see them and to complete their life of faith. The υἱοθεματα τῆς πίστεως are to be referred not so much to infirmities of the power of faith (for that had been up to that time certainly described as energetic), as to defects in the knowledge of faith which develops itself by degrees only, which defects admit of being gradually supplied through a longer intercourse and instruction. On the other hand, true faith has in the very first beginning full power to oppose resistance to all dangers. For the rest, it is understood without difficulty that St Paul imagines the καταρτισματε practicable not with his own powers, but only in the strength
of the Holy Spirit. (Ver. 10. ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ has already occurred at Ephes. iii. 20, it is also found at 1 Thess. v. 13.—The eἰς τὸ after δεόμενοι expresses the object of the praying.—As to ὑστέρημα see 1 Cor. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. ix. 12.—Καταρτίζω is properly to set up again something that is destroyed [Matth. iv. 21; Gal. vi. 1], here to bring to perfection without reference to antecedent destruction, = προσαναπληρῶ or ἀνταναπληρῶ, 2 Cor. ix. 12; Col. i. 24.)

Vers. 11—13. In conclusion, St Paul explicitly utters the petition that God and Christ may prepare for him the way to his dear Christian brethren in Thessalonica, and fill the latter themselves with love, and confirm them in sanctification. It is peculiar to this passage that Christ also is here besought along with God to prepare the way. The external relations are commonly attributed, in the Scriptures, to the Father, but this passage shows that it is allowable to bring these also before Christ. However, no example but this occurs in the New Testament, as indeed prayers generally to Christ are but seldom found. But the juxtaposition of Father and Son taken strictly is to be understood thus: "may the Father operate so and so by means of His Son." (Ver. 11. κατατόνων is the optative sorist, as at 2 Thess. iii. 5, not the infinitive.
—Ver. 12. The readings ὁ Θεὸς and ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς are, it may be supposed, only interpretations of the simple ὁ κύριος. That Christ, not the Father, is to be understood by it cannot be doubtful after verse 10. Πλεονάζειν and περισσεύειν are related to one another as cause and effect, "to grow, and the riches proceeding from the growth."—The love eἰς ἄλληλους and that eἰς

1 The words: αὐτῶν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς κατατόνων τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς are certainly decisive for the opinion that prayers to the Son are not inadmissible, even if they refer to external relations. But the very circumstance that such occur no more in the New Testament, and then the whole analogy of faith, are, surely, decidedly opposed to making prayers to the Saviour frequently, much more predominately and almost exclusively, in all external occurrences, as is done in the community of Moravian brothers. The entire ancient Church knows of no prayers to Christ which have reference to externals. If, therefore, beginners in the life of faith often confess themselves to be uncertain whether they shall address their prayers to the Father, or to the Son, or even to the Holy Ghost perhaps, it is to be assumed as a general rule according to the rightly understood relation of the Trinity, that external relations must be brought before the Father in prayer, but the religious moral relations before the Son and the Holy Ghost, or, in fine, that one should pray for everything of the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost.
πάντας are related to one another as brotherly love and universal love, 2 Pet. i. 7. [Compare 1 Thess. iv. 9.] With the καθιστηρ καὶ ἡμεῖς not παλαιόσατι, but ἀγάπην ἔχομεν, can be supplied.—

Ver. 13. The growth in love has afterwards the consequence of confirming the heart in holiness, similarly to the way in which it is represented 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. The combination ἀμέμπτως ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ unites the negative and positive sides. [Upon ἀγιωσύνῃ see Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 1. It denotes the process of being made holy, the result of which is ἀγιασμός, 1 Thess. iv. 3.] But both are meant not of a holiness in the sight of purblind human eyes, but of such a one that is so before the eye of God. Such an absolute holiness belongs to the believer after his new man, the Christ in us, which is hidden here below, but is made manifest at the day of the Lord’s appearance. Hence the addition ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ Κ.Τ.Λ., similarly to v. 23. On the dogmatical meaning of the phrase and the parallel formulæ see the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 1.—The term ἄγιος can, it is undeniable, mean “angels,” after the analogy of the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם, Ps. lxxxix. 6; Zachar xiv. 5; Dan. iv. 10, viii. 13, xiv. 20. Besides, angels are named as accompanying Christ in His advent, Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; 2 Thess. i. 7; Jude verse 14. Yet the addition of αὐτῶν and the mentioning the body of believers [μετὰ πάντων] give rise to the opinion that the earlier perfected believers may be here imagined as Christ’s followers at His advent, for the angels are never called Christ’s angels, nor is it conceivable that all the heavenly hosts should accompany Him, but it might be all believers should. We shall not, however, be able to explain ourselves more in detail on this point until later [see at iv. 10], where we consider St Paul’s views upon the end of the world in their connection.—The ἀμήν, which concludes this passage in some Codd., is doubtless come into the text from liturgical use alone.
II.

 PART SECOND.

 (iv. 1—v. 28.)

§ 4. EXHORTATIONS TO A HOLY LIFE.

 (iv. 1—12.)

After the prayer, that God will through His Spirit fill the Thessalonians with love, St Paul now turns to them also, and calls upon them to do their part in the work of sanctification, so that here too human agency seems not to be annihilated by the divine, but stimulated. But now, as a rule for their walking so as to please God, St Paul appeals to the commandment given them by him during his personal presence among them. We may, of course, assume that the exhortations which follow contain only a repetition of the same, for they keep altogether to generals, and it is scarcely imaginable that St Paul in the short time of his sojourn could have gone beyond generals. (Ver. 1. We have already had λοιπὸν, used as an adverb, 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. vi. 17; Ephes. vi. 10; Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8. In that expression alone the tendency of St Paul’s hastening to the conclusion is announced. The reading of the text. rec., τὸ λοιπὸν, must for extrinsic reasons give way to the λοιπὸν. — The collocation of the words, in so far as the ἧνα περισσεύσατε μᾶλλον ought to subjoin itself immediately to ἐροτόμου ύμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν, is not quite accurate; again, an οὖτος ought to have corresponded with the καθὼς. It is true, B.D.E.F.G. have ἧνα before καθὼς παρελάβετε, and Lachmann has even put it into the text, but in all probability this is only a correction of the more difficult original reading. On the other
hand, Lachmann has with perfect justice, on the authority of A.B.D.E.F.G., adopted the addition καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε wanting in the text. rec. after ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ. The apostle acknowledges their Christian walking, but exhorts them to increase still in the care and fidelity with which they live.—Ver. 2. We find the term παραγγελία, "commandment, precept," also at Acts v. 28, xvi. 24; 1 Tim. i. 5, 18.—The addition διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is to represent St Paul as empowered to publish moral commandments, that is, as invested by Jesus with the full powers of an apostle.)

Vers. 3—5. To this general exhortation St Paul now causes the special moral precepts to succeed, and first of all indeed those for sexual purity and chastity (vers. 3—8.) The sinfulness of human nature in general, which makes temptations in this point particularly dangerous, and the immersion of the Gentile world in sins of lust, which were even preeminently in vogue in Thessalonica, in particular, justly induced St Paul to put this exhortation in the foreground. The ἁγιασμός, "the state of holiness," is to be taken here in a special sense as "chastity," as it is also used at Rom. vi. 19; 1 Tim. ii. 15. The proper term for it is ἁγνεία, 1 Tim. iv. 12, v. 2. But, considered as true inward chastity, it is necessarily conjoined with universal moral purity, whence the justification for such a special application of the word proceeds. But now St Paul first describes chastity negatively as abstinence from all impure sexual acts (πορνεία taken in the widest sense), then positively as governing the body in chastity and honour. The body here too appears, according to the Christian fundamental view, not as a prison of the soul, but as its holy organ, which, like the soul itself, must be preserved pure and undefiled, in order to be made a temple of the Holy Spirit. (See the remarks on 1 Cor. vi. 15—20.) The antithesis to κτάσθαι σκέδος ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ is κτάσθαι ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίαις. In this phrase the ἐπιθυμία is imagined as a power operating perniciously on man; he must comport himself only passively, i.e. receptively, towards the Holy Spirit of God; on the other hand, as regards everything connected with sin and nature he is to stand up as a master, and at the same time as a sentinel. (See on this point especially 1 Pet. ii. 11.) This simple acceptance of the words, which is also perfectly adapted to the context of the passage, has been
already defended by Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Greek Fathers, in the West by Tertullian, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius, then by Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Le Clerc, in later times by Baumgarten, Flatt, and Pelt. In fact, the use of σκεῦος as ἔχει offers no difficulty. Philo, too, uses several times the phrase ἰδέα τῆς ψυχῆς (de migr. Abr. p. 418. Quod deterior pot. insid. p. 186.) In the New Testament 2 Cor. iv. 7 is decisive. It is true, Schott is of opinion πνεῦματος or ψυχῆς must be added to σκεῦος if it be meant to denote the body. But 2 Cor. iv. 7 shows that this is not necessary, where the context makes the meaning of the word sufficiently clear. But besides, in reality such an addition is also couched in the εαυτοῦ, by which the individuality, the ψυχῆς, is distinguished from the σκεῦος, and the latter designated as belonging to the former. The only difficulty which seems to arise with our interpretation is couched in the κτᾶσθαι. For in the present that word is “to acquire,” in the perfect alone “to possess,” i.e. “to have acquired.” But now it seems improper to speak of an “acquiring” of the body, as it is inborn in man. But even if the substance of the body is inborn in man, yet the dominion over the body is not, and by this dominion the body is first made a true σκεῦος, a serviceable organ for the soul. We may, therefore, aptly take the expressions thus: “let each know, i.e. let each learn, by means of practice and experience, to guide and to master his body as a true instrument of the soul, and not abandon it to a fierce violence of the passions.” Thus Chrysostom on this passage has already quite correctly interpreted in the words: ἀρα ἦμεις αὐτὸ (τὸ σκεῦος) κτώμεθα, ὅταν μένῃ καθαρὸν, καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν ἀγαμίῳ, ὅταν δὲ ἀκάθαρτον, ἀμαρτία scil. κτᾶται αὐτό.—In comparison with this sole admissible interpretation of this passage other acceptations of it must decidedly give way. First of all, that defended by Erasmus Schmid, that σκεῦος stands, like the Latin vae, for the male organ of generation. For, though σκεῦος occurs in that sense in profane writers (see Aelian hist anim. xvii. 11), still the Holy Scriptures are not acquainted with that use of the word, and, besides, nothing in the context justifies us in such an assumption. But, secondly, very distinguished interpreters, after the example of Augustine, viz., Schöttgen, Wetstein, Koppe, and Schott, choose to understand σκεῦος of the woman, who in the Oriental mode of contemplation is looked
on as the instrument of the man, as מַעַרְכָּת, or Chald. as מַעַרְכָּת.

Daniel v. 2, 3, 23. According to this, then, the woman is called 1 Pet. iii. 7, σκέφος ἀδελφότερον. But the altogether general conception of the exhortation is against the application of that meaning in this passage. To abstain from πορνελα refers not to the men only, but just as much to the women; but if σκέφος is interpreted of the woman the ἅματος ὑμῶν would refer to the men only, and even among them only to those living in wedlock, with the exclusion of the unmarried and of the widowers, which clearly does not suit the general nature of the expression. Neither can one look for any support of this view in the use of the κτάσθαι, for κτάσθαι γυναικα means, it is true, “to marry” (Ruth iv. 10, Sir. xxxvi. 29), but not “to be married, to live in wedlock,” which meaning the context here would require. (In ver. 4 τιμή forms the antithesis to ἀτύμλα. It answers here to our “honourableness.” The reading ἄτυμλος for ἐπίθυμλος has surely only come into the text here from the parallel passage Rom. i. 26. In verse 5 the καλ after καθάπερ is, similarly as at iv. 13, to be explained by the assumption that St Paul is thinking of those Jews or Christians who allow wicked lusts to reign in them; these, continues he, act as the Gentiles also do, they thus place themselves on an equality with the Gentiles, deny the knowledge imparted to them of the true God which the Gentiles do not even possess, and are plainly, so far, yet more amenable to punishment than they.)

Vers. 6, 7. That in the two verses here there cannot by any means be contained an entirely fresh precept and warning, different from the previous one, as the one against covetousness would be, is clearly shown by the connection of ver. 7 with ver. 6, by which the calling of the Christians to chastity (ἀγασιμός, as at ver. 3), not to ἀκαθαρσία, is joined by means of γὰρ to what precedes. But to understand ἀκαθαρσία here otherwise than of sexual uncleanliness is decidedly unallowable, and then ver. 6 cannot well come in between with something heterogeneous, the less that the infinitives ἐπέμαλεσθεν and πλεονεκτεῖν plainly unite themselves to the τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, and thus stand co-ordinate with the ἀπεχείσθαι and εἴδειν κτάσθαι. The idea now of the ἐπέμαλεσθεν is so general that it forms no difficulty in the reference of ver. 6 to sexual relations; that is to say, it denotes, with or without νόμος, “the sinful transgressing of the law,” in Hebrew יָרָשׁ and
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which Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, in the passage Prov. xx. 2, render by ἵπτερβαίνειν, whereas the LXX. translate it παροξύνειν. But certainly the second verb πλεονεκτεῖν seems, according to the nearest meaning of the word, to be in favour of the supposition of Origen, to which Grotius also, Rosenmüller, Koppe, and Flatt, have adhered, viz., that ver. 6 contains a warning against covetousness, and especially against over-reaching in trade. However, the ἐν τῷ πράγματι forms in its turn a great difficulty for this interpretation, without looking at the doubts as to it already touched on, which result from the connection of ver. 7 with ver. 6. For πράγμα is not something like "bargain and sale," as Grotius insists, but πραγματεία. Then the article gives rise to great doubt. True, it has been proposed to conjecture τρέ, i.e. τιμή, but the circumstance that no MS. leaves out the article is sufficient evidence for the original existence of it. But all becomes intelligible if we, with the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, afterwards Wetstein, Baumgarten, Pelt, and Schott, take πλεονεκτεῖν in the figurative sense, and understand the whole of adultery, of the greedy invasion of the property of a brother, therefore of the seduction of his wife, for there is no ground at all for thinking of unnatural sins of lust. The words ἐν τῷ πράγματι are then quite simply "in the matter which is here in question." This mode of taking the πλεονεκτεῖν recommends itself the more that, as we saw at Ephes. iv. 19, v. 3, 5, St Paul uses πλεονεξία elsewhere too of sins of the flesh. The second half of ver. 6 contains a further enforcement of the exhortation to chastity through the admonition that God punishes all sins of lust, which it was by no means superfluous to remark for the benefit of the Greeks, who treated those relations very lightly. It is for that reason too that St Paul remarks, that he has already set before them previously the guilt of those acts. (Ver. 6. ἐκδίκος, avenger. Sir. xxx. 6; Rom. xiii. 4.—The form προ-εἶπαμεν, which the text. rec. has, is certainly unusual in the compound, but it deserves the preference for that very reason, especially as the critical authorities also favour it pre-eminently.—Διαμαρτύρεσθαι = μαρτύρεσθαι: see ii. 12.—In ver. 7 ἐπὶ and ἐν are to be so taken that ἐπὶ "unto" denotes the object of the obligation, ἐν, on the other hand, the permanent state of chastity in which the Christians are to live, so that the words may be thus paraphrased: "the holy God called us not to uncleanness, i.e. that we should
serve uncleanness with His will, but that we might be and continue in chastity.")

Ver. 8. St Paul closes this serious exhortation with the remark, by which ver. 7 is completed, that every one that despiseth the same despiseth God Himself, viz., because it emanates from Him, in that He not only operates by means of the apostle, but also gives to all Christians the Holy Ghost, who urges to chastity. (Τουγαρον is the strengthened τονάρ. Hebr. xii. 1.—Ἀβετεῖν has rarely an accusative of the person with it, but usually one of the thing [Mark vii. 9; 1 Tim. v. 12.] Joined with the former, it is “to despise,” Gal. ii. 21. As to the strict mode of taking ὁκ—αλλὰ see Winer’s Gramm. p. 464, upon this passage; it is not to be translated: “not so much men, as God,” all the emphasis is rather to be laid on God and the despising Him alone.—Lachmann reads τόν διδώντα for τόν καὶ δόντα, but it is extremely improbable that the καὶ would have been added, if it were originally wanting. On the other hand, the omission of it is easily explained, especially with the reading εἰς ἄμας, which it will not suit at all. However, the reading εἰς ὑμᾶς is to be preferred on extrinsic and intrinsic grounds, for the idea of the verse is considerably heightened by it, if the sense is this: “whoever despiseth this commandment unto chastity, despiseth God Himself, for He giveth it not merely by means of us the apostles, who are filled with the Spirit, but also in that He gave yourselves the Holy Spirit, i.e. the gift of examination and insight into divine things, along with the strength to keep God’s commandments,” they are thus in this respect, also, Θεοδιδακτος, as they are directly (in ver. 9) called with reference to brotherly love.)

Vers. 9, 10. To the first exhortation to chastity (vers. 3—8) the second to love is now (vers. 9—12) annexed, as well to brotherly love, as also to universal love. It is true, it seems as if in ver. 11 something quite different was introduced, viz. the exhortation to industry; this, however, does not come forward independently, but only indirectly: “for,” says St Paul, “they are to work, in order to give no cause of offence to the non-Christians.” It is love, therefore, which is in the whole paragraph (vers. 9—12) recommended to be practised towards Christians and non-Christians. Now St Paul entirely acknowledges the position of the Thessalonians in reference to brotherly love, and therefore alludes to what
they have done to all the brethren in Macedonia. What sort of service of love is hereby meant is not more accurately known to us. St Paul gives, as the inner foundation of this their faithful practice of love, which renders all further instruction as to it needless, that they are Θεοδίδακτοι, i.e. (according to ver. 8) that the Holy Ghost has been given them; for where He is there He also teaches, and where He teaches there He also creates the practice. (In ver. 9 we prefer, with Lachmann, ἔχομεν to the ἔχετε, after A.C.E. and other critical authorities, for the first person forms a clearer antithesis to the Θεοδίδακτος, "where God teaches," St Paul means to say, "there I can be silent." [See at John vi. 45, where διδακτὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is found, and John xiv. 26.]-In the εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλ- λήλους the intimation is couched that God, who is love, also teaches all to love.)

Vers. 11, 12. This one thing alone St Paul beseeches of them, not to stand still at that point to which they had already attained, but to increase in love, especially to let their brotherly love expand into universal love, πρὸς τοὺς ἐξω. (See on 1 Cor. v. 12, Col. iv. 5.) Now this universal love they are, according to the representation given here, to practise not so much positively, which the separation of believers and unbelievers admits of in a less degree,—as negatively, viz. by means of avoiding all cause of offence, and of giving no occasion to the non-Christians to blame anything in the professors of the Gospel. Now it is to be supposed that such had even at that time occurred in Thessalonica, although, as it seems (see at v. 1), on other grounds than afterwards, when St Paul wrote the second Epistle (2 Thess. iii. 10, ss.); St Paul, therefore, in his wisdom, takes that up separately with reference to his vivâ voce commandments, and thus admonishes his readers in the most conciliatory form. (Ver. 11. As to φιλοτι-μεῖοσθαι see on Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. v. 9. It is "zealously to strive after anything."—The ἡσυχάζειν receives its explanation from the parallel passage 2 Thess. iii. 11, 12. For it forms the antithesis to the unquiet religious bustle into which the Thessalonians had fallen through their outward acceptance of the doctrine of the second coming of Christ. It is therefore to be taken: "to keep one's self quiet; to continue in the prescribed circle of one's calling." The πράσσειν τὰ ἰδία (=τὰ ἐαυτῶν) which follows expresses the same idea positively which ἡσυχάζειν declares nega-
tively, for it stands in opposition to the mixing one’s self up with other people’s affairs.—The ἰδίας, which follows, is to be cancelled with Lachmann on the authority of B.D.E.F.G. From the exhortation to work with their hands we see that at least the majority of the Christians in Thessalonica belonged to the class of mechanics.—Ver. 12. εὐσχημόνως, honestly, decently, without giving just cause of offence, Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 40.—Μὴ ἄνθρωπος is to be taken as masculine, in the sense: “that others may not be obliged to work for you.”

§ 5. INFORMATION AS TO CHRIST’S ADVENT.

(iv. 18—v. 11.)

As we have already remarked in the Introduction to the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the doctrine of the second coming of Christ to the kingdom of God had become especially important to the Christians there. This circle of ideas might till then have been quite unknown to them as formerly Gentiles. The new and striking nature of them made itself, therefore, master of their excitable Greek fancy, and threatened to hurry them into fanatical vagaries. As to the rest, it was only during the composition of the first Epistle that St Paul had notice of a misunderstanding, which he here, ver. 13—18, rectifies. The expressions in v. 1—3 do not as yet point to the fact that St Paul feared the Thessalonians might also engage in fixing the time of the second coming of the Lord, which, however, occurred at a later date notwithstanding, as the second Epistle shows. But the misapprehension, which is first of all coming under discussion, consisted in their supposing at Thessalonica that those only who were living on earth at Christ’s coming again would have part in the kingdom of God. This excited anxiety on account of the departed, as if they were debarred the kingdom of God. Not, as Koppe thinks, in so far as if they had altogether doubted the resurrection of the dead, that was the case with Gnostics alone, of whom we find no trace in Thessalonica. They rather seem not to have been duly informed of the first resurrection and its relation to the universal one. They thought (as St Paul’s communication which follows shows) that those only who
were found alive at Christ's coming again would enter with Him into His kingdom. The dead, they therefore thought, would not return to life till at the general resurrection of the dead after the kingdom of God, and would therefore be debarred from the bliss in the kingdom of God. To this error St Paul now opposes the information that those dead in the faith would arise before the general resurrection, and accordingly those living at Christ's coming could not possibly anticipate the former. From this, then, it follows that St Paul in his eschatologic views has appropriated the two fundamental views of the Jewish theology, just as the other writings of the New Testament do, which 2 Thess. ii. establishes even still more, viz. first, the distinction of a double resurrection, one of the just or faithful, and the general one, on which the remarks in the Comm. on Luke xiv. 14; John v. 25, ss.; Acts xxiv. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23, and, above all, Rev. xx. 5, ss., xxi. 1, ss., are to be compared; secondly, the supposition of a kingdom of God on earth, the so-called Millennium. True, nothing certain can be concluded from the phrase βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ in St Paul, for he uses it in such a comprehensive manner, as is done also in the Gospels (see on Matt. iii. 2) and the other books of the New Testament, that he always comprises in it at the same time with the earthly kingdom eternity also, as indeed it is understood at once that whoever has a part in the kingdom of God also enjoys eternal happiness, because no falling away again can happen in the kingdom of God; but, vice versa, not every one that attains eternal happiness has also a part in the kingdom of God. (Compare Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 11, 20, vi. 9, 10, xv. 24, 50; Gal. v. 21; Ephes. v. 5; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 18.) But St Paul never uses the phrase βασιλεία τ. Θ. so that he understands by it eternity alone with an exclusion of the earthly kingdom; if he means to express that he makes use of the words σωτηρία, σώζωσθαι, for that purpose. The only passage in St Paul's Epistles, in which it can seem as if βασιλεία τ. Θ. denoted eternity alone without the kingdom of God, is 2 Tim. iv. 18, where the epithet ἐπουράνιος is used. But the kingdom of God is not called heavenly here, in so far as St Paul imagines it to himself in heaven, but in so far as it is of heavenly nature, makes earthly relations heavenly. The expression ἐπιστευος of course does not occur, because it would inevitably give rise to misapprehensions. The Jews
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erred in their otherwise correct doctrine in that very point that they deemed the Messiah's kingdom earthly, and that too in such a way that in place of the Gentiles, who reigned at that time, the Jews would reign in it and the Gentiles serve. If the better-minded among them, who followed the pure instructions of the Old Testament more than the perverted views of the Rabbins, willingly acknowledged the moral transformations also, the reign of justice, truth, and love, in the kingdom of God; still even among them the look to the outside predominated too decidedly. Therefore it was that so few only were able to recognize in Christ and His followers the germ of the kingdom of God. (Ver. 13. See as to οὐ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν Rom. i. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8.—Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B., preferred the reading κοιμωμένων, which in fact the circumstance, that the form of the perfect κεκοιμημένων is so predominant in the New Testament, that it can easily be supposed that it was put in where it was not found,—is in favour of. The name, to go no further, points to a waking at some time or other from the slumber of death.—"Ινα μὴ λυπησθε scil. peri αὐτῶν, as if they were debarred from the kingdom of God.—As to καὶ after καθὼς see at iv. 5.)—"Οι λαοὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχουσι ἐλπίδα, i.e. the Gentiles; certainly these mourn in another sense over their relations that are fallen asleep, viz. as such who consider death as annihilation; but St Paul means precisely by this forcible comparison to render the total inadmissibility of such sorrow prominent.

Ver. 14. Now, first of all, St Paul declares, for the comfort of his readers, that the great events of Jesus' life, the representative of the whole of human nature, also afforded security for the belief that God would awaken them which slept, for they too are surely His like the living. This line of argument has clearly the force of demonstration then only when the κοιμωμένων (ver. 13) are believers. He that died without faith in Christ had of course in no case a claim to participation in the kingdom of God, but Christ's whole work even, the blessing of His death, as well as that of His resurrection, passes over to those dead in the faith. Now this could certainly, according to the letter, be, as Koppe has taken it, so understood, as if the Thessalonians had doubted of the resurrection altogether. But if one only takes this passage in connection with the whole chain of argument, especially the transition from ver. 16
to ver. 17, it cannot but be confessed, that the first resurrection alone, that of the just, which is, in the fullest sense of the words, an ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν,—is meant. St Paul takes no account at all in his words of such a possible misapprehension of them, because he knew what a lively faith his readers had in the resurrection generally. (The construction εἰ—οὕτως is unusual and harsh. To join, with Storr and Flatt, οὕτω to κοιμηθέντας, in the sense "those thus [i.e. in the faith] asleep," is, of course, quite inadmissible. The οὕτω stands pleonastically at the beginning of the minor clause. Winer's Gramm. p. 559. In Rev. xi. 5 οὕτως is used just so in the minor after εἰ.—The connection of the διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ with κοιμηθέντας, either in the sense "those asleep in the faith in Christ," or, "at the time of Christ," is justly given up as entirely contrary to grammar by the latest interpreters Pelt and Schott; it can only be joined with ἀξίωτα. It is true, one then expects σὺν αὐτῷ, but αὐτῷ explains itself quite well too. According to the usual representation of the New Testament [John v. 28, vi. 39, xiv. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Phil. iii. 21] God awakes men through Christ and then lets them ever be with the Lord, as it is immediately said in what follows, ver. 17. But in the ἀξίωτα more is couched than the mere act of awakening, viz. this in conjunction with the ἀπαύξασθαι, which subjoins itself to the former in ver. 17, on which see the particulars.)

Ver. 15. St Paul now announces more explicitly to his readers the progress of the occurrences as certain revealed truth. At first he expresses himself in ver. 15 only negatively, the living will not come before the dead, i.e. they will not go into the kingdom of God alone, may not even earlier than the latter; then in vers. 16, 17, he gives the positive heads in the sequence of occurrences. But the most important thing in this verse is the ἡμεῖς before οἱ ζώντες οἱ περιπλευτόμενοι, which is repeated ver. 17. It is unmistakeably clear from that, that St Paul deemed it possible he and his contemporaries might live to see the coming again of Christ. But now this supposition need not excite even the slightest doubt. For, that it has continued unfulfilled, this hope of St Paul's, is, no doubt, true; but St Paul himself, with all the apostles, acknowledges also in terms, that no one knows the time or hour (see on v. 2), not even the angels, nor the Son (Mark xiii. 32); the Lord Himself declares that man may not know them (Acts i. 7), but that still the
coming again is to be at all times expected as near (see on Luke xii. 34, ss. Matt. xxiv. 1). Therefore this passage would be a stumbling-block only in case the τοῦτο λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου were also to be referred to the subordinate point which is couched in the ήμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες. For, had St Paul said: "I know by a communication of the Lord that we shall witness the advent of Christ even in our life-time," then a detrimental conclusion might with justice be drawn from the non-fulfilment of that saying; but here the saying of the Lord refers merely to the chief idea, that those remaining will not prevent them that are asleep, and not to the subordinate designation of the ήμεῖς. St Paul supposes the hope of living to see the advent of Christ as generally diffused, and finishes speaking of it without declaring anything at all about it itself; the sense of the words is therefore only: "we, who hope to continue to live until the advent of Christ." A misapprehension could not take place in this relation, because it is immediately explained in what follows (v. 1, ss.) that the time is not known. Certainly, the mode of proceeding of the older interpreters, who thought St Paul spoke in the plural only conversationally, without really meaning to say that they themselves, he and his readers, might be still living at the occurrence of that catastrophe, is decidedly to be rejected. For this passage does not stand there isolated, but all the writers of the New Testament consider Christ's advent as near (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 John ii. 18; James v. 8); in fact, the whole doctrine even would not have the slightest practical significance, unless the longing after the second coming of Christ were each moment alive, and therefore continually deemed it possible. It was only towards the end of his life (Phil. i. 23) that Christ's advent retreated in St Paul's mind to a remoter distance. (The λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ (= ἐν λόγῳ) is to be explained: "we express our ideas in a word of the Lord's," and this stands then in opposition to the mere subjective γνώμη of St Paul. [See on 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25.] But it is a question, does St Paul mean by "word of the Lord" an immediate revelation which was bestowed on him, or a declaration of Christ's which had come down to him by tradition, and which, in that case, either may or may not be preserved to us in the Gospels? Pelt insists on it that Matt. xxiv. 31, ss., was in St Paul's mind, but the very special idea of this verse occurs neither there nor anywhere else. The appeal to a lost expression of Christ's has
something very arbitrary in it; I decide, therefore, for an immediate revelation, as St Paul elsewhere also claims them for himself, ex. gr. 1 Cor. xi. 23, in reference to particular points.—The περιλει-πόμενοι is to be explained by the notion of death snatching the majority away, leaving but few remaining; εἰς, which connects itself immediately with that, expresses then the terminus up to which the living are left.—Upon οὐ μὴ, which recurs v. 3 also, in the meaning neutiquam, see Winer’s Gramm. p. 472, and upon the form of the aorist, which follows, ib. p. 473.—Had the Thessalonians believed in no resurrection at all, then there could have been no talk of a φθάνειν of the living: in that case too their dead must have been called νεκροὶ, not κομηθήνειν.

Ver. 16. To this the positive side is then subjoined, from which follows the groundlessness of the anxiety of the Thessalonians for their dear ones dead in the faith. For at Christ’s coming again these will arise first, consequently none can come before them. Christ’s coming is expressly referred to His holy person and glorified body itself (ἀυτὸς ὁ κυρίος),—therefore every manifestation of Him as in mere operations is excluded,—and represented as a descent from heaven, clearly with an allusion to the ἀναληφθήναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, Acts i. 11. That this descent of Christ’s will be a visible one, and prepared by means of a sign of the Son of man, is clearly shown by Matth. xxiv. 30 (on which passage see the remarks in the Comm.), but whether the glorified Redeemer will tread the earth, or only show Himself to men, which ver. 17 might make the more probable, is no where in the Holy Scriptures openly declared. In Revelations the passage xix. 12, ss., describes this appearance of Christ’s for the Millennium; but there too the discourse seems in like manner to be only of a showing Himself on the part of Christ, to the terror of the unbelieving, to the joy of the believers. In the ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ heaven, the right hand of God, is designated as the present place of Christ’s abode since the ascension (see on Matth. xxvi. 64.) How the appearing of the Lord will have an annihilating effect on the wicked and their head, Antichrist, 2 Thess. i. 8, ii. 8, declare more in detail; in accordance with which the Lord is here described as a leader of armies, as a heavenly στρατηγὸς. He comes not alone, but all His saints with Him (iii. 13), who form, as it were, His heavenly army, which surrounds Him, like as in the Old Testament Jehovah appears with His
armies of angels (Gen. xxxii. 2.) The description in Revelations (chap. xix.) is completely in accordance with it; a heavenly army follows Christ on His appearance (vers. 11—13), “clothed in white and clean silk,” (ver. 14.) This addition leaves no doubt upon the fact that sanctified men are to be understood by it, for, according to ver. 8, clean silk is the mark of the righteousness of the saints. But in our passage the phrase ἐν φωνῇ ἄρχαγγέλου excites the doubt whether by the army angels might not be meant. (See on Matt. xxiv. 31.) For, although men may bear the name of angels (Matth. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27, compared with Mal. iii. 1), yet no passage is found where man is named ἄρχαγγέλος. True, it is, as we shall immediately show further on, very questionable, and to me not probable, that ἄρχαγγέλος here denotes an angel, Christ Himself seems rather to be understood by it. But, even if one takes the expression to be used of an angel, it does not follow from that, that the army is composed of angels only; on the contrary, as in Rev. xix. 17, xx. 1, also angels are named too along with men, it seems most correct to suppose that sanctified men as well as angels too will accompany Christ’s appearance. Compare 2 Thess. i. 7, 10. (Κελευσμα according to vulgar pronunciation, attice κέλευμα, means in general “a command, loud call,” then particularly in war “the word of command, for marching, for the attack.” See Thuc. ii. 92; Prov. xxx. 27.—The phrases ἐν φωνῇ ἄρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ are to be considered as epeexegeses of the κέλευσμα. As all signals in war were usually given by means of the trumpet, the term σάλπιγξ is chosen to designate the mighty working which will penetrate the universe, and which will be connected with Christ’s appearance, and by which both the assembling of the faithful then living, and the awakening of those asleep, will be operated; external physical phenomena, earthquakes, storms, and the like, will, no doubt, accompany this working; but it is principally to be conceived as of a spiritual nature. [See on Matth. xxiv. 7, 31; 1 Cor. xv. 52, and especially Rev. viii. 2.] The genitive Θεοῦ is not meant to show the force of the sound, but God as the author of the κέλευσμα given by means of the trumpet. The combination ὁ κύριος καταβηστεῖ ἐν κέλευσματι, ἐν σάλπιγγι, is to express the permanent and concomitant operations of the divine power during the appearance of the Lord: “He descends in the sound of the trumpet,” i.e. so that
God's energy, which penetrates and calls into life all things, permanently accompanies His descent.—The middle phrase ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου denotes the commander of the heavenly army [the ἀρχων στρατιῶν οὐρανίου, Luke ii. 13], as ordering it with His voice and giving the κέλευσμα. But the question occurs, are we to imagine a particular angel to be meant by the expression or not? One might from Rev. xii. 7, Dan. x. 13, xii. 1, be inclined to think of the Archangel Michael; but, as the article is wanting, this is plainly inadmissible: "the voice of an archangel," therefore, would admit of being so taken that the powerful quality of the voice would be thereby denoted, unless it shall be preferred to suppose that Christ Himself is here called ἀρχάγγελος. For the circumstance, that Christ plainly appears here as the leader of the heavenly hosts, the κέλευσμα is His word of command, the voice, therefore, must also be His voice,—is in favour of that. If one understands a created angel by the word, the order of the series would be too startling: ἐν κελεύσματι Χριστοῦ, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου, ἐν σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ. Certainly it is not found elsewhere that Christ is called ἀρχάγγελος, but, if one only resolves the expression into its fundamental idea, ἀρχων τῶν ἀγγέλων, there is surely not the least cause for scruple to call Christ so; the name denotes nothing else than Jehovah Sabaoth, by which Christ is meant to be described as infinitively exalted above all human leaders of armies.

Ver. 17. To this description of Christ’s appearing are then annexed details as to the relation of those fallen asleep to the living. That is to say, the course of events will be this according to the revelation which had been made to St Paul on the subject: first the dead in Christ shall rise, then those remaining alive (after they have been changed, i.e. have received the glorified body clothed upon them, see 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 2 Cor. v. 2—4) will be caught up to the Lord together with the believers risen up. The living do not, therefore, come before those that were asleep (verse 15), but both come to the Lord together. Schott erroneously chooses in this verse to join ἐν Χριστῷ to ἀναστήσου-

1 Thus Ambrosiaster had already correctly interpreted. Ipse enim Christus Dominus, says he on this passage, voluntate patris quasi primus angelus Dei cum exercitu caelesti, sicut continetur in Apocalypsi, (cotp. 11) descendet de caelo ad gerendum bellum contra antichristum.
ταύ, not to νεκροί, for he thinks this passage cannot be used for the distinguishing of a double resurrection, that of the just, and the universal one, the former before, the latter after, the kingdom of God, because the ζωντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι cannot refer to the universal resurrection. Now, that is, no doubt, correct, for, as to the ζωντες, there is no mention at all of a resurrection, they are clothed over (2 Cor. v. 4, ss.); neither can anything, therefore, be inferred from the πρῶτον and ἐπετεία, for both, the resurrection, and the catching up of the living, occur before the beginning of the kingdom of God; but there are other reasons which compel us to the combination οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ. For if the meaning of the words were: "the dead, i.e. all those that have died, good as well as bad, believing as well as unbelieving, rise by Christ's power," all the apprehension of the Thessalonians (ver. 13) would have had no foundation. How could they possibly have feared their dear ones that slept might be debarred from the joys in the kingdom of God? if all the dead arose at Christ's coming, then surely theirs too must arise. By this interpretation, therefore, one would be driven to Kopp's utterly inadmissible assumption that the Thessalonians doubted the resurrection altogether; a doubt, which St Paul would have treated in a totally different way than is done here, as 1 Cor. xv. shows. The whole exposition of St Paul acquires meaning solely on the supposition already given above, that two resurrections are distinguished by him; now, that the dead of the Christian church there would also return to life at the general awaking of the dead was not doubted in Thessalonica, but, if they were awakened then only, in that case they would necessarily be debarred from the kingdom of God, which preceded the general resurrection, and therefore it must have afforded them comfort to hear that those who died in Christ would be awakened even before the change or clothing-over of the living. Accordingly, if this passage, like 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, testifies unmistakeably to a twofold resurrection, whom have we to understand by the νεκροί ἐν Χριστῷ? merely those converted after the ascension, or the pious men of the Old Testament also? The decision of this question depends especially on the way of taking Matth. xxvii. 52, 53. If one finds there no awaking of the dead, one must suppose that all those under the Old Covenant who really believed in the Messiah, as also those who at Christ's descensus ad inferos laid hold
of the salvation preached unto them (see on 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6), are awakened with the dead believing Christians at the first resurrection. If, on the contrary, one finds, as we do, the awakening of the believers of the Old Testament in Matth. xxvii. 52, 53, the awakening of the believing Christians alone is to be supposed at the first resurrection. Only one might lay more stress on the πολλὰ σώματα, Matth. xxvii. 53, than has been done in the Comm. on Matth. xxvii. 52, 53, and combine with the resurrection of Christ the awakening of some early-ripe natures indeed of the Old Testament, but suppose the mass of them to rise only with the Christians before the kingdom of God. But now the concluding words of iv. 17 are still to be considered, and they evince themselves as particularly difficult but also as exceedingly influential on the doctrine of the end of the world. For, if we read in this passage merely: καὶ ἡμα ἐν ἀγωγὶ πάντως σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα, we should not be able to think otherwise than that St Paul meant to say that the faithful will live and reign with Christ on this earth, which has been renewed and restored as paradise. (See on Rom. viii. 17, ss.) But, instead of that, we also find in this verse the enigmatical words: ἀπαγομένων ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα. The meaning of these words cannot be doubtful. The quick and the dead, (both of whom are to be imagined clothed with their glorified body), borne by clouds, caught up from the earth by a sudden power, come to meet the Redeemer descending from heaven in the air, and thus (οὐτῶ = "under these circumstances, in the given state of things") are gathered together unto the Lord, (see 2 Thess. ii. 1, as to this ἐπισωματωγη ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου), therefore not on the earth but in the higher regions. (The ἀπαγομένων is used of the forcible sudden catching up through the power of the Spirit. See on 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; Rev. xii. 5. The clouds [i.e. bright clouds, see on Matt. xxiv. 30; Acts i. 7; Rev. i. 9, xi. 12, xiv. 14] appear as the visible means by which this snatchting up is performed.—The phrase εἰς ἀπαντήσιν (ἦν) is found also at Matt. xxv. 1, 6; Acts xxviii. 15.) But how shall we represent to ourselves this being caught up in the air on the part of the faithful, and their being together with Christ? This question can with difficulty be answered, because in the whole of the New Testament no parallel passage affords any elucidation of the idea expressed here. We can in no case imagine a diatribe
against the Jewish doctrine of the earthly kingdom, because this doctrine is a necessary presupposition for the understanding of the whole of St Paul's exposition in this section. However, it is extremely probable that the passage must be understood so, from the doctrine of the New Testament as to the end of the world and the state of existence in the kingdom of God on the whole. We nowhere read in the New Testament, not even in the leading passage, Rev. xx. 4, ss., that Christ and the glorified believers will abide permanently in the Millennium on this earth (even if it be restored to the purity of paradise). In the passage Rev. v. 11 the βασιλεύων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is to be translated: "to reign over the earth," and not "to reign as dwelling on the earth." To suppose a permanent dwelling of Christ and the saints on the earth presents also great objections, inasmuch as it leads almost unavoidably to fanatical notions. Now, if one imagines to himself that Christ and His saints will, it is true, reign absolutely by their influence in the kingdom of God (whereas now many withdraw themselves from their dominion), perhaps even now and then appear to individuals as Christ did in the forty days after His resurrection, and the saints in like manner (Matt. xxvii. 53), but not dwell permanently on earth,\(^1\) this passage receives complete elucidation. Those risen again, like the living clothed over, cannot then remain here below but go to Christ; as, however, Christ is described as coming away from heaven to meet them, it is not said εἰς οὐρανὸν, but εἰς ἄδημα, in order to mark in a distinct manner the direction of the movement (in the passage Ephes. ii. 2 ἄνω is used in quite another sense); there is couched in it, however, that the Redeemer, after His aim has been attained by means of His coming, returns with them all into His heavenly abode at the right hand of God. How by this view everything else which regards the doctrine of the kingdom of God takes an easier and more harmonious form, we shall take occasion to show in detail in the Exposition of the Revelations. But in any case Usteri's assertion that, according to this passage 1 Thess. iv. 17, in conjunction with other passages of St Paul's Epistles, "a progressive alteration in St Paul's representation might be assumed," is altogether unfounded. (See "St Paul's system of doc-

\(^1\) What classes of men in the kingdom of God are to be imagined as permanently dwelling on earth it will not be possible to indicate more closely till the exposition of Rev. at xx. 3, 8.
trine," p. 359, sq. 4th ed.) For those other passages are said to be 1 Cor. xv. 23, 51, 52, from which Usteri thinks must be gathered the doctrine of the continuation of the life on this earth, rather than that of a life in a region above the earth (in the διαφορά), as 1 Thess. iv. 17 declares. Further, 2 Cor. v. 1, 8, is said to speak of a life in heaven, with the glorified body (therefore like 1 Thess. iv. 17), lastly, Phil. i. 23 of a being with Christ in heaven without bodies. But the latter passage is, first of all, to be entirely separated from the rest, as it treats of the condition of the soul after death, and has no reference at all to the resurrection of the body and Christ's coming again. Secondly, as to the other passages, it is no doubt true that our passage declares most expressly that those risen from the dead will not be on the earth itself, but, as 2 Cor. v. 1, 8, already points to that too, so also 1 Cor. xv. is not at all against it. In ver. 23 the order of the series in which the resurrection takes place is alone given, and in vers. 52, 53, the change of those living at the time of Christ's advent is described, but without ever so slight an intimation that they will dwell on the earth after the clothing over. The only difference, which, as has been already remarked before, is found, consists in the circumstance that the apostle towards the end of his life no longer considers the coming of Christ as so near at hand that he hoped to live to see it yet. (See on Phil. i. 23).--But if now St Paul tells nothing further about all that which, according to the testimony of the Revelations of St John, will take place after the kingdom of God, that is not to be explained by a variation in view upon the point, for the same ideas had already been propounded by the Rabbins, and St Paul knew them, no doubt, from their instruction; on the contrary, the reason of this silence certainly consisted in the single fact that no doubts had been expressed in Thessalonica as to these far distant events. Finally, this representation of the end of the world by St Paul declares once more what we have several times already had occasion to remark, and shall further explain in the exposition of the Revelations, viz. that the life of Christ Himself may be considered throughout as the type of the development of the destinies of the Church. This exaltation of the faithful into the air, namely, mentioned here, corresponds for the whole body of believers to the event of Christ's ascension into heaven; it is the
elevation of the perfected believers with their glorified corporeity above coarse matter into the spiritual kingdom.

Ver. 18. The concluding words lead us back to the λυπεῖσθαι (ver. 13.) "But they are to comfort one another," as all might not be equally afflicted by the loss of beloved ones fallen asleep in Christ, and St Paul's words might take effect on one earlier and more forcibly than on another. (Παρακαλεῖν is construed with the dative alone, and with ἐν.—The λόγοι are to be taken here as λόγοι τῆς πίστεως, "words of faith," as 1 Tim. iv. 6.)

Chap. v. 1. After this special dissertation, St Paul comes also to the general question as to the time of the coming again of the Lord. It is asked, what can have induced him to bring this point under discussion here? From the communication in 2 Thess. ii. one might think that the Christians in Thessalonica had even then, when St Paul wrote this first Epistle, supposed Christ's coming too near, which the exhortation in this Epistle (iv. 11), "to continue at their handicrafts," seems to countenance. But the representation in this passage does not give one the impression at all as if St Paul meant to blame the Thessalonians because they thought the coming of Christ too near, he rather blames those who talk of peace and security, and calls upon all to watch, that they may not be unexpectedly overtaken by the day of the Lord. Had St Paul so conceived their position in regard to this hope, as he knew it when composing the second Epistle, then he would, no doubt, have expressed himself more cautiously. Now, as Timothy had only come from Thessalonica shortly before the composition of this Epistle (iii. 6), it is improbable that such a tendency should have continued unknown to St Paul, if it had then already developed itself in the Christians there. If we must, accordingly, assume, that the Thessalonians had not at that time, when St Paul wrote the first Epistle, as yet shown in any striking manner that they went wrong, not merely in thinking the time of Christ's coming possibly near at hand, but also in teaching as certain this nearness of His coming again; it is also probable that the exhortation (iv. 11) not to give up their work, does not stand quite parallel with the same exhortation in the second Epistle (chap. iii.). According to the latter Epistle, the notion of the certainly and infallibly imminent advent of Christ had, no doubt, an influence on the opinion that
it did not pay to earn their bread any more for themselves pain-
fully with the work of their hands; on the other hand, at the
time of the composition of the first Epistle the Thessalonians
seem, merely out of heedlessness and religious excitement, to have
given themselves up to idleness, which then was certainly but too
well adapted to generate such enthusiastic aberrations as St Paul
had to combat in his second Epistle. But now, as there must surely
have been some motive or other which induced St Paul to discuss
the question of time in connection with the doctrine of Christ’s
advent, it seems most natural to suppose that the Thessalonians,
impelled by their restless zeal, had sent the question to St
Paul, through Timothy, when the advent was to be expected.
Now St Paul answers the question so that he pronounces
every settling of the time as inadmissible, but for that very
reason summons them to continual watchfulness. Neither is it
to be asserted: “the Lord is coming even now!” nor yet:
“He comes not now, but only at such and such a time;” every
fixing of the time, be it of a positive or of a negative nature, is of
evil. In this acceptation the doctrine of the advent is of a truly
practical nature, in that it promotes moral watchfulness, without
countenancing anything fanatical. (The two expressions χρόνος
and καιρός bear such a relation to each other, that the latter defines
the former more accurately, as a time suitable, adapted to the cir-
cumstances. The plural, however, is explained by the consideration
that in the collective fact of the advent many separate points are
contained together, which precede and succeed one another, as has
just been decided on iv. 16, ss.)

Ver. 2. St Paul now appeals to the knowledge which his
readers would necessarily already possess through the instructions
by word of mouth which he had given them; he designates the
day of the Lord as κλείστης ἐν νυκτί, in order to express the
αἰφνίδιον in it, no doubt with reference to the word of Christ,
Matth. xxiv. 43; Luke xii. 39. We have at those passages al-
ready spoken of the offensiveness that is couched in that compari-
on. Here we have only further to consider Schott’s remark (ad
h. 1.), declaring, in order to remove the stumbling block, that
Christ Himself is not compared with a thief, but only His coming
with a thief’s coming. Certainly, but the offensiveness is only very
little mitigated by that, as so many other nobler images presented
themselves in order to express the suddenness in Christ's coming. We shall, therefore, be forced to assume for the explanation of the choice of this precise expression, that the image is conceived from a state of security in the possession of worldly things, in which point of view the advent of Christ will appear to man like a thief's unexpectedly breaking into his well-guarded house. (Compare further the passages 2 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15.) As to the rest, the ἡμέρα κυριοῦ is only another phrase for the παρουσία (iv. 15), but in the ἡμέρα the idea of the judgment-day, the ἡμέρα κρίσεως, to which idea the δεθρός here points, comes forward more. St Paul very often uses the appellation ἡμέρα κυριοῦ or Χριστοῦ. See 1 Cor. i. 18, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. i. 6, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 2. Now here in this passage the reference of the phrase to the coming of Christ to the kingdom of God is quite clear by means of the context, but usually, as in the Gospels (see on Matth. xxiv. 1) so also in St Paul, the future decision is not conceived in its separate points, but these are understood collectively under that one expression. Though the decision did not await the Gentiles at the advent, before the kingdom of God, but not till after it, at the beginning of eternity, yet St Paul speaks of the day of the Lord in reference to them also (Rom. ii. 5, 16.). Both older and later interpreters have chosen here to understand by "the day of the Lord" death, but that is so far only correct as death has for all those who die before Christ's coming a great similarity with the occurrence of the last judgment. For, though the dead will not experience the actual judgment till after their resurrection, yet there is also a preliminary decision given with death itself. Thus, then, is also explained how the doctrine of Christ's coming again has significance for all generations, although that one only, which lives to see it here below, experiences it in its effects. The whole history of the world, accordingly, as has already been declared in another place, is in a certain point of view a continual advent, a continual judgment of the Lord; in every great event in the world, indeed in the death of every individual, the Lord comes and judges! Thus the prophecy is a truth for every one, not merely for the few who just happen to live when the advent takes place. (See on Matt. xxiv. 1.)

Ver. 3. St Paul uses yet a second comparison in order to make the sudden bursting in of the day of Christ clear; as a pregnant
woman is seized quite unexpectedly with the pains of the hour of delivery, so the day of Christ suddenly seizes mankind. (See as to this figure the remarks on Matt. xxiv. 8; Mark xiii. 9. It is also found very often in the Old Testament, especially in Jerem. vi. 24, xiii. 21, xxii. 23, xlix. 24, l. 43.) There is couched in it not only a parallel with the Lord's coming on account of the suddenness and violence of the pain, but the very striking figure points also to the circumstance that a more elevated life is to be produced in human nature from this painful state according to God's will. As to the rest, St Paul here takes Christ's coming on its threatening, punishing, side, in order to excite the Thessalonians to serious watchfulness, in order not to grow like the God-estranged men of this world, whose soul's state is denoted by the exclamation, εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια, in using which the passage Ezekiel xiii. 10 was certainly in St Paul's mind. Peace and security where sin reigns, where a lively faith in the reconciliation and redemption in Christ is wanting, is pitiful self-delusion.

Vers. 4—6. To this is now subjoined the exhortation (which appears in the form of supposing the best in the readers), not to be in that spiritual situation that the day of the Lord can seize upon them like thieves in the night; consequently to walk in the light, not in darkness. Light and darkness, day and night, waking and sleeping, to be sober and to be drunk, are treated as synonyms and correlatives, as in numberless passages of Scripture. (See John iii. 19, viii. 12; Rom. ii. 10; Ephes. v. 7, viii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, v. 8.) The reading κλέπτας in these verses, which is supported by A.B., and justly received by Lachmann, is important, for κλέπτης might very easily have been altered from verse 2, but the correction into κλέπτας is exceedingly improbable. The κλέπται are then represented as νιῶτες σκότους, who ply their trade in darkness. (In verse 4 ένα can only, as Schott justly observes in opposition to Fritzche, by doing the greatest violence to the sentence, be taken τελικώς, for the οὖν ετέλεσεν σκότει is a premiss, "ye are certainly, as I know, not in darkness," which a particle strictly denoting purpose in no wise suits, especially as afterwards γίγνεται follows upon it.—In the well-known formula νιῶν φῶς, ἡμέρας, more is couched than a mere external relation; in it is expressed the idea of hav-
ing received one's higher life from the light and its sanctifying influence.)

Vers. 7, 8. St Paul designates the night as that time in which sleep and drunkenness usually take place; those things, therefore, no longer become those who have night in the spiritual sense behind them, they are awake and armed for the combat. The metaphor of arming we became fully acquainted with at Ephes. vi. 10, ss., and there also spoke of the discrepancies which are found between the two passages in the comparison of the several weapons with different Christian virtues. As to the rest, we find the order of succession of the three Christian cardinal virtues here again just as it is in the passage i. 3, where see the Commentary.

Vers. 9—11. St Paul fastens on the ἐνίκες σωτηρίας in order to express the idea, that God hath not appointed the faithful to wrath, but to salvation, that therefore also the day of the Lord brings them not destruction, but blessing. The election of grace by God is, no doubt, couched in the ἔθερο, but only in the sense of a prædestinatio sanctorum, as it has been proved in the Commentary at Rom. ix. to be scriptural, and especially to be St Paul’s doctrine. The atoning death of Christ is named as the means by which the σωτηρία is realized according to God’s ordinance. The εἶτε γηγορῶμεν, εἶτε καθεύδωμεν seems strange at first sight, as in ver. 6 sleeping among the faithful was altogether denied. But it is clear that the two expressions are here used in a totally different sense, viz. of the antithesis of the ζητεῖ and the κοιμᾶται, iv. 13, ss. St Paul again connects his discourse with the previous discussion, in which he had made it clear that those fallen asleep in Christ forfeit nothing of their blessedness; with a reference to that he says, we believers shall live with Christ (iv. 17), whether we be still in the body, when He cometh, or already fallen asleep. (Compare Rom. xiv. 8.) As to the rest, καθεύδσεως is found in no other passage of the New Testament used of death, for in the history of the awakening of Jairus’ daughter (Matth. ix. 24; Mark v. 39; Luke viii. 52) it means, in opposition to ἀπέθανον, really “to sleep”: κοιμᾶσθαι is everywhere else found of the death-sleep. In the same way γηγορεῖ is found nowhere else in the meaning “to live, to walk in the body.” The passage, therefore, has certainly something singular about it, and the more so
indeed, as no one can avoid the impression that a preference is
given the γρηγορεῖν, as the state of waking consciousness over the
καθέδεων, whereas we are inclined to claim for the soul of the
pious man released from the body a higher degree of consciousness. 1
However, this difficulty is solved on the ground which we
have already detailed in the Commentary on 1 Cor. xv. 19, 20.
From the representation of the New Testament the state of the
soul separated from the body is not, it is true, an unconscious one,
but yet of such a nature, that the consciousness seems depressed.
The complete self-consciousness only comes in again with the re-
surrection of the body; a living on without bodily resurrection St
Paul treats (1 Cor. xv.) as a losing of eternal life. The striking
part of the passage is really, therefore, solely couched in the use
of the words chosen, and not in the idea.—Verse 11 then closes,
like iv. 18, with a summons to reciprocal encouragement and edifi-
cation. (Ver. 9. περιπολήνως, "attaining, acquiring," St Paul
uses also at 2 Thess. ii. 14; Ephes. i. 14; it is also found Heb.
x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9.—Ver. 10. As to the use of the conjunctive
instead of the optative in this passage see Winer's Gramm. pp.
246, 270, note.—Ver. 11. εἰς τὸν ἐνα = ἄλληλους iv. 18 is found
in profane writers also. See Kypke observv. p. 339.)

§ 6. CONCLUDING EXHORTATIONS.

(v. 12—28.)

Verses 12, 13. The two first verses of the closing exhortations
which follow concern the relation of the readers to the teachers and
heads of the church. St Paul exhorts the Thessalonians duly to
honour them in their position. As nothing similar is found in the
second Epistle, and no express polemical doctrine shows itself in
this passage, nothing obliges us to suppose that in Thessalonica
theoretical or practical errors in regard to the relation of laymen to
the teachers of the church had been disseminated. As it is inhe-

1 How universally this notion is spread appears from the ordinary mode of expres-
sion which one uses in reference to the dead: "now everything is clear to them, the
veil is removed from them!" from which it appears unmistakably that one conceives
the connection of the soul with the body as a hinderance to complete consciousness.
rent in human nature that such errors ever and everywhere appear in individuals, because obedience and subordination are such difficult duties, it may reasonably be supposed that St Paul found himself impelled to give his precepts merely with a view to the relation as such. Only the slight intimation v. 27 (of which passage see the explanation) might seem to countenance the idea that the relation between the church and its heads was not altogether untroubled. However, nothing certain can be deduced from that. So much, however, results unmistakeably from these verses, viz. that St Paul supposes a difference among the members of the church. All do not stand on a level according to the principles of democratical equality, but there are teachers and learners, leaders and led, as will be discussed more in detail in the exposition of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. As to the rest, the terms by which the teachers are here designated are to be taken so that the appellative οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν ὑμῖν designates them quite generally as labourers (ἐν ὑμῖν is to be taken in the sense “among you,” not as ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, as Flatt and Pelt insist; for the question is not merely of a purely inward labour, but also of outward guidance of the church). On the other hand, προϊστάμενοι and νουθετοῦντες do not denote, for instance, two other classes along with the κοπιῶντες, but two different forms of the labours of the κοπιῶντες are denoted by them, as is clear from the absence of the article. One could labour in the church in a more outward or in a more inward way; the former is the προϊστάσαι (compare 1 Tim. v. 17, where προεστῶτες are named), the latter the νουθε-τεῖν. Whether, indeed, St Paul already conceives these two forms of labour in the church as two entirely separate church-offices may, it is true, appear uncertain, considering the church in Thessalonica was so young, and, no doubt, small too; but in later times (see 1 Cor. xii. 18; Ephes. iv. 11; 1 Tim. iv. 17) such a distinction between the offices is decidedly expressed. (Ver. 12. εἰδέναι is used, after the analogy of the Hebr. יִרְאָה, Gen. xxxix. 6, Prov. xxxi. 13, and the Latin respicere, in the sense of respectful acknowledgment. See 1 Cor. xvi. 18.—Ver. 13. ὑπερεκπεριστοῦ, see iii. 10.—The phrase ἵγεισθαλ τίνα ἐν ὑμῖν is harsh. Schott compares Job. xxxv. 2, ἵγεισθαλ τί ἐν κράτει, ὑπερεκπεριστε. The phrase is to denote the esteem and love which are equally due to the rulers of the church for their painful labour so beneficial to the
laity.—By the *eipruevete euv eautous* disputes among the Christians in Thessalonica seem, it is true, to be pointed to, but the whole remaining contents of the Epistle, which breathe only acknowledgment on the part of the apostle, do not suit that at all though. (But compare v. 27.) Certainly one cannot well take the words by themselves as an independent exhortation, nor annex them to what follows, because the *patrakevoun de yuvas* answers to the *protopmen de yuvas* (ver. 12) and marks a fresh beginning; but they afford a very good sense also in connection with what precedes, if they are taken so that the exhortation to preserve the proper relation towards the labourers for the church is, in conclusion, comprised in the exhortation to peace. Where teachers and taught stand in a false position towards each other, there the peace of the church is already undermined. D.E.G. read *airotis* for *eautous*, but it is presumably only a slip of the pen for *airotis*. Further, it is again to be taken, as in ver. 12, in the meaning *euv mevrop yuvas*.

Ver. 14. As to the rest, how far St Paul is from hierarchical notions of the dignity of the rulers is shown by the circumstance that he here immediately summons all to the *nouveteu*, which he seemed in ver. 12 to adjudge to the *labourers alone*. (The exhortation to warn the *atautoi*, i.e. to return to subordination, refers, it may be supposed, to the state of things brought under discussion in 1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11.—*Olyanpsi-xos* is found nowhere in the New Testament but here, often, however, in the LXX. for the Hebrew *rav* or *re*-*rav*, Isaiah liv. 6, lvii. 15, Prov. xiv. 29.—*Auvtevethai,* “to care for one, to support one.” See Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13. The *atautoi* are surely to be understood less of the bodily, than of the spiritually, weak.—The *pros panta* is more accurately defined by the *eis allhlos kai eis pantas*, which follows in ver. 15, to the purport that the absolute universality of all men is to be understood by it.)

Vers. 15—18. There now follows a series of single exhortations, which altogether presuppose the highest moral standing, as it reigns, e.g., in the sermon on the mount, and seem in part formed on well-known utterances of the Lord. Ver. 15 answers in meaning to Matt. v. 44, in words to Rom. xii. 17, 1 Peter iii. 9. (See as to *opav, in the sense sibi cuvere*, for which *betaeiw* also stands.—Matt. viii. 4, xviii. 10.—*To avathov* is here to be taken, as
at Matt. vii. 11, in the sense, "the beneficial, useful," in opposition to κακῶν.) In ver. 16 the πάντα τε χαίρετε is to be explained as the same phrase is at Phil. iii. 1.—Ver. 17 is to be understood, from Luke xviii. 1, Rom. xii. 12, Ephes. vi. 18, Col. iv. 2, not of merely frequent, but of unceasing, prayer (ἀδιαλείπτως, see i. 2), i.e. of a pervading tendency of life directed towards God.—Finally, St Paul in ver. 18 exhorts to thanksgiving unto God under all circumstances, be they pleasant or unpleasant. (Ephes. v. 20.) This thankful state of mind is to be considered as the expression of child-like dependence on God, which in every state of things, even in what is unpleasant, honours God's will. The τὸ τῶτο γὰρ θέλημα (comp. iv. 3) can only be referred to εὐχαριστεῖν, "it is God's will that you give thanks for all things," and cannot be taken, with Storr, so that τὸ τῶτο is meant to stand = τούτῳ, as if the meaning were: "God's will is of such a nature towards you, that you have only cause to thank Him, as He does you only good." Such an exchange of the τὸ τῶτο and τούτῳ is to be rejected as contrary to grammar.—As to the rest, definite reasons cannot be shown for the position of the several propositions, one might conceive them just as well arranged in the inverse order.

Vers. 19—22. The next exhortation: τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβένωντε supposes the comparison of the Spirit to a candle or fire, which, as is well-known, is frequently found in the New Testament, and has occasioned various modes of expression. (See John iv. 24; Ephes. vi. 16; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. xii. 29.) But the question whether πνεῦμα is to be taken here as a religious-moral principle, or as the source of the Charismata, is to be altogether declined, because the two cannot be separated, or at least did not make their appearance separately in the apostolical times. Where the Spirit was, He shewed Himself as well in a religious-moral relation as also in the extraordinary gifts. But, inasmuch as the efficacy of the Spirit was outwardly recognizable in the Charismata, therefore also in those a quenching was alone possible, perhaps out of fear of enthusiasm, of which there could be no question in a religious-moral point of view (for who would have thought of quenching the virtues of faith, love, and hope, called forth by the Holy Ghost?), for that reason we are, first of all, in connection with πνεῦμα, to think of the gifts, and what follows suits this view well, for a form of Charisma, viz. the προφητελα, is there especially brought forward and
recontinued. (See at 1 Cor. xii. 4, ss., xiv. 1, ss.) As to the
rest, we plainly see, from these exhortations, that St Paul had no
presentiment at the time when he wrote this, that the Christians in
Thessalonica were in danger of becoming a prey to fanaticism,
though this was the case later, according to the second Epistle.
True, the προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε, considered by itself, might be
understood so that St Paul would wish by it to make the Thessa-
lonians, like the Corinthians (1 Cor. xiv. 1, ss.), observe the value
of calm conscious prophecying over the more fanatical tongue-
haranguing. But the πνεύμα μὴ σβέννυτε does not permit this
mode of taking the words. From this exhortation the Chris-
tians in Thessalonica must rather have had the sorrowful no-
tion of all gifts that they might easily give occasion for abuses,
and, to avoid those, have slighted the gifts themselves. When
St Paul at a later date wrote the Epistles to the Corinthians,
he himself even found it proper to moderate the over-estimation
of them, and at length in his latest Epistles the gifts retreat entirely
into the background, which is especially shown in the pastoral
Epistles (comp. the Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles).—Ver.
21. Now it is clear from the context that the words: πάντα δὲ
δοκιμάζετε κ. τ. λ. are not to be taken in the totally general sense
in which they are usually employed; they rather refer to the
Charisma of the διάκρισις πνευμάτων, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 30; 1 John
iv. 1. The readers are called on to prove the representations of
the prophets by the gift of proving, dwelling in them; the individual
gifts are meant to complete and rectify one another. (Compare the
remarks in the Comm. on 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiv. 29.) Here, then,
reason, as man's natural power, is not set up for a judge over divine
revelation, but by God's ordinance the modes of operation of the
Holy Ghost are variously distributed, so that in some the com-
munication of what is new predominates, in others the criticism of
what is communicated. The words in ver. 22: ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδος κ. τ. λ. form no fresh sentence, but only the complement to
the τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε. The idea, therefore, of the δοκιμάζεων (=
κρίνειν, to separate, to sift) is divided into its two aspects, into the
recognizing of the good and the rejection of the evil, which latter

1 In meaning the exhortation coincides with the well-known apocryphal utterance of
Christ's: γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι τραπεζίται.
has mixed up the sinfulness of the prophets with the divine power operating in them. It can only be doubtful how the εἰδος is to be taken. The meaning "appearance" is inadmissible because the combination εἰδος πονηρὸν is without example, the idea, too, of abstaining from evil appearance does not suit what precedes. Therefore, in case of employing that meaning, ver. 23 must first have been brought into connection with ver. 23, but that too is not suitable. The exhortation to abstain from evil appearance presupposes that they are already free from evil itself, but in ver. 23 that deliverance from evil seems in the ἀγαθὰ κ. τ. λ. to be only gained by prayer. Now, even if this admits of being put aside by the remark that ἀγαθὰ here can only be understood of the growth of the already existing pure new man, yet the αὐτὸς δὲ κ. τ. λ. shows that something fresh is to follow. Εἰδος is, therefore, to be taken in the signification, "species, sort," as Josephus (Arch. x. 3. 1) writes πᾶν εἰδὸς πονηρὸς, so that πονηρὸν is taken as a substantive. (Ver. 21. The conjecture πνεύματα for πάντα is not only unnecessary, but also unsuitable; the discourse is not of distinguishing true and false prophets, but only of true and untrue utterances of such to whom the gift of prophecy belonged.)

Vers. 23, 24. As the Thessalonians are, as members of the Christian Church, already ἅγιοι, i.e. set apart from the sinful world, filled with the principle of true holiness (see the remarks on Rom. i. 7), stress is especially to be laid on the ὅλοτελείας. Sanctification extends itself only by degrees over the collective powers and natural qualities of man; it is precisely progress in this process of glorification and the preservation of the whole personality spotless, till the judgment at Christ's coming (iii. 13), that St Paul wishes them in these words, and that too of God Himself, through His spirit, as no one can sanctify himself by his own power. But God is here called Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, because sanctification is the condition of outward and inward peace; God, therefore, who carries peace in Himself, will also impart it to men through sanctification. (Ὁλοτελείας is found only here in the New Testament. Aquila renders Deut. xiii. 17, ἱσαρός by ὅλοτελείας. It stands here quite synonymous with ὅλοκληρος, which, according to James i. 4, is found in the meaning of τέλειος, as it also often occurs in the LXX. and Josephus for ἄδειον or ἀτίμιον. Of course the ὅλοκληρον refers to every
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single one of the three parts of human nature named. Each is to be preserved entire in itself, and all together are to be kept spotless. By sin not only the proportion of the parts among themselves, but also the stability of each single one by itself, may be weakened.) That, lastly, the juxtaposition of the three terms: πνεῦμα, ψυχή, σῶμα, is not a mere rhetorical amplification for the idea of the totality, nor yet that πνεῦμα can be understood of the Holy Spirit, but denotes the human spirit (see on Rom. viii. 16),—is acknowledged by the latest interpreters, though Pelt and Schott will not admit that the distinguishing of πνεῦμα and ψυχή pervades the system of anthropology of St Paul and of the Bible generally. But, as the distinguishing of πνεῦμα and ψυχή here cannot surely be merely accidental,—as, further, a difference in the use of the two expressions can be proved to exist elsewhere also (even if in many passages, where nothing depends exactly on an accurate distinguishing of them, the one expression also stands, and may stand, for the other),—as, lastly, the partition into spirit, soul, and body, was current among the Jews, just as it was among the Platonists; it appears, even in the case when one cannot one's self recognize this division, indispensable, according to a purely historical mode of contemplation, to acknowledge the triple division of human nature as a doctrine of the apostolical age. But now it follows that many Christian points of doctrine (to name some, the doctrines of regeneration, of the relation of the old to the new man, and whatever connects itself with that), can be made intelligible only by assuming the distinction between spirit and soul. We have, therefore, by continued investigation been only more and more convinced of the correctness of the result of our treatise de trichotomia humanae naturae (printed in the opusc. theol. pp. 143, ss.), which in essentials Vitringa also had already (observ. sacr. pp. 549, ss.) in earlier times expressed in reference to cabalistic1 and Platonist views, just as in later times Usteri (in "the system of St Paul," pp. 404, ss.) at least recognized it as an

1 The Cabalists assumed, in appearance only, besides נפש and שדים, also נשימה as different from both; therefore three spiritual powers, and, with the corporeity, four parts of human nature. For נשימה answers to the πνεῦμα ἄγιον of the New Testament, which also St Paul distinguishes from the human πνεῦμα (Rom. viii. 16), so that in the regenerate man also three spiritual powers are to be supposed; but the πνεῦμα ἄγιον is not an integral part of human nature, but a working of God in him which elevates it above itself.
historical fact. For, whilst the ψυχή denotes the lower region of
the inner man,—comprises therefore the powers to which analogous
ones are found in animal life also, as understanding (φένεσ), ap-
petitive faculty (καρδία), memory, fancy,—the πνεῦμα includes
those natural dispositions which constitute the true human life,
viz. reason (νοῦς), as the faculty of perceiving the divine; conscience,
as the faculty of distinguishing moral good and evil; free-will, as
the faculty of moral choice, by which the ability to form a history
is purchased. Just according to the predominance of the one or
the other principle in man he appears either as πνευματικός, or
ψυχικός, or even σαρκικός. The divine spirit, attaching itself
to the human spirit weakened by sin, and filling it with complete
energy, frees man from the power of sin which rules him, and ex-
hibits him as πνευματικός in the full sense of the word. (See the
remarks on Rom. vii. 23 to viii. 3.) The certainty of the fulfil-
ment of the wish for his readers expressed in ver. 23 St Paul
now finds (ver. 24) grounded in the faithfulness of God, who has
called them unto participation in the merits of Christ; the will of
God exhibited in this calling will also, in accordance with His un-
changeableness, arrive at completion. The necessity that is couched
in this idea is to be referred to the prædestinatio sanctorum alone,
in the sense in which we set it forth as a doctrine of Scripture at
Romans ix. 1. St Paul does not mean here to say God knows
how to make good His calling by the force of His gratia irresis-
tibilis even to the complete sanctification of man against his free
will; but God knows how to lead the will of man through the in-
fluences of His grace even to full concordance with His holy de-
crees. The possibility of resistance is not excluded by that, it re-
 mains to man even after his conversion, but then too, by reason of
the all-knowing eye of God, no true calling takes place in rebellious
persons. As to the rest, the δι καὶ ποιήσει has something elliptical
in it; one comprehends how copyists might then be themselves
obliged to complete the sentence. In some, though unimportant,
MSS. we find the addition: τὴν δνίδα υμῶν βεβαιαν. But it
seems more suitable to supply merely ταύτα πάντα, insomuch as
the πνευμα is most naturally referred to what is prayed for in ver.
23. (As to the πνευμον Ὀλος see at 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13.)

Vers. 25—28. The recommendation of praying for him, and the
commission to greet all the brethren with the holy kiss, are also found
Rom. xv. 30; Col. iv. 3; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12, on which passages compare the remarks in the Commentary. Only in the three last cited passages it is always said ἀναγινώσκειν ἀλλήλους, whereas here the commission is given to some to kiss all the other brethren. But this is sufficiently explained by the fact that, as ver. 27 clearly shows, this Epistle is first of all addressed to the rulers of the church, yet only so that it is at the same time designed for the whole brotherhood. It was, therefore, we may suppose, delivered to the elders according to St Paul's intention, read first by them, and then read out to the whole church in public assembly. But that St Paul lays this injunction on the elders with the formula of adjuration, ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν κύριον, so emphatically is certainly striking, and points to a special reason to us unknown. If one looks back to vers. 12, 13, one might think that at least slight traces of differences between the church in Thessalonica and its rulers had suffered themselves to be perceived, and that St Paul, therefore, apprehended the rulers might not communicate the Epistle to all. Michaelis proposed, with reference to the fact that an Epistle had been forged (2 Thess. ii. 2), to take the passage so that ἀναγινώσκειν would be understood of the recognition of the Epistle as a genuine writing of the apostle's throughout the church. But the term constantly denotes in St Paul "to read, to read to," only. (See especially Col. iv. 16.) Besides, surely St Paul cannot possibly here take cognizance of a fact that only happened later. ('Ὅρκίζω, with a double accusative in the meaning obtestari aliquem per, with νῷ to be supplied, is found again in the New Testament at Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 13. Lachmann has, on the authority of A.B.D.E., preferred ἐνὁρκίζω, which, at all events, has the rarity of the form in its favour. The same critic, supported by the authority of B.D.E.F.G., leaves out ἀγίους, but the rarity of the term, "holy brothers," which is only found at Col. i. 2, Heb. iii. 1, renders it more probable that it is primordial here. The ἀμήν after the benediction is, like the subscription, certainly not genuine here.)
EXPOSITION

OF THE

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

§ 1. THANKSGIVING FOR THE FAITH OF THE CHRISTIANS IN

THESSALONICA.

(i. 1—12.)

After the salutation, which coincides literally with that of the first Epistle (see the explanation of 1 Thess. i. 1), St Paul begins, just as at 1 Thess. i. 2, to express his thanks to God on account of their faith and love (ver. 3). Now this has something extraordinary in it, inasmuch as he had by no means, as chap. ii. shows, reason to be so contented with the then state of the church as he could be at the time of the composition of the first Epistle. In the short time which might fall between the dates of composing the two Epistles circumstances had, certainly, already changed very much, and the weak stirrings of enthusiasm at first existing were now come to their full development. Nevertheless, St Paul might, in spite of those aberrations, against which he steps forth in chap. iii. with such emphatic denunciations, thankfully acknowledge the faith and love of the Thessalonians with a good conscience, as those aberrations proceeded not from unbelief, but rather from a too great eagerness of belief, to which only a clear judgment was wanting. This exaggeration in the eagerness of belief St Paul perhaps indulgently points to by means of the expression ἰπεραυξάνειν, in which there is scarcely couched a mere intensification of the simple verb. (Ver. 3. The καθὼς ἔξιον ἐστι is to be referred not so much
to the greatness of the thanks, as to the indispensability of the thanks in themselves.—It cannot be inferred from the ἐνὸς ἐκάστου that no differences at all had taken place among the Thessalonians; chap. iii. shows the contrary. But St Paul recognizes even in these differences a foundation of love, which only manifested itself in them in a perverted form of application; they had both faith and love, but without being as yet able rightly to direct them by means of wisdom.)

Ver. 4. Just as at 1 Thess. i. 7, ii. 19, St Paul again describes the Thessalonians with their powerful faith, which approved itself so brilliantly in the persecutions, as his glory before the churches of God. But one expects that πίστεως, as the more general idea, would have stood before the ὑπομονῆς here, which would have been requisite too, if in accordance with Schott a Hendiadys were to be supposed here, as if ὑπομονὴ καὶ πίστεως stood for πίστεως ὑπομένουσα, which however is not to be approved of, not to mention that faith in the general sense is constantly to be conceived as ὑπομένουσα, therefore something pleonastic would be couched in it. But πίστεως in the definite reference to the persecutions is to be taken here not in the general, but in the special, sense, as it is used in Rom. xiv., viz., solely of the irrefragable fixedness of conviction which allows itself to be perplexed by no combats, without reference to the object of faith. In ver. 3, on the contrary, πίστεως is to be taken in the comprehensive sense, therefore also with reference to the contents of the Gospel which are believed. (The αἱ ἀνέχεσθε explains more nearly the διωγμῶν ὑμῶν.—The αἱ stands, as is well-known, by the law of attraction, for δια. The present indicates the continued duration of the persecutions when St Paul wrote.)

Ver. 5. Now St Paul finds in this approving of their patience and faith in every combat an evidence of the just judgment of God, that they may be made worthy of the kingdom of God, for which they suffer. The words ἐνέδειγμα τῆς δικαιας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ unite themselves very strictly with the preceding idea of the sufferings endured with patience and faith; so that it stands for εἰκ ἐνέδειγμα of ἐνδείγματι, which some MSS. also read from a desire to make the passage easier through the correction. (Hesychius interprets ἐνδείγμα by ἀπόδειξις. At Phil. i. 28 the form ἐνδεικτις is found for it, in the same meaning, "evidence, proof.")
Now this idea is commonly explained so that δίκαια κρίσις is said to be the future judging of the world; but how can the present, patiently endured, suffering for the sake of the kingdom of God be an evidence of the future just judgment of God. It is said, in so far as God will in His future judgment reward those who have suffered for the sake of the good, and punish the persecutors. But one does not see by the present that God rewards the good; to take their patience as reward might certainly be too bold; neither, therefore, does it suit that the present is to be an evidence for the future. The passage becomes clear only if one conceives the present sufferings even already as an expression of the future just judgment of God. The parallel passage 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18 is elucidatory of this idea. The sufferings of the Church are there called τὸ κρίμα τοῦ ὀίκου τοῦ Θεοῦ, the judging of the world begins with the faithful, and their sufferings are represented as a means of perfection for the faithful. Now in like manner St Paul too here (compare at 1 Thess. iii. 4) contemplates their sufferings as a testimony that God is executing His just judgment on them, not however in order to destroy them, but in order to perfect them, and so make them worthy of God's kingdom. By this kingdom is of course, from the historical connection of the two Epistles, to be understood the kingdom of God on earth expected as quite near at hand. Even for that reason alone the δίκαια κρίσις cannot be the universal judgment of the world, because that will not take place till after the kingdom of God on earth.—In the ἔπερ ἐς καὶ πάσχετε there is of course no mention of a purchasing the kingdom of God by means of sufferings, as if they conferred a merit, but ἔπερ here denotes only the object of the suffering, "for the sake of which ye also suffer, which ye therefore represent, in that ye bear it in you, and to which ye, accordingly, must also at some time outwardly belong." (The compound καταξιωθῆναι does not differ in meaning from the simple verb. See Luke xx. 35, xxii. 36; Acts v. 21.)

Vers. 6, 7. And now the judicial action of God is described in detail, as it manifests itself in Christ's advent (vers. 6—10). This detail does not connect itself with ἐνδειγμα δικαίωσεως, but with the words εἰς τὸ καταξιωθῆναι κ.τ.λ., by means of ἔπερ δίκαιον. Suffering here below in the cause of what is good supposes also, in conformity with God's justice, the receiving the
reward of fidelity. As in the whole course of the world's history, so also in the coming of Christ, God manifests Himself as the just one, who weighs out reward and punishment by an unalterable law; however, this is not yet the κρίσις ἔσχάτη, that does not take place till the general resurrection after the kingdom of God. (See on Matt. xxv. 1, xiv. 31; Rev. xx. 12, ss.) Now, justice is here conceived quite in its strict form, as jus talionis; the θλήσσωτες are requited with θλήσις, the θλησμονεον rewarded with θλησις. It need not be mentioned that the θλήσις as such is not meant here to be represented as giving a title to peace and comfort in the kingdom of God, without looking at the disposition with which it is undergone, but that the patient, believing, endurance of the same must be supplied as described in ver. 4. Just as little does the δίκαιον form an antithesis with the divine grace; St Paul does not mean to say God must grant the eternal happiness of the believing sufferers,—it can be demanded of Him. The point of view is only, as at Rom. ii. 5, 6, taken purely in the manner of a judge according to the principle of retribution, without denying that another point of view also comes into consideration, which St Paul declares at Rom. xi. 35, according to which the worthiness of man at the tribunal of God is itself God's work. (Ver. 6. As to εἰπερ, si- guidem, see Rom. viii. 9, 17, 1 Peter ii. 3. Only it is not here to be translated "if at least," but "if, that is to say," with an assumption of the certainty that it is so, whereas "if at least" admits the possibility of the contrary.—Παρὰ = ἡ νήσις. —Ἀνταποδώνω see Luke xiv. 14; Rom. xii. 19; 1 Thess. iii. 9. Ver. 7. As to θλησις see 2 Cor. vii. 5, viii. 13. It is = θλήσις, Acts iii. 19, which is equally used of the kingdom of God also.—The μέθ ήμών is to be referred to St Paul and his companions. Of these, after their election by grace, the attainment of eternal happiness in the kingdom of God is so confidently assumed, that the others are designated as uniting themselves to them, who constitute the flower of the inhabitants of the kingdom of God.—The ἀποκάλυψις ἀπ ’ οὐρανοῦ = the καταβαλέων ἀπ ’ οὐρανοῦ described 1 Thess. iv. 16.)

Ver. 8. Christ's coming is now again described (comp. 1 Thess. iii. 18, iv. 16), as accompanied by angels. As, however, the article is wanting, we can only suppose some angels, not the whole countless army of angels, as has been already remarked at the passages cited. As δύναμις stands after ἂγγέλου, it cannot, of
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course, be taken, as Michaelis wanted, in the meaning "army," but is meant to designate, conjoined with ἄγγελοι, the angels as servants and executors of the power of Christ. A new feature in the picture of the advent, as St Paul sketches it, which did not occur at 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17, is εν πυρι φλογός, for which Lachmann, in accordance with authorities of importance, has adopted εν φλογὶ πυρός. But this reading is easily explained by the endeavour to bring the phrase nearer the usual mode of expression, in which one talks of a flame of fire, i.e. fire-flame, indeed, but not of a fire of flame. For the question here is not of a single fire-flame, but of a flaming, glowing, fire, in opposition to a low fire not breaking out into bright flames. But this is here named as the element which consumes all that resists, and lends at the same time its fearful brightness to the appearance of the divinity. (Compare Ex. iii. 2, ss., Dan. vii. 9, ss.) It stands, therefore, = to the ἐν τῷ δόξῃ αὑτοῦ, Matth. xxv. 31, or to the ἐπὶ τῶν νεφέλων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ibid. xxvi. 64, by which, as has already been remarked at 1 Thess. iv. 17, bright clouds are to be understood. The description at Rev. xix. 12, where Christ is represented in His advent as sitting on a white horse, and with eyes ὡς φλόξ πυρός, is, according to the analysis of the figurative language of the Apocalypse, also parallel to this passage. The primitive aspect of Christ's coming is here now particularly treated of, not certainly in order that the Thessalonians might feast to their heart's content on the future punishment of their persecutors, but as means of warning, in order to deter them from falling away. For the Scriptures know no such pretended divestment of all egoism, that man needs neither fear nor hope, even of damnation or eternal happiness, as motives, and rightly, for it exhibits itself either as a fanatical error, as in the instance of Madame Guyon, or, which is certainly the most common, as indifference and torpidity.—The repetition of the article before ὑπακούουσι certainly countenances the idea that St Paul means to name two classes of persons who will not escape punishment at Christ's coming. But the supposition that the Θεων μὴ εἰδότες are the Gentiles, and the τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ μὴ ὑπακούουσι the Jews, is improper for this reason, to go no further, that surely many Gentiles also did not receive the Gospel offered to them, and, on the other hand, many Jews also did not know God, that is to say in reality (John viii. 54, ss., xv. 21, ss.); for a merely out-
ward knowledge of the existence of God cannot surely be meant here; only the true ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ Θεοῦ is everlasting life (John xvii. 3). The two phrases denote not classes of nations, but moral conditions; those among the Jews and the Gentiles who knew not God in the sense pointed out, and were not obedient to the Gospel which was preached unto them and whose divine power touched their hearts,—meet with their recompense in the day of the Lord (see 2 Thess. ii. 11). There is, indeed, also couched in them, that all so-called Gentiles are not rejected as such, but only those who were not true to the light that shone even for them too, but by actual sins augmented their original sin to the complete blinding of the spiritual eye. Compare the remarks in the Comm. on Rom. i. 19, 20, ii. 14, 15, 26. (Εκδικήσεως διδόναι τῷ ποιεῖν = ἐκδικεῖν. Compare Luke xviii. 7, sq.; Acts vii. 24.)

Ver. 9. "Οἰλεθρος αἰώνος is named as the punishment which the reprobate (by which, according to ii. 8, Antichrist with his followers is to be understood,) at the coming of Christ have to suffer. This is the only passage in St Paul’s Epistles in which everlasting damnation is openly declared, whereas not a few occur in which a bringing back of all the lost ones is apparently assumed as possible. (Compare the Comm. on 1 Cor. xv. 25—28.) For, although but little can be inferred from the expression αἰώνος considered in itself, as it might also denote merely an uncommonly long time, yet it is not to be disputed that the comparison with the formula ζωῆς αἰώνος does not permit us to interpret the phrase ὀλεθρος αἰώνος otherwise than of everlasting damnation. For the supposition that St Paul did indeed in this earliest of his Epistles still teach everlasting damnation, but gave it up in later times, there exists no sufficient foundation, because the bringing back again is nowhere freely and openly declared. This alone admits of being maintained: that among the writers of the New Testament St Paul is the one that lets the doctrine of everlasting damnation retire to the background most, and affords the defenders of the Apocatastasis the most plausible support. (The formula δίκην, ξημίαν, τίεν, so common in the profane writers, is found in the New Testament here alone.—"Οἰλεθρος is used in the New Testament by St Paul alone, 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Thess. v. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 9. In the last passage it stands beside ἀπόλεια, which is elsewhere commonly used as an antithesis to σωτηρία.) It is very difficult to decide how the
διδ is to be taken in the concluding words of ver. 9. For it can be taken merely as denoting either the source of the punishment or the separation of the reprobate from the face of the Lord. Flatt, Storr, and Pelt, among others, advocate the former, either taking πρόσωπον κυρίου as a mere circumlocution for the person of the Lord, or understanding πρόσωπον emphatically of the threatening avenging countenance. The latter interpretation is defended by Beza, Michaelis, Koppe, and Schott. The decision is very difficult, because the two members of the sentence which stand parallel to each other, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου and ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἱεράς αὐτοῦ, seem to favour the two different interpretations. The words "from the face of the Lord" seem more to declare for the idea of the separation, because the looking on the face of the Lord is used to denote the approach of God and of eternal happiness, but the phrase "from the glory of His power" seems more to favour the other acceptation, viz. that ἀπὸ is meant to denote the point of departure of the punishment. The mention of power does not suit well the idea of the separation, division, from God. We should allow ourselves to be determined by this latter important point to conceive the idea thus: "they will receive their punishment from the face of God as its source," so that the latter is imagined as menacing (the eyes like flames of fire, Rev. xix. 12), the rather that it is somewhat harsh to interpret the ἀπὸ alone of the separation, unless the collation of Isaiah ii. 10, 19 made it more than probable that St Paul had that passage, which accurately coincides with this of Thessalonians, before his eyes. But in the prophet the ἀπὸ is sufficiently explained by a κρυπτοθαυ preceding, and accordingly we have to acknowledge a conciseness here, in which St Paul assumed the allusion to the passage of the Old Testament as well known.

Ver. 10. The other phase of the advent, the rewarding of the faithful, is denoted only indirectly, viz. so that Christ Himself is represented as glorified and as an object of admiration by the recognition of them. But the greatness of the recompense which is given to the faithful is plainly declared in it, only the recognition of them is referred not to them but to Christ as the author of it. In Rom. ix. 23 St Paul utters the same idea. In like manner it is also expressed in Psalm lxxxi. 8. As everything serves the end of manifesting the glory of God, so do especially the great
events at the συντέλεω τοῦ αἰώνος, in which the justice and mercy of God will beam forth in the brightest splendour. As to the rest, the ἐν must be translated not merely an (German, anglicè "at, on,"') but "in," for Christ is represented as glorified in the faithful by His inward indwelling in them. (See details at ver. 12.) Then it certainly is not put here expressly that Christ comes with His saints, as it was said at ver. 7 that He comes with the angels, but, according to the doctrine of the ἐπισυναγωγή of the faithful with Christ in heaven (1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Thess. ii. 1), this must here too be necessarily assumed. (The compound ἐνδοξάζεσθαι is found in the New Testament only here and at ver. 12. In the Old Testament it occurs Ex. xix. 4, Ezek. xxviii. 22, for דּוּרָם.) Lastly, as to the concluding words of ver. 10, the connection: δὲ ἐπισταδὴ τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ is inadmissible, because the aorist cannot possibly have the meaning of the future. Besides, the acceptation of the words as: "my testimony as to you, i.e. the testimony which I bear to your faith (ver. 4) will be established on that day, which the defenders of that connection, Grotius, Bengel, Koppe, and Flatt, urge, is not without harshness. For, on the one hand, μαρτύριον generally refers to the testimony of Christ, the κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας; on the other, ἐπισταδὴ, in accordance with the πιστεύσασι which precedes, is also to be taken in the meaning "to believe." Therefore δὲ ἐπισταδὴ τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, can only be taken as a parenthesis, in the sense: "ye have truly believed our testimony unto you, i.e. received the Gospel preached unto you by us." The ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, on the contrary, belongs to the former half of ver. 10, διαν ἐλθῃ κ.τ.λ. (Πιστεύσασι is, on the authority of the MSS., to be preferred to πιστεύσωσι, the reading of the text rec. Their faith is represented as completed, as they on that day have passed into seeing (the face of God).

Ver. 11. To this is then subjoined the remark that St Paul remembers his readers in praying for them that God may perfect them in their life of faith. (Ἑκ δὲ is our "for that purpose, to that end," viz. "that Christ at His coming may be glorified through you," as ver. 12 shows.—Ἄξιον τῆς κλησεως might in itself mean: "to favour with the call." i.e. "to hold worthy to be called." But, as the Thessalonians were already called, the context requires: "to make worthy of the call which has already taken lace," viz. by
fidelity and zeal in sanctification. These would, therefore, not be looked upon as a work of man, but as God's work in man's soul, which he may, however, hinder through unfaithfulness. The concluding words: καὶ πληρώσῃ —ἐν δυνάμει describe more in detail the process of the ἑξιοῦν. Ἐιδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης might in itself, like the corresponding Hebrew לְמַעַת, be referred to God's goodness, which He manifests unto man according to His good pleasure, for ἀγαθωσύνη is only the abstract form of the ἀγαθόν, and receives its closer definiteness by means of the context alone. But the ἐργον πίστεως, which stands parallel with it, requires that εἰδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης also be referred to the condition of the Thessalonians, so that the sense is: "God fill you with all the good which is well-pleasing to Him, i.e. may He fill you with all the good which is well-pleasing to Him in you."—The phrase ἐργον πίστεως is not put merely for πίστις itself, neither can the independent activity of man in the fight of faith be understood by it here, as at 1 Thess. i. 3, because the discourse is of God's work, and not of man's; ἐργον πίστεως rather denotes here faith as God's work in the souls of men, which is capable of a continued development in respect to its discernment and depth. Ἐν δυνάμει refers to the whole clause ὑπὸ πληρώσῃ κ.τ.λ., and is to be taken adverbially: "in a powerful, efficacious, manner."—As to the rest, the construction of the πληροῦν with a double accusative is altogether unusual; it is usually joined with the accusative and the genitive, or the dative, πληροῦν τινὰ τιμὸς or τινὶ. [Compare Acts ii. 28, xiii. 52, Rom. i. 29, 2 Cor. vii. 4.] If one does not choose to let εἰδοκίαν and ἐργον pass for accusatives absolute, one might from what precedes refer merely ἕνα without ὑμᾶς to πληρώσῃ, and supply ἐν ὑμῖν with the accusatives εἰδοκίαν and ἐργον. But this construction too is clearly so harsh, that the former acceptance might yet be worthy of the preference. It is true at Ephes. v. 18 πληροῖσθαι is found joined with ἕν, but there it is put with the thing, not the person, which latter would hardly be found.)

Ver. 12. In conclusion, St Paul applies the idea pronounced in ver. 10 generally of all believers to the Thessalonians themselves. Instead of the Lord, His δύναμα only is named here as the object of glorification, but δύναμα stands, like פִּשָּׁה, for the very essence of His person, as has been already remarked on Matt. xviii. 19, 20, John xiv. 11, ss., in the Comm.—But then, with the substance the glory
of Christ Himself is at the same time necessarily contained in the expression ἄνωθεν, as Phil. ii. 9, 10, on which see the Comm., especially shows. Now the addition ὑπείρα ἐν αὐτῷ clearly points to the inference, that the ἐν ἦλθεν, as has been already remarked on ver. 10, is not to be taken merely in an outward sense, but in an inward one, of the indwelling of Christ in the souls of the faithful. For this admits of being conceived also conversely as a being of the faithful in Christ, and the ὑπείρα ἐν αὐτῷ is meant to bring forward that other phase. As to the rest, this passage has in ideas and expression a tinge quite of St John's style. (See the Comm. on John xiii. 31, xvii. 1, 21, 26, also further Rev. iii. 20.) But now all this is only the operation of the grace of God and of Christ, not of one’s own strength and exertion. The juxtaposition of the Father and Son here again is to be explained by the remark on 1 Thess. iii. 11.

§ 2. OF THE CONDITIONS OF THE HAPPENING OF CHRIST’S ADVENT.

(ii. 1—17.)

After this introduction acknowledging his readers' state of faith, St Paul now comes directly to the chief point of his Epistle, to the question with regard to Christ's coming again, as to which fresh errors had developed themselves in Thessalonica after the first Epistle was sent off. In a properly prophetic communication St Paul delivers himself on the point of what must precede the coming of Christ, and imparts on this occasion extremely important information as to the nature of Antichrist, the mode of his operation, and what still hinders his being revealed. The two first points, the nature of Antichrist and the mode of his operation, are, it is true, circumstantially described in Revelations also, so that we here learn nothing new from St Paul; however, this communication still serves very much for the confirmation and elucidation of the profusely figurative descriptions of the Apocalypse. But the third point, on the contrary, viz. what still withholds the revelation of Antichrist, is of that nature, that neither in the Apocalypse, nor elsewhere in the Old or New Testament (slight, and by themselves unintelligible, intimations excepted), does anything similar occur,
so that by means of this communication an entirely new, and, as we shall see, deeply penetrating, point in the doctrine of the last things is thus unveiled to us. But, before we examine the particulars of the important communication which follows, we have to answer the preliminary question, whether St Paul declares in only his private view, which he might have formed for himself in concordance with the reigning Jewish notions, or propounds the doctrine of Antichrist and what is connected with it from a divine revelation. St Paul certainly does not observe here expressly, as at 1 Thess. iv. 15, τοῦτο λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, but nevertheless we have to consider this communication of his also as objectively true divine information, and that for the following reasons. Firstly, we nowhere in the New Testament generally, and in St Paul particularly, find that the distinction between purely subjective private views and objective divine revelation receives a reference to the dogmatic department. All that belongs to that, and without any fear of mistake the following information as to the end of all things is also to be reckoned to that mass, is everywhere and without distinction considered and treated as a communication through the Holy Ghost who leads into all truth, as the result of the anointing which teaches all things (1 John ii. 27). Subjective private views are acknowledged as admissible in the department of discipline and indifferent things alone. (See the remarks in the Comm. on 1 Cor. vii. and Rom. xiv.) But to this general consideration there comes here in addition the special one, that St Paul in what follows (2 Thess. ii. 15) recommends his instructions to the Christians in Thessalonica with such emphasis for their observation, that it cannot possibly be misunderstood that he wishes to perceive it considered as a divine revelation, so that we have to supply here from the first Epistle the express declaration about it. Further, the undoubting, confident, manner, in which St Paul propounds what follows testifies that he is conscious of declaring not subjective conjectures as to futurity, but objective certainty. It remains to be said that, beyond Matt. xxiv. and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, this passage is the most copious in the New Testament in which the purely prophetic element, in the sense of seeing into futurity, exhibits itself; but it is not till we come to the Apocalypse that all the individual features scattered in these and in other passages of the New Testament as to the last
catastrophes of the history of humanity and of the earth, are united into one great picture and placed in living connection with the intimations of the Old Testament on the subject.

Vers. 1, 2. St Paul now connects his eschatologic communications with his previous information in the first Epistle. There he had (iv. 15, ss.) spoken of the παρουσία of Christ, and of the manner in which at Christ's coming the faithful (both those risen from the dead and those still living clothed over) will gather themselves unto Him, as they will be moved forward in clouds into the air to meet the Lord. (This St Paul here denotes with the phrase ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγή ἐπὶ αὐτῶν. The putting ἡμῶν before has the object of forming an antithesis with the παρουσία Χριστοῦ, Christ's coming and our being gathered unto Him, i.e. our coming to meet Him, denote in this proceeding the divine action and the human action, which meet one another. (The substantive ἐπισυναγωγή is found in the New Testament only once more, at Heb. x. 25, of meetings for divine service. The verb, on the other hand, is often found, (to name some passages, at Matth. xxiv. 31, Mark xiii. 27), likewise of the elect being assembled before the advent. Only in those passages the discourse is not of a being assembled in heaven, but on earth, which latter is to be conceived as preceding the former, as the lifting up into the air is not to be imagined taking place with each individual by himself, separated from the others, but as a joint process in all, and proceeding from one place. This leads to the idea of a mountainous place on which the faithful are assembled in order to go to the Lord from it. [Compare on this point the remarks on Matth. xxiv. 31.]—The use of the ἔπει in ἔπει αὐτῶν is most simply explained by the contemplation according to which the person of Christ is, as it were, the centre of the assembly, to which centre the entire assembling movement goes along. (See Winer's Gramm. p. 386.) What is now propounded here in reference to the coming of Christ and the assembling of the faithful unto Him by St Paul as an exhortation (ἐρωτάω stands, as at 1 Thess. iv. 1, per euphemismum for παρακαλέω,) consists, according to ver. 2, in warning the readers not to imagine the day of the Lord as immediately impending and allow themselves to be made uneasy by it. One might think that a person considered the day of the Lord as immediately impending without being made uneasy by it, viz. while he looked forward to the coming of Christ in calm
cheerful faith, nay in blessed joy (compare on Luke xxi. 28); though
even in the faithful and regenerate will be found fear of the day
of the Lord along with the joy, inasmuch, that is to say, as even
in them the old man still makes his influence good, for he knows
he cannot stand before the Lord: in that case the confidence
with which such a one fixed the time or the hour would alone be
blameable. But among the Christians in Thessalonica complete
disquiet, utter loss of their calm inward peace, took place, inasm-
much as they were yet too unenlightened to be able in the power
of faith to bear the notion of the nearness of such prodigious
events. The moral harm of this disquietude is further spoken of
in the third chapter. (Σαλεύω, a verb that often occurs in the New
Testament, denotes, first of all, "to produce the wavy motion of
the sea," thence σαλεύεσθαι, "to be in motion as waves are." Transferred to
conditions of mind it denotes all violent passions of joy, grief, or fear. The latter relation predominates here, as
the θροείσθαι, which defines the term σαλευθήναι more closely,
shows. Θροείσθαι, from θρός, "a noisy cry," is not found in the
New Testament again except at Matth. xxiv. 6; Mark xiii. 7.)—
But the ταχέως is difficult; it means not merely "swiftly, hastily,"
but also "soon," with reference to a previous point of time. But
the reference to a point of time seems here inadmissible, because
it seems alone possible for the meaning of St Paul to be that the
Thessalonians are not to let themselves be disquieted at all, not
merely that they are not to let themselves be soon put in anxiety.
But, if one conceives St Paul's personal presence with them, or
the receipt of his first Epistle, as the point-of time to which St
Paul refers, their fault certainly shows itself greater, if they, directly
after, let themselves be led away from the right state of mind,
than if this had not taken place till many years later. For the
short interval also supposes but a short employment of assaults
against their established state of faith, and that these nevertheless
soon overthrew them supposes a weakness of faith in them which
is meant to be reproved by the ταχέως. It is to be added that
St Paul, sparing them, chooses the form of representation, that he
assumes they had not yet allowed themselves to be altogether dis-
quieted, which is couched in the ερωτώμεν—eis τὸ μὴ. By that
means he not only prepossessed in his favour those among the
Christians in Thessalonica who had in some measure remained
firm, but also linked himself to the better element in those already quite carried away, in order to bring them back the easier. The tone of opinion from which they are not to let themselves be led away is denoted merely by νοῦς. One expects an epithet to it, as they are not to let themselves be led away "from the right disposition, from sentiments firm in the faith," by far-fetched illusions. But St Paul deems an epithet unnecessary, because to him the νοῦς is of itself the designation of the higher powers of the soul in man which define self-consciousness. (See on Rom. vii. 23.) Where anxious fear becomes dominant the νοῦς loses its power, the condition of the ἀνοια commences. (Instead of μὴ τροποεῖσθαι one expects, according to the rules of the language [see Winer's Gramm., p. 456], undoubtedly μηδὲ, which Lachmann has even received into the text, although in opposition to his critical principles, and Schott also approves. For not a single MS. or critical authority reads μηδὲ, and we must decidedly reprobate the altering of the text by conjecture. It is rather to be openly acknowledged that St Paul has not here observed the more accurate distinction between μηδὲ and μὴτε.)

But now what St Paul further communicates in ver. 2 as to the causes which had brought about this disquietude of the Christians in Thessalonica is especially important for the understanding of the state of affairs in the church there. For it might have been thought quite legitimately that the expectation of the immediate proximity of the day of the Lord and the disquietude of the Thessalonians produced by it had developed themselves without any especial cause. St Paul had called on them in the first Epistle (chap. 5) to be above all things watchful, not to think in themselves they had still peace and safety; after this it was natural to light upon such views as St Paul is now combating, viz. that it was certain the Lord must come shortly. From the description in the third chapter of this Epistle we have to imagine this "shortly" as certainly some weeks or months at most, which the Thessalonians thought they still had for a respite until the day of the Lord. - For, if they had supposed even some years only until this catastrophe, the giving up their handicrafts would have been insufficiently accounted for. But we perceive from St Paul's more detailed communications, which here follow, that, besides those general causes producing similar notions out of the folly of men at all
times, there were in Thessalonica special causes also, which had there called forth the fanatical expectation of the proximity of Christ's coming. He names three such causes: μὴτε διὰ πνεύματος, μὴτε διὰ λόγου, μὴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι' ἡμῶν. That St Paul means to denote by these only possible sources of fanaticism, not such as had already become actually operative in his readers, is utterly improbable, especially as at iii. 17 precautions are taken against Epistles fathered on him, a case which must, therefore, have already happened. Now, before we take the separate points more closely into consideration, we have to answer the preliminary question as to whether the ὡς δι' ἡμῶν refers merely to the last member of the sentence, or to the two last, or even to all three. If the last were the case, the sense of the words would then be that the Christians in Thessalonica had been deceived, not merely by means of supposititious doctrines and Epistles, but also by means of pretended prophecies of St Paul's. Such an acceptance of the words would be utterly impossible, yet Reiche (in the essay above cited, p. 9), approves of it. Had St Paul wished to express that idea, not only would he undoubtedly have written not πνεύμα, but προφητεία (for that πνεύμα denotes an isolated prophecy is without any example), but it would also be difficult then to escape tautology, as then λόγος and ἐπιστολή could surely be only understood again too of different forms of the communication of that prophecy which had been granted to the apostle. If we, accordingly, must decline the connection of the ὡς δι' ἡμῶν with all these substantives, the reference, on the other hand, of the words to the two last articles, not to ἐπιστολή only, is more than probable. For some doctrine propounded by a man unknown to, or without influence among, the Thessalonians could be no inducement for them to take up such opinions into their minds as St Paul blames in them, but that could well be, and was necessarily, the case, if they believed the doctrine came from their beloved apostle. If we, accordingly, do not refer the words διὰ πνεύματος to St Paul, the question is how the words are to be taken. The referring them to prophecies of the Old Testament is plainly quite inadmissible, for nothing could be deduced from them as to the time of Christ's coming. True, it has been proposed to understand διὰ λόγου of calculations (comp. Phil. iv. 15, 17) which were
instituted in consequence of prophecies in the Old Testament; but, first, we find no example of such calculations having been instituted in the time of the apostles, and secondly, the usual combination of λόγος and ἐπιστολή for denoting vivâ voce and written instruction, which recurs directly at ver. 15, is decidedly against it. Accordingly, διὰ πνεύματος can only be referred to the gift of prophecy of the Charismata, so that the abstract is put for the concrete πνευματικός. Of course, St Paul cannot recognize this prophecy as a pure one, but one need not still on that account turn one's thoughts to false prophets, properly so called, who were urged on by the evil spirit (these St Paul would certainly have designated by stronger expressions), on the contrary, the true Charisma of προφητεία, and especially that of the γλώσσας λαλεῖν, in which the personal consciousness retired very much into the back-ground (see in the Commentary on 1 Cor. xiv. 1), might easily be defiled by admixtures from the sinful nature of him that exercised the gift, wherefore indeed St Paul ordained that the words of the prophets and of those speaking with tongues should ever be judged by such as were in possession of the gifts of the διάκρισις πνευμάτων. (See in the Comm. at 1 Cor. xiv. 29.) By this acceptance then the question of what men these prophecies may have proceeded from is also solved. Emissaries who had penetrated from without into the church at Thessalonica are not to be thought of even in what follows (chap. iii.), in spite of the strict measures which St Paul recommends, not the slightest intimation is found that intruders had caused these disturbances. The authors of those prophecies were, no doubt, members of the church, who had brought their Charismata into employment in fanatical guise, and thus by subjective immixtures dimmed the Holy Spirit in them. That in this conduct a conscious evil design was at work is scarcely to be supposed; this overclouding of the gifts of grace of the Spirit will rather have been occasioned by a one-sided predominance of the feelings and imagination. But the case must have been otherwise with those who pretended declarations of St Paul by word of mouth or in writing; for in the ὥς δὲ ἡμῶν σει. γεγραμμένης is plainly expressed the intention that the non-apostical epistle should be taken for apostical according to the design of the deceivers. It is true, Jerome, Krause, Nüsselt, and others, have thought misap-
prehensions merely of St Paul's doctrine and Epistles may be spoken of; but iii. 17 is decidedly against that; for St Paul, in order to obviate such deceptions, there gives a fixed mark for his genuine Epistles. But in what mind are we to imagine those persons to have been? One does not perceive at all what they could have in view with such a deception. It was this consideration that prompted Hug (Introduct. vol. ii. p. 344) to the supposition that those persons might have had no evil design in their deception, but had been induced to it solely by the wish to operate a wholesome fear, and, by that means, amendment, in some thoughtless members of the church in Thessalonica by a representation of the proximity of the day of Christ. This assumption, however, of a pious fraud has clearly not sufficient foundation; it is simpler to imagine that fanaticism, that fruitful source of deceit, suggested to certain persons, by means of supposititious communications of St Paul's, to give preponderance to their notions of the immediate proximity of the advent in Thessalonica. (In ver. 2 the ὥς ἤτι = ὅλων ἔι or ὥς ἄν, as Pelt has already justly remarked in accordance with Alberti's observ. phil. p. 318. By means of the ὥς the assertion: ἤτι ἐναστὴκεν ἡ ἁμέρα τοῦ κυρίου is meant to be represented as the notion which was intended to be propagated by πτεύμα, λόγος, and ἐπιστολή.—As to ἐναστήκεν see Rom. viii. 38; Gal. i. 4.)

Vers. 3, 4. Now St Paul warns his readers (μὴ τις κ. τ. λ. scil. βλέπετε, ὄρατε) against all these forms of deceit, and that too because the day of the Lord had necessary preliminaries which must have first been fulfilled, before it could come. For it need not be mentioned that the ἐὰν μὴ before ἔλθῃ must not be taken with Storr and Flatt certissimè, but that the apodosis, as being understood of itself from verse 2, is to be supplied, in this way: ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον, οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ ἁμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. The passages to which Storr and Flatt refer (Numb. xiv. 28; Ezek. xvii. 10) cannot be compared with this one, because ὃς ἐστὶ is a form of an oath. "But when," St Paul means to say, "the apostacy shall have happened and Antichrist have been revealed, then too the day of the Lord will immediately come,—immediately follow Antichrist. The coming in of the apostacy, and

1 Kern (Tübingen Journal for 1839, p. ii. p. 150) will have the expression understood of a false exposition of the first Epistle; but this would be inadmissible for this reason, to go no further, that then the article before ἑσετολήγει could not be omitted.
the revealing of Antichrist, are therefore named here as prelimi-
naries. Whilst the latter is described circumstantially and in ex-
ceedingly characteristic features, nothing further is said of the ἀπο\v{s}\v{s}\v{s}ia, and it remains therefore uncertain what St Paul wishes to
have understood by it. The article points to something known to
the readers, and indeed St Paul refers in ver. 5 to his viv\v{a} voce
instructions on the point. Since we do not know those, there re-
main to us only the general analogy and the whole body of doc-
trine in order to determine what St Paul most probably wishes to
have understood by "the falling away." Many interpreters, as
Le Clerc, Nösselt, Rosenmüller, and Usteri, choose to imagine
the revolt of the Jews against the Romans, before the destruction
of Jerusalem, to be meant. If the term occurred in the passage
Matth. xxiv. this acceptation would be well-grounded, supposing,
that is to say, that it, like the destruction of Jerusalem itself (see
the Comm. on Matth. xxiv. 1), is referred typically to a remoter
event. But no reference at all to events lying nearer is traceable
here; we have therefore no occasion either to overlook the most
general idea of the falling away from the faith, from love, from
hope, in short from everything divine and holy, as it is described
by the Lord Himself in Matth. xxiv. 8, ss., and from which, ac-
cording to Matth. xxiv. 24, the elect alone are preserved by God's
grace. The article points to a known falling away; St Paul will
have already given his readers information about it by word of
mouth. Only it is a striking feature in the case, that the coming
in of the falling away is put before the revealing of Antichrist,
whereas it seems that the falling away arrives at fulfilment only
by means of Antichrist and his seductive arts, as St Paul him-
self describes it ii. 9 in harmony with Rev. xiii. 14, ss. It was,
we may suppose, this apparent impropriety which induced many
of the Fathers to take the falling away for Antichrist himself,
as him that operated the falling away, as, to name some, Chry-
sostom and Theodoret among the Greeks, Augustine among the
Latins. But nothing whatever countenances that. However, the
difficulty of the falling away being put before the revelation of
Antichrist certainly requires its solution. The simplest inter-
pretation and the one most corresponding to the representations in
Matt. xxiv. and the Revelations seems to be this. In a certain
aspect Antichrist and the revealing of him are themselves a result
of the falling away, which will take place not among the Christians merely, but among all nations and in all religions and constitutions a falling away from the fundamental pillars of all truth and universal justice will take place, as St Paul describes it 1 Tim. iv. 1, ss.; and Antichrist will, viewed from the one side, grow out of this as the fruit, viewed from the other side, however, conversely, himself accomplish in its totality this tendency of the falling away, and endeavour to bring to it even the truly faithful; an attempt, which must, it is true, through God's grace, serve to the perfecting of the saints and of the Church in general. Particulars as to these events can only be taken into consideration in the explanation of the thirteenth chapter of Revelations, in which the great falling away of mankind and the influence of Antichrist and of his prophet upon it are described more in detail. (As to the form of the word ἀποστασία it is of later origin. The earlier is ἀπόστασις. See Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 528. In the Greek translations ἀποστασία is met with for ἢς and τῆς 2 Chron. xxix. 19; Jerem. xxix. 32.) The revealing of Antichrist is then named as the second of the events without which the coming of Christ is not to be expected. The idea of his ἀποκάλυψις is to be explained by the pervading parallel between Christ and Antichrist, as indeed in ver. 9 the latter's "coming" is also spoken of. But another idea, to which also the ἀποκάλυψις leads, is not to be separated from that one, viz. that, as Christ before His ἐπίδημια ἀιώνια ἑτήσια was already present among men in ἐπίδημια νυκτική, so too Antichrist veiled has been long at work already, as ver. 7 openly declares. But a time will come when he throws off every veil and makes himself known bodily (σωματικῶς), as an incarnation of Satan himself, in which sense Judas Iscariot was his prototype, (whom the Lord Himself [John vi. 70] calls the devil, i.e., him, who was that among the disciples, which the devil is among the children of God), and at John xvii. 12 is called ὁ νοετός τῆς ἀπωλείας, just as Antichrist is here. Now the names too which St Paul gives him characterize Antichrist as such. The two first, ὁ ἀνθρωπὸς τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ὁ νοετός τῆς ἀπωλείας, might also denote every bad man quite fallen under the power of sin, for instance such a one as committed the sin against the Holy Ghost. But the article

1 Thus the Schollin in Matthai explains quite correctly: ἀποστασία ἢ διὰ τοῦ ἀντίχριστου ἀλλοτριώσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.
only admits of the reference to a definite, known, individual, to
whom sin and destruction belong in a special sense, viz., so that
he not merely has sin and falls into destruction, but that sin
and destruction proceed from him as their source, and that he
drags every one else into sin and destruction after him. As such,
he is afterwards in ver. 7 also called ὁ ἄνωμος, whose element the
ἄνωμα is, in that he acknowledges no law, no higher will, but, as
selfishness personified, will have his own will recognised as the one
only law. In like manner as Satan is often called ὁ ποιητὸς and
ὁ ψεύστης (Joh xviii. 44), Antichrist also is called ὁ ψεύστης
1 John ii. 4, 22, and ὁ πλάνος 2 John ver. 7. However, the name
ἀνθρωπος characterizes him at the same time as a real man, with
body and soul, whom Satan, the principle of evil, thus makes his
dwelling, as the Son of God united Himself with the man Jesus.
The revelation of Antichrist exhibits itself, therefore, as an eping
of the appearing of Christ. What in the Redeemer was a profound
substantial truth appears in Antichrist as a caricature counterfeit,
as, generally, evil prolongs its existence only by aping the good.
Thus the Fathers had already correctly interpreted, the leading pas-
sages from whom Pelt has collected in his Commentary. (In
using these phrases it is to be presumed passages of the Old Tes-
tament were in St Paul's mind. Ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας answers
to the Hebr. וֹוֹוֹ, Isaiah lv. 7; Prov. vi. 12, וֹוֹו תֹּו הֶשְנַלַה, Isaiah lxi. 4, which the LXX. translate by
tέκνον ἀπωλείας. The reading of the Codex B. and some MSS.
of less authority, ἄνωμα for ἁμαρτία is, we may suppose, only
come into the text here from ver. 7.) Proceeding in the painting
of the portrait of Antichrist, St Paul further names him ὁ ἀντικε-
μένος, where the article is again to be remarked. Although the
LXX., in the passage Zachar. iii. 1, put ἀντικείμενος for ἄνωμος, yet
Antichrist can signify not here Satan downright, because in ver.
9 he is distinguished from him. But he has certainly the disposi-
tion and tendency of the devil, viz., resistance to God and against
all that is godlike in Church and State. Whilst he seeks to destroy
what is God's, he aims at setting himself in His place, at making
himself God, which is the highest pitch of wickedness, but also at
the same time the expression of the perfect folly and inward con-
tradiction which are the attributes of evil. This highest manifes-
tation of Antichrist St Paul describes in the concluding words of
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ver. 4, ὁ ἰπαριφμένος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν κ.τ.λ. According to this, as Chrysostom has already correctly remarked on this passage, Antichrist will not promote idolatry, but seduce men from the true God, as also from all idols, and set himself up as the only object of adoration. This remarkable idea, that sin in Antichrist finally issues in a downright self-deification, discloses to us the inmost nature of evil, which consists in selfishness. In Antichrist all love, all capability of sacrifice and self-denial, shows itself entirely submerged in the making of the I all in all, which then also insists on being acknowledged by all men as the centre of all power, wisdom, and glory. Daniel (xi. 36, ss.) had already said in his description of Antichrist, whom he represents as a king, as an universal monarch, ἤνθωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλονθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα Θεὸν κ.τ.λ., and in the 13th chapter of Revelations, ver. 15, it is prophecied how an image of Antichrist will be vivified by pretended miracles, and the adoration of that image required of all on pain of death. (Ὑπαρισθαι has already occurred 2 Cor. xii. 7.—The phrase ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν reminds one of 1 Cor. viii. 5. We are not to understand merely the true God, but also all forms of religious life, even the lowest. These show themselves by the side of the worship of Antichrist as still, relatively, worthy forms of God's worship, for the men who were worshipped as Gods or heroes were certainly mostly benefactors to humanity, in whom some rays of the better element gleamed; but in Antichrist the quintessence of all that is evil appears combined and yet presents itself for adoration. Even the self-deification of the Roman Emperors appears as modesty by the side of that of Antichrist, for the Cæsars did not elevate themselves above the other gods, they only wanted to have a place beside them as representatives of the genius of the Roman people. Antichrist, on the contrary, wants to be the only true God, who suffers none beside him; what Christ demands for Himself in truth, he in the excess of his presumption claims in falsehood.—The supposition of Michaelis, Baumgarten, and others, that Θεὸς here, after the analogy of the Heb. דִּיָּבָ֖ו, is meant to denote the princes and authorities, is to be utterly rejected, as the mention of the ναὸς which follows shows.—Στέβασμα denotes everything holy as an object of worship, be it a person, an idol, or a place [Acts xvii. 23]; but, as it does not appear as a fresh idea by the repetition of the article, the
first reference to persons is preferable. It may be presumed St Paul in using it thought of the heroes and other subordinate personalities of the heathen mythology.) The words: ὄσε τι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καθίσαι ἀποδεικνύοντα ἕως τῶν ἐστὶ Θεὸς, are substantially a result, which is understood of itself, of what precedes. Whoever exalteth himself above all that is called God must necessarily consider and declare himself God. But more is couched in the ἀποδεικνύοντα than the mere assertion; it is, doubtless, as Schott has already correctly assumed, to be referred to the proving his pretended divinity by means of sham miracles (ver. 9), such as is described Rev. xiii. 15 also. The reading ὅς Θεοῦ before καθίσαι, which Matthæi, Kuppe, Knapp, and Schott, defend, would in itself, it is true, be not unsuitable, but the critical authorities are so decidedly in favour of the omission, that we, in concurrence with Griesbach and Lachmann, must strike it out. But the most difficult point is the καθίσαι εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. If there stood merely εἰς ναὸν, "into any temple," it might be thought the phrase was meant in symbolical wise to denote only the act of presenting one's self for adoration; viz. the sitting, after the analogy of the sitting of kings on the throne, is here to denote his taking possession of the Temple as his property, and his readiness to receive the homage of his subjects. But ὅ ναος τοῦ Θεοῦ seems necessarily to refer to the Temple of the only true God in Jerusalem, which still stood at the time at which St Paul wrote. If we glance, first, at the parallel passages, if there be any, in Matth. xxiv. 15 the phrase βδελυγμα τῆς ἑρμοῦσας ἐστὼς ἐν τῷ ὁλίγῳ presents itself. These relate, as is well-known, to the passages of Daniel ix. 26, 27, xi. 31, xii. 11, and allude (compare the Comm. on Matth. xxiv. 15) not to Autiochus Epiphanes, but to the destruction of Jerusalem and pollution of the Temple by the Romans. It will hardly be possible to give the fact indicated more definitely with sufficient certainty. But, in any case, in all that occurred to pollute the Temple at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans but a faint type of the occurrences here prophesied by St Paul can be recognized. The Apocalypse contains nothing which might explain this mention of the Temple; true, Hezek. xxviii. 2 bears a certain typical analogy, where the King of Tyre is represented as declaring himself God; but neither there is the Temple spoken of. We are, therefore, absolutely tied down to this
SECOND THESALONIANS II. 5, 6.

passage alone. Now, if one reflects that in the Temple at Jerusalem there was no image or throne of Jehovah at all beyond the ark of the covenant, as is well known, that besides, according to Matth. xxiv. 2, John iv. 21, the demolished Temple is not to be built up again; it appears, as too the later interpreters assume, necessary to understand the Temple of God here in a symbolical sense, of the Christian Church, which is elsewhere too called (2 Col. vi. 16, Ephes. ii. 21) θεός in the New Testament as Christ's abode through His Spirit. The sense of the words would then be this: Antichrist will seek to thrust Christ, the real object of adoration, out of the Church, and to put himself in His place. (In the αποθεωσώνα έκτόν ὅτι there is a sort of attraction for: αποθεωσώνα έκτόν εκτος to be recognized.) After this contemplation of the single features of the picture that St Paul sketches of Antichrist, we have now still to inquire how he may have conceived the realization of the same, whether in one individual or in several, and all that is connected with that: further, to what historical facts the prophecy has reference according to the various views of the interpreters. But these questions are so intimately connected with the interpretation of the κατέχων, of which St Paul speaks in what follows, that we can only enter into the investigation of them after the elucidation of the next three verses.

Vers. 5, 6. St Paul told the Christians in Thessalonica nothing new in these communications; he only reminds them of the fact that he had already declared the same thing to them during his presence in person. That these subjects had already come under discussion in the few weeks of his stay there (see the Introd. to these two Epistles, § 1) cannot surprise us if we reflect what importance the doctrines of the kingdom of God and the advent of Christ had in the apostles' time; an importance which they will receive again only at the end of the world. It might rather surprise us that so little on the subject is found in St Paul's other Epistles. To me it is probable, as I have already remarked above, that St Paul was induced by his experiences in Thessalonica to dismiss his eschatologic views more into the back ground in the Gentile world. They were too new to the Gentiles, and excited their fancy in a way which almost inevitably generated fanatical errors. But now the question, οὐ μημονεύσετε, has here the meaning: "Have ye quite forgotten that I propounded this to you, that ye have been
able to give ear to such deceitful discourses (ver. 2)?" Even the next communication as to the *κατέχον* St Paul supposes to be known to his readers in the words: *καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον· οἴδατε.* Still deferring the investigation as to the difficult and extremely obscure *κατέχον*, we first investigate how the *νῦν* here might have to be taken. Storr, Schott, and Flatt, take it as an antithesis to *ἐτί* in ver. 5. But in that case one would expect the collocation *νῦν καὶ*. Besides, one does not see how the Thessalonians could now have known anything of the *κατέχον*, unless St Paul had already in person made communications to them about it, for neither Epistle contains the least thing on the subject. For the same reason it will not suit either to take, in concurrence with Pelt and others, *νῦν* as a mere transition-particle, for something following as a consequence is surely couched in it even so; *igitur* or *nunc igitur* requires that there should have been something in what precedes which could serve for the knowledge of the *κατέχον*. If we compare the phrase ὁ *κατέχον ἄρτι* ver. 7 it seems most suitable here too to connect *νῦν* with *κατέχον*. True, one expects in this connection the collocation *τὸ νῦν κατέχον* or *τὸ κατέχον νῦν*, but in any case the adoption of an inaccurate collocation of words is an unsubstantial difficulty in comparison with the aid this connection affords for the comprehension of this obscure passage. For, as we shall see later, it is precisely the idea, "what now withstands, hinders, the revealing of Anti-christ," that promotes the explanation. If, however, one will not condescend to the adoption of an inversion, and chooses to prefer one of the two other above-mentioned ways of taking the *νῦν*, still the ἄρτι must, at all events, be supplied here too from ver. 7.¹ Now an appointed time is ascribed to the ἀποκάλυψις (ver. 3) of Anti-christ by the apostle, as it must needs happen according to God's dispensation (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ. Cf. John vii. 6, 30.) In *this*, too, the analogy with the advent of Christ declares itself. When the time was fulfilled God sent His Son (Gal. iv. 4.) What withholdeth is, accordingly, operative not against God's will but in conformity with it. It is the

¹ Kern (ubi suprà, p. 161) also lays a stress on the *νῦν* as a definition of time, and with justice. With regard to the connection with *νῦν* be considers, as to sense, the connection with *κατέχον* and that with *οἴδατε* on a par, grammatically that with *οἴδατε* seems to him to be preferred. But the ἄρτι (ver. 7) is, in my opinion, more for the connection with *κατέχον*. The question is not of the fact that they (the readers) now know something which they did not know before, but that they know what hinders the appearance now.
medium in God's hand for keeping back the appearance of Antichrist till the time appointed him. The divine intention with the katechou is precisely intimated in the eis to: "which is meant to serve the end that Antichrist may be able to reveal himself only in his time (not earlier)." According to this, the idea of the katechou is plainly strictly defined, viz., as the hindering operation by which the evil power urging Antichrist to appearance is paralyzed in its operation.

Ver. 7. This position of the katechou (for which o katechou here comes in, of which change of gender we shall speak later,) to the Satanic power which urges forward Antichrist as its fruit, ver. 7 describes more closely. The power that produces him is already continually active (h'dh evryeitai), only the katechou does not allow him to appear, as soon as it shall be removed Antichrist will reveal himself. But the phrase μυστήριον της ἀνυμίας here is peculiar. The reference of it to the ἀποστασία (ver. 3), or to the heretics who shall desolate the Church, is inadmissible, because these phenomena can only be considered as subsequent, or at most preparative, operations of Antichrist. From the relation of the opening words of ver. 7 to the closing ones (opening ones of ver. 8 by our version of the Bible): καὶ τὸ τέτο ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἀνυμος—μυστήριον τῆς ἀνυμίας can also denote only Antichrist himself. But, it is asked, on what ground does St Paul use this phrase in order to characterize him? In the Apocalypse too the Babylonian whore, ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνών καὶ τῶν ἰδελουμάτων τῆς γῆς (Rev. xvii. 3), in whom the formation of the universal anticchristian spirit in the city of Rome is alone to be recognized (ib. ver. 18), bears on her forehead the name μυστήριον (ib. ver. 5, ss.), it is true not principally in reference to the ἀνυμία, but to the peculiar mysterious formation of antichristianity in the rulers of the kingdom which the whore of Babylon represents. But if we compare 1 Tim. iii. 16, Christ is there called το τῆς ἐνεσθείας μυστήριον, and that too because in Him God Himself appeared in the flesh: Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. In accordance with the pervading analogy between Christ and Antichrist we shall, therefore, not be in error if we say St Paul here calls Antichrist μυστήριον τῆς ἀνυμίας because ὁ διάβολος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. As the Holy Scriptures speak of deep things of the Deity (1 Cor. ii. 10), so too they know βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ (Rev. ii. 21); these are, fortunately, veiled even to the sinful
man, but at the appearing of Antichrist these depths of Satan will reveal themselves, just as in Christ and His appearing the depths of God have revealed themselves. Through the entire history of the world the activity of the powers of darkness, an element which excites our horror and dread, manifests itself to the deeply penetrating inquirer; the wickedness of Satan exhibits itself now in this form, now in that, but the time will come when these scattered appearances will present themselves all together in their highest power, and in complete fusion in Antichrist as a real embodiment of Satan. It follows from this that what now still keeps back the revealing of him (τὸ κατέχον or ὁ κατέχων) must be a beneficent power, which is only overpowered in the end by the power of evil, under God's permission, becoming predominant. By this acceptance the choice of the phrase ἐκ μεσοῦ γίνεσθαι, in which the intimation of a hostile power which removes an object by force is always couchèd,—is also explained. That is to say, it is chosen from the point of view of the growing Antichrist, who exerts himself to put aside that which hinders his full development. (Compare 1 Cor. v. 2; Col. ii. 14; Isaiah lvii. 2.) But the construction in ver. 7 offers difficulties, which it has been attempted to resolve in various ways. Storr and Flatt, whom Pelt too joins, propose to supply the verb κατέχει αὐτῷ from the participle κατέχων. But that is not enough, for even so ἐκς with the καὶ τὸτε following does not come in well. Others, as Baumgarten, propose to supply merely ἐστὶν after μονον, but then the troublesome ἐκς with καὶ τὸτε following is equally unexplained. Rosenmüller, Nösselt, Heidenreich, and Schott, suppose a transposition of the ἐκς, and translate as if it stood before ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι, in this way: " till only he who still withstands it shall have been taken away." But this is very harsh, because, according to it, a wrong meaning must be given to the ἐνεργεῖται τὸ μυστήριον; that is to say, the words must then be taken thus: " illegality works in secret only so long, until" &c. The ἐκς is decidedly against this acceptance. The only plan that remains is to acknowledge in this passage a fusion of several propositions into one; St Paul meant to say: " the mystery of lawlessness is already at work, it is already in motion; nothing hinders its revelation but he only that now keeps it back; until he shall have been removed it cannot come forth; but when he has been removed, then the lawless one will reveal himself without delay."
But this series of ideas fuses itself in St Paul's vivacious style into the single irregular sentence, which does not admit of being fairly analysed.

Here now closes the description of Antichrist and of what keeps back his being revealed. In what follows, Christ's conflict with him at His coming, and the efficiency of Antichrist for the seduction of men by lying wonders, are alone described, which things have no further influence on the chief ideas. We, therefore, in conclusion, here review the whole remarkable representation in its entirety. The idea that the principle of good does not gradually extend itself victoriously in the development of the history of the world, but that beside that principle the evil also heightens itself within itself, and by no means gradually disappears, but is first entirely overcome in a last great fight in which it apparently conquers, is not peculiar to this passage only, but pervades the whole of Holy Writ, and has already met with examination in the Comm. on the parable of the wheat and the tares. (See on Matt. xiii. 29, 30.) But one might be uncertain whether the representation here given of Antichrist, according to which he is plainly described as a person, as an individual, is the general form of representation in Scripture. The proof of the individuality of Antichrist can plainly be wrested from this passage only by forcing its meaning. He is not merely called expressly ὁ ἀνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας κ.τ.λ., ὁ ἀντικελευθεν (ver. 4), but a coming is also ascribed to him as to the person of Christ, and an action (καθίσαι εἰς ναὸν), such as is imaginable in a person only (verses 4, 9.). But the description of the Apocalypse, to go no further, seems less favourable to that assumption; the representation of Antichrist as a beast with seven heads (Rev. xiii. 1) rather seems to lead to a multiplicity of Antichrists, which is at length expressly declared by St John in his Epistles (1 John ii. 18, 19. 22, iv. 3, 2 John ver. 7), where the name ἀντίχριστος alone occurs. Elsewhere, too, as e.g. Acts xx. 29, 30, 2 Pet. ii. 1, ss., iii. 3, ss., Jude v. 18, ss., where the hostile powers and seducers in the latter days are described, several, not one, are always spoken of. In Daniel

---

See particulars as to the etymology of the word at 1 John ii. 19. The ἀντί denotes not taking the place of another, “one, who appears instead of Christ, arrogates to himself His position” (that is rather couched in the word ψευδόχριστος [see on Matt. xxiv. 4, 24]), but hostile opposition, “him, who is full of enmity against Christ.” (See Lücke ad h. 1.)
alone, chap. xi., the individuality in the picture of Antichrist again predominates in a typical form. Now how are we to explain this apparently contradictory form of doctrine to ourselves? Is Antichrist to be considered as only a spiritual tendency diffused in many individualities? or merely as a single individual, who communicates his tendency to others? Neither of the two could be the correct solution; rather the conjunction of both points, the individuality and the spiritual tendency in masses of individuals. As has been already remarked above (ver. 3), Antichrist does not step on the scene suddenly without any preparations; on the contrary, a stream of Antichristian sentiment and conduct pervades the whole history of the world. From this stream in the last days proceeds Antichristianity as the completed evil fruit; it will announce itself in many individuals, but by all these one personality will be considered as the centre of all their striving, and acknowledged as the master by whom they let themselves be guided.¹ A struggle to mould all the depths of good and evil into concrete appearances manifests itself in history. In the case of Christ's advent this struggle has arrived at the highest forms, and those too, in accordance with the tendency of history to form persons, living personalities, in whom all the ideas of good and evil present themselves embodied. We cannot, accordingly, assent to the view that Calixtus had already expressed, and which Pelt (pp. 167, 204, ss.) also makes his own, viz., that the mystery of iniquity, here described by St Paul, will be as nothing outward, that strikes the eye, but merely an inward spiritual proceeding, viz., the inward dominion of the principle of evil (evil principle).² The communications of St Paul (ver. 5) as well as, particularly, those

¹ This relation of the individuality to the tendency in the masses is expressed extremely significantly in Revelations by the beast and its heads. The heads are a result of life in the beast, and yet, vice versa, alone lead him. The different heads, however, are to be conceived, according to the meaning of Revelations, not along with, but after, one another on the beast; the unity of the personality of Antichrist is therefore not prejudiced by them.

² Lücke too (on 1 John ii. 18), seems to leave the personality of Antichrist at the least very doubtful, when he writes: "St John's conception of Antichrist is of that nature, that it is easier in it than in St Paul's to carry back the idea to its true universal import, by a severance of the form of a definite outward historical personality, in which form it had been first of all conceived,—and to make it thus more easy to be realized." That St John does not either deny the definite personality of Antichrist we shall see in the interpretation of his Epistles.
of the Apocalypse (chapter xiii.), are of that nature, that they necessarily suppose outward facts, as indeed too the dominion of evil inwardly must manifest itself outwardly, and the French revolution with the abolition of Christianity, and the setting up prostitutes on the altars for adoration, gives us outwardly, as the daily wider spreading denial of the fundamentals of all religious truth and morality, of the doctrines of God, freedom, and immortality, as also the self-deification of one's own I as a consequence of erroneous speculation, give us inwardly, a strong foretaste of what might at some future time be but too really executed in the universal monarchy of Antichrist under his iron sceptre. But if one chose to say, "true, there is nothing to object to the assumption that the evil principle, which arrives at dominion in many, will bring forth real evil fruits outwardly too, in increased proportion, as happened in the French revolution; only it is not to be imagined that such occurrences should be set in motion and conducted by one personality, which is as it were Satan himself incarnate; Antichrist is, like the devil, a mere abstraction, only there are many Antichrists, i.e. men, in whom the evil principle operates, no doubt, very powerfully, but who yet always bear in them still something better along with the evil;" if one chose to say that, we say historical analogy is altogether opposed to that argumentation. All great movements in the history of the world have definite personalities for pillars, who are, as it were, the centres, proceeding from whom they are carried on. No doubt the spirit that animates them is also spread in many others, but more in a derivative, not in an original, way. According to this, the assumption that the last and utmost development of evil will also attain to its centre in a personality, that all the labour of the evil powers strives, as it were, after the production of this individual, has the analogy of history in its favour throughout. But the opinion that evil is only to be conceived as abstract in Antichrist as in the devil contradicts the doctrine of Scripture quite clearly; it may be said on the contrary, evil is never abstract, but ever appears in concrete personalities. This view of the devil and Antichrist as real personalities is far removed from Manicheism by the circumstance that their powers must be still acknowledged as good in substance, as they are God's powers, only the misapplication of them against God's will to objects of selfishness constitutes the essence of evil.
If we, after this, turn to the contemplation of the various interpretations which have been made of this passage, it is, first of all, clear that all those who believe that the prophecy is already exhausted in one fact of the past are decidedly in error. As Christ's coming and the kingdom of God are still impending in the future, so too are the occurrences which immediately precede those, viz., the universal falling away, the appearance of Antichrist, and his destructive operation. Among the interpretations which find the fulfilment of this passage in the past the class of those which suppose in it the time next to St Paul's own day is to be named first. As in Matth. xxiv. Christ Himself connects His coming with the insurrection of the Jews against the Romans and with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans which followed it, so too they will have St Paul's representation here referred to those events. Accordingly, the ἀποκάτασις is said to denote the insurrection of the Jews, or, according to Hammond, the falling away of the Gnostics. The man of sin is said to be Simon Magus, as the father of heresy, or, according to Wetstein, the Emperor Titus and the gens Flavia along with him, because Titus at the destruction of Jerusalem, according to Josephus (B. J. VI. 2.) sacrificed in the Temple. Grotius, on the other hand, declared the Emperor Caligula for the ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας described; others Nero, because he first persecuted the Christians. Kern too belongs to the interpreters who refer this passage to past events and therefore attribute no further prophetic meaning to it. This divine thinks it necessary to transfer the description of the Antichrist to be expected to the time after Nero's death, when the report was spread that that Emperor was not dead and would come again (Tac. Hist. ii. 8, Suet. Nero c. 57), out of which the notion was developed among the Christians that Nero would return as Antichrist. (Lactantius de mort. persec. c. 2. Augustin de civ. Dei xx. 19.) On account of this circumstance, then, Kern also believes, as has been already remarked in the Introduction to these Epistles, it necessary to place the composition of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians in the times after Nero, and therefore to declare it spurious. But we find nothing in the description of Antichrist, as St Paul gives it here, which would lead to the inference, that he exactly

1 See the special excursus on this passage in the latest Commentaries, particularly in Koppe, Peit, and Schott.
meant Nero to be understood by it, and that the notion of Nero's return after death is supposed. This description contains such traits alone as could be cited even before Nero's time, from the picture of Antichrist already sketched by Daniel: viz. insolent transgression of the law, and scornful presumption towards the Gods, whom he puts himself on a par with, or even sets himself above. No doubt these traits are in part found in Nero, and that madman is also, doubtless, to be considered as a type of Antichrist just as much as Antiochus Epiphanes; but that holds good of many others also. The prophecy cannot be looked on as fulfilled in him in its fulness, because the facts foretold by St. Paul have not met with their accomplishment in his person.

Just as discrepant are the views as to the κατέχων. Either Christ Himself, or the divine will, or the apostle Paul and his supplication, or the Christians and the supplicating Christian Church in general, have been interpreted as the beneficent power which keeps off the coming of Antichrist. But the most usual view as to the κατέχων, which the Fathers especially defend, was the one that the Roman Empire (τὸ κατέχων) and the Emperor as its representative (ὁ κατέχων) were denoted thereby. This supposition extended itself even through the middle ages and modern times; for Charlemagne was considered as the restorer of the Roman Empire, and, in conformity with the guidance of the prophecy of Daniel (Dan. ii. 40, ss.) of the four universal monarchies, the Roman Empire was considered as the fourth monarchy, therefore as the hip, legs, and feet, of the image that is described in the passage cited. The legs were referred to the division into the eastern and western Roman Empires, the toes to the later kingdoms of Christian-German Europe. So interpreted the later interpreters of Revelations, Newton, Bengal, and Stillings. As these recognized at the same time in Popery the Antichristian power, they might think they had the two chief powers continually before them; in the Pope and the Emperor Antichrist and he that kept him off were plainly symbolized to them. By another turn of this view one might think one's self justified on Napoleon's appearing in considering him as Antichrist, in that he laid a plan for a universal monarchy. It is true, Napoleon entered into a downright hostile opposition to Popery and the hierarchy, but through his dissolving the German empire in
1806 as the fourth universal monarchy of Daniel, he was looked on by many as he who removed the κατέχων. But, as even after the dissolution of the German Empire Christ's advent has not happened, the whole view of the Roman Empire as the fourth monarchy is plainly endangered. The assumption, that is to say, of the continuation of the fourth universal monarchy, after the dissolution of the German Empire in 1806, in the states of the Rhenish Confederation, or of the German Confederation subsisting since 1815, is too doubtful for one to be able to give in one's adhesion to it at once. In order to make it good, scarcely anything else would remain but to assert that the German, i.e. Roman, Empire would be restored again at some time, precisely as it was restored again by Charlemagne in 800, after the destruction of the western Roman Empire in 476, a view to which we shall yet come back again later. The referring Antichrist to the Pope, or rather to Popery, is found as early as the middle ages among those individuals and parties who came out as hostile opponents to the hierarchy; but it is especially since the Reformation that this view has been the prevailing one among the Protestants, whereas the Catholics designated Mahomet as Antichrist in earlier times, but afterwards Luther and his labours by way of retaliation. The interpretation of Antichrist of the Papacy has even passed into the confession of faith of our church. (See the articles of Smalcald, art. vi. p. 314, edit. Rechenberg.)

If we, after this, turn to the critical examination of these various opinions upon Antichrist and upon what detains him, we must by all means lay it down as an axiom that every interpretation is false which admits the apostle's representation to be exhausted in any phenomenon of the past. For, according to his express declaration, Christ's coming, and with it the resurrection of the faithful and the kingdom of God, are immediately to follow on the coming of the falling away and of Antichrist. Now as up to this time nothing of that has happened, the coming of Antichrist also can only be considered as something future. But it by no means follows from that that the references to past historical points cited are downright false; only they must not be conceived as exhausting the prophecy of St Paul, but as real types of the last great catastrophe. Thus it is, in particular, to be decidedly acknowledged that the revolt of the Jews from the Romans, and the fearful judgment of God, the destruction of Jerusalem, with which the abolition of the inde-
pendsence of the people of God and of the dispensation of the Old Testament were united, are to be conceived in this passage as a type of the Antichristian events, just as in Matt. xxiv. In St Paul's spiritual horizon the special relations of the remote future could not occur, he expected, as we saw at 1 Thess. iv. 15, ss., the advent during his life. It is, therefore, more than probable that he too, in conformity to the guidance of the prophecies of Christ Himself (Matt. xxiv.), which were, no doubt, known to him, in uttering this prophecy had particularly the impending catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem in his thoughts. That is vouched for not so much by the mention of the ναός τοῦ Θεοῦ (for it is extremely improbable that St Paul imagined Antichrist would place himself in the stone Temple upon Zion, as there was no throne in it, as, besides, no Jew entered it; further, this Temple was precisely the one to be destroyed according to Christ's prophecy), as on the other hand by the phrases τὸ νῦν κατέχον, ὁ ἄρτι κατέχων, for it cannot well be doubted that nothing else than the Roman Empire, or in the masculine form the Emperor, as representative of it, is immediately meant to be denoted by them. By means of the additions νῦν, ἄρτι, St Paul intimates the fact that the overthrow of this iron kingdom (see Dan. ii. 40, ss.) is imminent, and with the same the overthrow of all order and legality, which spread themselves among the nations through its influence. According to this, we must decidedly disapprove of one of the Roman Emperors being looked on as Antichrist, even in a typical sense only, in the interpretation of this passage; he is rather (not as an individual, in which relation he may have much that is Antichristian in him, but from his official position,) the κατέχων here. St Paul, doubtless, imagined Antichrist as proceeding from the revolted Jews, or rather from apostate Christians (as it is said also at 1 John ii. 10 ἐὰν ἡμῶν ἐξηλθοῦν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἡσαυ ἐὰν ἡμῶν), but in no case as a Gentile. Since he represents the highest height of sinful development, there must necessarily be also supposed in him the highest height of consciousness, which only admits of being attained under the influence of Christianity. It is not, therefore, by that denied that, e.g., the Emperor Nero, no regard being had to his official position, conceived purely as a person, might be a type of Antichrist; on the contrary, that is to be assumed by all means, as indeed it is also, surely, well known that Christian antiquity so considered him, and
therefore did not believe in his death, but expected his coming again (see the interpreters on Rev. xvii. 8, and the passages in Kern, loc. cit. p. 200, ss.) ; but in this passage another relation is to be made good for the Roman Empire and the Emperors, viz. the beneficent aspect in them, the strict legality, opposing all revolution and ἄρωτον, of the principle of the Roman Empire.

If we go further down in the history of the world, in like manner it is decidedly to be acknowledged that in Mahomet and his spiritually devastating activity, in the development of Popery in the course of the middle ages,¹ finally in the person of Napoleon in the present age, single traits of the Antichristian spirit show themselves; but no one will be able seriously to maintain that Mahomet or Napoleon was Antichrist, not merely because upon their appearing that did not follow which Scripture represents as following upon the revealing of Antichrist, viz., the universal falling away and the setting up of the kingdom of God, but also for the reason that they possess, it is true, some of, but not all, the traits of Antichrist. But only the combination of all the traits together consummates Antichrist in the same way as the combination of all the traits together of the picture of Christ, as the prophets had previously painted it, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, makes Him Christ. Again, if one wished to establish the view that Popery is Antichrist, one would be obliged previously to give up the doctrine of the personality of Antichrist, which has been expressly demonstrated as scriptural; he could in that case be conceived as a spiritual principle only. As, however, the principle of Popery has made itself good a whole series of centuries, it is not to be perceived how its appearing can constitute a fixed time for the beginning of the kingdom of God, in which sense St Paul here (ver. 3) treats of the revealing of Antichrist. But if one proposed to apprehend the reference to Popery so that it would be conceived as the principle out of which the personality of Antichrist was at some time to shape itself, so that some Pope or other would in the end present himself as the bodily Antichrist, it is to be considered that this would be imaginable only after preliminary annihilation of the Roman Catholic Church and, with it, of the Papacy too. For, as both are grounded on the confession of Christ as the

¹ See especially the passages collected by Peti, Comm. in Epist. ad Thess. p. 201, ss.
Son of God, Antichrist can appear in a Pope in no other way than by the removal of this foundation, because from the description in the first Epistle of St John the denial of Christ is an essential feature in his portrait.

We may, accordingly, pronounce as the result of this contemplation that the history of the world certainly presents to us personalities and tendencies, in which significant traits out of the picture of Antichrist are predominant, also groups of events, in which the analogy with the last catastrophes before the setting up of the kingdom of God is quite unmistakeable, which, to name a few, is true of the insurrection of the Jews against the Romans, as of the destruction of Jerusalem which directly followed it, and of the French Revolution of 1789, but that neither in these separate occurrences, nor in all taken together, can the deep meaning of the prophecy in this passage be looked on as exhausted. The saying (2 Thess. ii. 7) το μνημήνων ἡδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνωμλίας still holds good yet. The demoniac powers, which we see at work in the history of the world, call forth Antichristian formations now in this shape, now in that, and that too in such a way that an augmentation of evil is visibly to be observed. This manifests itself especially in the course of the French Revolution, which, in fact, presents in little an accurately corresponding type, especially in its Antichristian spirit, of the events of the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος,—a course unprecedented, comparable to no event in the history of the world. But the prophecy as such still stands fast even yet, after that event. Now it might present no especial difficulty to conceive to ourselves as possible an universal ἀτυπωσία from all the fundamentals of religion and morality, as we see before our eyes how busily the undermining of them is worked at on more than one side, and how infidelity and superstition strive for the dominion over mankind. It presents just as little difficulty to conceive that from the universally disseminated elements of unbelief and wickedness, which are daily increasing, an individual is being produced, who, as the centre of all these Satanic tendencies, combines them in himself in the highest height and strongest strength, and so, as the fruit of the whole sinful development in human nature, as the corporeal Antichrist, as the incarnate Son of Satan, steps upon the scene and seeks to hurl the Son of God on high from His throne. But it is very doubtful what the κα-
τέχνων is to be according to this interpretation of ours. True, it
might be said, this one feature in the prophecy has no meaning for
times to come, the addition of the τῶν and ἀπρα points to the fact that
it has reference to the times of the apostles only; however, I can-
not subscribe to that interpretation, partly because it seems to me
unsuitable to declare so important a feature of the picture ful-
filled, and the others not, partly because precisely the putting off
the advent of Antichrist for centuries long leads to the conclusion
of the enduring energy of the element that keeps it off. But I am
hindered from thinking on this occasion, as has been already re-
marked above, of the Roman Empire, as the fourth universal
monarchy of Daniel, in its German-Christian form, by the subse-
quent dissolution of it in 1806. The notion of a future restoration
of it, such as Maxvon Schenkendorf dreamed of, requires, however,
consideration on this ground, because the matter treated of is not
the mere restoration of the name, "Roman Empire, Roman Em-
peror," but of the thing itself. The Emperor of the middle ages
was the representative of all worldly power generally, the first
prince of Christendom. But this relation had already entirely
changed very long before 1806, and therefore the outward dissolu-
tion of the Empire is also plainly less important, because it had
very long changed its nature inwardly. But now it is by no means
to be perceived how according to the present situation of political
relations the position of the Emperor in the middle ages will ever
be able to be restored again. Daniel's fourth universal monarchy
will therefore have to be understood only of the preponderance
of the Christian world in its German-Roman constituent parts over
the terrestrial sphere, and not of the concentration of this dominion
in one individual. One might, therefore, imagine the Church.
But one cannot well understand the κατέχων of the Church and
her earthly or heavenly representatives, because it is very plain
that what Antichrist wishes to annihilate opposes him, and by that
means keeps him off; the κατέχων must be something equally dis-
tinct from the Church and Antichristianity. Besides, the change
of the gender remains inexplicable so, for St Paul cannot have set
himself up as the representative of the whole Church, and if he
meant Christ, one does not see why he does not name Him openly.
And according to that there remains then the single assumption
only for the explanation of the κατέχων, that we are to understand
by it the whole rightly-ordered political system, with which is given on the one side the continual repression of all διώδοσεια and διώπολα, and on the other the progressive calm development of Christianity. Of this system the Roman Empire, as the firmest and most regularly-organized state that history is acquainted with, is the natural type. This leads us then to the conclusion, that insurrection against the subsisting (see on Rom. xiii. 1) political arrangement is a principal lever of the Antichristian power, in order to bring the man of sin into existence, and indeed at Math. xxiv. 7 insurrections are expressly named among the influences preparing the last times. With the appearance of Antichrist, accordingly, all order equally in church and state will tumble down, and the Satanic disorder of his government will alone exercise dominion, until through Christ’s power the Lord’s everlasting kingdom of peace shall be raised on the ruins of his universal monarchy after the last sore fight. By this mode of taking the prophecy the idea of the Roman Empire is, therefore, adhered to in its inwardness, as the regulated politico-religious order of things in general, which is defined as to the state of sin as divine order. By this means, then, it becomes explicable how Rome can be represented in Revelations as the depository of the Antichristian principle without any contradiction of St Paul’s description in this passage. For a twofold element is to be distinguished in Rome and the Roman state even as in Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Firstly, the divine calling and destination, and secondly the actual realization of the same. As Jerusalem was destined for the centre of the kingdom of God, but was turned into Sodom through its unfaithfulness (Rev. xi. 8), so also Rome was intended to maintain the principle of right and order in the world, and it is on this side that St Paul here considers it, but it took up into it in its outward appearance even Antichristian elements, in that it persecuted Christ’s saints against all right, and in this point of view Rome appears in Rev. xvii. 3, 9 as the depository of the Antichristian spirit. Such apparently different conceptions, and yet both founded on the innermost nature of the circumstances, proclaim in the clearest manner that the apostles, taught by the Holy Ghost, uttered their prophecies without external concert and conference. But, if St Paul here only points to the idea of the importance of the state and its relation to the development of God’s designs in the human
race, and does not openly express it, nothing particular is on that account to be looked for in it, because he supposes the knowledge of it in his first readers (ver. 6). It is the less possible to suppose any design which could occasion him to express himself mysteriously, as by this representation so respectable a position was appointed the Roman Empire.

Ver. 8. St Paul now, in continuation of his communications as to the last times, describes Christ's victory over the hostile powers of Antichrist; when the ἀνωμος thinks he has attained to all in the possession of his universal monarchy, in which he has united all spiritual and worldly power in his own person,—Christ will annihilate him by His appearance. Isaiah prophesying of the Messiah expresses the same idea in the words: πατάξει γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεῖ ἀνεβῆ (Is. xi. 4). In the Apocalypse the appearing of Christ and His fight with Antichrist are described in such a way that ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται ῥομφαία ὀξεία, and Antichrist together with his prophet and whole party is conquered with it (Rev. xix. 15, 19, ss.). According to this, the sense of the words is that Christ merely by His word and His appearing, thus by the smallest means and the slightest trouble, will destroy the whole of the threatening power of Antichrist, which no earthly power could conquer. He, from whom powers of the Almighty issue, need only command, and the breath of His mouth (Ps. xxxiii. 6), the brightness of His appearance, suffice to annihilate all His adversaries. Πνεῦμα here has no reference to the Holy Ghost, still less are we to understand storm, burning wind, by it, but it denotes the breath of the respiration, as an expression of the word and of the will. The combination ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας, which is found here only, is, however, peculiar. That is to say, commonly ἐπιφάνεια by itself denotes the advent (so especially St Paul frequently in the Pastoral Epistles), as it in profane writers denotes divine apparitions, on account of the blinding splendour of light, the δόξα, which was thought to be conjoined with them. Here the apparent tautology is to be explained so that ἐπιφάνεια denotes the subjective, παρουσία the objective, aspect, i.e. this latter expression puts forward the actuality of Christ's appearing, that former one the contemplation of it on the part of man, the consciousness of His presence. (For ἀναλώσει A.B.D.F. read ἀνε-
SECOND THESSALONIANS ii. 9, 10.

λεί, which Lachmann has received into the text. But the more uncommon ἀναλωσὶς is no doubt to be preferred, as ἄνελεί is, surely, only a gloss from Isaiah xi. 4. The word ἀναλωσὶς occurs nowhere else in the New Testament but at Luke ix. 54. The LXX. often use it for ἡλικία or ἱμάτια. Gen. xli. 30; Numb. ix. 33.—As to καταργεῖν, so familiar in St Paul’s language, see on Luke xiii. 7, Rom. iii. 31. It, of course, denotes here not absolutely to annihilate, but to make inoperative, to deprive of influence as Antichrist; for, according to Rev. xix. 20, his condemnation in the lake of fire, not his entire annihilation, follows his subjection.

Vers. 9, 10. As to the rest, the whole of verse 9 has a parenthetical nature, for the ὅποι ἐστιν connects itself again with ver. 7. Here, now, the ἀποκάλυψις is called, by analogy with Christ’s advent, also παρουσία. It is true, the appearing of Antichrist on earth properly stands parallel to Christ’s birth in the flesh, or the Lord’s official, public, appearance at the baptism, but παρουσία is used for those also 2 Pet. i. 16, as ἐπιφάνεια is at 2 Tim. i. 10. Now Antichrist’s coming is also brought into comparison with Christ’s labours on earth, insomuch as it too makes itself known as surrounded with all the forms of wonderful action, which, however, are grounded, not, like Christ’s miracles, in truth, but in falsehood, in that they are performed, not in God’s power, but in Satan’s power. For the Apocalypse (xiii. 2) relates of Antichrist: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸ ὁ διάκον τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν θρόνων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην. As, therefore, the Father gave all power to Christ, the Son, and sets Him sit on His throne (Rev. iii. 21), so too in the imitation by the devil Satan gives all his power to Antichrist, his dear son. But, as Satan himself is a created being, although a mighty one, the wonders also which he performs by means of Antichrist can be merely mirabilia, no true miracula; they will exhibit themselves as striking occurrences exciting outward attention, but without connection with the salvation of mankind and the designs of the divine government of the world, as the miracles of Jesus and the apostles present themselves; consequently, as mere magical monstrosities. Nevertheless, they will yet be seductive enough for many a disordered, unsettled, mind, as the remarkable word of the Lord at Matth. xxiv. 24 shows, according to which, if it were possible, even the elect might be seduced into error by the wonders of the false prophets.
For the false wonders will not be done by Antichrist alone, but, as Christ imparted to His disciples also the gift to work miracles, so will also all the false prophets who accompany Antichrist execute lying wonders. In the Apocalypse the beast, which comes up out of the earth (xiii. 11), which has two horns like the Lamb, *i.e.* appears outwardly as a hypocrite, but speaks like the dragon, shows itself as a designation of the prophets of Antichrist, by means of whom men are brought to him. (See Rev. xvi. 14, xix. 20.) It is quoted (Rev. xiii. 15) as an especially characteristic wonder, that the spirit is given to an image of Antichrist, that it speaks and thus invites men to the adoration of it. As to the relation of the lying seeming wonders of Satan to the genuine divine miracles of the Lord, also as to the entrance of these phenomena into the highest developments of evil as well as of good, and their object of legitimizing the messengers of light as of darkness, and of serving for marks to recognize them for what they are, what is necessary has already been brought forward at Matt. viii. 1, in the general remarks on the miracles, and at Matt. xxiv. 24, to which we here wholly refer the reader. In like manner, the difference between the appellatives δυνάμεις, σημείον, τέρας, which terms are used likewise of the genuine miracles, has also been already spoken of at Matt. viii. 1. The genitive ψευδόνιμοι is of course to be referred to all three appellatives, for, as evil in itself is incumbered with contradiction, so too all that proceeds from it is intrinsically untrue; its seeming strength is real want of strength. In what follows (ver. 10) καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάθῃ τῆς ἁδικίας is put parallel with ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει. One may say, the wonders themselves that proceed from Antichrist and his ministers are nothing but deceit either; meanwhile they are still really astonishing extraordinary operations in nature, which only have their foundation in the application of demonic powers. From these, therefore, other forms of deception are distinguished which are not wonderful and proceed all together from the disposition of ἁδικία—have their root in it. To draw men from God and to evil is to be imagined as the aim of these deceptions, just as it is in the wonders; but this only succeeds with the ἀπολλυμένους, for God knows how to defend the ἐκλεκτοι through His grace; according to Matt. xxiv. 24 with these deception is impossible. In this idea St Paul’s theory of predestination again comes forward, but also only in the way that it was developed at Rom. ix. 1. That is to say, the ἀπολ—
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λύμενοι are not those lost through God's decree, through a decreatum reprobationis, but through their own act, because they, as it is expressed in the concluding words of ver. 10, τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέχατο. They also would, therefore, have been able to be saved through the truth in Christ, if they had appropriated it to themselves in repentance and faith, but they loved falsehood and darkness more than light, and continued, therefore, excluded from the σωτηρία. On the other hand, the elect attain to salvation not through their merit, their fidelity, their faith, their perseverance unto the end, but fidelity, faith, perseverance, are God's work in them; there is a prædestination sanctorum, but no reprobatio impiorum. (In ver. 9 the ἐν before τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου is wanting in A.D.F.G., and Lachmann has therefore cancelled it. But it is surely not to be doubted that the omission of it has its origin purely in the double ἐν preceding, by which the preposition seemed to the copyists too frequent. The common reading is to be considered as the correct one. The ἐν before διανόησι and ἀπάτη is to be taken as nota dativi, the ἐν before ἀπολλυμένουs, on the contrary, = ἐν μέσῳ, so that the lost ones form the circle in which these Satanic proceedings take place.

—Ver. 10. On ἄθροισαν, which = ὑπέρ προς, see Luke i. 20, xix. 44; Acts xii. 23.—The phrase τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας δέχασθαι is significant. The natural man has no love for truth, the stirring up the love for truth must therefore precede the reception of truth itself. Where the first advances of grace, which attempt to stir up the love of truth, are repulsed, there neither can truth itself be received afterwards.)

Vers. 11, 12. God punishes sin by means of sin, therefore it is He sends to the lost ones, who through their fault did not allow the love for truth to be stirred up in their hearts, a strong delusion, that they may believe a lie. The energy of the eis τὸ, which = ἔνα, must not, according to St Paul's meaning, be weakened here (see on Matt. xiii. 14, 15, John xii. 40); it is exactly the judgment on obduracy which is meant to be described. (See on Rom. ix. 15.) In itself every obduracy need not be contemplated as absolute, it can be relative, and can be subsequently overcome through a greater force of grace, and the obdurate one thus won for God. But here, where the latter days are spoken of, the progressivo ἔνα κριθώσι, with a reference back to διελθροσ αἰώνοις (i. 9), must be understood.
of eternal damnation, therefore κρίνεσθαι = κατακρίνεσθαι in the writer's mind, just as it is said in the parallel passage Rev. xix. 20: "all, who had received the mark of the beast and worshipped the image of the beast, were thrown into the lake of fire." Now in so far as here in this passage the ἐνέργεια πλάνης at bottom denotes Antichrist himself, who brings about his ἀπάτη in the ἐνέργεια τοῦ σατανᾶ (ver. 9), Antichrist appears by means of πέμπει as sent by God. The Lord God does not make Antichrist in so far as he is evil, but He certainly makes him so far as he makes his appearance in this form and shape, under these circumstances and relations, which is denoted in a popular mode of expression by the term "permission." But the engeretical Scripture-language expressly brings forward even as to evil the positive aspect of the divine work. (See also the remarks on Rom. ix. as to that point.) (The reading πέμπει is so well established by A.B.D.G. that it is to be preferred to the future πέμψει. St Paul gives the whole description of ver. 9 as present in prophetic wise; a copyist, to whom that did not appear suitable, has given the πέμψει, we may suppose, its first existence.—Τὸ ψεύδος does not refer to a definite single lie; it rather denotes the element of the lie, in opposition to ἡ ἀλήθεια. [See on John i. 14, viii. 44.] The μὴ πιστεύειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ is the consequence of the contempt of love for truth (ver. 10), and the εὐδοκεῖν ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ is only the other side of non-belief. The craving nature of man absolutely requires some supporting point, if it does not obtain it in truth, it turns to its contrary, falsehood, which, apprehended in its relation to the divine will, i.e. to the law, is ἀδικία. [See on Rom. iii. 21.] The ἐν before τῇ ἀδικίᾳ is wanting in B.D.F.G., however not even Lachmann has ventured decidedly to reject it; the analogy of the Hebrew בּ תְּמוּנָה seems to favour the genuineness of the ἐν.)

Vers. 13, 14. After ending this prophetic communication, St Paul now returns to his readers, and once more declares his obligation to give thanks to God (compare i. 8) that He had chosen them (his readers) unto salvation in Christ, had therefore preserved them from the ἀπώλεια of those who allow themselves to be deceived by the πλάνη of Antichrist (ver. 11). This election by God St Paul represents, after his manner, as an eternal one, which has proceeded ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, i.e. πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Ephes. i. 4), ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων (Ephes. iii. 9, 11.). That by this phrase a pre-
existence of the soul is not meant to be asserted, but only the
decree of election, as one independent of time, to be placed in God,
has already been fully proved at Ephes. i. 4. On the formula ἀδελφος
ἡγαστήρευοι cf. ibid.—Διιεύθυνται is here used as = ἐκλέγεων, see
Phil. i. 22. As to the Alexandrian form ἔλατο for ἔλετο see
Lobeck’s Phrynichus, p. 183. The reading ἀπαρχὴν for ἀπ’
ἀρχῆς has surely arisen from a misapprehension alone. As St Paul
frequently talks of the first fruits of conversion [see on Rom. xvi. 8;
1 Cor. xvi. 15] that idea was thought to be found here too.—The
concluding words alone in ver. 13 cause difficulty, partly with re-
gard to their connection with what precedes, partly with regard to
the position of the two clauses. If one considers that both ἄγιασμός
and πιστίς denote the subjective aspect, a connection with ἔλατο
seems unsuitable, and a closer definiteness of the σωτηρία appears
to be aimed at by means of the ἐν ἄγιασμοῖς κ.τ.λ. But, as sal-
sation is the ultimate aim, on the attaining of which faith passes into
contemplation and sanctification into sanctity, this connection
seems yet nowise admissible. The connection of the words with
ἔλατο can, accordingly, be only taken thus: “God has chosen
you unto salvation, in the design, or on the condition, that ye walk
in sanctification of the Spirit and in belief of the truth.” It
is understood of itself that πνεῦμα here is not the human spirit,
which is sanctified, but the divine one, which sanctifies, so that it
is parallel with the divine truth. But with regard, secondly, to the
collocation, it seems that belief in the truth of the Gospel must pre-
cede sanctification by the Holy Ghost, as the cause precedes the effect.
The interpreters pass over this difficulty, which, however, is not
a slight one. It is to be presumed St Paul understood by the πιστίς
ἀληθείας here the faith that is perfected in judgment also (see on
1 Thess. iii. 10), which presupposes sanctification, and not the en-
tirely general faith, which is given with the very first elements. In
ver. 14 the εἰς δὲ cannot be joined with what immediately precedes,
as it is usually taken, for St Paul cannot intend to say, “for that
reason, because men are to walk in sanctification and faith, God
has called them by means of the Gospel.” If St Paul had had
this connection in view, he would have said: “in order that they
may be able to walk, &c.” The εἰς δὲ ἐκάλεσε can only refer to
ἔλατο in this sense: “therefore, because God conceived the de-
cree of election from all eternity, he has also called the elect by
means of the Gospel;" thus εἰς περιπολὴν δόξης comes to stand parallel with εἰς σωτηρίαν, and forms a more accurate definition of this general expression. That is to say, the περιπολὴν δόξης (1 Thess. v. 9) defines the σωτηρία more accurately, to the purport that it is participation in the glory of Christ in the kingdom of God. (See 1 Thess. ii. 12.)

Ver. 15. St Paul now calls upon his readers for the attainment of this end not to let themselves be led astray (with reference to ii. 2), and to hold fast the doctrines which had been delivered to them. For the genuine apostolical παραδόσεις define the true nature of the Gospel, which was just now designated as the means of calling men. If the Gospel is changed (Gal. i. 6, 7) it must lose its efficacy. St Paul now mentions a double form in which the παραδόσεις have been communicated to them; by word of mouth and by writing they have been taught by him. But as he says δὴ ἐπιστολῆς there exists no reason for thinking here of any other written compositions than the first Epistle to the Thessalonians. (Κρατεῖν stands here = κατέχειν, which also occurs 1 Cor. xi. 2, in reference to the παραδόσεις. Compare Mark vii. 3, ss.).

Vers. 16, 17. As God must give the success to every good thing, St Paul prays in conclusion that He may afford to the Thessalonians also support for their life of faith, and the approving of it in word and work. But it is quite unusual that in ver. 16, in the juxtaposition of Father and Son, the name of the Father follows that of the Son, whereas it everywhere else precedes it. As to the rest, the epithets of God are chosen so that the prayer for comfort and strengthening from God is plainly justified through their purport. For in the ἀγαπής ἡμᾶς is couched, as the aorist shows, the allusion to the work of redemption, as the greatest proof of the love of God towards man. If God has established the atonement out of love, he will, surely, be also inclined to win men for it and to preserve those won by means of His Spirit. In the second epithet: δούς παράκλησιν αἰώνιαν καὶ ἑπτά δεκατὸν ἐν χάριτι God is depicted as the source of comfort in the distresses of the present, and of good hope for the future, by means of the operation of His grace. But if the παράκλησις is here called αἰώνιος, this is only to be understood in opposition to the transitory and deceitful comfort from the earth, especially as hope is named besides. Comfort in general can find no application to
eternity as the sufferings which are presupposed by the application of it cannot have any place there. (In ver. 17 ὑμᾶς is wanting in A.B.D.E.F.G., and is in concert with Lachmann and Schott to be expunged from the text. Further, the collocation ἐργαφοῦ καὶ λόγω on the authority of A.B.D.E. seems to deserve the preference over the inverted collocation.)

§ 3. CONCLUDING EXHORTATIONS.

(iii. 1—18.)

Vers. 1, 2. In conclusion St Paul then calls on the Thessalonians also to pray for him; not to the end, however, that God may strengthen him (St Paul) and keep him in the faith, but only that God may be pleased to bless his labours. St Paul supposes his own personal position in the faith as incapable of being lost, he was so conscious of his election by grace that with him a falling away was not to be thought of. Besides, it would have been against decorum if St Paul had begged his disciples to offer up supplication to God for his preservation in the faith. The apostles were completely secured against every falling away from the faith with the possession of the Holy Ghost. See on Ephes. vi. 19. "Ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου is here = εἰναγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ. But in the πρέχειν the contrast of the being bound [2 Tim. ii. 9] is couched. A reference to Ps. cxlii. 15 is certainly comprised in the term. The δοξάζεσθαι here expresses the recognition of the Gospel in its glory. Now, in order to be able there too, where he is just now, in Corinth, to labour effectually for the Gospel, as had been done among them in Thessalonica, he utters a wish to be delivered from all adversaries who hinder him. But whether these ἀτόποι καὶ πονηροὶ ἀνθρώποι (ἀτόπος is, according to Hesychius = ἐκθέσιος, αἰσχρός) are to be looked for within or without the Church depends on the meaning of the following: οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις, and on the way in which one connects those words with what precedes. As πίστις has the article here, it can only mean the Christian faith, and not, for instance, "fidelity," as one might think from the πιστὸς ὁ κύριος, which follows. But the idea "not all have the faith" is so trivial that it can find no application, especially as St Paul had
only just uttered the wish that the Gospel might spread. Accordingly, there can only be couched in the clause that all are not ready to receive the faith, that they strive against the Spirit who wishes to effectuate the faith in them, as St Paul calls them at 2 Tim. iii. 8: ἄνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τῶν νοῶν, άδόκιμοι περὶ τῆς πίστεως. Only this incapacity must not certainly be thought absolute, or even derived from a divine decree, but from personal unfaithfulness and impurity. Now, if we ask after the connection of this clause with what precedes by means of γὰρ, the idea: "that we may be delivered from wicked men, for all are not capable of faith," might mean, "that God may take them away from the earth, as there is certainly no prospect of their conversion." But, if we reflect that St Paul himself in the first Epistle to the Corinthians does not imprecate death on the incestuous man, but will only have him given over unto Satan for the saving of his soul, we must also here declare that acceptance entirely inadmissible. As long as a man is in the life of this body there is also the possibility of conversion for him. Even incapability of faith and unfitness can be removed through grace. Therefore the ρύσθαι here can be understood only of a deliverance by change of place and other circumstances, and not of death. According to this, it follows, then, that the ἄνθρωποι ἁπάτως and πονηροὶ must not be supposed members of the Church, but persons out of the Church, and, indeed, probably the Jews in Corinth, who had set so many persecutions on foot against St Paul. (See Acts xviii. 12, ss.)

Ver. 3. From himself personally St Paul turns back again directly to his readers, and utters the conviction that God would establish them and preserve them from evil. From the context not every temptation can be understood by that word, but such a one only as might proceed from the influence of such hostile persons as were described in ver. 2. No relation at all is to be supposed between the πιστός and the πίστις which precedes. God's faithfulness refers purely to the calling of the Thessalonians unto the kingdom of God, by which the decree of election is pronounced, "and this," St Paul means to say, "God will also faithfully preserve unto you by the removal of everything which can injure you in your life of faith." Considered in itself the ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ might by all means be taken as neuter; but, as St Paul acknowledges evil to be embodied in Satan, as he ex-
pressly teaches a fight of the faithful with Satan (Ephes. vi. 12), it
is more conformable to the meaning of the author to keep to the
masculine here also. As to the rest the ἀντι τοῦ ποιητῶν refers
only to φυλάξει, not to στρατικεῖει too. On the contrary, the context
is to be taken thus: "the Lord will establish you and, as being es-
blished, or after ye are established, also guard you from the evil
one." True, it might be said, the φυλάξει must then have stood first,
for what is not as yet established requires preserving from the fight,
but not what is already established. But this objection disappears
if one only understands the φυλάσσειν ἀπὸ not of the keeping en-
tirely remote from every fight but of the guarding in the fight.
The being established, therefore, precedes, in order to make fit for
the maintaining of the fight.

Vers. 4, 5. The exhortation to obedience to his commands St
Paul pronounces in the form of sure confidence in the Lord. He
therefore expects fidelity, not from the Thessalonians as such, but
from the Lord who is efficient in them. It is unsuitable here to
refer ἐν κυρίῳ to the person of St Paul himself and his fellow-
workers, with δυτεις supplied. The prayer which follows (ver. 5)
suggests the conduct adapted to realize this obedience to the
apostle’s commands, viz., the directing of their hearts to the love
of God and the patience of Christ. The combination ἀγάπη and
ὑπομονὴ does not allow us to understand the love of God merely of
universal love. It must rather be referred to the manifestation of
the love of God in Christ and His work of redemption. The ὑπο-
μονὴ Ἀριστοτοῦ is, according to that, also to be taken in a special
sense of His patient giving Himself up to death for the reconcilia-
tion of men; and the sense of ver. 5 is accordingly this: "may
God be pleased to direct your hearts to the centre from which all
the strength of the Christian proceeds, viz., to God’s love as it
manifests itself in the sufferings of Christ.

Ver. 6. After this St Paul then delivers a command, and that,
too, in his apostolical authority in the name of Christ Himself.
This communication which now follows enables us to perceive what
moral injury the errors of the Thessalonians had brought on the
church. What in 1 Thess. v. was but briefly hinted at required
now an open and very severe denunciation. On account of the
supposed proximity of the kingdom of God, working had been
given up by many, who now wandered about in fanatical idleness.
However there was yet a number of quiet persons also in Thessalonica who had not permitted themselves to be carried away. It is to be presumed these were the elders. For that reason, too, St Paul turns to them first, and calleth upon them to give up communion with the brethren that walked in a disorderly manner. (For ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου the parallel διὰ τοῦ κυρίου stands in ver. 12. In it both the command of the Lord, and His power, which knows how to operate the carrying out that command, are pointed to. Στέλλεσθαι ἀπὸ τινος, or ἀποστέλλεσθαι τίνος, denotes, like ὑποστέλλεσθαι, which has only more the subordinate idea of the clandestine [Gal. ii. 12], “to separate, draw back, one’s self from any one.” [See Eurip. Suppl. v. 598.] Ver. 14 shows more nearly how St Paul wishes to have this understood here.—Ver. 11 further elucidates the idea of the ἀπάκτως περιπατεῖν.—We have no ground for supposing other causes of the disorderly life of the Thessalonians than the errors as to the Apocalypse only; the παράδοσις which St Paul here mentions refers also merely to that. It expresses the obligation to await quietly the time and hour of the advent, without neglecting one’s earthly calling.—The discrepancy of the readings at the close of the verse is very great. The text rec. reads παρέλαβε, with a reference to ἄδελφος; the codices waver between ἐλάβοσαν, παρελάβοσαν, παρέλαβον, which last reading Lachmann has adopted on the authority of B.F.G. I should, with Griesbach, take παρελάβοσαν for the original reading; first, because the more unusual form [see Winer’s Gramm. p. 73], which, however, often occurs in the New Testament, might easily be changed into the more usual one; then, because after the allocution ἄδελφοι the second person is expected rather than the third, or at least, with reference to the brother walking disorderly, the third person singular.)

Ver. 7—10. In order to convince the Thessalonians that were gone astray of their perversity in giving up their handicrafts, St Paul sets himself forth as an example to them; with all his spiritual labours he had yet continually followed his handicraft too, and earned his own livelihood. It is true, he insists here too, that the privilege certainly belonged to him of allowing himself to be maintained by the churches, but, for the sake of the good example, he had made no use of the privilege. But now, that this was not the only motive that led St Paul to this conduct has already been re-
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marked at 1 Cor. ix. 7, 8, on which passage the Commentary is to be consulted upon the causes of this mode of proceeding of St Paul's. This point had also already (1 Thess. ii. 9) been spoken out upon by St Paul, partly in the same words. (Ver. 7. ἄτακτας is defined here by the context; it denotes: "to give up the regular earthly calling." As at that time, so even now also, on the rousing of the soul to new life happening, a contempt of external action is very apt to appear,—a tendency which he that has the cure of souls cannot counteract powerfully enough.—Ver. 8. ἐκαθαρίσεως is here "without labour," therefore without having earned one's maintenance. For the phrase ἄρτου φαγεῖν = ἁμάρτωλιν, and denotes here livelihood in general, as the ἐσθίειν in ver. 10.—As to the ἐπιβαρήσας see on 1 Thess. ii. 9.—As to εὐσκύπτων see on 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5.—Ver. 10. In the axiom: ἐὰν τίς οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθίετο an allusion to Gen. iii. 19 is couched. It is an universal law in the world, that man should eat his bread in the sweat of his face; he that has no business allotted him must therefore choose for himself a useful business.)

Vers. 11, 12. After this, what was merely intimated in ver. 6 is then more particularly set forth. Whether Timothy had brought the apostle the news of these disorders with him to Corinth, or whether he had received information elsewhere, is unknown; but the former assumption is the more probable, because a short time only seems to have elapsed between the composition of the two Epistles. (Ver. 11. The expression περιεργάζομαι is significant; it is found nowhere in the New Testament but here. Hesychius explains it by πράσσειν περισσά, to do superfluous, needless, things. It occurs so also at Sirach iii. 22. In this passage it is to be referred to the spiritual labours which were not enjoined on the Thessalonians [see on James iii. 1.] In their fanatical excitement they sought, it may be presumed, more and more to inflame themselves by a busy but unprofitable activity, others by the idea of the proximity of Christ's coming.—Ver. 12. μετὰ ἰσχύως of course only refers to the outward quiet perseverance at their handicrafts.—O ἄρτος: is bread earned by one's own labour, the livelihood which the handicraft afforded, in opposition to the allowing one's self to be be maintained by others.)

Vers. 13—15. Instead of making the rebuke of the disobedient the next topic, St Paul first introduces an exhortation to those that
had continued firm, which is obscure in its connection. Καλοποιεῖν can be taken in a perfectly general sense, like ἁγαθοποιεῖν 1 Pet. ii. 15, or it can be understood of almsgiving, of doing good in the narrower sense. But trustworthy passages are wanting to prove this latter meaning; besides it will not well suit the context, for the exhortation, not to grow weary in almsgiving, almost looks like a favouring of those lazy fanatics: But Koppe's opinion that St Paul meant to say, "they should not support the lazy indeed, but the really poor they should," clearly imports something into the passage which is not at all in it. We shall therefore be able to explain καλοποιεῖν only of doing good in general. But certainly the context requires us to refer καλοποιεῖν principally to the affectionate, indulgent, treatment of the brethren, so that ver. 15 contains a more particular elucidation of this term.—In ver. 14 the connection of the διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς is disputable; it admits of being joined with what precedes or what succeeds. The position of the τοῦτον, however, favours the former; for, if the meaning were: "denounce him by a letter," τοῦτον would stand before διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς; then too the article would have to be omitted before ἐπιστολή, as a definite epistle would be denoted by the τῆς. (But see Winer's remarks, Gramm. p. 99, note.)—As to the meaning of σημειοῦσαί one may be doubtful whether it is to denote indicare or adnotare. But in the former case ἡμῖν would scarcely be wanting, we therefore prefer the meaning "to note." However, the term is not to be understood of an outward noting or registering, but only figuratively of an inward noting in one's own mind.—The στέλλεσθαι ἀπό in ver. 6 is more closely defined by the μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι here; it denotes the breaking off church-communion (see on 1 Cor. v. 9),—more intimate intercourse, therefore excommunication, but in the lowest form. (See Winer's Encyclop. vol. i., p. 158, ss.) The aim of this punishment is meant to be humiliation, i.e. amendment, by true repentance. (See as to ἐντρέπεσθαι on 1 Cor. iv. 14; Tit. ii. 8.—"Εχθρὸς as an antithesis to ἀδελφὸς denotes no personal enemy, but God's enemy, i.e. one altogether fallen away from the faith.)

Ver. 16. A prayer for peace from the Lord of peace, who carries it complete in Himself, and can, therefore, impart it to others too in every relation for the interior and exterior, then closes the Epistle. (Lachmann has, after A.D.F.G., put τόπῳ in the text
for τρόπῳ. But, as the Epistle is addressed merely to Thessalonica, this reading seems quite inadmissible; it might according to Schott’s probable conjecture have crept in here from other passages, as 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8.)

Vers. 17, 18. St Paul usually dictated his Epistles; Timothy seems to have written these two. (See 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.) But, to meet such abuses as were touched on at 2 Thess. ii. 2, St Paul added a salutation with his own hand, as a mark of his genuine Epistles. It might only strike us that St Paul promises this mark ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ, whereas it is found in some only; however, what was needful as to this circumstance has already been mentioned in the Introd. to these two Epistles, § 2.

FINIS.